European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

Working conditions and gender in an enlarged Europe

Working conditions and gender in an enlarged Europe

Authors: Anna Pollert, Working Lives Research Institute, London Metropolitan University
Eva Fodor, Department of Gender Studies, Central European University, Budapest

National report authors: Lilia Dimova (Bulgaria), Marie Čermáková, Alena Křížková (Czech Republic), Krista Loogma (Estonia), Éva Berde, Judit Nosztrai (Hungary), Brigita Zepa, Liene Jeruma (Latvia), Vida Kanopiene (Lithuania), Wieslawa Kozek, Anna Kwiatkowska (Poland), Liliana Voicu, Speranţa Pîrciog, Radu Necşuliu (Romania), Ludovít Czíria, Margita Barosová, Anna Reinerová (Slovakia), Aleksandra Kanjuo Mrčela, Nevenka Černigoj Sadar (Slovenia).

Foundation project: Working conditions in the central and eastern European countries
Research manager: Sabrina Tesoka

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

Working conditions and gender in an enlarged Europe

Wyattville Road, Loughlinstown, Dublin 18, Ireland - Tel: (+353 1) 204 31 00 - Fax: (+353 1) 282 42 09 / 282 64 56
email: postmaster@eurofound.eu.int - website: www.eurofound.eu.int

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2005

ISBN 92-897-0907-3

The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions is an autonomous body of the European Union, created to assist in the formulation of future policy on social and work-related matters. Further information can be found on the Foundation website at www.eurofound.eu.int

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions
Wyattville Road
Loughlinstown
Dublin 18
Ireland
Telephone: (+353 1) 204 31 00
Fax: (+353 1) 282 42 09 / 282 64 56
Email: postmaster@eurofound.eu.int
www.eurofound.eu.int

Printed in Denmark

The paper used in this book is chlorine-free and comes from managed forests in Northern Europe.
For every tree felled, at least one new tree is planted.

Foreword

Significant socio-economic transition in central and eastern European countries in recent decades has impacted significantly on the working conditions and quality of life for both women and men. With the enlargement of the European Union in 2004 which embraced eight of these formerly communist countries and with Bulgaria and Romania preparing to join the EU in the coming years, these changes are also set to have implications for policymakers in the new enlarged European Union. As a result, there is a very real need for a comprehensive overview of the situation in this domain.

On the basis of national reports and Foundation survey analysis, this report, *Working conditions and gender in an enlarged Europe* presents a comparative study of working conditions for women in these 10 central and eastern European countries (CEECs). The evidence shows that, broadly, the situation of women in these countries today is similar to that in western Europe in terms of gender segregation. However, some interesting differences emerge, such as the rapid increase in private service sector employment for men in all CEECs – a far greater increase than for women.

As for the pay gap, few countries have improved on their early 1990s position, which appears to suggest that the last decade of a market economy has done little for women's progress towards equal pay.

As this important debate continues across Europe, we trust this report will offer a useful perspective on working conditions and gender in an enlarged Europe.

Willy Buschak
Acting Director

Contents

Foreword	**v**
Introduction	**1**
1 – Demographic, economic, and employment trends	**3**
2 – Gender segregation	**13**
3 – Gender inequality in the labour market	**31**
4 – Working and raising a family	**39**
5 – Gender equality policies	**43**
6 – Gender and employment: industrial relations context	**51**
7 – Conclusions	**57**
Bibliography	**61**
Appendix	**63**

Introduction

Working conditions and gender in an enlarged Europe presents a comparative study of working conditions for women in 10 central eastern European countries (CEECs). Some eight of these countries (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia) are among the 10 new Member States (NMS) of the European Union, while Bulgaria and Romania are two candidate countries in the process of joining.

This report aims to evaluate the Foundation's 2001 working conditions survey in the acceding and candidate countries (Foundation, 2003), as well as providing original analysis of data gathered by 10 national research teams. The resulting national reports provide a wealth of material analysing key dimensions of the labour market and work situation for women during a period of economic transition. This report puts these findings in context, and synthesises and analyses them at a comparative level, in addition to examining the Foundation's survey in greater depth.

By its nature, such a wide harvest of information means that not all the material in the national reports can be included, partly because of length, and partly because of comparability issues. This report has been made possible by the increasing harmonisation of statistical data to EU criteria. However, there is still a lot of variation so the different sources are explained here and, in greater detail, in the national reports. To reflect the rapid changes in information and statistical gathering, each national report provides a detailed statistical literature review, explaining dates of harmonisation with Eurostat and Labour Force Surveys, and indicating other information sources on income, household, and policy developments relevant to employment and gender.

The national reports follow a standard presentation, so that chapter headings and tables can be compared. Some reports provide further elaboration, such as figures, or a descriptive or explanatory narrative, depending on access to wider sources, but these are contained within the overall framework. This comparative report uses a broadly similar presentation to the national reports, although its purpose necessitates a slightly different structure.

The report's purpose is threefold: to bring together the findings of the national reports; to explore in greater detail the Foundation data in terms of comparison between its 2001 survey of the acceding and candidate countries and 2000 survey of the EU15; and to use the national reports to evaluate the Foundation findings. In addition to the national reports, other data and literature are drawn upon to check or extend analysis.

A particular feature of this study, and one considered essential for transition analysis, is its historical dimension. The aim of the national reports and this consolidated one is to provide not only up-to-date information on the situation of the NMS and candidate countries in order to evaluate convergence towards the EU, but to explore the trajectory of change. Of course, because of problems of reliability as well as non-comparability of earlier data, it is not possible to provide a strict time-series. Statistics according to gender are either unavailable or different before 1989 ('pre-transition') and, even for the early 1990s, are problematic in many countries. Thus, there are major reservations about this historical attempt. Nevertheless, there is sufficient material to demonstrate the direction and shape of change from the period of transition to maturing market economies. These changes in the economies, employment structures and gender distribution patterns are presented in tables within the body of the report, and in more detail in the Appendix.

Chapter 1 addresses broad demographic, economic, and labour market trends, including population, gross domestic product (GDP), and employment, activity and unemployment rates by gender. These figures are vital to demonstrate similarities and contrasts in economic contexts, and to set the background to a gender analysis of labour market participation rate changes, employment and unemployment. A particularly important element is the inclusion of the United Nations Gender Development Index, which shows women's comparative advantage in many areas of social development during the communist period, and how this changed.

Chapter 2 explores gender segregation, presenting historical trends. Some countries were able to obtain figures for pre-transition (1985) and, although they are based on Soviet enterprise-level data rather than labour force survey data, they are included as rough benchmarks for the past. For the most part, 1990, 1995 and 2001 are compared as benchmarks. The analysis begins with economic and sectoral restructuring in order to frame the subsequent study of horizontal gender segregation within overall changing employment patterns. This includes both the changing composition of men's and women's employment and the changing distribution of men and women across sectors. Standard NACE categories (Nomenclature générale des activitées économiques) are available from 1990 for some countries, and for others only from 1995. Evidence of sectoral segregation in the central and eastern European countries is also compared with findings from the Foundation's third survey of the EU15 in 2000 (Fagan and Burchell, 2002).

Occupational and vertical gender segregation is then explored using the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88), followed by a brief overview of women's employment by education level. This subject is studied in greater detail in the national reports but, because of the differences in educational categories, reviewed only in broad terms here. Chapter 2 concludes with the key issue of the gender pay gap, and discusses this in comparison with the Foundation's study of the income gap.

Chapter 3 focuses on Foundation findings on women's labour market situation in the east European region compared with that of women in the EU15 countries. It draws on data from the Foundation surveys in 2000 (EU15) and 2001 (acceding and candidate countries) to explore differences between the groups, and also to set against the national findings. In general, the Foundation survey is compared with national LFS data. The dimensions of east–west gender differences examined here are employment status, gender segregation by occupation and sector, and management authority structures. Other characteristics of work are also considered. This section concludes by evaluating the reliability and validity of the Foundation findings on the central and eastern European countries.

Chapter 4 looks at the issues of family benefits and childcare, using both Foundation and national data.

Chapter 5 looks to the future in terms of national gender equality policies, including active labour market programmes, policies and legislation relating to equal opportunities, monitoring and enforcement institutions, and industrial relations.

The conclusions draw lessons from this study, and outline possibilities for change.

1 Demographic, economic, and employment trends

Demographic background

The 10 central and eastern European countries (CEECs) included in this report vary widely in terms of population size, ranging from large (Poland: 38.6 million, Romania: 22.4 million), to medium (Hungary and the Czech Republic: 10.2 million each) and small (Slovenia: 1.9 million, Estonia: 1.3 million) (2001 figures, Table A1 – in the appendix). In all countries, there are more women than men, and population is declining in most, by as much as one million between 1985 and 2001 in Bulgaria, to just tens of thousands in others. Only Poland and Slovakia show an increase, but this took place between 1985 and 1990; since then, the figures have remained static. The percentage of the working age population (15–64) varies between just 62.9% (Slovakia) to 70% in the Czech Republic and Slovenia, showing an increase on 1985 levels in most, although not in all (details, Table A1).[1]

Falling populations reflect the decline in birth rates, the greatest being in Poland and Slovakia. Average life expectancy for both men and women in the CEECs remains below the 'High human development' level of over 75 years in the advanced capitalist world, except in Slovenia and the Czech Republic (75.9 and 75.1). Male life expectancy remains in the mid-60s, and female, in the mid-70s, whereas in most of western Europe it is in the mid-70s for men, and around 80 for women (UNDP, 2001, 2003, Human Development and Gender Development Indexes) – see Table 1.[2]

Table 1 Annual birth rate and life expectancy CEECs, male and female, 1985–2001

	1985			1990			1995			2001		
	Birth rate	Life expectancy		Birth rate	Life expectancy		Birth rate	Life expectancy		Birth rate	Life expectancy	
		M	F		M	F		M	F		M	F
BG	13.3	68.2	74.5	12.1	68.1	73.6	8.6	67.1	74.9	8.6	68.5	75.2
CZ	12.8	67.8	75.0	12.6	67.6	75.4	9.3	69.9	76.9	8.9	72.1	78.4
EE		65.7	74.4		64.6	74.6		61.7	74.3		64.7	76.2
HU	12.3	65.1	73.1	12.1	65.1	73.7	10.8	65.3	74.5	9.5	68.2	76.5
LV	15.4	65.5	74.5	14.2	64.2	74.6	8.7	60.8	73.1	8.3	65.2	76.6
LT	16.5	65.5	75.4	15.4	66.6	76.2	11.4	63.6	75.2	9.1	65.9	77.4
PL	18.2	66.9	75.3	14.3	66.5	75.5	11.2	67.6	76.4	9.5	70.2	78.4
RO	15.8	66.5	72.6	13.6	66.6	72.7	10.4	67.3	73.4	9.8	67.0	74.2
SK*	19.1	66.8	74.2	15.1	66.6	75.4	11.4	68.4	76.3	9.5	69.5	77.6
SI	13.1	67.5	75.1	11.2	69.4	77.2	9.5	70.3	77.8	8.8	72.1	79.6

Source: national reports. Birth rate: live births per 1,000 population. *1980 instead of 1985

Life expectancy declined from 1985 until 1995 for men in Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, reflecting the economic and social crisis of the early transition years, although by 2001, it had recovered – but only to pre-transition levels. Women's life expectancy, on the other hand, remained stable and had increased by 2001.

1 15–65 years is the LFS definition. Differences and changes in men and women's retirement ages complicate the definition and calculation of working-age populations in the CEECs, and are discussed in the national reports.

2 CEEC abbreviations as in Eurostat (2002): BG Bulgaria; CZ Czech Republic; EE Estonia; HU Hungary; LT Lithuania; LV Latvia; PL Poland; RO Romania; SI Slovenia; SK Slovakia.

Economic and social background

The welfare of men and women in any economy is crucially influenced by a country's gross domestic product (GDP). During the early stage of transition, all countries were affected by recession. For the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia, the timing and causes of these crises are discussed in detail elsewhere (Pollert, 1999) as well as in the national reports. The Baltic states suffered banking crises in the late 1990s and were affected by the Russian financial crisis of 1999, while Romanian GDP growth was negative from 1996 to 2000. However, since then, most countries have seen a recovery, although Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Romania had still not returned to their 1989 levels in 2002, despite positive growth in 2000 (Table 2).

Table 2 Real GDP/NMP* in 10 CEECs, 1980–2002 (Index 1989=100); and post-transition annual GDP growth rates, % change on previous year, 1993, 1995, 1997, 2000

	GDP 1989 index= 100						GDP annual growth rate			
	1980	1989	1990	1995	2001	2002	1993	1995	1997	2000
B	76	100	90.9	79.7	79.5	82.91	–1.5	2.9	–7.0	5.8
CZ	n.a.	100	98.8	94.1	103.3	105.8	0.1	5.9	–1.0	3.1
EE	74.5	100	91.9	66.4	88.6	93.6	–9.0	4.3	10.6	6.4
HU	86.3	100	96.5	85.6	108.2	111.7	–0.6	1.5	4.6	5.2
LV	68.5	100	102.9	54.7	76.2	80.6	–14.9	–0.8	8.6	6.6
LT	64.7	100	96.7	56.1	70.0	74.1	–16.2	3.3	7.3	3.3
PL	91.1	100	88.4	98.6	128.0	129.6	3.8	7.0	6.8	4.0
RO	88.5	100	94.4	84.8	83.5	87.4	1.5	7.1	–6.1	1.6
SK	n.a.	100	97.5	84.1	104.2	108.7	–3.7	6.7	6.2	2.2
SI	98.9	100	91.9	89.3	113.6	117.3	2.8	4.1	4.6	4.6

GDP Index 1989=100 *Net Material Product

Source: For GDP figures: United National, Economic Survey of Europe, 2003, No. 1, Appendix, Table B.1 (Data for eastern Europe based on GDP measure and countries of former Soviet Union, Net Material Product, NMP, data for 1980-1990 chain linked to GDP from 1990).

For GDP growth rate: Eurostat, Statistics in focus, Theme 2 – 18/2001 'The GDP of the Candidate Countries'.

The most widely used measure of economic prosperity is GDP per head, and this is shown in Table 3 (below) both in terms of US dollar purchasing power parity (PPP), and in Purchasing Power Standards (PPS), an artificial currency which makes allowances for varying price levels in different countries.

These figures clearly show a wide disparity in per capita GDP, with Bulgaria at only 24% of the EU15 average, while Slovenia has 71.5%. The Czech Republic comes closest to Slovenia at 59%, followed by Hungary, Slovakia and Poland.

However, per capital GDP does not show all aspects of standard of living and is not sufficiently revealing for the position of women in society. A number of studies of gender and post-communist transformation have therefore turned to the United Nations Human Development Index (HDI) and Gender Development Index (GDI) (UNICEF, 1999).[3] From the time the GDI was first calculated in 1991, it became evident that the CEECs ranked high internationally in gender equality, and 10–15 places higher than their HDI. An alternative index, the Relative Status of Women, which avoids conflating absolute human development with gender equality, as does the GDI, places post-communist countries even higher, outstripping advanced Nordic countries. Based on these calculations, using UN Development Programme sources for 1995/96, Estonia came first, followed by Latvia, the Russian Federation, Lithuania, Slovakia, Finland, Poland, Hungary and Sweden (Dijkstra and Hanmer, 2000, p.69). Table 4 shows where the eastern European countries rank internationally on the HDI and GDI indexes between 1990 and 2001.

Table 3 GDP per capita in Purchasing Power Parity US$ (PPP) and in Purchasing Power Standard (PPS), and compared with EU15 per capita average

	GDP per capita (PPP US$) 1995	GDP per capita (PPP US$) 2001		GDP per capita in PPS 1996	GDP per capita in PPS 2000	CEEC GDP as % EU15
B	4,604	6,890		4,600	5,400	24.0
CZ	9,775	14,720		12,000	13,200	58.6
EE	4,062	10,170		6,100	8,400	37.3
HU	6,793	12,340		8,600	11,700	52.0
LV	3,273	7,730		4,700	6,600	29.3
LT	3,843	8,470		5,300	6,600	29.3
PL	5,442	9,450		6,600	8,700	38.6
RO	4,431	5,830		6,100	6,000	26.6
SK	7,320	11,960		8,500	10,800	48.0
SI	10,594	17,130		12,200	16,100	71.5
EU15	n.a.	n.a.		18,500	22,500	100

Source: For PPP US$, United Nations Human Development Reports 1998, 2003.
For PPS, Eurostat, Statistics in focus, Theme 2 – 18/2001 'The GDP of the Candidate Countries'.

Table 4 shows a consistently higher GDI ranking than HDI until 1995, which indicates that women's general development index was better than the overall human development index. The significance of the high GDI of the CEECs is discussed more fully in Pollert (2003). Key factors contributing to it were women's high educational levels, state support for childcare and working mothers, and women's high labour force participation rate during the communist period. The

[3] The HDI was created in 1990 to give a measure of the well-being of the nation beyond GDP, and included social welfare. It uses life expectancy at birth (representing a long and healthy life); a composite indicator for educational attainment (the adult literacy rate and educational enrolment) representing knowledge; and real per capita income (based on GDP and more recently, US$ purchasing power parity), representing standard of living. In the UN Development Programme 1991, separate HDIs were calculated for men and women based on life expectancy, adult literacy, wage rates, employment levels and mean years of schooling. An overall gender-sensitive HDI was developed for 30 countries. The GDI was introduced for all countries in 1995. The greater the inequality, the lower the GDI value. Another measure representing gender equality in the area of political power is the Gender Empowerment Measure (UN Development Programme 1995).

figures show that, with the development towards capitalism, the GDI rank has dropped while HDI has started to recover. Those countries which have developed furthest towards market economies and are now EU Member States, such as the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, show similar ranks for HDI and GDI – the typical pattern for advanced western economies.

Table 4 Human Development Index (HDI) and Gender Development Index (GDI) – World Rank Order of CEECs, 1990–2001

	1990 HDI Rank	1990 GDI Rank	1992 HDI Rank	1992 GDI Rank	1995 HDI Rank	1995 GDI Rank	2001 HDI Rank	2001 GDI Rank
SI	n.a	n.a.	n.a.	n.a	37	24	29	29
CZ	27	8	38	15	39	25	32	32
SK	27	n.a.	40	16	42	26	39	39
HU	30	n.a.	50	23	47	34	38	36
PO	41	n.a.	51	22	52	35	35	35
B	33	n.a.	65	n.a	67	47	57	51
RO	58	n.a.	98	n.a	74	57	72	57
EE	n.a.	n.a.	43	21	77	59	41	38
LT	n.a.	n.a.	71	n.a	79	62	45	42
LV	n.a.	n.a.	48	24	92	71	50	47

Source: 1990 data, UNDP, 1991; 1992 data, UNDP, 1995; 1995 data, UNDP, 1998; 2001 data, UNDP, 2003

However, the countries with lower human development ranks still show the legacy of women's relative advantage – their GDI rank remains several points above their HDI. Romania, for example, ranks fifty-seventh in GDI, but a much lower seventy-second out of a hundred in HDI. It seems that the less advanced in capitalist development terms, the stronger the gender-progressive communist legacy. While there is a vast literature on the limitations of these advances for women during the communist era, there is also established evidence on the deterioration since transition (e.g. Einhorn, 1993). The gender equality legacy is essential to making sense of the trends explored here.

Labour market trends

Labour force participation, employment and activity rates

A feature of communist development was the early integration of women into the labour force. Whereas in OECD countries, women's share of the labour force only reached between 35% and 45% as recently as the mid-1980s, these levels had been already reached by the late 1960s in the CEECs. Women still represent a high share of over 45% in these countries, although in some, such as the Czech Republic, it has declined slightly (Table 5).

Female labour force activity rates were very high in 1989, ranging between 70% and 90% of working-age women (15 to 55 years), similar to the Swedish level, but much higher than the 50% European average (UNICEF, 1999, p.24). However, since capitalist transformation, women's activity rates have dropped, although with substantial variation between countries and periods of change (Table 6 and Table A2). Lithuania had a 75% female activity rate in 1995, but by 2001 it had dropped to 66%. The largest drop was in Hungary, from 76% to 50% between 1990 and 1995, with only slight recovery to 52% in 2001. The male activity decline from 84% to 68% was also significant.

Table 5 Gender composition as % of labour force (employed + unemployed), 1985–2001

	1985		1990		1995		2001	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
BG	51.9	48.4	n.a	n.a	52.9	47.1	52.7	47.3
CZ	53.6	46.4	55.8	44.2	55.8	44.2	55.7	44.3
EE	n.a	n.a	51.6	48.4	52.2	47.8	51.2	48.8
HU	54.2	45.8	55.3	47.5	56.4	43.6	55.4	44.5
LT*	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	49.9	51.1	51.3	48.7
LV*	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	52.4	47.6	51.4	48.8
PL	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	54.1	45.0	53.7	46.3
RO	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	53.7	46.3	53.5	46.5
SI**	54.7	45.3	53.5	46.5	53.8	46.2	54.2	45.8
SK	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	55.3	4.7	54.7	45.3

Source: national reports. Figures for 1995 and 2001, LFS. Basis and calculations for pre-1995 are provided in national reports.

*Figures for Latvia and Lithuania 1996, not 1995.

**Slovenia, figures for percentage of labour force from Statistical Year Book of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia, 1986 and 1991, collected from monthly surveys of workers.

The disappearance of women from the Hungarian labour force (employed and unemployed) is the chief factor explaining the seeming paradox of higher unemployment rates for men than for women in Hungary. This is the opposite of the pattern in the rest of the CEECs for most of the period under review, except for reversals since 2000. In Hungary, many women became invisible in labour market statistics, even if they were working informally. However, elsewhere too, decline in female activity is a key issue in the post-communist transformation more generally, arguably of equal importance to the problem of gender inequalities in working conditions among those still in employment.

All countries experienced massive declines in employment rates with the recessions of capitalist restructuring after 1990. Apart from Hungary and Slovenia, employment rates were still slightly lower in 2001 than in 1995, although most were close to the EU15 rate of about 60% (Table A2, see also Eurostat, 2002, p.15).[4] The highest employment rates in 2001 were in the Czech Republic, Estonia and Romania, although the latter estimate needs to be treated with caution, because of the large proportion of agriculture (from twice to as much as nine times that in the other CEECs), and the amount of work taking place on the border-line between subsistence and economic activity. Eurostat (2002, p. 14) explains that it is difficult to give accurate figures for those employed in agricultural small-holdings, because some declare themselves as employed while others do not think their work counts as economic activity.

The change in employment rates has differed by gender across countries. Between 1990 and 1995 (data are available only for some countries), employment decline was the same for men and women in Hungary (22.7 percentage points, falling to 60% and 45.9% respectively), greater for

[4] There are some discrepancies between the statistics in the national reports and in the Eurostat national time series, e.g. the Eurostat employment rate for Slovenia in 2001 is 63.6% but, in the national report, it is 54.4%. The explanation may lie in definitions of working-age limits.

women in Bulgaria, but slightly less in Estonia, while in Slovenia it increased by a small amount for both men and women (Table 6). Between 1995 and 2001, it increased slightly for both men and women in Hungary, while in Latvia, it marginally decreased for men but increased for women. In Slovenia, a net zero change conceals a slight increase for men and a decrease for women. In other countries, the employment rate decreased for all in this period, but more so for men than for women. It should be noted that this was from a female employment rate which was already lower than that for men (Table A2).

Table 6 Changes in total, male and female employment and activity rates, 1990–1995, 1995–2001

	1990–1995						1995–2001					
	Change in employment rate			Change in activity rate			Change in employment rate			Change in activity rate		
	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F
BG	-9.1	-6.4	-11.9	-1.1	n.a.	n.a.	-2.7	-3.9	-1.7	-2.4	-2.9	-1.8
CZ	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	+1.4	n.a.	n.a.	-1.5	-2.1	-1.0	+2.3	+1.5	+2.4
EE	-11.9	-12.3	-11.4	-5.3	-4.4	-6.1	-4-4	-5.7	-3.2	-2.5	-4.1	-0.9
HU	-22.8	-22.7	-22.7	-21.2	-15.9	-25.6	+2.5	+2.4	+2.6	+1.2	+0.1	+2.1
LT	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-7.3	-9.3	-5.5	-8.1	-7.4	-8.6
LV	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	+1.8	-0.1	+3.5	-3.8	-5.9	-1.7
PL	n.a.	na.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-5.2	-6.0	4.7	-2.6	3.1	-2.3
RO	+2.2	n.a.	n.a.	+8.5	n.a.	n.a.	-9.1	-10.0	-8.2	-0.5	+1.8	-1.2
SI	+2.0	+2.5	+1.5	+10.2	+8.5	+11.3	0.0	+0.2	-0.3	-0.2	-0.8	+0.3
SK	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-3.3.	-5.6	-1.1	+1.0	+0.4	+1.6

Source: national reports

Unemployment

With this background of changes in activity rates, it is important to consider not only unemployment rates, but also whether men and women's representation among unemployed people is proportionate to their representation among those who are employed. Table 7 shows that, in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and Slovakia, women were over-represented in the unemployed group, compared with their proportion in the employed group. This pattern is similar to that in the EU15 in 2001, where women formed 42.8% of total employment, but 50.6% of unemployment (calculated from European Commission, 2002, p.173).

In Estonia, Hungary, Latvia and Slovenia, men were over-represented among the unemployed compared with their presence among the employed, although the Hungarian case must be seen in the context of the exceptionally large drop in female activity rate during this period. In some countries, this pattern changed in 2001, but needs to be interpreted with caution. For example, in Romania, women amounted to 41.9% of the unemployed and 46.6% of the employed, but their activity rate had declined by 1.2% while men's had increased by 1.8%. As argued above, the size of the informal sector in Romania makes it difficult to assess unemployment. Slovenia shows a change since 1995, from women being under-represented to becoming over-represented among the unemployed, suggesting that they were experiencing similar problems to women in those countries showing a disproportionately high share of women among the unemployed.

Table 7 Men and women as % of total employed and total unemployed (LFS definition) (2nd quarter), 1995, 2001

	1995				2001			
	% of employed		% of unemployed		% of employed		% of unemployed	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
BG	52.8	47.2	51.9	48.1	52.0	48.0	55.1	49.9
CZ	55.4	44.5	46.9	53.1	56.6	43.4	46.3	53.7
EE	51.7	48.3	56.2	43.6	51.2	48.8	52.7	47.3
HU	55.7	44.3	64.3	35.7	55.3	44.7	61.7	38.3
LT	50.8	49.2	48.9	51.1	49.7	50.3	59.4	40.5
LV	52.1	47.9	53.7	46.3	50.6	49.4	56.6	43.4
PL	54.7	45.3	44.9	55.1	54.6	45.4	49.5	50.5
RO	54.0	46.0	50.4	49.6	53.4	46.6	58.1	41.9
SI	53.6	46.4	56.2	43.8	54.4	45.6	51.1	48.9
SK	55.6	44.4	46.6	53.4	53.8	46.2	43.8	56.2

Source: national reports

Turning to the unemployment rates themselves, figures were available for the key dates only for 1995 and 2001. The unemployment rate for the CEECs has been rising since 1995 (and from 1990, where figures are available) whereas, in the EU15, it had decreased to 7.4% by 2001 (Eurostat, 2002, p.16; European Commission, 2002, p.173). In Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland and Slovakia, it rose significantly from 1995 levels (Table 8), although since 2000, it started to decrease again in the Czech Republic, Estonia and Latvia. Only in Hungary and Slovenia has the unemployment rate been decreasing since 1995. In 2001, rates were lowest in Slovenia, Romania, Hungary and the Czech Republic, ranging between 5.6% and 8% (Table 8).

Table 8 Unemployment rates: total, male and female (%), 1990–2001 (LFS, 2nd quarter).

	1990			1995			2001		
	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F
BG	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	15.7	15.5	15.8	19.4	20.2	18.4
CZ	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	4.0	3.4	4.8	8.0	6.6	9.9
EE	6.7	6.6	6.8	9.8	10.5	8.9	12.8	13.2	12.3
HU	2.4	2.6	2.1	10.1	11.4	8.3	5.6	6.3	4.9
LT*	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	16.4	15.9	16.9	17.0	19.7	14.2
LV*	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	20.5	21.0	20.0	13.3	14.7	11.9
PL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	12.6	11.5	14.0	18.4	17.0	20.0
RO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	8.0	7.6	8.6	6.6	7.1	5.9
SI**	9.1	9.9	8.3	7.4	7.7	7.0	5.9	5.6	6.3
SK	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	13.3	12.8	13.8	19.2	19.7	18.6
All	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	11.7	11.7	11.8	12.6	13.0	12.2

Source: national reports. Note: *Latvia and Lithuania, figures are 1996, not 1995; **Slovenia, figures closest to 1990 are 1993.

Romania's relatively low unemployment rate must be set in the context of agriculture as a refuge for the unemployed with a large number of informal jobs, while Hungary's low unemployment must be set against a low activity rate of 60%, compared with close to 70% in other low unemployment CEECs. Unemployment rates in other countries were high or very high, ranging from 12.8% in Estonia to over 19% in Bulgaria and Slovakia.

There are variations between countries in terms of different unemployment rates for men and women. In the Czech Republic, unemployment is higher among women and the gender gap has grown between 1995 and 2001. It is also higher in Poland, reaching 20% in 2001 (men 17%), and in Slovenia (women 6.3%, men 5.6%), whereas in 1995 the rates had been about the same.

Higher female unemployment than male is a feature of the EU15: in 2001, it was 8.7% for women and 6.4% for men (European Commission, 2002, p.173). In some east European countries, the opposite occurred: in Bulgaria and Lithuania, female unemployment was higher than for men in 1995. However, it is now lower. As Table A2 shows, female activity rates also decreased in these countries between these dates, particularly in Lithuania, where it was 74% in 1995, and only 54.9% in 2001. These labour market changes must be set in the context of the differing sectoral and economic structures in these countries, and how they have been changing.

Employment and sectoral change

The CEECs have very varied sectoral structures. In 2001, agriculture represented 41% of employment in Romania, 29% in Poland and 17% in Lithuania, but only between 4% and 6% in the Czech and Slovak Republics, Estonia and Hungary (Table 9). In all the CEECs, apart from Poland and Romania, the agricultural sector has declined since transition. In some countries, this has been dramatic: in Estonia, from 18% of employment in 1990, to 6.5% in 2001; in the Czech Republic from 11.7% to 4.0%; in Hungary from 11.3% to 6.2%, and in Lithuania from 23.7% in 1995 to 17% in 2001. Slovenia, with about 10%, shows no major change. Of course, there is major variation within the EU15 too, but the average in 2001 was only 4.2% of employment.

Employment in industry also declined in all countries between 1990 and 2001 by varying degrees. The amounts appear to vary depending on the data source. According to Eurostat, (2002, p.20), the general decline appears to be around 5%, although in Romania it is 15%. The national report data present greater variation: the largest decline, of 16.7%, was recorded in Estonia, followed by 13.4% for Romania. Lithuania, Poland and Slovakia experienced declines of 8.0%, while the Czech Republic and Slovenia dropped by 6.5%. Hungarian industrial employment shrank by only 2.5% over the decade. Nevertheless, industry still employs between 20% and 33% of employees in these countries (26.4% in the EU15, European Commission, 2002, p. 173).

The transition to market economies has brought major expansion of employment in the service sector. When private and public sector services are added, the total in some countries begins to come close to the EU15 figure of 69.4% for services as a share of employment (European Commission, 2002, p.173), although Romania and Poland are still significantly lower. While private service employment has expanded everywhere, the public sector has not, which is hardly surprising in view of the importance of privatisation in the transition process. In Hungary, Latvia and Romania, public sector employment declined between 1995 and 2001. The next chapter will consider the implications of economic restructuring for women's work, in terms of employment share in changing sectors.

Table 9 Employment by sector (% of total), 1990–2001

	1990				1995				2001			
	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector
BG	n.a	n.a	n.a	n/a	12.4	30.3	27.8	24.1	9.7	27.8	32.8	24.7
CZ	11.7	37.8	26.0	16.7	6.2	32.4	34.2	17.9	4.0	31.7	37.1	19.2
EE	18.0	28.8	22.3	19.4	9.6	28.6	31.3	24.0	6.5	26.2	34.6	25.4
HU	11.3	29.7	28.2	25.5	8.0	26.7	30.1	29.3	6.2	27.2	33.7	25.9
LT	19.5	28.8	20.4	22.1	23.7	21.2	23.3	24.7	17.0	20.7	28.3	27.1
LV	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	16.0	22.0	28.1	27.7	13.9	19.7	32.3	26.5
PL	28.4	28.0	n.a	n.a	27.7	24.7	24.8	17.2	29.2	20.2	27.5	18.0
RO	29.0	36.9	17.7	9.9	40.2	26.7	14.8	13.8	40.8	23.5	19.1	12.6
SI	10.7	38.7	25.3	19.3	10.4	38.1	27.3	18.9	9.8	32.2	30.0	20.8
SK	11.7	37.8	26.0	16.7	9.2	30.4	26.8	25.0	6.1	29.6	29.7	26.2

Source: national reports, Labour Force Surveys or earlier data (details of sources in 'Changing structure of economy' tables, national reports.

Notes: Bulgaria: for 1995, uses 1997. Hungary: for 1990, uses 1992; Lithuania: for 1990, uses 1992 when NACE first used. Latvia: for 1995, uses 1996. Slovenia: for 1990, uses 1993. In 1990, the Czech and Slovak Republics were both in the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic, hence same figures.

Subtotals: Agriculture: NACE 1. In some countries includes fishing, NACE 2, please see national reports); Industry: NACE 3,4,5 (Mining, Manufacturing, Electricity, Gas, Water);

Services: NACE 7 Wholesale and retail trade; 8 Hotels and restaurants; 9 Transport, storage and communication; 10 Financial intermediation; 11 Real estate, renting and business;

Public sector: NACE 12 Public administration, defence, compulsory social security; 13 Education; 14 Health and social work; 15 Other community and social and personal service activities.

Note: The totals do not add up to 100% because Construction is a sector on its own which does not easily fit into the aggregate industrial groups and has been omitted.

Gender segregation 2

Sectoral change and the changing gender composition of employment

The effects of sectoral change on the distribution of male and female workforces has varied between countries, and is summarised in Tables A3 and A4. In agriculture, both men and women experienced employment decline, albeit to different degrees in different countries. In Bulgaria, the 13.9% who were employed in this sector in 1995 halved to 7.1% in 2001; in Lithuania, the rate dropped from 31% to 21%, whereas in other countries the decline was smaller. Romania is the exception, where agricultural employment grew for both men and women between 1995 and 2001. In the Czech Republic and Slovakia, there was a steeper drop for women than men in agriculture.

Industry remained the major sector for men's employment in most countries, at between 25% and 45% in 1995. Up to 2001, there was little change in some countries (Estonia), some increase in others (Lithuania and Hungary), a slight decline in others (Bulgaria and the Czech Republic), and a major decline in Romania.

The services sector consisted predominantly of female employees in communist times, even though more women were employed in industry than in the west. In the more agricultural economies in the east, this was also the case in agriculture. The growth in services has, not surprisingly, been accompanied by an increase in the proportion of total female employment in services. By 2001, except for Romania, over 60% of women worked in services (private or public), and in some countries this figure was around 70% (Table A5). It is worth noting that the percentage of male employment in services also increased. For instance, between 1990 and 2001, in Estonia, male service employment increased from 31% to 46%, and in Hungary from 45% to 50%. For women, these proportions during this period grew from 57% to 73% (Estonia) and from 64% to 71% (Hungary) – see Table A5. Table 10 below shows the percentage changes from 1990 to 2001 (where data are available), and from 1995 to 2001.

Table 10 Change in % of male and female employment in all services, 1990–2001 and 1995–2001

	1990–2001		1995–2001	
	M	F	M	F
BG	n.a.	n.a.	+6.7	+5.2
CZ	+10.5	+8.3	+0.6	-1.4
EE	+15.1	+15.6	+0.9	+6.9
HU	+5.0	+7.4	-0.2	+0.5
LT*	+14.8.	+12.2	+11.3	+3.2
LV*	n.a.	n.a.	+1.5	+3.9
PL	n.a.	n.a.	+6.3	+3.0
RO	n.a.	n.a.	+8.2	+2.2
SI**	+.4.4	+6.1	+5.7	+7.6
SK	n.a.	n.a.	+2.6	+5.3

Based on Table A5 (drawn from national reports' – Table 14) Note: *Latvia and Lithuania, figures are 1996, not 1995; **Slovenia, figures closest to 1990 are 1993.

The changes have varied in the proportions of men and women working in the expanding service sector of central eastern Europe. Data are not available in many countries for the years 1990–2000 but, where they are, it is clear that there were large increases for both men and women in the Czech

Republic, Estonia and Lithuania, with smaller increases in Hungary and Slovenia, although the size and growth of services in these economies were similar. Between 1995 and 2001, the cross-national data show that the rate of increase was smaller, although it was greater for women than men in Estonia, Latvia, Slovenia and Slovakia. In the Czech Republic, rates actually declined for women over this period and remained more or less stable in Hungary. An interesting finding in the above table is that, in several countries – Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania – the increase in growth in male service sector employment was greater than for women. The major contrast in the experience of recent service sector expansion in the CEECs and post-war western Europe is the fact that the latter was a clearly feminised process, whereas the former is not. Both men and women are being drawn into this sector in eastern Europe, compared with the growth of female, largely part-time service jobs in the more western countries.

Of considerable importance is men and women's distribution between the private and the public sectors. The private sector is itself highly fragmented between higher paid and lower paid jobs. The public sector, while containing many professions, has in the first 10 years of transformation been held back in terms of pay. This can be seen by comparing absolute pay in the private and public sectors in the national reports. Restructuring disputes and conflicts over pay in the public sector were striking characteristics of the first decade of transformation (Pollert, 1999). Distinguishing the public sector through means of NACE classification is fairly clear for health and education, although privatisation is taking place here too, but in NACE 15 (Other community, social and personal service activities), it is more difficult as it contains 'personal services', many of which are likely to be private. Nonetheless, for current purposes, the four NACE categories, 12 (Public administration, defence, compulsory social security), 13 (Education), 14 (Health and social work) and 15 (Other community, social and personal service activities) will be considered broadly as public sector employment. Table 11 illustrates the trends in terms of female employment (although there were few data for 1990).

Apart from Romania, which, as signalled earlier, remains exceptional in its low percentage of women workers in services (only around 30% for private and public together), in most countries, the public sector takes a larger share of women's employment than private services, although both take a third or more. In 2001, 45% of Polish female employment was in the public sector, true also for 40% of employed women in Lithuania. The trend since 1995 suggests increases in women's public service employment, except for Latvia and the Czech Republic, the latter having only about a quarter of women in this sector. By the same token, a higher proportion of women are employed in private services in the Czech Republic, increasing since 1990. Generally, women's employment in private services, while high, shows only moderate increases over each time period, of about 3% or less. The small increase in women's private sector employment raises the question of how service sector expansion has affected male employment.

Men's (private) service sector employment in all the CEECs rose from about 20% in 1990 to 30% in 2001 – a far larger increase than for women. This is in striking contrast to the public sector: here, only 13% of men were employed in 1990 for the countries for which data are available, and only 14% in 2001 (un-weighted CEEC average). Thus, while currently about a third of men and women work in the private services, this is the result of a rapid increase for men. By contrast, while another third of women work in the public sector, less than half of this percentage of men do so.

Table 11 Percentage of female workforce in services 1990, 1995, 2001

	1990		1995		2001	
	Services (mainly private)	Public Sector	Services (mainly private)	Public Sector	Services (mainly private)	Public Sector
BG	n.a	n.a	26.8	32.0	31.8	32.2
CZ	29.5	25.7	37.4	27.5	39.0	24.5
EE	24.4	28.7	30.4	33.6	33.2	36.6
HU	30.8	32.9	31.8	38.8	34.0	37.1
LT*	25.0	29.0	29.0	34.0	25.7	40.5
LV*	n.a	n.a	28.1	38.7	33.9	36.8
PL	n.a	n.a	27.5	43.9	29.4	45.3
RO	n.a	n.a	14.5	15.0	15.9	15.8
SI	n.a	n.a	27.0	27.0	31.4	30.2
SK	n.a	n.a	29.3	35.6	31.7	38.5
All	27.4	28.3	28.1	32.6	30.6	33.8

Source: Table A3; national reports, LFS surveys. Services: NACE 7, 8, 9, 10, 11;
Public sector: NACE 12, 13, 14, 15. *Lithuania and Latvia, 1996 for 1995. Total is an un-weighted average.

Table 12 Percentage of male workforce in services, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2001

	1990		1995		2001	
	Services	Public Sector	Services	Public Sector	Services	Public Sector
BG	n.a	n.a	27.7	17.1	33.8	17.7
CZ	22.7	9.9	31.2	11.3	35.7	7.7
EE	18.1	10.8	27.4	11.7	31.4	14.8
HU	26.0	19.3	28.8	21.7	33.5	16.8
LT	15.0	14.3	17.4	15.4	29.1	15.0
LV	n.a	n.a	28.1	17.6	30.7	16.5
PL	n.a	n.a	24.7	14.7	29.7	15.7
RO	n.a	n.a	15.0	13.0	22.4	12.8
SI	n.a	n.a	24.4	12.6	29.2	13.5
SK	n.a	n.a	24.6	16.6	28.1	15.7
All	20.5	13.6	24.9	15.1	30.4	14.6

Source: Table A4 (based on national reports, LFS surveys). Total is an un-weighted average.
Services: NACE 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. Public sector: NACE 12, 13, 14, 15.

Tables 11 and 12 make clear that gender segregation exists from the perspective of distribution of male and female employment across sectors. However, this is still a very aggregated analysis. If men are increasingly being drawn into the private service sector, which parts are being 'masculinised'? What are the implications for the types of jobs men and women do? To begin to look at these questions, the analysis of horizontal gender segregation turns to a more detailed look at sub-sectors and their changing gender compositions.

Gender segregation in industrial sectors

The above discussion focused on economic transformation and the sectoral composition of male and female employment. Analysis now shifts to the gender composition of sectors. Once again, trends are an important part of the analysis. As a benchmark for discussing overall gender segregation, a 'snapshot' for 2001 is provided and compared against the Foundation's third working conditions survey (2000) of the EU15 (Fagan and Burchell, 2002, p.24) (Table 13). The full picture for the CEECs, based on 2001 LFS data, is shown in Table A6.

Table 13 Gender segregation by industrial sector (%), CEECs, 2001 and EU15, 2000

NACE sectors	CEECs Male	EU15 Male	CEECs Female	EU15 Female
Construction	87.8	91	12.2	9
Fishing	85.0	n.a.	15.0	n.a.
Mining	82.7	84	17.3	16
Electricity, gas, water supply	77.6	84	22.4	25
Transport, storage and communications	69.1	75	30.9	25
Agriculture	63.9	66	36.1	34
Manufacturing	59.4	73	40.6	27
Real estate, renting, business	55.3	n.a.	44.7	n.a.
Public administration, defence, compulsory social security	54.3	56	45.7	44
Wholesale and retail trade	47.1	(47)	52.9	(53)
Other community, social and personal service activities	41.0	44	59.0	56
Financial intermediation	36.6	58	63.4	42
Hotels and restaurants	34.5	(47)	65.5	(53)
Education	23.8	(25)	76.2	(75)
Health and social work	21.2	(25)	79.8	(75)
All	55.9	56	44.1	44

Notes: Sectors are ranked by the degree of male-dominated segregation.
Source: CEECs, national reports using LFS (Final Report, Table VI).
EU15, Foundation. Figures in brackets show NACE categories which have been amalgamated (Fagan and Burchell, 2002, p.24).

The ranking of segregation in the CEECs is remarkably similar to the EU15 pattern, but the degree of segregation has a different pattern in each. For the male-dominated sectors in the EU15, the degree of segregation is greater in terms of male dominance from construction down the list as far as manufacturing. In the CEECs, segregation is greater in the degree of female dominance in the feminised sectors of public services and hotels and restaurants. Women represent 53% of those employed in both country groupings in wholesale and retail. The greatest contrasts between the CEECs and the EU15 are in manufacturing, which is far less segregated in the former group, and in finance, which is male dominated in the EU15, but female dominated in the CEECs. These differences can be explained in terms of the legacy of women's high industrial participation in the post-communist countries, and the higher percentage of women in economics and finance, largely due to their high education levels (Pollert, 2003).

As a broad generalisation, one can argue that the sectoral pattern of gender segregation is similar in both groups of countries, but the pattern of the heaviest concentrations in the CEECs is the reverse of that in the EU15. In the EU15, greatest segregation is in the male-dominated industry

sectors, whereas, in the CEECs, greatest segregation is in the female-dominated public sectors. This evidence does not, however, support a contention that there is less gender segregation in the new Member States than in western Europe. Rather, it exists but is different in that a pre-transition legacy still remains in some sectors.

These aggregate country data inevitably obscure important differences between countries. In the CEECs, there are very different sectoral compositions, changes in the gender composition of employment and other changes over time. This is examined in the national reports and the broad trends are summarised in Table A7, in terms of female representation in aggregate NACE groups (agriculture, industry, services and the public sector), for 1985, 1990, 1995 and 2001. For example, the average 36% female representation in agriculture obscures contrasts of between 50% in Romania or 46% in Slovenia and only 25% in Hungary. In most countries, women's share of agriculture has declined but, in Poland, it has grown from 27% in 1985 to 39% in 2001, reaching as high as 45% in 1995. Women's share of industry, as a composite of mining, utilities and manufacture, has declined overall but, bearing in mind the difficulties of comparing communist-period statistics with LFS data, it appears that, in Poland, it grew from 37% in 1985 to 47% in 2001, and in Hungary, from 36% to 40%. In Romania, the female share of industry also grew, from 39% in 1995 to 43% in 2001.

Services (both private and public) require further scrutiny, because of their increasing economic role in the transforming economies (Table 9), their importance to women's employment, and because the strong feminisation in the public sector compared with EU15 data calls for exploration. Due to the differing trends observed in the discussion of sectoral change and the changing gender composition of employment between the private and public sectors, initial analysis examines trends in the proportion of women in these aggregate sectors (Table 14).

Between 1990 and 2001, the proportion of women in private services has either remained stable, gone down, or fluctuated (only Latvia showed a slight increase). It has declined relative to the female share of all employment, from being over-represented to being a similar proportion in 2001. In the public sector, however, women are over-represented compared with their percentage of overall employment, and six countries show an increase in female representation, with only one (Poland) showing a decrease. The process over time, leading to the service sector segregation shown in Table 13 comparing the CEECs with the EU15 in 2000/2001, is of further feminisation in the public service sector, but not in private services. This evidence complements the findings on the concentration of women's employment in the public sector and the fact that men have been drawn into the private but not the public service sector.

Women's employment in the service sector over a decade of transition raises the issue of job gain or loss by gender, as well as segregation in the types of jobs gained or lost. In post-war western Europe, expansion of services was the chief factor in drawing more women into the labour force, and this coincided in many countries with the formation of part-time service jobs. Workforce feminisation entailed labour market segmentation between male full-time and female part-time workers. Development of services in the post-communist countries took a different trajectory. Women were already well represented in the labour force and, where comparison allows, there is evidence of little change between 1985 and 2001 in women being roughly 45% of the total employed (see Tables 7 and A7).

Table 14 Changes in female representation in the service sector, private and public, 1990, 1995, 2001

	Women's share private services (%)				Women's share public sector (%)				Women's share all employment (%)		
	1990	1995	2001	Direction of change*	1990	1995	2001	Direction of change*	1990	1995	2001
BG	n.a	46.1	46.5	stable	n.a	62.2	62.6	stable	n.a	46.8	48.0
CZ	55.4	49.1	46.5	down	70.6	67.2	69.2	fluctuating	46.3	44.5	44.3
EE	53.1	48.2	51.5	fluctuating	74.0	68.8	71.9	fluctuating	48.0	47.0	49.0
HU	55.8	52.9	54.5	fluctuating	58.9	58.6	64.2	up	45.7	44.3	44.8
LT	67.7	62.6	47.8	down	66.9	68.9	73.6	up	52.9	50.2	58.2
LV	n.a	47.9	51.9	up	n.a	66.9	68.5	up	n.a	47.9	49.4
PL	n.a	54.1	54.8	stable	n.a	63.9	58.7	down	n.a	45.3	45.5
RO	n.a	45.0	46.3	stable	n.a	49.6	51.8	up	n.a	46.0	46.8
SI	n.a	49.1	47.3	stable	n.a	65.4	65.5	stable	n.a	46.6	45.8
SK	n.a	48.7	49.0	stable	n.a	63.2	67.7	up	n.a	44.4	46.0
All		50.4	49.6	stable		63.5	65.4	up		46.4	48.0

Source: National report tables, LFS unless otherwise stated.
Services (NACE 7, 8, 9, 10, 11); Public service sector (NACE 12, 13, 14, 15).
Notes: Bulgaria: 1997 for 1995; Latvia: 1996 for 1995; Lithuania: 1992 figs for 1990; Poland: 1990 Statistical Year Book, GUS, KGN classification (only comparable data included) and NACE 1996 figures for 1995; Slovenia: 1990 pre-NACE, not strictly comparable and NACE 1993 for 1995, 2002 for 2001.
Change: If below 2.00, 'stable'. If decline from 1990 to 1995, and increase from 1995 to 2001, 'fluctuating' (own definitions).

In the service sector, however, women's share of employment dropped from between 55% and 67% in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary and Lithuania in 1990 to between 46% and 54% in 2001 (Table A7). Table A8 shows that, for the CEECs between 1990 and 2001, women's share in wholesale and retail trade declined from 68% to 54%; in hotels and restaurants, from 70% to 66%; in financial services from 77% to 64%; and in real estate, rental and commercial from 48% to 45%.

A few countries showed an increase in women's participation in some sectors, such as hotels and restaurants in Estonia (75% to 82%) and Latvia (70% to 77%), and real estate in Poland (43% to 47%). But, in many countries, the declines were far greater than the average. In retail and wholesale, women's share dropped from 72% to 41% in Estonia, and from 82% to 51% in Lithuania. In financial services, it declined from 83% to 64% in Estonia, 86% to 51% in Lithuania, and 84% to 58% in Poland.

These huge declines, which, as was seen in Table 13, are converging with EU15 levels, can only be interpreted at a qualitative level. However, it has been suggested that privatisation is creating a gendered re-segregation within these sectors, with men occupying, for example, the senior and better paid positions in retail (Pollert, 1995). In financial services, women have lost their dominance although they remain strongly represented. It remains to be seen whether their legacy of educational strength in accounting and economics (Pollert, 2003) benefits them in the new, better paid jobs in the growing private banking sector, or whether they will hit a glass ceiling.

In the public sector, the education, health and social work category is about 75% staffed by women in the CEECs, except for Poland, where their presence has declined to 60% (Table A9). In general,

women's high representation has increased further in education, from 72% to 76%, rising to 82% in Estonia and Latvia, and over 78% in Bulgaria, Lithuania and Slovakia. In health and social work, there has been a slight drop overall, from 82% to 79% but, in some countries, such as Hungary, Latvia and Lithuania, there have been slight increases. In public administration, there was an initial decline in women' share during the early transition phase (1990–95), but this was followed by a recovery between 1995 and 2001. That trend was probably as a result of initial reductions in large state administrations, and subsequent restructuring – a hypothesis which needs to be tested at the micro-level. In other community, social and personal service activities, there has been a slight decline from 59% to 55% (again, with some exceptions, such as rises since 1995 in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia and Slovakia). The breadth of this category and the likelihood that many activities are in the private sector, mean that its inclusion in the public sector is less straightforward, and requires interpretation of these trends at a more detailed NACE level.

The general conclusions from this use of national LFS data are that, while gender segregation by sector is similar to the EU15, women have a greater presence in agriculture and industry, and are more over-represented in public services than their counterparts in the EU15, although female dominance in the latter sector is clear here too. The loss of women's former major dominance in private services may mean less gender segregation, but it also means that women have not been the main beneficiaries of new jobs in the expanding private services. Exactly how men and women are currently distributed in this expanding sector, by pay and status, requires research at national level.

Gender segregation and occupation

Having reviewed the distribution of men and women in different industrial sectors, this section now considers gender segregation in occupational categories. It is well known that occupational segregation is one of the major explanatory factors behind the wage gap, and it is perhaps the most persistent and consistent feature of the labour markets both in eastern and western Europe.

The patterns of occupational segregation in the CEECs are quite similar to those in the EU15: women are under-represented in high level managerial positions (about 30–35% of all legislators and managers are women), and heavily represented in clerical, service and professional work (Fagan and Burchell, 2002, p.18). In contrast, fewer women are in blue-collar manual skilled and unskilled labour, and in agriculture.

Several comparisons are meaningful beyond the basic pattern above. Firstly, it is useful to note the trend over time. Table A10 illustrates the proportion of female representation in occupations, and shows remarkable stability in this regard in the 10 CEECs since 1995. Two categories deserve special attention. First, the proportion of women in the top occupational category (ISCO 88 Group 1: legislators, managers and CEOs) has not changed (or in fact has increased somewhat) since 1995. This is noteworthy because it means that women's position at the top of the occupational hierarchy is not deteriorating. Indeed, Tables A11 and A12 show that, while a higher percentage of male than female employment is in the top category, it has increased for both men and women. At the bottom of the occupational hierarchy there is less change, with perhaps a small increase in the proportion of blue-collar manual worker women (Group 8) at least in some countries, such as Estonia or Hungary.

The next comparison to be made is among the countries themselves. Focusing on the most recent figures (2001), a significant variation can be seen in the degree of occupational segregation. Although the basic pattern is quite similar, there are some interesting contrasts as well. First, the percentage of managers (Group 1) who are women varies between 26% (Czech Republic) and 47% (Lithuania – a large increase on 1995). While this might be partly due to classification variation, it could also hide some real differences in women's chances of getting ahead. Similarly, high percentages of women managers are noted in Poland (41%) and Latvia (38%). While these percentage differences also reflect the overall level of female employment, which is high in Lithuania and lower in the Czech Republic (see Table 7), the differences are so large that they probably also represent real variation in the degree of segregation. This is supported by the fact that, in the Czech Republic, only 3.9% of women workers were in Group 1, compared with 6.9% in Lithuania. Indeed, there is substantial variation in proportions of women workers in Group 1, ranging from 1.3% in Romania to 8% in Estonia and Latvia.

Another area of variation is in clerical work, Group 4: 93% of clerical workers are women in Hungary, while the percentage ranges between 67% and 84% in the other countries. All of the occupational groups, however, indicate wide segregation. Among agricultural workers (Group 6), the highest representation of women is found in Romania (52.4%). Here too, the proportion of female blue-collar manual workers (Group 8) is also relatively high (30.2%). At the other extreme, in Hungary, less than 30% of agricultural workers, and only 18% of blue-collar workers, are women. Looking at unskilled elementary occupations (Group 9), men and women are more or less evenly distributed in all countries, with the notable exceptions of Poland and Slovenia, where women outnumber men (over 60%), and Romania (41%), where the opposite is the case. However, there is a question as to whether some of these findings are due to real differences in occupational distribution, or merely differences in classification patterns.

Comparing EU15 occupational segregation (Fagan and Burchell, 2002, p.18) with the patterns observable from the CEEC national research team, some differences can be seen, although the broad patterns are similar. In Groups 2 and 3 ('professionals' and 'associated professionals'), women dominate in eastern Europe, but not (or less so) in western countries (except in certain sectors, such as teaching and health). For example, the average percentage of women in professional occupations stands at between 51% and 75% in the CEECs, in contrast to 50% in the EU15. Similarly, between 50% and 67% of associated professionals are women in the CEECs, true for only 48% in the EU15. This difference probably reflects the long years of state socialist rule, where women gained high levels of education, and could attain professional (or semi-professional) jobs, but had trouble advancing further in the occupational hierarchy.

Comparing the proportion of women's and men's total employment in certain jobs (Tables A11 and A12) shows that the gender gap at the top of the hierarchy varies considerably across countries, from a comparative equality rating of 87% in Lithuania to an equal rating of just 45% in Romania.[5] There seems to be very little relationship between a country's economic development and its gender gap in positions of authority: the Czech Republic has the second highest gender gap at this

[5] This gender gap is calculated by dividing the proportion of women by the proportion of men in the occupational category 'managers and legislators'. For example, the proportion of women in ISCO88-category 1 in Lithuania is 6.9%, and the proportion of men is 7.9%. Dividing the former by the latter gives 0.87, or 87% equality. Similar calculations were carried out to obtain the gender gaps in other occupations. All data came from Tables A11 and A12.

level (47%), while Slovenia's gap (54%) is comparable to that in the much less developed and less westernised Bulgaria (53%). These tables again show women's higher representation in professional and semi-professional categories: about twice as many women as men work in these jobs. As already pointed out above, women also dominate (by a factor of between three and 10) in clerical occupations, while men tend to work in agricultural and blue-collar professions. In this latter category (Group 8, plant and machine operators), the differences across the countries are considerable: the gender gap ranges from 17% (in Hungary and Estonia) to 75% in Slovakia, while the EU15 average is 33%. Similar trends can be observed in the occupation 'craft and related trade workers' (Group 7). The proportion of men and women, as mentioned earlier, is roughly equal in the unskilled elementary occupation group, which seems to correspond with patterns in the EU15.

In terms of changes since 1995, women do not seem to be losing their labour market positions in the CEECs, although their presence in Group 1 is lower than in the EU15. Slight improvements may be observed in many countries. The proportion of women has increased, for example, in the top occupational category in Bulgaria, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia and Slovenia (towards or slightly surpassing the EU15 average of 6%), but there has been no improvement in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Poland, Romania and Slovakia. There seems to be a more consistent increase in Group 2, which shows greater percentages of women (between 13% and 22%, except for Romania) compared with a 14% average in the EU15. Women seem to be holding on to these higher level positions with some success. In contrast, the average percentage of women in the bottom occupational categories (plant and machine operators and elementary occupations) has declined in many countries, the last (Group 9) being similar to or below the EU15 average of 11%. The proportion of women in blue-collar manual work is higher, reflecting women's higher employment in industry in eastern Europe than in the west.

Women's employment and educational attainment

Table 15 below shows that women employees are more likely to hold university degrees than men. Female employees with secondary school qualifications are over-represented in the employed population, compared with women's overall employment share and, in general, their representation in both educational attainment categories has increased since 1995. Slight exceptions are found in the Czech Republic and Slovakia, where women represented only 38% and 41% of graduate workers in 1995, though these figures had risen to 39% and 47% respectively in 2001. Women were particularly highly represented among graduate employees in certain countries: Latvia (63%), Lithuania (60%) and Hungary and Bulgaria (both 58%). Women are also over-represented among secondary school graduates in all countries, particularly in Poland, the Czech Republic and Slovakia. This increase in female workers' educational achievement since 1995 is arguably a factor in explaining the increase in the number of female professional and semi-professional employees, as well as the rise in the number of female clerical workers at the lower levels.

Whether women's high educational attainment helps in their pay, as the 'human capital' theory would suggest, is another question.

Gender segregation and pay

Cross-national comparisons

The gender pay gap is a fundamental aspect of gender inequality. Improving the definition, measurement and comparability within Europe is of key importance to policy on gender equality

(European Commission 2003, p.8), and data are now largely based on the European Community Household Panel survey. Among the CEECs, it remains difficult to find comparable and longitudinal data. In this report, the national research teams found disaggregated gender data for sectors from various sources, such as statistical yearbooks, special studies on men and women, or calculated data from statistical offices. These sources are shown in Table A13, and in the national reports. This variation means that cross-national comparisons need to be interpreted with caution. The same applies to gender disaggregated pay data by occupation. Again, sources are described both in the national reports and in the footnotes to Table A14. A further issue is that, at present, data are mostly presented as gross monthly wages, whereas EU15 data have been calculated to provide hourly wages. Only Estonia provides hourly wages by sector, while Latvia has both hourly and monthly pay for occupations (see national report). Nevertheless, these cautionary remarks also apply, although to a lesser extent, to EU15 analysis, and the data presented here contribute important findings on recent pay trends (1996–2001) in the CEECs. As explained below, they can be broadly compared with the EU15 hourly figures.

Table 15 Women as a % of all employees, by education level, 1995, 2001

	Basic		Completed secondary*		University**		As a % of all employees	
	1995	2001	1995	2001	1995	2001	1995	2001
BG	41.8	40.2	48.1	59.1	55.2	58.1	46.9	47.8
CZ	61.8	57.2	68.2	65.4	37.5	39.3	44.2	43.4
EE	n.a.	35.7	n.a.	50.8	n.a.	54.9	n.a..	48.8
HU	43.0	37.9	54.3	55.9	55.1	58.3	45.0	45.0
LT	n.a.	42.2	n.a.	50.7	n.a.	59.9	n.a.	50.3
LV***	35.5	35.8	52.5	51.8	57.7	63.0	49.3	50.9
PL	44.0	42.0	75.3	68.5	n.a.	n.a.	45.3	45.4
RO****		57.0		52.0		44.0		40.5
SI	52.1	50.3	46.2	51.9	47.2	54.7	48.1	47.4
SK**	56.9	61.0	63.6	65.3	41.1	47.3	44.4	46.0

Note: These figures are adapted from national reports to adhere to the International Standard Classification of Education, ISCED 1997. For discussion of comparative methodology, see: http://www.unesco.org/education/information/nfsunesco/doc/isced_1997.htm

http://www.prie.cl/ingles/seccion/documento/annex_3.pdf

*Full secondary general (non-technical), broadly ISCED 3a and 4.

**Also called 'first stage of tertiary' (e.g. Hungary).

***Latvia: 1996, not 1995.

****Romania: 1999, not 2001.

Source: CEEC teams, national reports' Table 11.

Pre- and post-transition

In keeping with the historical perspective of this report, an attempt is made to compare recent trends with those before transition, using a combination of figures provided in UNICEF 1999 and the national data. Table 16 below gives gender pay ratios for four periods: pre-transition, early post-transition (1990–92), 1996 and 2001.

Most strikingly, there has been an improvement in the gender pay ratio since pre-transition periods for those countries for which data are available, but improvements have slowed in recent years. Explanations for the communist period pay gap have been explored further in Pollert (2003) and

reside mainly in the fact that, as several national reports observe, men worked in the better paid 'core' industries, while women worked in poorly paid 'peripheral' or 'light' industries, services and administration. Gender segregation, though not identical to western capitalist countries, still clearly operated to the disadvantage of women's earnings.

Table 16 Gender pay ratios based on gross monthly pay, pre- and post-transition, women's pay as a percentage of men's

	Pre-transition	Date and source	Early transition	Date	1996*	2001*
BG	n/a	n/a	74.0	1990c	68.9	76.7
CZ	66.1	1987a	73.0	1992d	77.1	74.4
EE	n/a	n/a	79.8	1992e	71.0	73.0
HU	74.3	1986a	80.8	1992f	79.0	80.1
LT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	70.3	81.4
LV	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	78.3	80.2
PL	73.7	1985a	79.0	1992g	80.0j	81.8
RO	n/a	n/a	78.6	1994h	79.0	81.6
SI	87.0	1987b	88.6	1991i	85.0	89.2
SK	66.1	1987a	73.3	1992d	74.5	74.1

Source for pre- and early-transition, UNICEF, 1999, p.33. *Data for 1996 and 2001 from national reports, See Table A11
Notes: a. Atkinson and Micklewright, 1992. b. Orazem and Vodopivec, 1995. c. Tzetokova-Anguelova, 1998. d. Social stratification surveys. e. Papp, 1998. f. Lakatos, 1998. g. Polish labour force surveys. h. NCS, 1998. i. Shircel, 1998. j. Poland, uses 1999 for 1996 column.

Substantial inter-country variation is also clear from the pre-transition figures. The Slovene pay ratio was almost as good in 1987 as in 2001 (and has remained steadily better than all other CEECs as well as EU15 countries), the Hungarian and Polish ratios were intermediate and not vastly different from western ratios for the time, while the Czechoslovak ratio was very poor. This pattern remains the case today. In terms of the changes over this period, it is noteworthy that there were improvements during early transition (1990–92), but 1996 showed a slower improvement for several countries, and a decline for some, such as Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary and Slovenia. Since then, the trends have varied: the pay gap has widened again in the Czech Republic and Slovakia but has narrowed in the other countries, slightly in most, but substantially in Bulgaria and Lithuania. These findings serve to qualify a suggestion in a European Commission paper (2003, p.12) that 'the gender pay gaps in the accession countries have been declining over the last decade'. Few countries have improved on their position in the early 1990s, which suggests that the last decade of a market economy has done little for women's progress towards equal pay. These findings raise important questions about the meaning and reliability of the Foundation findings on gender and the income gap, discussed below.

Comparing east and west incomes

The Foundation data only allow comparison between monthly pay for east and west Europe, which conflates the issue of working time with pay (although the issue of part-time work in the EU15 is discussed by Fagan and Burchell, 2002, p.49). This means that the gender gap in income can be compared, but not pay rates, which are crucial to the principles of equal pay. The Foundation comparison shows that women's chances of being in the bottom fifth of the income distribution is

1.4 times higher than those of men in the east, while it is 2.4 times higher in the west. The difference between women's overall chances of being 'poor' (so defined) is small in the two regions; it is men's prospects which are much better in the west. A similar pattern emerges with respect to becoming a top earner (in the top 20%): women's chances are less than half (46%) of those of men in the west, but almost 70% of those of men in the east (67%). Overall, the gender gap in earnings is smaller in the east at both ends of the income hierarchy (Table 17).

Table 17 Percentage of men and women classified in top and bottom fifth of income distribution, EU15 (2000), candidate countries (2001)

	EU countries		CEECs	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Top fifth (really 25%) of income distribution	31.9	14.8	29.1	19.7
Bottom fifth of income distribution	12.6	30.8	19.8	27.8

Source: Foundation Surveys, EU15 and in the acceding and candidate countries

However, this comparison may say as much about working hours as about pay rates. A further consideration is that Foundation data are for net monthly pay, so the evidence conflates tax issues as well as working time and pay. The Foundation's conclusions that 'a higher proportion of women in these countries is found in the higher income bracket and conversely a lower proportion in the lower income bracket' (than EU15 women) (Foundation, 2002, p.5) must be interpreted with caution. The Foundation survey may suffer in reliability both in terms of its measure of income and in the small size of the sample.

Table 18 Working hours and part-time work, CEECs, 2002

	Average working hours			Share of employees, part-time		
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
BG	41.3	40.3	40.8	2.4	3.7	3.1
CZ	41.5	39.1	40.4	2.1	8.3	4.8
EE	41.1	38.6	39.8	3.9	9.6	6.7
HU	41.1	39.5	40.3	2.3	5.1	8.0
LT	39.2	36.9	38.0	8.6	11.0	9.8
LV	44.0	40.9	42.9	7.3	11.2	9.3
PL	42.0	38.3	40.2	8.3	13.4	10.7
RO	42.1	41.3	41.8	10.2	12.8	11.4
SI	41.2	39.6	40.4	5.2	8.3	6.6
SK	41.9	40.9	41.4	1.2	2.7	1.9
All	41.5	39.5	40.6	5.2	8.6	7.2

Source: derived from Table A5, European Commission 2003, p. 28, based on Eurostat Labour Force Survey (LFS), Spring 2002 results

Differences in working hours

Comparison of the hourly pay gap in both the CEECs and EU15 would be the ideal methodology. However, the CEEC national statistics on gender and pay are based on gross monthly wages, so a more accurate picture may be achieved by looking at gross hourly figures in the EU15, rather than attempting to compare gross with net pay. In the CEECs, monthly pay figures for men and women

do not demonstrate wide differences from hourly pay data, because working hours of men and women are not vastly different, as they are in the west (Table 18 and for details of EU15, European Commission, 2003, p.28).

In the case of the EU15, monthly data widen the gender pay gap, since men work far longer hours than women, so hourly pay is crucial to give a real picture of differences in pay rates (although differences in income are reflected in monthly figures). Working time differences in the EU15 are partly due to labour market segmentation between part-time women workers and full-time male workers. While 33.5% of EU15 women worked part time in 2002, only 6.6% of men did. In addition, there is a high amount of overtime work in some countries, such as Britain. Overall, this means that the difference in working hours per week between men and women can be as much as 11 hours (in the UK) or nine in Germany, and averages seven across the EU15 (European Commission, 2003, p.28).

In the CEECs, the working hours gap between men and women is only two hours on average (European Commission, 2003, p.28 and Table 18), and the incidence of part-time work still only affects 7.2% of all employees (compared with 18.2% in the EU15). Furthermore, in contrast to the EU15, the difference in the percentage of men and women working part time is not large (5.2% and 8.6% respectively). Although part-time work has increased since the immediate post-transformation period, it does not appear to be growing fast and, in some countries, such as Slovakia, has recently declined (see national report).

In summary, while monthly figures will slightly widen the wage gap between men and women in the CEECs (for an illustration, see Table 18 in the Latvian report, which provides both hourly and monthly pay ratios for occupations), this is negligible, and cannot account for the scale of divergence from EU15 hourly figures.

Pay gap by sectors

It should be explained at the outset that measuring the pay gap within sectors does not reveal anything about differences between absolute levels of pay in different sectors, which is a crucial aspect of wage segregation. Thus, in the public sector, the gender wage gap may be smaller than in the private services, or in industry, but that is little comfort when overall wages are low for both men and women. Thus, the only way to assess how far women are ghettoised in low-paying sectors is to compare the absolute levels of pay in other sectors. This can be gleaned from a glance at the national reports, which provide both absolute pay figures, and the gender gaps within sectors and occupations. Systematising the inter-sectoral pay comparisons, by comparing total and gender specific pay to, for example, the median pay level, would be an important exercise. However, it is beyond the scope of this study.

The evidence from the national reports on the pay gap in the CEECs shows that it is in fact bigger than that of the EU15, contrary to a possibly optimistic interpretation of Foundation (2002, 2003) data on gender and income levels, and a European Commission Working Paper (2003, p.12, based on a World Bank report [2002]), which suggested that 'the gender pay gaps in the accession countries are similar to, or even smaller than, those prevailing in the current European Union Member Countries'. The EU15 gap was 16% in 2002, whereas in the CEECs it averaged 20% in 2001 (see Table 19 below). Even if this gap is slightly inflated because of using monthly pay data,

it is certainly not less than the EU average. By subtracting 2% to estimate possible effects of women working slightly fewer hours than men, the gap would still be another 2% wider than the EU15.

Four countries still have women earning only around three quarters of men's gross monthly wages (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia and Slovakia), the other countries are around 80%, with Slovenia standing out at 89%. This follows an overall 3% improvement on 1995/6, but sectoral analysis shows that much of this appears to be due to a better gender pay ratio in the agriculture/fishing sectors, which on average only employed about 10% of employed women in 2001 (Table A3; Romania is exceptional with 45%).

Table 19 Women's gross monthly pay as a % of men's gross monthly pay, by sector, 1996 and 2001

Country	Agriculture/Fishing		Industry		Manufacturing		Services		Public sector		All sectors	
	1996	2001	1996	2001	1996	2001	1996	2001	1996	2001	1996	2001
BG	72.9	79.3	71.9	77.0	71.1	68.3	82.5	85.9	92.0	80.0	68.9	76.7
CZ	80.0	80.1	68.2	68.4	68.2	68.0	73.0	65.5	75.9	75.2	77.1	74.4
EE***	88.5	90.5	60.0	68.0	79.0	73.0	69.0	62.0	83.0	78.0	71.0	73.0
HU	90.9	91.9	70.7	71.8	71.4	72.0	87.7	85.9	79.2	76.6	79.0	80.1
LT*	81.7	89.2	*80.7*	77.1	n/a	77.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	70.3	81.4
LV*	84.8	84.0	81.1	81.1	82.2	84.3	72.4	70.7	78.7	81.4	78.3	80.2
PL**	(111.6)	99.4	(73.5)	73.9	(77.7)	78.2	(80.1)	79.4	(82.8)	85.4	(80.0)	81.8
RO*	n/a	103.9		69.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	79.0	81.6
SI*	n/a	75.5	n/a	80.8°	n/a	78.5	n/a/	84.5°°	n/a	84.5°°	85.0	89.2
SK	74.5	81.8	69.4	67.9	68.6	68.7	82.0	66.1	81.0	78.2	74.5	74.1
CEEC average	81.9	87.5	71.7	73.5	73.4	74.2	77.8	75.0	81.6	79.9	75.9	79.6 **(81)**

Sources: National reports. see note to Table A13 for details of national data sources.

Key: Agriculture (NACE 1, 2). Where separate figures appear for each, the average has been calculated from the two percentages; Industry = NACE 3, 4, 5; Manufacturing = NACE 4; Private Services = NACE 7, 8, 9, 10, 11; Public sector = NACE 12, 13, 14, 15.

Notes. *These countries use 1995 figures, not 1996. Italics for Lithuania refers to 1994.

**Poland brackets denote that 1999 figures are provided for 1996.

***Estonia figures are for hourly pay.

Hungarian figures for industry, services and public sector are weighted for populations.

Slovenia: °Industry 2001 = NACE 3, 4, 5, 6 (includes construction). Construction inflates the figure (women earn 119% of men's wage, see Table A11). °°Services = 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 (i.e. private and public) and has thus been included in both services and public sector columns. Women's pay relative to men's is higher in the public sector than in private services, so inclusion of composite services in private services slightly inflates women's pay and affects the CEEC average for this sector.

CEEC-average calculation for 1996 based on combined 1995 and 1996 figures. Poland has been omitted since 1999 is regarded as non-comparable. The average provides only indicative trends, since calculations exclude some countries for some years where data were not available.

Figure (81%) 2001 is weighted average.

Breaking down the figures by sector shows important commonalities, while national variations must be noted too. In general, women's pay as a percentage of men's is best in agriculture and fishing and the public sector, and worst in industry and services. Where data allow comparison, the percentage has declined in the latter two since 1996. In agriculture and fishing, Poland shows

a slight deterioration since 1999, but these two sectors appear to employ only 1% of female workers in Poland (Table A3), so the pay figure cannot be very significant for women. However, there may be a statistical issue since the female share of agriculture was as much as 37% in Poland in 2001, with little change since 1995. Therefore, an explanation of the narrower pay gap is not due to the presence of a few women in a male dominated sector, such as in construction, where the pay gap is small because few females are likely to be in high skilled or supervisory functions (see *EU15 in construction*, European Commission 2003, p.11). Further research is needed in this regard.

A general observation, and one supporting the wide literature on the association between feminisation and under-valuation of jobs, skills and pay (e.g. Čermaková, 1999 on the Czech Republic), is that the more female the sector, the larger the pay gap or, as in the case of the public sector in the CEECs, the lower the absolute level of wages. In manufacturing (NACE 4), which was 41% female in both 1995 and 2001, women earned only 74% of men's pay in 2001, a mere 1% improvement on 1996. In some countries, the picture is even worse: in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, women earned only 68% of men's monthly pay. Since 1995/6, stagnation or a further widening of the gap occurred in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, and Slovakia, with only slight improvement in Hungary and Latvia (earlier data not available for other countries).

In the public sector (65% female and employing over a third of women but only 16% of men in 2001, Tables A3 and A4), although the pay gap (79.9% in 2001) is narrower than in industry or manufacturing, it widened by almost 2% from 1995/6. Only two countries showed any improvement – Latvia and Poland – while the rest remained static or deteriorated, with Bulgaria showing a 12% drop from what had been a good equality record of women earning 90% of men's pay. These declines require analysis at occupational level, but are of particular concern considering the high proportion of professional and educated workers in, for example, health and education.

More detailed sector analysis shows both convergence and divergence between countries. In education, the pay gap narrowed slightly in Bulgaria and the Czech Republic, and narrowed rather more in Lithuania, Poland and Slovakia. However, it widened in Estonia, Hungary, and Latvia. In health and social care, it drastically worsened in Bulgaria (where, in 1996, women had earned appreciably more than men) and Estonia. It widened substantially in Lithuania, Latvia, Poland and Slovakia while, in the Czech Republic and Hungary, the gap narrowed somewhat. In general, it widened in other community and personal services. In public administration and defence, it improved in Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia and Poland while it worsened in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary and Slovakia.

Some of the explanation for the lack of improvement in women's pay in the public sector may reside in the general pay limits in state employment during capitalist transformation, due to cuts in public spending and privatisation (see, for example, discussion in Pollert, 1999). An examination of the pay gap in the CEECs' public sector is especially called for in view of the fact that it is becoming more feminised (Table 14), which may itself contribute towards explaining the depression in wages. The pattern should be contrasted to the EU15, where the pay gap had closed to 12% in 2002 (European Commission 2003, p.10). Gender monitoring and equal pay policies are most clearly adhered to in the EU public sector. It appears that this policy needs to be further diffused within eastern Europe.

The services sectors were examined in terms of the substantial growth in men's private service employment which was greater than for women; and the decline in the presence of women in well-paying sectors, such as finance, particularly in some countries. Women's overall comparative pay decline is demonstrated in the drop from 78% to 75% of men's pay between 1995/6 and 2001 (Table 19). Although the national reports advise caution in comparing the two periods, the most serious drop appears to be in Slovakia (from 82% to 66%), in the Czech Republic (from 73% to 65.5%), and in Estonia to 62%.

Variations in the private sector are complex at sectoral and national level. In some sub-sectors within services, the proportion of women has grown in some countries while, in others, it has declined. An important line of enquiry is whether further occupational segregation is responsible for some of the pay gap variations in certain sectors. In finance, women's representation has declined (Table A7) alongside a widening of the pay gap in every country, especially in the Czech Republic and Slovakia, where the gap grew to 50% in 2001 (Table A13). This seems to confirm the hypothesis that, as women's representation declines here, men are taking the higher paying jobs.

The same seems to be happening in retail in some countries: in the Czech Republic, Estonia and Lithuania, for instance, women's representation in this sector has declined, while the pay gap has grown, suggesting they are losing out in the higher levels to men. In hotels and restaurants, only Lithuania showed a marked improvement in the gender pay gap; elsewhere, things got worse, especially in Latvia. Here, women's representation increased between 1995 and 2001, so it appears that this expansion meant increasing feminisation of poorly paid jobs. Country and sector detailed analyses are required to understand what processes are responsible for the gender gap. To understand the real social dynamics involved, company surveys and case studies are needed.

Some explanations can be excluded at a fairly general level for women's disappointing fortunes in the CEECs regarding the gender pay gap. One factor is education. Earlier in this report, it was shown that women improved their representation among upper secondary and university qualified employees between 1995 and 2001, and their representation in these two categories is higher than their representation of all employees. Lower education among women workers cannot be an explanation for their pay disadvantage. More research is needed here. The Slovene national report uses national statistical data to examine the gender pay gap at different educational levels. It shows that women in all professional qualifications are paid less than men (around 88%) and, comparing 1991 and 2001, the pay gap is increasing for women with university or post-university degrees, and among skilled and highly skilled workers. Only among unskilled workers has the gap diminished. Čermaková (1999) found the same disadvantage for women graduates in the Czech Republic, women university graduates having the same level of earnings as men with a secondary school certificate (p.134).

Occupational pay gap

Occupational segregation is closely related to the wage gap. While the information about wage differences between men and women by occupational groupings (Table A14) is not complete, there are still some interesting issues to point out. The general finding is that, as with the sectoral pay gap, there has been a widening segregation in a number of occupations since 1995. For example, in Bulgaria in 1995, female managers earned over 90% of male managers' wages, a figure which had fallen to about 60% by 2001. A similar drop may be observed in the Czech Republic and

Slovakia. There seems to be a narrowing of the gap in this category in Estonia, and no change in the other countries about which data are available.

In the occupational category with the highest percentage of women (Group 3, technicians and semi professionals), employing between 11% and 25% of women workers in 2001 (Table A11), the wage gap ranges between as much as 60% in Lithuania and 85% in Latvia. It is surprising that in Lithuania, where the gap at the top of the hierarchy is the smallest in terms of women's access to jobs (it was 46.9% female in 2001, Table A10), wage differences are quite large in all occupational categories. This is reminiscent of the Scandinavian pattern of gender inequality in the workforce. Among managers (Group 1), women make the least compared to men (55%), and are also poorly represented (26.2%) in the Czech Republic. In Estonia, they make the most (84%), and here they are moderately represented. At the top, greater female presence may improve wage equality, but there are too few cases, because of the 'glass ceiling', to assess this.

The size of the wage gap seems to fluctuate over time across occupational categories and countries. Yet one striking trend is notable: in at least the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, and Slovakia, professional women (Group 2) seem to be making less money relative to men compared with the mid-1990s. For example, in Hungary, the gender gap in wages among professionals increased from 70.5% in 1997 to 64.3% in 2001. This indicates the segregation of women within the professional category, and the ability of men increasingly to monopolise higher paying, more privileged positions.

Overall, what is obvious is that the gap is largest in the occupational category where concentrations of women are likely to be found: service workers, who probably do very different kinds of jobs, within this broad occupational classification, than men. The gap is smaller in occupations where very few women are represented (skilled agricultural work, or blue collar manual labour), confirming the hypothesis mentioned earlier that feminisation depresses pay. In these male areas, the minority benefit from higher pay, and are also more likely to be in skilled or in supervisory jobs (a pattern opposite to that suggested for top management posts). Concluding this section, the wage gap did not seem to decline consistently in any of the countries in the past five years and a slight increase was noted in some of the categories.

Gender inequality in the labour market

3

Aims of analysis

While Foundation data have already been used in some comparisons, this section focuses exclusively on the working conditions surveys, reviewing some of the basic differences in women's labour market position in the CEECs and EU Member States. It also evaluates the validity and reliability of some of the Foundation findings against the national data explored above. As discussed earlier, before 1989, women in eastern and central Europe were better integrated into the labour market than their counterparts in western Europe. As the first part of this review demonstrated, state socialist women were more likely to be employed, employed full-time, and had made some inroads into previously exclusively male-dominated areas, especially in educational, but also to some extent in occupational, attainment.

Recent comparative research has found indications that at least some aspects of this advantage linger on even after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the advent of mass unemployment, a conservative gender ideology, and a general convergence towards the capitalist west (Trappe and Rosenfeld, 1998, 2000; Brainerd, 2000; Fodor, 2003). This confirms the legacy of CEEC women's high gender development index, discussed in Chapter 1 and explored more fully in Pollert, 2003. This chapter pursues this issue using the uniquely comparative and up-to-date dataset collected by the Foundation in the EU15 and the acceding and candidate countries.

The following questions motivate this part of the analysis: how does gender inequality in the CEECs compare to that in the EU15, based on the findings of the Foundation surveys? Is there less gender inequality, or is it of a different type than in western Europe? Some of these questions have already been addressed in Chapter 2, and suggest that a different form of labour market segmentation is occurring, that women continue to be highly educated, but that their pay relative to men's is scarcely improving and is worse than in the EU15.

From the discussion of the communist legacy, it would be expected that women would retain some of their past labour market position. Many women grew up with the expectation to work, and spent significant amounts of time in paid occupations. Training opportunities as well as state-provided childcare allowed (and still formally allow) many women to keep these jobs. Whether these advantages are likely to disappear once the countries catch up with the EU15 in other areas is something that further, longitudinal research should attempt to uncover.

In brief, findings from the preliminary analyses of Foundation data presented below support the hypotheses of significant differences in women's labour market position in eastern and western Europe, and women's relative advantage in post-state socialist countries in some forms. While gender segregation in the labour market by occupation and sector shows similarities between the two regions, significant differences were noted in types of segregation. As was indicated in Chapter 2, the Foundation's finding of a narrower income gap in eastern European countries may be based on a small sample, using a problematic measure of pay, and is not supported by LFS-based and other national data on pay. The following section looks at other aspects of Foundation research on women's labour market position.

A brief note on methodology

All the tables below rely on the Foundation survey taken in 2000 in the EU15 and in 2001/2 in the acceding and candidate countries, including the 10 CEECs considered in this report. The tables display percentages (after weighting the samples by w2 and excluding missing values).

Working time and employment status

Foundation evidence on working time supports Eurostat data cited in Table 18 above. The gender gap in hours worked is much smaller in the east than in the west, with men working only two hours longer than women in the CEECs, while the difference is 13 hours in the EU15 (Table 20).

Table 20 Percentage of men and women who are self-employed, work part time, have a second job, and the average number of days longer than 10 hours worked in the past month (EU15, 2000, CEECs, 2001)

	EU15		CEECs	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Self-employed	20.1	13.4	24.4	19.5
Self employed with employees	6.4	3.0	6.2	4.3
Part-time worker	6.8	29.3	6.5	8.6
Has second job	6.3	6.0	9.7	8.5
Average hours worked	40.7	33.9	43.7	41.6
Average days of 10+ hrs worked	3.9	1.9	5.7	4.8

Source: Foundation Survey data on working conditions, EU15 (2000) and acceding and candidate countries (2001/2).

Much of this is due to the fact that women are more likely to work full time in the CEECs (only 8.6% have part-time jobs, practically the same percentage as men) than in western countries, where 29.3% of women but only 6.8% of men work part time. This confirms Eurostat figures and the discussion of working time in terms of pay in the previous chapter. In addition, in the CEECs, there is a smaller disparity in overtime work: while, in the EU15, men on average spend twice (200%) as many days working over 10 hours as women do, the comparable number in eastern Europe is only about 115%. It should be noted that both men and women seem to work longer hours and do more overtime work in the east. Thus, the relative gender gap in working time is smaller in the CEECs. No such differences can be found with respect to self-employment, where the two regions show similar gender patterns.

An important difference between the EU15 and the CEECs is the greater significance of second jobs, for both men and women, in the transition economies: applicable to 9.7% of men and 8.5% of women, compared with only 6.3% and 6.0% in the west. This could be due to a number of factors, including low pay.

Gender segregation

Occupational segregation is itself a cause and an outcome of gender inequality and thus of significant importance for researchers. The Foundation finds similar patterns in terms of horizontal occupational segregation by sector in eastern and western Europe (although several problems can be found which may question the validity of the occupational classifications in the Foundation survey). Below, occupational classification is reviewed in an aggregated form, which is likely to yield more reliable results than a disaggregated one.

Occupational segregation

In both the CEECs and EU15, women tend to occupy professional, lower professional and semi-professional positions, outnumbering men significantly in these categories (Table 21).

Men still dominate in managerial positions as well as the blue-collar skilled labour group (although this is more true in western than in eastern Europe where a large number of women work in occupations classified as skilled blue-collar.) In both regions, women are slightly more likely than men to work in unskilled blue-collar positions. While Foundation figures for the CEECs are similar to Tables A11 and A12 on managerial grades, there are considerable differences for the other groups, particularly Group 4 (clerical), where the Foundation finds far more women. The figures for men are also very different.

Table 21 Percentage of men and women in occupational categories (EU15 2000, CEECs 2002)

	EU15		CEECs	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Manager	9.4	6.8	6.7	4.8
Professional	12.2	15.7	13.0	13.2
Technician	28.3	55.3	25.6	42.5
Skilled worker	35.0	8.0	36.4	18.2
Unskilled worker	8.0	10.1	7.8	10.5

Note: agricultural workers have been omitted because this category showed questionable reliability when comparing the percentages from the survey to aggregate data. Managers and professionals represent the first two categories of ISCO; technician is used here to combine category 3 and 4.

Sector segregation

This section complements the examination of segregation by sector in Chapter 2. It compares Foundation data on the EU15 and CEECs, comparing the latter with national LFS data.

As already indicated, segregation of employed men and women by sector varies considerably across countries due to the structure of the economy, primarily the role of agriculture and services. Nevertheless, the patterns of gender difference in eastern and western Europe show similar trends although, according to the Foundation, they appear less pronounced in the CEECs (Table 22).

In general, a comparison between Foundation and LFS data suggests that the former underestimates the degree of gender segregation. For sub-totals of NACE 3, 4 and 5 (collectively, industry) LFS data from the country studies show greater segregation than Foundation data. In both regions, women are concentrated in the service sector, especially public services (such as education, health, etc), while men are more likely to be found in manufacturing, mining, construction and agriculture. Slight differences include women's stronger presence in agriculture in eastern Europe (although Foundation data give higher proportions than LFS country data), as well as a smaller gender inequality in manufacturing (Foundation data give less segregation than the data at national level).

Gender and management structure

The Foundation produces a useful insight into gender and organisational structures by asking questions about the number of subordinate workers for men and women. Table 23 below outlines

women's greater presence in positions of management authority in the CEECs compared with the EU15. While greater percentages of men in both regions are in management posts, the ratio between the proportion of women to men in these positions is much greater (81%) in the east than in the west (54%).[6] In higher level managerial positions, women's relative advantage (compared to the west) remains: even among those with more than 10 subordinates, the gender gap (comparing the women's proportion against the men's share) is 73% in the east and 38% in the west. This is, of course, not to say that gender inequality in positions of authority has been eradicated in the east. Nonetheless, women in candidate countries are significantly more likely than their western counterparts to be found in managerial positions and to supervise a larger number of people.

Table 22 Percentage of employed men and women by NACE sector, EU15 and CEECs

	EU15 (Foundation)		CEECs (Foundation)		CEECs (LFS, 2001)	
	% Men	% Women	% Men	% Women	% Men	% Women
All employed	100	100	100	100		
0.5 Agriculture	7.6	4.7	23.6	18.7	13.0	10.9
3. Mining	0.5	0.1	1.9	1.1		
4. Manufacture	24.4	12.9	22.5	20.0		
5. Electricity	1.2	0.3	1.7	2.1		
6. Construction	11.8	1.4	9.0	3.5		
sub-total 3, 4, 5	26.1	13.3	26.1	23.2	30.4	23.2
7. Wholesale trade	13.3	16.7	11.6	13.3		
8. Hotels	3.1	5.7	2.0	2.7		
9. Transportation	8.3	3.5	7.0	5.7		
10. Financial services	3.1	3.7	1.4	2.3		
11. Real estate	8.0	7.1	3.4	3.5		
sub-total 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	35.8	36.7	25.4	27.5	30.2	30.3
12. Public administration	7.4	6.6	5.5	5.7		
13, 14, 15 Public services	11.3	37.2	10.4	21.2		
subtotal 12, 13, 14, 15	18.7	43.8	15.9	26.9	16.1	33.1

Source: Foundation surveys 2000 and 2001/2, and national LFS data

Table 23 Percentage of men and women with subordinates

	EU15		CEECs	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Has subordinates	23.9	12.9	20.6	16.8
Has many subs	6.8	2.6	5.5	4.0
Has male boss	90.9	56.9	81.9	60.8

Source: Foundation survey data on working conditions, EU15 (2000) and acceding and candidate countries (2001/2)
Note: Has subordinates = at least 1, has many subordinates = at least 10 subordinates.

[6] The ratios are derived by dividing the proportion of women in positions of authority by the proportion of men in similar positions, then finding the percentage (and multiplying the ratio by 100). This is analogous to calculations of the wage gap. For example, in candidate countries, 16.8% of women and 20.6% of men have subordinates. Dividing the former by the latter and multiplying the ratio by 100 gives 81%, or a gender ratio in positions of authority of 4:5.

On the other hand, the gender gap is smaller in the east in terms of having a male boss (ratio percentage of women to men is 74%) compared with the west (female to male ratio is 63%) – suggesting women are slightly more likely and men slightly less likely to have a male boss in the CEECs than in the EU15.

Other job market resource aspects

There is evidence in the Foundation data that the labour market experience of men and women in terms of job and employer continuity is more similar in the CEECs than in the EU15. While there is roughly a 20% difference in the length of men's and women's tenure in jobs in their present company in the EU15, no such gender difference appears in the CEECs. Similarly, there is no difference in the percentage of men and women who work for larger companies in the CEECs, although the percentages are smaller than in the EU15. This finding needs further elaboration in terms of economic structure since, although there was fragmentation of large companies after privatisation in the transition economies, there are substantial numbers of large companies and multinationals. Data also demonstrate lower levels of on-the-job training in eastern Europe, but with a smaller gender gap. However, this could be due to differences in vocational training systems, and need not imply that CEEC workers are less trained or skilled than their western counterparts (Table 24).

Table 24 Percentage of men and women who received job training and average number of years in the job and at the company, by gender; percentage of men and women working in large companies (EU15 2000, CEECs 2001/2)

	EU15		CEECs	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Received job training (%)	20.1	18.4	13.7	12.9
Time in job (years)	11.2	9.1	12.5	12.4
Time in company (years)	11.6	9.3	9.6	9.8
Employed in large company (50 + employees) (%)	36.9	31.3	27.8	26.4

Source: Foundation survey data on EU15 (2000) and acceding and candidate countries (2001/2)

Other job characteristics

Table 25 shows several more indicators characterising people's jobs and job satisfaction. However, caution is needed in interpreting these numbers. The most striking observation is that, in eastern Europe, more men than women claim that they have experienced harassment or discrimination on the job. However, considering the overall lower percentage of people who report health risks associated with their jobs, it is plausible that people's perception of 'discrimination' and 'harassment' is not easily comparable between the regions. Difference in terminology and understanding of what constitutes discrimination raises the possibility of high thresholds of tolerance. Additional factors are a long history of weak trade unions, a fear of job loss, and, overall, a lower number of successful demands made on employers and of labour protests. In this context, women may have lower expectations of non-discriminatory and non-sexist treatment for historical and anti-feminist reasons.

Table 25 Percentage of men and women who experienced discrimination, considered their jobs as health risks, and mean number of hours taken by travelling to work (EU15 2000, CEECs 2001)

	EU15		CEECs	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Ever felt discrimination (%)	11.5	16.7	12.6	11.6
Health risk (%)	68.5	76.5	54.3	61.8
Travel time to job (Hours)	37.7	36.5	43.3	44.9

Note: The 'discrimination' indicator in the first row was created by asking respondents whether they ever experienced harassment, violence or any form of discrimination on the job.
Source: Foundation survey data on EU15 and acceding and candidate countries

Occupational classifications

In discussing occupational and horizontal segregation, a number of differences were noted when comparisons were made with national data and that presented in Chapter 2. Here, this is taken further by juxtaposing Foundation ISCO-88 occupational distribution data with those derived from the individual national reports (Labour Force Survey, LFS, and national statistical office surveys, Table A11).[7]

Table 26 Percentage of female employment in each occupation using ISCO-88 codes by country, weighted by w2

	All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
BG	100	3.6	18.2	12.5	12.2	14.8	4.6	13.6	7.6	11.9
CZ	100	**10.6**	18.6	16.3	8.5	15.9	3.5	10.1	3.7	12.6
EE	100	5.8	18.8	11.0	8.0	15.3	**12.7**	13.1	2.0	13.3
HU	100	8.9	14.6	18.2	**7.6**	20.8	**6.8**	7.1	**1.8**	14.3
LT	100	5.4	14.6	16.6	**15.4**	16.5	**2.0**	14.8	2.3	10.6
LV	**100**	**2.4**	**11.3**	15.5	**19.2**	23.8	-	2.2	**21.8**	3.0
PL	100	6.4	**13.4**	**5.6**	4.5	9.1	**13.2**	**26.1**	9.6	8.8
RO	**100**	**6.7**	20.7	15.9	15.4	16.3	**1.2**	9.7	3.0	11.1
SI	100	3.7	**3.7**	**20.8**	**28.3**	21.3	**1.4**	7.5	1.2	11.8
SK	100	3.7	13.1	23.9	10.9	18.8	0.9	13.4	2.9	12.4

Note: highlighted figures are those which diverge markedly from LFS data.
Source: Foundation survey in acceding and candidate countries, 2001/2

[7] ISCO-88: 1: Legislators, senior officials, managers; 2. Professionals 3. Technicians and associated professionals, 4. Clerks, 5. Service workers, 6. Skilled agricultural and fishery workers. 7. Craft and related trade workers, 8. Plant and machine operators and assemblers, 9. Elementary occupations.

Table 27 National (LFS) data: % of female employment in each occupation using 1SCO-88, 2001

	% female workforce in ISCO-88, 2001									
	All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
BG	100	6.2	16.9	15.6	10.3	18.3	5.5	9.4	7.8	9.3
CZ	100	3.9	13.0	23.1	14.7	18.1	1.8	7.0	7.7	10.7
EE	100	8.0	18.8	19.5	7.7	18.5	1.1	3.9	3.3	14.3
HU	100	5.2	14.9	19.2	13.8	19.0	2.2	8.7	7.6	9.1
LT	100	6.9	21.7	11.9	7.2	18.1	11.2	10.6	2.9	9.4
LV	100	8.0	17.5	15.7	8.4	20.9	7.5	5.7	4.1	12.2
PL	100	4.2	24.2	21.9	17.4	8.9	0.3	7.1	4.1	11.9
RO	100	1.3	6.9	10.8	5.4	10.0	44.7	10.0	4.3	6.6
SI	100	4.8	14.6	15.1	14.6	16.0	8.9	2.2	15.3	7.0
SK	100	3.7	14.0	24.6	10.9	19.7	1.1	7.3	6.6	12.1
All		5.2	16.3	17.7	11.0	16.8	8.4	7.2	6.4	10.3

The numbers in the Foundation data (Table 26) are quite different from the percentages derived from the national reports and shown in Table 27, with the latter probably producing more reliable results. One obvious problem is the classification of white-collar workers: there seems to be some confusion in the Foundation survey about category 3 and especially 4 (technical and clerical workers). Category 4 is underestimated in several countries (e.g. Hungary, 7.6% (Foundation) and 13.8% (LFS)) and overestimated in Latvia and Lithuania. The sum of the two categories seems more stable, suggesting the difficulty of differentiating between these two categories of lower white-collar work.

The second major area of confusion is in category 6, agricultural workers. This category has percentages in the Foundation survey which are vastly different from the LFS numbers in several countries, (it is overestimated in Estonia, underestimated in Latvia).

In addition to these recurring problems, there are several large discrepancies in random categories in some of the countries. For example, nobody is classified as a skilled agricultural labourer in Latvia. In Poland, 26.1% of women are coded as 'craft and related trade workers', which compares to only 7.1% in the report from Poland. In Romania, 6.7% in the Foundation survey but only 1.3% in the national report are coded as legislators/managers. Even more striking, while the national report classifies over 44% of women as agricultural labourers, only 1.2% appear in this category in the Foundation survey – clearly an underestimation in this highly agricultural country, even if data are problematic in the LFS due to the issues of the informal agricultural sector, as discussed in Chapter 2. Many more such problems could be listed. These raise the question of how aware the coders (and/or interviewers) were of the precise meaning of these categories in the Foundation survey.

Overall, it is difficult to view the occupational classification in the Foundation dataset as entirely reliable. Instead of these detailed categories, therefore, if this variable is to be used at all, more aggregate categories should be created to assess women's position in the employment structure, since much of the difference in the detailed categories could be due to lack of precision in coding. Since this is probably the hardest category to code, the problems with the occupational data by no means imply overall unreliability. Further variables should be checked against alternative datasets.

Working and raising a family 4

Household, employment and childcare

Before 1989, all state socialist societies had (to varying degrees) generous maternity and family policies which allowed women to leave employment for periods of time with guarantees of getting their jobs back when they returned. Most benefits were insurance based but, since all women were required to work, this only made a difference in a few countries, where the agricultural and/or self-employed population was of significant size. In all countries, maternity benefits allowed most women to raise children but interrupt their working careers for short periods of time only. The state provided benefits which were most often lump sums, never quite sufficient, but a significant contribution nevertheless to the family budget. In addition, pre-school childcare (kindergarten) was provided at work.

After the end of the communist regimes, the system of benefits was overhauled in all the countries, mostly because the states could not and would not finance these expensive policies any longer. As a result, various restrictions as well as liberalisations were introduced. Nurseries were privatised and often became too expensive (Pollert, 2003). Table 28 below summarises the information available about this complex system of policies.

All of the countries have maternity leave policies which allow women (and also men in some cases) to look after newborn babies. The length of this leave varies from two to four months, and benefits are usually tied to social insurance (thus previous employment). Income replacement levels range from 70% to 100%. After the maternity leave period expires, most countries allow parents to take extended paid leave for two to four years. The conditions for childcare or parental leave vary significantly, however: some are tied to social insurance, some to income tests, while in some countries they are guaranteed as a universal right. The level of benefit also varies: in some cases, this is based on previous income, most often it is a lump sum, determined by the state and adjusted – occasionally – to the inflation level. The real value of most of these benefits has declined over the past 10 years, but they still often represent a significant portion of poor families' budgets. The period spent on caring for children counts towards retirement credits in most countries, although the actual conditions vary and are usually not particularly beneficial to women who spend a lot of time away from the labour market.

In addition to longer term childcare leave, many countries pay family allowances to parents with dependent children, either as a universal right or if they are in financial need. These payments, along with a number of other benefits in kind or less regular cash benefits, are supposed to help families raise children, and often target poor families or families with a large number of children. The amount is often higher in single parent families, but it is rarely sufficient to cover the actual costs of raising a child.

Parental leave policies also provide job protection although, in economies where companies change, restructure, and disappear as rapidly as they do in eastern Europe, such protection is often meaningless.

There are a few important national variations in the character and conditions of maternity and child benefits. First, while all countries allow fathers to take parental leave, only in Slovenia do fathers have a non-transferable right to spend time with their offspring. In all the other countries, fathers can choose to take leave if the mother does not but, because of cultural expectations as well

as financial constraints, this happens in less than 1% of cases. Slovenia, however, has started to experiment with a more radical solution to encourage fathers to take care of their children, the result of which is still to be evaluated.

Very few countries have benefits which accrue on the basis of universal rights, even though such eligibility produces the lowest amount of stigmatisation, the easiest navigability within the system, and more political acceptance for such welfare policies. Hungary has the most extensive universal provisions, while Poland seems to be at the opposite end: here a means test and an insurance criterion must be passed for women to get the most typical form of childcare benefit.

Attempts to overcome declining birth rates include providing incentives by increasing childcare/family benefits with each subsequent child. However, the amount is rarely enough to cover the expense. Unfortunately, comparable statistics are not available to show the proportion of family income which comes from family benefits. From the countries where these data do exist, it seems that such benefits form a significant portion of many large (and poor) families' budgets. Some countries are in the process of introducing or experimenting with new forms of family benefits. Tax credits, for example, are growing in popularity in Hungary. While providing tax credits to parents raising children may be popular politically, it also redistributes financial support away from very poor families (who do not have enough income to take advantage of tax credits) to middle class, or at least lower middle class ones. Since, in Hungary, as in a number of other eastern European societies, poor families are disproportionately more likely to come from the Roma minority, tax credit type policies often have a racially discriminatory implication, encouraging and supporting birth among the white majority.

With regard to childcare facilities, it is not considered fashionable to have nursery care for children up to two or three years of age: most women are now expected to look after children at home until this age. The number of places in nursery schools has declined sharply in most countries in the past 10 years, although the proportion of children who used these facilities had never been particularly high. Kindergartens are more popular, and cater for children between three and six years of age. While some reports emphasise the significant drop in kindergarten places, this is not true for most countries (ILO, 2003). In several of the countries, even though there was a drop in the number of children enrolled, this was largely due to a lower number of children born over the past decade. The proportion of children in kindergarten among the appropriate age range actually increased (in Slovakia and Slovenia, for example). In some countries, such as Poland, the expense associated with a kindergarten place has increased prohibitively, making it difficult for certain families to place their children in day care. In summary, children under three years of age tend to be taken care of in households in the CEECs (mostly by mothers, increasingly by grandparents, and rarely by fathers). After three years of age, and especially between four and six, most children attend some form of day care, which seems to be available, especially in urban areas, in all of the CEECs in this study.

Table 28 Summary of family and childcare provision, 2001

	Basic maternity and parental leave	Fathers' rights	Other child-related benefits
BG	135 days leave + additional paid leave up to age 2 + additional 1 year unpaid leave	Father and grandparents can take it	Child allowance for poor people
CZ	Maternity leave: 14-28 weeks at 69% of pay for the insured Parental leave: non-income tested, up to 4 years. Based on subsistence minimum. Available to those taking full-time care of children. Earnings limited, child in day-care max. 5 days per month	Fathers can take it but don't (0.74%)	Child allowance: income tested and set sum using minimum + age of child Social allowance: income tested
EE	n/a	n/a	n/a
HU	Maternity leave 70% replacement (insurance; 24 weeks) mother only Childcare benefit (GYED). For insured parents, 70%, up to age 2. Cannot be employed. Childcare allowance (GYES) to parents who care for child to age 3. Part-time job allowed. Flat rate. Minimum pension. Universal. GYET (1993): 3+ children under age of 8, now universal, minimum pension	Father can take all, except maternity leave in 2000: 0.4%	Family allowance: up to age 16. Universal Child protection benefit income tested – now supplementary family allowance Tax credits: increased
LV	112 days at 100% of pay if insured, or at the average of insurance pay if not	Fathers can take 10 days at 80% of salary	
LT	Maternity leave at 100% replacement for 16 weeks, some prior Parental leave – if insured: 60% replacement to 3 years. If uninsured, social benefit universal, not means tested	Father, grandparent, or any parent figure can take it, 1.2% men in 2001	Large families get universal benefits Low income families get additional income tested benefits
PL	No universal benefits. Maternity benefit: 16 weeks, at 100% for insured Child raising leave and allowance: 3 years to care for child up to age 4. Income tested: 60% of net minimum wage. Money for 24 months only, leave may be longer. Must be insured	Father can use 2 weeks of maternity leave Men can take childcare leave as well (1996) Higher for 3+ children	Special childcare leave: 80% of wages, if child is sick, or nursery school closes or crisis, for 60 days per year. Only under insurance Family allowance: means tested, higher for 3+ children
RO	Maternity leave: 126 days. Insurance based, 85% replacement Parental leave up to 2 years and part-time work up to 7 years of child. Insurance based. Supplementary non-paid leave for 1 year	Father can take it too + paternal leave for 5 days in first 5 weeks	
SK	28 weeks at 90% replacement, insurance based. Parental leave up to age 3	Father can take it too	
SI	Maternity leave – insurance, 105 days Childcare leave – 260 days to age 3, insurance based	Fathers get 90 days non-transferable leave without pay	Child allowance: means tested Parental allowance – universal lump sum, adjusted

Source: Information from national reports

An issue discussed elsewhere (Pollert, 2003) is that the legal availability of childcare provisions for working mothers, whether generous or not, has become an excuse for gender discrimination. The argument used by employers – and one which is widespread in western Europe, often flying in the face of official equal opportunities policy and rhetoric (e.g. Collinson et al, 1990) – is that women are allegedly less attached to the labour market and are expensive to employ because of their propensity to raise families.

The analysis now moves to the wider policy arena for implementing equal opportunities in the CEECs.

Gender equality policies 5

Labour market policies and gender

Active labour market programmes

The evidence in this section draws on the national reports, and details of sources can be found in these. All countries have active labour programmes including vocational training, temporary job and public works schemes, and programmes to encourage entrepreneurship, employability and self-employment, all targeted particularly at the long-term unemployed, unskilled, young and old people. There is no general regional pattern in, for instance, the Baltic or Balkan countries, but it appears that, with rising unemployment, measures have become increasingly passive.

In Estonia, state spending on labour market measures has been increasing, but its already low relative share of GDP decreased during 1994–2001, with passive programmes rising by 27% and active ones falling by 38%. The share of jobseekers participating in active measures also decreased during 1995–2001 (from 20.9% to 14.1%; Estonian National Development Plan, 2002), perhaps reflecting the fact that unemployment training programmes do little to help find jobs. Although these programmes are rarely specifically aimed at women, women are often the most active participants (see Bulgarian and Estonian reports), in line with their generally high participation in education and training. In some countries, such as Lithuania, there are programmes to enable women with young children to re-join the labour market. Hungary has worked with the EU equal opportunities programme on developing four pillars within its employment plans: employability, entrepreneurship, adaptability and gender mainstreaming. In particular, women, Roma and disabled people are targeted for special action.

Between 1997 and 2000, Poland had a specific programme to reduce female unemployment and prevent women's poverty. This campaign increased women's participation in special programmes to 50% but, among these, the percentage who were registered as unemployed decreased from 43% in 2000 to only 12% in 2001. This coincided with the shift towards more passive labour market policy for 2003–2005. However, part of this programme also requires state bodies to mainstream gender equality, including cooperation with non-governmental organisations and research activities to gather gendered data. The 'Sectoral operational programme for human resource development' (2003) supports the findings of the present study that women, although better educated, are more active in searching for jobs and more flexible in their occupational reorientation than men, but continue to have poorer opportunities for employment, earning and advancement in the job market. Legal amendments relating to adjustment to EU standards do not produce much effect, supporting concerns that harmonisation on paper may not put policy into practice (Pollert, 2003).

In Slovenia, there were no special action programmes for women until the late 1990s, despite the fact that two-thirds of all persons in job seekers clubs were women in 1996/7 and, in 1998, more than 60% of those in training and educational programmes were women. However, from 2000/01, things began to change. The Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs and the Ministry for Small Enterprises and Tourism prepared a programme for enhancing the vocational promotion of women. The programmes of active employment policies up to 2005 also aim at easing work and family integration.

Slovakia endorses active labour market programmes in its national action plans on employment for the years 2002/3. These are based on the guidelines of the European employment strategy, paying specific attention to the issue of equal opportunities for women and men.

Romania is unusual in increasing its active labour market programmes. In 1991, re-training programmes were run by the administrative departments of the Ministry of Labour and its 42 county labour offices dealing with major job loss. The National Agency for Employment was established in 1999, taking over the existing administrative network, including the 15 training centres dedicated to unemployed people, job search, managing the unemployment fund, and paying unemployment benefits. Since 2000, its work has shifted towards active measures, such as organising job fairs for specific target groups, and offering subsidies for hiring new graduates and mature unemployed people; small loans for establishing small and medium-sized enterprises, as well as training and career guidance. Active measures increased from 1% to 20% of the agency's activity from 1999 to 2002. Women have been targeted by specific measures, especially in deprived regions, even when female unemployment decreased below the male rate. This was largely inspired by preparations to join the EU in terms of promoting greater gender equality in employment.

National action plans

As the national reports show, the eight new Member States included in this report signed up to employment plans to increase men and women's labour market participation and reduce unemployment from the beginning of 2000, with specified targets to increase the employment rate. The principle of establishing national action plans on employment (NAPs), following EU guidelines on tackling gender gaps and reconciling work and family life, became widespread from 2002. Adherence to goals set in Lisbon (2003) for employment rates in 2010 of 70% (total) and 60% (for women) varies slightly. In Latvia, these targets are 67% and 57% respectively for 2005, in Estonia, 63% and 59% for 2004. Lithuania plans to cut unemployment from 11.1% to 8.7% between 2003 and 2005, but women are not named as a special target group. In Slovenia, the active employment policy guidelines (2002) defined women as one of four target groups for participation in active employment policy programmes (the other three being people younger than 26 years old, persons with disabilities, difficult-to-employ persons and redundant workers). Female-oriented programmes were directed towards assistance at home, encouraging self-employment and entrepreneurship. However, in the national action programme for employment for 2004, the government does not envisage any programmes targeted specially at women, but plans to have equal opportunities as a 'horizontal' measure in all programmes and policies.

Gender equality and the legislative framework

The progress of gender equality legislation in the CEECs is uneven. Some countries, such as Bulgaria, have experienced problems in agreeing on definitions. Here, the 'Law against discrimination' came into force in 2003, but several drafts for an equal opportunity law had not been passed by that year, with a seeming reluctance among women members of parliament to consider separate gender issues. Similar problems in raising gender issues across the CEECs are discussed in Pollert, 2003. Romania ratified international conventions on gender equality and existing gender equality laws during the communist period. In addition, there is a 2002 law on equal opportunities containing provisions for equal pay, protection against dismissals resulting from gender discrimination, an equal treatment principle for access to vocational training, and promoting equality in working conditions. No mention is made in the national report of positive action to remedy disadvantage.

In most countries, equality laws are integrated into labour laws. Separate equality legislation on gender discrimination and provisions for positive action to reduce disadvantage are in various

stages of development. In the Czech Republic, the 1991 Act on Employment was amended in 2000 to ban employment discrimination on the basis of gender, sexual orientation, marital and family status or family obligations. The Labour Code was revised in 2001 to include provisions for equal treatment, and ban direct and indirect discrimination as well as sexual harassment. The Slovakian Labour Code was similarly revised to comply with EU Directives on equal pay and on direct and indirect discrimination but, as has been already noted, the wage gap remains large. Currently, the government, in cooperation with various Slovakian and international NGOs, is drafting a general anti-discrimination law.

In Hungary, the Act on Equal Treatment and Promoting Equal Opportunities was passed in 2003, including definitions of direct and indirect discrimination, although the national report does not discuss indirect discrimination such as age barriers, or conditions at work which disproportionately affect women. This raises the question of how the term is really interpreted. Latvia introduced new labour laws in 2002, on equal pay for work of equal value, equal opportunities in occupational categories and professional education, and against gender discrimination in job advertising and selection. However, the national report refers to research which finds that, 'Real life shows that these rules do not always work'. In Lithuania, according to the 2000 regular report from the European Commission on Lithuania's progress towards accession, legislation is substantially in line with EU law. In Estonia, paragraphs of the constitution deal with equal rights, while prohibition of discrimination is contained in the Employment Contracts Act, Employment Services Act, Wages Act and Advertising Act. A more wide-ranging Gender Equality Act was finally approved in draft by Parliament in early 2004, after numerous revisions since 2001, to cover areas left too vague within labour law.

Poland adheres to EU requirements in equal opportunity legislation for recruitment, promotion, salaries, job protection, prevention of gender-based discrimination, and protection of employed women. Most of these changes were included in the revised 2002 Labour Code, which contains a chapter on men and women's equal treatment. This defines equal treatment, and direct and indirect discrimination, as well as stating that women's rights cannot constitute grounds for discrimination. However, as in the case of Latvia, research shows that implementation of those rights is unsatisfactory (Zielińska, 2003; Pollert, 2003 for wider evidence across the CEECs of this problem). Polish research also shows that Polish women do not demand implementation of their rights (Titkow, 2003) as they have not yet learned to make use of them. Specialists suggest that most women in Poland, especially those less educated, do not recognise some obvious signs of individual discrimination, although most do recognise more general discrimination patterns (Fuszara, 2002; see also earlier discussion in this report about problems of interpreting perceptions of 'harassment' and 'discrimination' in the Foundation's research).

In Slovenia, the two most important recent laws on equal opportunities are the Labour Relations Act (2002) and the Act on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men (2002). The first prohibits discrimination in all aspects of employment, outlaws gender preference in advertising, and enshrines equal pay for work of equal value. The second act has a broader remit to define common grounds for improving the status of women, and establishing equal opportunities for women and men in political, economic, social, educational and other fields of life. It defines terms such as 'gender equality', 'direct' and 'indirect' discrimination, and the general and specific measures needed to achieve equal opportunities. It also determines institutions responsible for equal opportunities, primarily the government and ministries.

In all the national reports, the key message which comes across is that, although legislation now largely conforms to EU standards, enforcement is a very different issue.

Monitoring and implementing equal rights

The machinery for monitoring gender equality is varied and multi-level, and the descriptions below reflect varying degrees of detail, and sometimes criticism, of its actual operation.

The Czech Republic established a Department for the Equality of Men and Women within the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs in 1998. Its brief is to coordinate ministerial and national gender equality policy and programmes. The Ministry produces periodic reports to the International Labour Organisation. However, according to recent research, it seems that this department has not greatly affected other state institutions, such as other ministries, Parliament, the Senate, the courts and non-state organisations such as political parties and trade unions (Musilová, 1999, p.201).

In 2001, a government council for equal opportunities of women and men was set up. Deputy ministers form a large portion of the members, along with representatives of NGOs, the Czech Statistics Office, and delegations of employers and trade unions from the tripartite Council of the Economic and Welfare Agreement. By 2003, it had met only three times. The initial meeting on 24 April 2002 was unique in that at least the deputy ministers were present. After this, they were often absent or were only represented by others, either with or without a voting right. Representatives of the Ministry of Finance, Healthcare, Defence, Agriculture, and Interior were absent most frequently. The agenda, set by individual ministries, usually covered fathers' rights in child custody proceedings, domestic violence and labour market discrimination. From the minutes of the meetings, it is clear that the importance of some issues (domestic violence, labour market, training of state officials) is recognised but the gender awareness of some Council members (mostly deputy ministers) is low, with 'displays of defensiveness and irony' (national report).

It also appears that Czech state institutions and ministries do not cooperate with women's NGOs. The Government Council for Human Rights, established in 1998, monitors the national Constitution, the Declaration of Basic Rights and Freedoms and other legal norms concerning human rights and basic freedoms. It includes a Committee for the elimination of all forms of discrimination of women. Again, the rights of fathers in child custody proceedings and visits are often addressed. There is also a parliamentary Commission for Equal Opportunities and Family within the Committee for Social Policy and Health Care. One of its responsibilities is to conduct research and participate in the development of new policies in relation to family-relevant issues such as social security and pensions (ILO, 2001). Since 1999, an Ombudsman (Public Protector of Rights) is in place, but this office has not received any submissions on gender equality.

A further development was a government resolution in 2001 for all ministries to create a half-time post (four-hours per day) to implement an equal opportunities agenda. Research shows, however, that there has been no systematic way of doing this, nor any system of accountability. The degree and type of activity vary between individual ministries, with the Ministries of Interior and Education, Youth and Sports being among the more active ones, covering matters such as domestic violence, gender equality in education, teachers and curriculum matters. The Ministry of Trade has a different approach. It cooperates with the Association of Female Managers and Businesswomen,

and concentrates on supporting women's small and medium-sized enterprises. Research shows that equal opportunities are approached from a general 'human resources' perspective, rather than one of women's rights. This terminology (using women's talents and resources for the development of society) appears less threatening and more acceptable in the higher power echelons at the ministries. The Czech report argues that this approach will not eliminate the unequal power distribution, nor will it reveal the existing division of labour and power between the genders. Rather, it will serve further to exploit women in that they will be expected to behave like men in the labour market without addressing the issue of the unequal division of labour at home. Thus, the existing gender contract is reinforced, as is the double workload of women.

Slovakia has followed similar institutional developments to the Czech Republic (Placintar, 1998, p.17), although fewer details of its practice have been given. In general, there appear to be a smaller number of institutional developments, although this does not mean that monitoring is any less effective (no evidence available). The country's Department of Equal Opportunities and Anti-discrimination was established at the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family in 1999, and is the only government institution dealing with equal opportunities for men and women and anti-discrimination. As elsewhere, its role is to develop policy and legislation in line with the EU, and it cooperates with women's NGOs. In 2003, the Parliamentary Commission for Equal Opportunities and Status of Women in Society was created at the Committee for Human Rights and Status of Women. It is an open forum for information and ideas related to gender issues.

In Estonia, a Bureau of Gender Equality was formed at the Ministry of Social Affairs in 1996. It is responsible for drafting legislation and research on equal opportunities, but the national report states a general lack of recognition of gender-related problems and of research in the area, with gender monitoring only beginning in 2003. In Latvia, the Ministry of Welfare is the main institution for developing and coordinating gender equality policy, and in 1998 it set up, within its Department of European Affairs, the Board of Gender Equality. However, it is staffed by only two people and, with only a consultative role, its influence is limited. A recent development is the Women's Commission of the Saeima (Parliament) and the Subcommission of Gender Equality. Monitoring and enforcing gender equality at work is divided between the State Labour Inspectorate, the State Bureau of Human Rights and the courts. NGOs are also active in monitoring equality issues but, as the national report argues, resources are invested mainly in dealing with the consequences, not the causes of inequality.

In Lithuania, there is a similarly multi-level institutional equal opportunities monitoring structure. In the Seimas (Parliament), there is the Group of Women Parliamentarians and the Committee of Family and Child Affairs. At government level, there is the State Consultant on Foreign Relations and Relations with NGOs. However, the main responsibility for policymaking on gender equality lies with the labour market and equal opportunities division within the Ministry of Social Security and Labour. In March 2000, the government approved the establishment of the permanent Inter-Institutional Commission on issues of equal opportunities for men and women. Members of the Commission are representatives from all ministries and certain departments. The Commission coordinates the activities of national institutions that are implementing equal opportunity policies for men and women.

In addition, the Office of Equal Opportunities has an independent public institution status. The Equal Opportunities Ombudsman supervises the implementation of the provisions on equal rights

and opportunities for women and men as set forth in the Constitution and in the Act on Equal Opportunities. The office investigates complaints related to discrimination and sexual harassment in cooperation with other officials. The Office of the Equal Opportunities Ombudsman, the Labour Inspectorate, and the courts all have the right to investigate claims regarding a violation of the principle of equal pay. The Law on Equal Opportunities requires annual reports from the Ombudsman to the Seimas on its activities, which are made available on the Internet. A further example of good practice is a cooperation agreement signed in 2000 between the Office of the Ombudsman and the State Labour Inspectorate that, if the latter finds infractions of the Law on Equal Opportunities during an inspection, it will inform the Ombudsman and hand the material over for investigation. At a voluntary level, Lithuanian NGOs have been growing and promoting gender equality. One of the most active organisations is the Women's Information Centre, which initiates social studies, and collects and analyses gender related statistics on employment, entrepreneurship, education and family issues (see http://www.lygus.lt).

In Hungary, the Ministry of Employment and the Labour Market has had the main monitoring responsibility, with a Secretariat of Equal Opportunities covering employment issues, drafting and enforcing labour-related legislation, and periodically reporting to the ILO on Hungary's compliance with conventions and UN treaty monitoring bodies. The national report cites the National Equal Treatment Authority as the main government agency, suggesting that this role has now become more autonomous. There is a Parliamentary Commissioner for Civil Rights, who can also investigate equal pay cases, and a Human Rights Policy Cabinet made up of government ministers. These deal with human rights issues, including equal opportunities for women, and cooperation with groups formed after the 1995 UN conference in Beijing. There is also a Hungarian Gender Databank sponsored by the Ministry of Social and Family Affairs, which contains information on women's issues (ILO, 2001).

Apart from these formal mechanisms, at the level of research and equal opportunities awareness, Hungary benefited from participating in an international equal opportunities programme in 1996, having been selected to join an ILO training and information dissemination project funded by the Dutch Government. The project's outcomes included a comprehensive report, 'Women in the world of work in Hungary' (ILO-CEET, 1998), the development of 30 equal opportunities trainers, and the first successful litigation against a company for infringing the prohibition of discrimination in job recruitment in 1997. Equal pay issues are largely the responsibility of the National Labour Inspectorate, which has authority to examine working conditions and pay. There are no exact data on this process. In public organisations, every employer with over 50 employees is required – together with the trade union or works council – to create a fixed-term equal opportunity action plan. This plan is supposed to be implemented in private firms also at some point in the future.

In Poland, equal opportunities monitoring and enforcement resides in the special Government Plenipotentiary, which focuses on education and promotion (its uneven development is outlined in Pollert, 2003). Its operation programme on human resource development aims at the re-integration of women into employment. However, the national report argues that the public discourse on women's issues lacks a gender mainstreaming perspective. As elsewhere, feminist and women's NGOs are active, but mainly in big cities and among educated young women.

In Slovenia, the Governmental Office for Equal Rights is authorised to monitor enforcement of the law, while the Human Rights Ombudsman is an autonomous person independent of state bodies,

elected by the National Assembly to protect human rights and basic freedoms in relations with state bodies, local government bodies and those holding public authority. In that function, the Ombudsman is also authorised to protect gender equality. Because both laws (the Labour Relations Act and Equal Opportunities Act) are fairly new, it is still difficult to assess how they are enforced and what the employer responses and employee attitudes are. Future research is needed in that regard. The Office for Equal Opportunities expects problems with enforcing the legislation primarily because of a badly informed workforce and an inefficient and slow judicial and enforcement system. These concerns are endorsed by recent research (2001) on organisational strategies concerning equal opportunities, which indicates an absence of any written equal opportunity/diversity policy in a sample of Slovenian organisations (with 200 or more employees). Only about 30% of organisations reported that they had unwritten organisational policies in this area, and only 17% monitored women's promotion.

In Romania, the machinery for implementing equal opportunities is multifaceted – in Parliament, within an Ombudsman institution, and in the Economic and Social Council structure. In 1995, a special equal opportunities department was created within the Ministry of Labour, identifying priority issues – new regulations, action programmes and national schemes, working in cooperation with other ministries and central bodies active in the field. An advisory intergovernmental commission was created in 2001, for consultation on equal opportunities between different governmental and non-governmental organisations, and for elaboration and monitoring of the national action plans on employment. However, the practice of monitoring equal opportunity related issues remains low. Efforts are being made to improve the situation, including a PHARE programme launched in 2003 to establish a National Agency for Equal Opportunities between men and women. Results to date are far from satisfactory. Gender disaggregated data are poor and inconsistent. With all the active promotion of equal opportunity issues, the National Agency for Employment remains the only national institution whose data are gender disaggregated. Even the national statistical office does not collect all its data by gender and, when it does, they are not easily available. A national action plan for the development and improvement of gender-based statistics is planned for 2004. The present government made special efforts to demonstrate its commitment to equal opportunities issues: four female ministers were appointed in comparison with none in the previous government.

The general picture, then, of tools for monitoring and implementing equal opportunities across eastern Europe, is that substantial institution-building is taking place, with often complex and perhaps duplicating systems of overseeing legal developments and broader gender-related issues. This fragmentation could lead to problems of responsibility and accountability: as to who, or which institution is ultimately responsible for gathering data and presenting information? However, the most pressing finding to emerge from this review is the yawning gap between official policy and enforcement mechanisms, and practice. There appears to be little official evaluation of the progress of equal opportunities, and the level of knowledge is commensurate with informal and academic efforts to research the situation. Where such research has taken place, it is critical of the efficacy of the law and effectiveness of law enforcement.

6 Gender and employment: industrial relations context

This chapter provides a brief background on industrial relations as a key dimension for promoting gender equality. Clearly, where there is no collective bargaining, weak union presence, or no conception of negotiation or social partnership, good equal opportunities practice is likely to suffer, along with all working conditions. When enforcement of equal opportunities legislation is left to state agencies alone, its success depends on the strength and effectiveness of that legislation, monitoring and enforcement. The outline of these mechanisms in the previous chapter suggests that they require other pressures to put them into practice.

However, the existence of unions and collective bargaining by no means guarantees the pursuit of gender equality. In the CEECs, as elsewhere, unions have been male domains, often strengthening gender differentials. This report makes a start in drawing together some information on the presence of gender awareness within unions. There has not been time to pursue this among employers; enterprise-based research, at this level, is greatly needed. Concerning the unions, the national teams have attempted to explore statistical membership, gender monitoring, female union membership, women's representation at senior union levels, and the existence, if any, of gender issues in collective bargaining.

Table 29 summarises collective bargaining coverage and unionisation rates in the eight new Member States included in this report.

Table 29 Bargaining coverage rates and unionisation rates in eight of the new Member States (%)

Country	Coverage rate of collective agreements	Unionisation rate
Czech Republic	25–30	30
Estonia	*	Under 15
Hungary	45–50	20
Latvia	Under 20	30
Lithuania	10–15	15
Poland	*	15
Slovakia	50	40
Slovenia	Almost total	41.3

Source: Foundation 2002a, p. 3.

* Coverage rates are available only for the various bargaining levels, and there are no general figures taking into account the overlapping of agreements concluded at different levels.

The higher rate is calculated on the basis of an active labour force working in areas where trade union membership is allowed by legislation.

Notes: All figures are estimates except trade union density in Slovenia; the figures refer to different years between 1999–2001; details of sources are in the Foundation 2002a report.

Recent research on industrial relations in the acceding and candidate countries was conducted in 2002 by the Foundation (European Industrial Relations Observatory, 2002a and b). Pollert (1999) has shown that the pattern of development of industrial relations in the CEECs has generally followed a path of tripartite institution building at national level, but leading to weak and increasingly fragmented bargaining practice arrangements. In most countries, there is a growing large non-union sector, and union membership has declined sharply even in organised sectors.

Foundation research shows that there is significant sectoral level bargaining coverage in only two countries, Slovenia and Slovakia (although the quality in the latter, according to the Foundation, is in doubt), so bargaining coverage is in general low, and occurs primarily at company level. Thus, in most countries, low union membership rates weaken collective control at the workplace. Union density and bargaining coverage, as Table 29 shows, vary from 40% in Slovakia and Slovenia to 15% in Estonia, Lithuania and Poland. Estimates for Bulgaria and Romania, which were not included in the Foundation study, are in the national reports and summarised below.

In some countries, unions have gender membership breakdowns and women's sections, but this varies. In most countries, the union confederations are members of the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) and have good links with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), both of which have established significant programmes of research and activity on gender issues.

Bulgaria
Women's membership of the largest trade union in Bulgaria (CITUB), was about 47% in 2002, and the representation of women in the last congress (2001) was similar (both close to overall female employment representation in the labour market). Some 27% of the highest body, the coordinating council, is female. A women's commission affiliated to the CITUB was established in 1995 and is an active member of various networks or coalitions, such as the ICFTU central and eastern European Women's Network and the Balkan Women's Network.

Czech Republic
The majority of trade unions belong to the Czech and Moravian Confederation of Trade Unions (ČMKOS). Membership is on a steep decline, although current figures are not easily available. The confederation has a council for equal opportunities.

Estonia
Union membership, organised in the Trade Union Confederation (EAKL) and the Office Workers Trade Unions organisation (TALO), has declined (the national report gives a figure of 30% – far higher than the Foundation's). Some sectors are better organised (engineering, light industry, mining and transport, and public sector workers such as teachers) while some are very poorly organised (services, especially finance). In their programmes, the unions have declared that they will stand for equal rights in gender relations, especially for equal pay, access to training possibilities, etc. In reality, the activity of unions on gender-related issues is uneven. In some traditional industries and occupational groups, such as public services (health care and education), the activity of unions is considerable. There are no separate sections for women in trade unions, nor are there data on membership by gender.

Hungary
The Hungarian trade union confederations have not collected gender breakdowns of membership. However, the National Confederation of Hungarian Trade Unions' handbook, 'EU Directives of industrial relations and their validation in the Hungarian practice of collective bargaining', has a chapter 'Gender equal opportunity and collective bargaining', which suggests that gender is officially recognised as an issue. Only one of the six union confederations has a women's section, the National Confederation of Hungarian Trade Unions. This section has a sub-committee of gender and equal opportunities. Its latest main event was the third National Conference of

Employed Women held in 2003, with a presentation on EU equal opportunities policies and an ILO conference in 2003, 'Gender mainstreaming in workplaces'.

Latvia

As in other post-communist countries, union membership in Latvia is low, and the problems of lack of interest are fully discussed in the national report. Only 20% of employed people in Latvia were members of the Association of Free Trade Unions of Latvia (AFTUL) in 2003 (a lower figure than in the Foundation's findings), and 86% were over 25 years old. However, women comprise a high, though declining, proportion: in 1996, 60% of all members were women; in 2002, the figure was 58%. A Women's Board of the AFTUL was set up in 1999 (re-named the Gender Equality Board in 2002) and has conducted research, and organised seminars and conferences on gender issues, as well as ensuring that member unions monitor membership by gender. Baltic women trade unionists have been among the more active in promoting equality in central and eastern Europe (Petrović, 2000). The national report for this study cites several instances of activity: cooperation with ETUC, the ICFTU and the Baltic Trade Union Council (BTUC), with projects such as women's training on labour rights and collective bargaining.

Lithuania

There are three main trade union confederations in Lithuania: the Lithuanian Trade Union Confederation (LPSK), which became affiliated to ETUC in 2003 and has a womens' centre; the Lithuanian Labour Federation; and the Trade Union 'Solidarity'. Each of these has several regional branches and organisations. As everywhere in the CEECs, union membership is declining and, as in Latvia, more than half are women (70%). The high female membership in these two Baltic states needs further research. In general, however, unions are highly fragmented, and have little influence.

Poland

Trade union membership has declined as elsewhere, with the national report calculating a mere 8% membership in 2001 (almost half the Foundation figure – though differing dates and possibly different data from the two union confederations could contribute to the varying estimates). Women's interests are not especially pursued by the unions, although Solidarity NSZZ, a Plenipotentiary of the National Commission for Women's Affairs, was established in 1996 with a research and policy function on women's problems at work. This office is responsible for monitoring women's position in the union, liaising with international women's organisations, and disseminating their findings and recommendations. One finding is women's under-representation at senior union levels: there are only eight women among 106 members of the Country Commission; in the presidium, there are two women out of 13 officers; and among chairpersons of 16 sector secretariats, there are just two women.

In the other main confederation, OPZZ, a women's commission has been created with a prepared agenda for the period 2002 to 2006. Its programme aims to address the equal status of women and men at work, politics, the public domain and family lives. The commission also supervises implementation of the 'Equal Status of Women and Men Act', and prepares and presents to state authorities opinions on current changes of the law which might affect women at work, in society, and in public and family life. It focuses on both law enforcement and raising women's awareness about their rights. Among its campaigning activities, it is attempting to restore the significance of International Women's Day. Activists are finding it difficult to change the traditional union culture of support for protective policies for women which reinforce acceptance of innate gender

differences and prop up the conventional worker-mother role. Gender mainstreaming, or women's promotion perspectives, barely manage their way into the collective bargaining agenda. With survival the pressing issue for unions, the position of women is seen as a diversion, rather than an integral part of the solution to this problem.

Romania

Unions have not made their membership figures available, but as elsewhere and for the same reasons, unionisation has declined. Women's membership depends on sector, but remains below the total female share of employment. Blocul Naţional Sindical (National Trade Union Confederation) states that it has 35% female membership (www.bns.ro), while the Confederaţia Sindicatelor Democratice din România (Confederation of Romanian Democratic Trade Union) gives a higher figure, having among its members feminised sectors such as textiles and education. The percentage of women in senior union positions remains low, but not as low as in some countries, though below 20% in most of the national representative confederations. All national representative confederations have women's sections, most of them active in pursuit of equal opportunity legislative elements in collective bargaining.

Slovenia

While union density has declined in Slovenia, this has not been as steep as in many other parts of central and eastern Europe. At the beginning of the 1990s, approximately 60% of the workforce were members of trade unions but, by 1998, the density rate had fallen to 42.8%, and remained at this level in 2000. Membership records on gender are poor. Not even the largest trade union (Association of Free Trade Unions of Slovenia, ZSSS, which has approximately half of the unionised workforce) has exact gender data. The second largest, the Confederation of Independent Trade Unions (KNSS), estimated that in 1991 women represented 30% of members, in 1995, 35% and in 2001, 25%. The ZSSS has had a committee for equal opportunities at association level for three years and some of its branch trade unions also have such committees. The KNSS intends to organise a women's section and has a person responsible for equal opportunities. The ZSSS committee for equal opportunities organised a preparatory meeting in 2003 for the integration of equal opportunities into collective bargaining. This covered three themes: balancing family and work responsibilities; the professional advancement of women; and sexual harassment and dignity at the workplace. It will prepare written proposals for branch collective bargaining. However, women are under-represented in senior union posts, with only 36 out of the 133 members of the ZSSS congress, two out of 22 in the presidency, and two out of 20 branch union presidents. The ZSSS represents all Slovene unions in ETUC and has a representative on its equal opportunities section. Although it is not a member of the ICFTU, its committee for equal opportunities is invited to all educational seminars organised by ICFTU in south east Europe.

Slovakia

The Confederation of the Trade Unions of the Slovak Republic (KOZ SR), which represents 34 sectoral trade unions, is the main union centre in Slovakia. Although union membership has also declined here (to about 30%), collective bargaining still plays a role and, with about 50 sectoral collective agreements signed each year, it is less fragmented than in some countries. The coverage by collective agreements is also high, with 45% to 50% of employees covered. Women comprised about 42% of the total KOZ SR membership in 2003. A women's committee was established at KOZ SR to coordinate gender equal opportunities issues and raise this as part of the collective

bargaining agenda. Analysis of selected sectoral collective agreements shows that the main gender issues dealt with were maternity leave and working time arrangements for working mothers with young children.

The industrial relations context of gender and equal opportunities is thus varied. Higher union membership and bargaining coverage do seem to be associated with at least some women's activity. Activity seems to be largely concerned with law enforcement, data gathering, presentations to and lobbying of government on equal opportunities, and awareness-raising (education) and training. Linking with international organisations appears to be an important area of this work. However, there are few countries in which gender issues are being mainstreamed into collective bargaining. In Latvia, there seems to be some individual unions which raise women's issues, and gender appears to be slowly entering the bargaining agenda in Slovenia and Slovakia. However, in all countries, despite women's sections, women are grossly under-represented at senior level.

Conclusions 7

Overview of gender equality and employment

This report explores the key dimensions of women's labour market position in 2001, and compares these to findings from the Foundation's surveys of the EU15 (2000) and the acceding and candidate countries in 2001/2.

Structural socio-economic changes in the central eastern European countries in recent decades have impacted on women's and men's conditions of work and quality of life. The contribution of women's employment and earnings to their gender development was one element in the formerly high GDI ranks of the CEECs, and this has clearly been cut. Although women continue to constitute around 45% of employed people, female labour force participation rates have gone down, and women have dropped out of the labour market to work in household and informal economies or, when still present, are over-represented among unemployed people.

The Foundation and other European Commission studies suggest that, in many ways, the gender equality situation in eastern Europe is similar to, or better than the west. It shows a similar but smaller income gap; similar but less sexual segregation; similar organisational structures at work, but with more women in management roles. If this is so, it would not be surprising. East European women come from a legacy of high education, high labour force participation, and both the expectation and the means to combine family work and employment. The 'worker-mother' model was intrinsic to communist labour market policy, instilling a conservative gender contract at home, but maintaining high female labour force participation. There were clear patterns of gender segregation, but women nevertheless broke into more professions and more senior positions than in western Europe. There is a tradition of a strong labour market attachment.

An important part of this study is to highlight not only common patterns across the CEECs, but also significant national differences, considering the vastly different economic structures and histories of the 10 countries. Sectoral structures have historically differed, most obviously between the more agricultural and industrialised economies, and their restructuring and changing gender compositions have been varied. All countries experienced deep recessions, but there are variations between countries in terms of unemployment rates for men and women. In the Czech Republic, Poland and, recently, in Slovenia, it is higher for women than for men, as is the case in the EU15. In other countries, such as Bulgaria and Lithuania, where this pattern pertained until 1995, female unemployment is now lower, although this may be due to lower female activity rates in the labour market. Even within the broad pattern of declines in agriculture and industry and increases in services, there have been exceptions, with agriculture expanding in Romania, and industrial expansion in Hungary.

However, there are common patterns which are significant for gender, transition and employment. A trend emphasised in this report is the overall rapid increase in men's private service sector employment for all the CEECs, from about 20% in 1990 to 30% in 2001 – a far greater increase than for women. This is in striking contrast to the public sector where only 13% of men were employed in 1990 for the countries for which data are available, and only 14% in 2001. Thus, while currently about a third of men and women work in the private services, for men, this represents a rapid increase as shown.

What does this study show about gender and work in the CEECs, and how does it reflect on those parts of the Foundation's survey where comparison is possible? The evidence shows that, broadly, women's position in these countries today is similar to that in western Europe in terms of gender segregation, with some influences from the previous legacy. As for the pay gap, it seems to be slightly larger than in the EU15, by some two to four percentage points. Moreover, between 1996 and 2001, the gap widened further in the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and only narrowed slightly in most other countries, although more so in Bulgaria and Lithuania. Four countries still have women earning only around three quarters of men's gross monthly wages (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia and Slovakia); the rest are around 80%, with Slovenia standing out at 89%. Among top professionals (ISCO-88, Group 2) in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary and Slovakia, women seem to be earning less money relative to men now compared with the mid-1990s. For example, in Hungary, women's wages among professionals as a percentage of men's decreased from 70.5% in 1997 to 64.3% in 2001. This indicates the segregation of women within the professional category.

These findings question the suggestion in a European Commission paper (2003, p.12) that 'the gender pay gap in the accession countries has been declining over the last decade'. Few countries have improved on their early 1990s position, which suggests that the last decade of a market economy has done little for women's progress towards equal pay. This throws into doubt the meaning and reliability of the Foundation's finding of a narrower 'income gap' in the east than the west. As discussed in this report, this may simply reflect a measure which does not compare like with like, because it is based on monthly pay in both regions, and compares eastern European women's longer earning hours with western European women's shorter ones. There is also a concern that the small size of the Foundation's sample may have provided misleading data.

This study finds that gender segregation is not more moderate in the CEECs. In terms of horizontal (sectoral) segregation, it is simply slightly different. Women are more present in some 'male' industries and manufacturing is far more gender-mixed. This is not surprising in view of the history of women's high participation in industry. But segregation works in another way in the east in terms of greater female crowding. Women are more heavily over-represented in the public sector than in the west. In this sector, pay is low and the pay gap (while narrower than in some sectors, at about 80%) is widening. In western Europe too, the pay gap in this sector is narrower than the average. In terms of vertical segregation, there are smaller proportions of women in the top occupations in most of the CEECs compared with the EU15 and, although there have been improvements, there is little sign of less segregation in this regard. Foundation data do show that more women have management posts in eastern Europe; but this merely reveals something about women's positions within the occupations and sectors in which they are concentrated – low-paying, feminised jobs – and says little about equal opportunities.

A key finding in this study points to the high and increasing level of educational attainment among women in the CEECs – a legacy which is enduring, despite labour market disadvantage. The data suggest differences between eastern and western European women: in the CEECs, greater numbers of women are in the professions and semi-professions than in the west. However, at present, this has delivered few financial advantages. As was seen in the sectoral analysis, these professions are mainly in the public sector, which has suffered from budgetary cuts in the economic transition programmes. Secondly, within these professions, women suffer disadvantage compared with men. Both Czech and Slovenian research indicate that women graduates earn considerably less than

their male equivalents. An examination of the wage gap within occupations shows a widening in the professions since the mid-1990s: women are well represented, but it is clear that the occupations themselves are becoming increasingly vertically segregated, with men taking the better paid posts. There is also the question of whether education is helping women gain the better jobs where new, high paying occupations and sectors are being created, such as in banking and finance. In the past, these were feminised jobs in many countries, because of women's high qualifications in economics and similar disciplines. But sectoral analysis shows that, while the sectors themselves are expanding, and remain more female dominated than in the west, they are becoming de-feminised. More generally, women are losing their share of other expanding private services, such as retail (Tables A6 and A8). At the same time, the occupational analysis shows that women are becoming increasingly ghettoised in clerical jobs.

These findings on occupational segregation in the CEECs differ from those of the Foundation. The Foundation finds a broad similarity in women's representation in professions and semi-professions when comparing its survey in the acceding and candidate countries (Foundation, 2003) with its earlier EU15 survey (Fagan and Burchell, 2002). However, comparing the national reports' occupational analysis with the EU15 survey, this study has found considerably greater percentages of women in the professions in the east than in the west. The most likely explanation for this discrepancy is in problems of occupational interpretation and definition in the survey organisations used by the Foundation in several countries.

Key advances and key barriers to gender equality

The accession to the EU undoubtedly provides opportunities to face the gender equality challenges outlined in this report. Harmonisation has encouraged existing active labour market programmes, through targets set in national action plans, to raise employment and mainstream gender equality. Existing legislation has been updated and sharpened in many areas, such as in equal pay for work of equal value, rather than just for equal work, and the inclusion of indirect as well as direct discrimination in anti-discrimination law. Most countries have now revised their labour codes and implemented gender equality acts, and have established institutional structures to monitor and enforce legislation. However, the majority of training programmes target unemployed people and few target women. Beyond the problem of unemployment, there is no evidence of any positive action programmes, either in training or recruitment, to counteract the effects of the occupational segregation noted in this study. Nor is there any mention in the national reports of a conception of 'indirect discrimination' – practices which indirectly disadvantage or exclude women, such as the use of age-related recruitment criteria, or requirements at work which are likely to affect and exclude more women than men – and how to counteract it. In general, however, all countries demonstrate some important advances, including banning typecast advertising and recruitment, and discrimination on grounds of sex, family position, sexual orientation, etc.

A significant problem is the gap between institutional structures, legislation and official policy on equality, and actual practice (a gap which can also be present in the EU15). If legislation and enforcement on discrimination and equal pay, for example, were beginning to work, there would be less evidence of continuing and widening pay gaps. If women are disproportionately represented among unemployed people, and if sectoral and occupational gender segregation remain entrenched; if women are in lower paid jobs, fail to break 'glass ceilings', and suffer pay disadvantage even if highly educated, then some form of discrimination is taking place, whether in

employing and retaining women or in paying them. Other social policy factors, such as the unemployment benefit system, and low pay, may make it uneconomic for women to remain in employment; these are beyond the scope of equality legislation and require an overhaul of wider policies which disadvantage women. If social benefits (for example, parental leave which effectively targets only mothers) maintain gender stereotypes, there is no real intervention to challenge the conservative gender contract in the household, which buttresses gender segregation in the world of employment. Legislation should be addressing many of these issues, but there is, as yet, insufficient evidence of this.

The national reports all refer to this dichotomy between policy and reality. Even the falling birth rate has hardly registered as a danger signal of this neglect. The reports are not optimistic about the rise of civil society as a wider context for promoting gender equality. Neither men nor women seem concerned about sex equality, and, although NGOs have sprung up everywhere, they represent very few people and tend to deal with the effects, rather than the causes, of inequality. Trade unions are weak, and few are concerned with women's issues. Employers are either unaware or have little concern for the law; and workers are unaware, or more concerned to hold on to their job than to protect their rights.

The barriers to progress, then, are that conventions, laws and formal EU requirements may become tokens and subordinated to other economic accession criteria, such as free competition. As with all EU policy, the social dimension needs to be challenged. Harmonisation to gender equality and mainstreaming is a positive measure for women and, without the EU, it is likely that the erosion of women's historical comparative gender advantage in the CEECs would be even greater. One positive development in the CEECs is the cooperation of unions, and other parts of the equal opportunities policy apparatus, with international bodies, such as the ILO, and with each other. Nevertheless, policymakers need to be aware that the creation of institutions and policies to satisfy EU requirements need to be followed-up in practice. They are an essential beginning, but not sufficient in themselves for enforcement.

Providing the evidence on gender relations at work through research is a vital foundation for furthering equal opportunities. Without gender-based data, progress is impossible. Indeed, part of the work for this report raised gender awareness in, for example, statistical offices which were required to provide breakdowns by gender – some of which had never done so before. Further work, including more research at micro-level, needs to be done with a wide dissemination to create further pressure for change. Communication among the CEECs and international networking are important for information gathering and sharing, as well as developing greater interest and a higher profile for gender inequality problems. It is hoped that this report makes a contribution to that process.

Bibliography

Atkinson, A. B. and Micklewright, J., *Economic transformation in eastern Europe and the distribution of income,* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Brainerd, E., 'Women in transition: changes in gender wage differentials in eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* Vol. 54, No. 1, 2000, pp. 138–62.

Čermaková, M., 'Gender differences among economically active university graduates', *Czech Sociological Review,* 7, 2, 1999, pp. 127–144.

Collinson, D. L., Knights, D. and Collinson, M., *Managing to discriminate*, London: Routledge, 1990.

Dijkstra, A.G. and Hanmer, C., 'Measuring socio-economic gender inequality: Toward an alternative to the UNDP Gender-related Development Index', *Feminist Economics*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 2000, pp. 41–75.

Einhorn, B., *Cinderella goes to market*, London: Verso, 1993.

European Commission, *Employment in Europe 2002,* Directorate-General for Employment and Social Affairs, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2002.

European Commission, 'Commission Staff Working Paper: Gender pay gaps in European labour markets – Measurement, analysis and policy implications', Commission of the European Communities: Brussels, SEC(2003) 937, 4.9.2003.

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, *Working conditions in candidate countries and the European Union, Résumé,* Dublin, 2002.

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, *Working Conditions in the acceding and candidate countries of the European Union,* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2003.

European Industrial Relations Observatory, *Industrial relations in the candidate countries,* Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2002a, http://www.eiro.eurofound.eu.int/2002/07/feature/tn0207102f.html.

European Industrial Relations Observatory, *Industrial relations in the EU Member States and candidate countries,* Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2002b, http://www.eiro.eurofound.eu.int/print/2002/07/feature/tn0207104f.html.

Eurostat, 'The GDP of the candidate countries', *Statistics in focus, Theme 2 – 18/2001,* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2001.

Eurostat, *Employment and the labour market in central European countries,* Theme 3, Population and social conditions, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1/2002.

Fagan, C. and Burchell, B., European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, *Gender, jobs and working conditions in the European Union,* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2002.

Fodor, É., *Working difference: Women's working lives in Hungary and Austria, 1945–1995,* Raleigh, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.

Fuszara, M., (ed) *Kobiety w Polsce na przelomie wiekow. Nowy kontrakt plci?* [Women in Poland in the turn of the centuries. A new gender contract?] Warszawa: Instytut Spraw Publicznych, Mimeo, 2002.

ILO-CEET, *Women in the world of work: women workers' rights in Hungary,* Budapest: ILO – Central East European Team, 1998, http://www.ilo-ceet.hu/PUBL/p_033/index.html.

ILO, Country summaries for Equal Opportunities Database for the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland (mimeo), Geneva: International Labour Organisation, 2001.

ILO, *The gender dimension of social security*, Geneva: International Labour Organisation, 2003.

Lakatos, J., 'Women in transition in Hungary', Florence: UNICEF International Child Development Centre, Mimeo, 1998.

Musilová, M., 'Equal opportunities as a matter of public interest: an analysis of institutional and social mechanisms', *Czech Sociological Review*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 195–204, 1999.

NCS National Commission for Statistics, Romania, 'Women and the transition in Romania', Florence, UNICEF, International Child Development Centre, Mimeo, 1998.

Orazem, P. and Vodopivec, M., 'Winners and losers in transition: returns to education, experience and gender in Slovenia', *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1995, pp. 201–30.

Papp, U. M., 'Gender policies in transition in Estonia', Florence: UNICEF International Child Development Centre, Mimeo, 1998.

Petrović, J., 'Women save the union' *South East Europe Review*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2000, pp. 117–131.

Placintar, E., 'Report on women and the transition in the Slovak Republic', Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Mimeo, 1998.

Pollert, A., 'Women's employment and service sector transformation in central eastern Europe: Case studies in retail in the Czech Republic', *Work, Employment and Society,* Vol. 9, No. 4, 1995, pp. 629–656.

Pollert, A., *Transformation at work in the new market economies of central eastern Europe*, London: Sage, 1999.

Pollert, A., 'Women, work and equal opportunities in post-communist transition', *Work, Employment and Society*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 2003, pp. 331–357.

Shircel, M., 'The analytic report on women in Slovenia', Florence: UNICEF International Child Development Centre, Mimeo, 1998.

Titkow, A., (ed) *Szklany sufit. Bariery i ograniczenia karier kobiet*, [A glass ceiling. Barriers and constraints to women's careers], Warszawa: Instytut Spraw Publicznych, 2003.

Trappe, H. and Rosenfeld, R.A., 'A comparison of job-shifting patterns in the former East Germany and the former West Germany', *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 14, No. 4, 1998, pp. 343–68.

Trappe, H. and Rosenfeld, R.A., 'How do children matter? A comparison of gender earnings inequality for young adults in the former East Germany and the former West Germany,' *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 62, No.2, 2000, pp. 489–507.

Tzetokova-Anguelova, J., 'Some aspects of women's situation in the transition in Bulgaria', Florence: UNICEF International Child Development Centre, Mimeo, 1998.

UNDP, *United Nations Development Programme Human Development Report*, New York: United Nations, dates as given in text references.

UNICEF, *Women in transition*, The MONEE Project, CEE/CIS/Baltics, Regional Monitoring Report, No. 6, Florence: United Nations Children's Fund, International Child Development Centre, 1999.

World Bank, *Gender in transition*, Washington, 2002.

Zielinska, E., 'Przeciwdzialanie barierom awansu kobiet w prawie Unii Europejskiej'. [Counteracting against barriers to women's promotion in European Union law] in A. Titkow (ed), 2003.

Appendix

Table A1 Population CEECs 1985–2001 in 000s, and working age population (EU definition) as percentage of total

	1985				1990				1995				2001			
	All	M	F	% 15-64	All	M	F	% 15-64	All	M	F	% 15-64	All	M	F	% 15-64
BG	8,949	4,443	4,514	67.8	8,669	4,270	4,399	65.6	8,384	4,103	4,281	67.1	7,929	3,862	4,066	68.1
CZ	10,340	5,019	5,321	63.1	10,636	5,037	5,326	66.3	10,331	5,020	5,311	67.7	10,295	5,020	5,275	70
EE	1,524	708	815	66.6	1,570	735	836	76.0	1,481	671	776	65.2	1,367	630	736	67.0
HU	10,640	5,138	5,502	66.1	10,709	5,189	5,521	64.6	10,246	4,904	5,342	67.7	10,200	4,851	5,349	68.3
LT*	2,093	1,079	1,014	56.9	2,4791	1,199	1,280	66.3	2,461	1,189	1,272	66.3	2,321	1,116	1,205	66.8
LV	2,588	1,196	1,391	67.1	2,658	1,237	1,422	66.7	2,470	1,139	1,331	65.7	2,346	1,080	1,266	65.4
PL	37,341	18,211	19,129	65.0	38,183	18,606	19,577	64.0	38,609	18,786	19,823	66.3	38,632	18,761	19,871	69.3
RO	22,779	11,240	11,539	66.2	23,192	11,440	11,752	66.3	22,656	11,108	11,548	67.7	22,408	10,949	11,459	68.7
SI	1,975	958	1,016		2,000	970	1,030	68.8	1,990	968	1,022	69.4	1,994	975	1,019	70.1
SK**	4,996*	2,455	2,541	63.5	5,311	2,596	2,715	64.6	5,368	2,614	2,754	66.8	5,379	2,612	2,767	62.9

*Lithuania: dates 1989, 1991, 1996, 2002

**Slovakia: date 1980 for 1985

Table A2 Employment rates (percentage employed of total, of male and female populations aged 15–64), and activity rates (labour force as percentage of total, male and female populations aged 15–64), 1995, 2001

	1990						1995						2001					
	Employment rate			Activity rate			Employment rate			Activity rate			Employment rate			Activity rate		
	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F
BG	63.1	63.9	62.4	64.2	n.a	n.a	53.9	57.5	50.5	63.1	67.4	58.9	51.2	53.6	48.8	60.7	64.5	57.1
CZ	n.a	n.a	n.a	66.3	n.a	n.a	61.5	71.5	52.3	67.7	70.4	65.5	60.0	69.4	51.3	70.0	71.9	67.9
EE	77.4	83.2	71.9	77.9	83.7	72.4	65.5	70.9	60.5	72.6	79.3	66.3	61.1	65.2	57.3	70.1	75.2	65.4
HU	75.6	82.7	68.6	80.0	83.8	75.9	52.8	60.0	45.9	58.8	67.9	50.3	55.3	62.4	48.5	60.0	67.8	52.4
LT*	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	65.0	68.3	61.9	77.8	81.2	74.5	57.7	59.0	56.4	69.7	73.8	65.9
LV*	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	57.0	62.2	52.3	71.7	78.7	65.3	58.8	62.1	55.8	67.9	72.8	63.6
PL	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	50.7	58.5	43.7	58.4	66.5	51.1	45.5	52.5	39.0	55.8	63.4	48.8
RO	70.5	n.a	n.a	70.5	n.a	n.a	72.7	79.0	66.4	79.0	72.9	63.6	63.6	69.0	58.2	78.5	74.7	62.4
SI**	52.4	58.5	46.9	57.7	64.9	51.1	54.4	61.0	48.4	67.9	73.4	62.4	54.4	61.2	48.1	67.7	72.6	62.7
SK	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	51.8	60.0	44.2	59.7	68.8	51.3	48.5	54.4	43.1	60.7	69.2	52.9

Source: national reports *Figures for Latvia and Lithuania, 1996, not 1995.

**Slovenia, figures closest to 1990 are 1993. This applies to all tables where these dates are used

Table A3 Composition of female workforce by sector of employment: percentage of total female workforce in four sectors, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2001

	% of women in sector, 1985				% of women in sector 1990				% of women in sector 1995				% of women in sector 2001			
	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector
BG	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	10.6	28.7	26.8	32.0	7.1	27.2	31.8	32.2
CZ	10.3	34.6	29.5	23.3	9.5	33.2	29.5	25.7	4.9	27.9	37.4	27.5	2.9	26.4	39.0	24.5
EE	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	13.8	28.6	24.4	28.7	7.6	24.5	32.4	33.6	3.8	22.2	36.3	36.6
HU	7.1	37.0	n.a	n.a	7.7	26.9	30.8	32.9	4.7	23.5	31.8	38.8	3.5	24.2	34.0	37.1
LT	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	15.3	28.1	25.0	29.0	16.5	18.5	29.0	34.0	12.9	19.6	25.7	40.5
LV	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	12.6	18.7	28.1	38.7	10.4	17.3	33.9	36.8
PL	4.2	30.5	n.a	n.a	3.3	27.8	n.a	n.a	1.2	27.9	27.5	43.9	1.0	22.6	29.4	45.3
RO	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	46.2	22.9	14.5	15.0	47.4	19.9	15.9	15.8
SI	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	10.0	33.9	27.0	27.0	9.6	27.3	31.4	30.2
SK	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	6.4	26.8	29.3	35.6	3.7	24.1	31.7	38.5
All	7.2	34.0	29.5	23.3	9.0	29.0	28.4	29.2	12.5	25.4	27.9	32.5	10.9	23.2	30.3	33.4

Source: National report tables, LFS unless otherwise stated. All (CEECs) unweighted average.

Key: Agriculture (NACE 1), where fishing separate (NACE 2) this is added to NACE 1; Industry (NACE 3,4,5); Services (NACE 7, 8, 9, 10, 11); Public sector (NACE 12, 13, 14, 15).

Notes: Lithuania: 1992 figs for 1990; Poland: 1985, 1990 Statistical Year Book, GUS, KGN classification (only comparable data included); NACE 1996 figures for 1995. Slovenia: 1990 pre-NACE, not strictly comparable; NACE 1993 for 1995, 2002 for 2001

Table A4 Composition of male workforce by sector of employment: percentage of total male workforce in four sectors, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2001

	% of men in sector 1985				% of men in sector 1990				% of men in sector 1995				% of men in sector 2001			
	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector	Agricul-ture	Industry	Services	Public sector
BG	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	13.9	31.6	27.7	17.1	12.0	28.3	33.8	17.7
CZ	13.1	43.8	21.6	9.3	12.9	42.0	22.7	9.9	6.9	36.5	31.2	11.3	5.0	36.0	35.7	7.7
EE	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	21.9	29.1	20.3	10.8	11.4	32.1	30.2	15.1	9.0	30.1	33.1	14.8
HU	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	14.3	32.1	26.0	19.3	10.7	29.2	28.8	21.7	8.4	29.5	33.5	16.8
LT	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	24.4	29.6	15.0	14.3	31.0	23.9	17.4	15.4	21.5	22.0	29.1	15.0
LV	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	19.4	25.1	28.1	17.6	17.3	22.1	30.7	16.5
PL	9.1	42.0	n.a	n.a	9.2	43.0	n.a	n.a	3.3	45.4	24.7	14.7	2.5	41.8	29.7	15.7
RO	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	35.1	30.0	15.0	13.0	41.1	23.3	22.4	12.8
SI	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	11.2	42.9	24.4	12.6	9.6	37.2	29.2	13.5
SK	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	11.4	33.1	24.6	16.6	8.2	34.3	28.1	15.7
All									15.4	32.5	24..9	15.2	13.0	30.4	30.2	16.1

Source: National report tables, LFS unless otherwise stated.

Key: Agriculture (NACE 1); Industry (NACE 3,4,5); Services (NACE 7,8,9,10,11); Public service sector (NACE 12, 13, 14, 15).

Notes: Lithuania: 1992 figs for 1990; Poland: 1985, 1990 Statistical Year Book, GUS, KGN classification (only comparable data included); NACE 1996 figures for 1995. Slovenia: 1990 pre-NACE, not strictly comparable; NACE 1993 for 1995, 2002 for 2001

Table A5 Distribution of men's and women's employment between three aggregate sectors, 1990–2001

	1990						1995						2001					
	Agriculture		Industry		Services		Agriculture		Industry		Services		Agriculture		Industry		Services	
	% of M	% of F	% of M	% of F	% of M	% of F	% of M	% of F	% of M	% of F	% of M	% of F	% of M	% of F	% of M	% of F	% of M	% of F
BG	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	13.9	10.6	31.6	28.7	44.8	58.8	12.0	7.1	28.3	27.2	51.5	64.0
CZ	12.9	9.5	42.0	33.2	32.6	55.2	6.9	4.9	36.5	28.7	42.5	64.9	5.0	2.9	36.0	26.4	43.1	63.5
EE	21.9	13.8	29.1	28.6	31.1	57.3	11.4	7.6	32.1	24.5	45.3	66.0	9.0	3.8	30.1	22.2	46.2	72.9
HU	14.3	7.7	32.1	26.9	45.3	63.7	10.7	4.7	29.2	24.8	50.5	70.6	8.4	3.5	29.5	24.2	50.3	71.1
LT	24.4	15.3	29.6	28.1	29.3	54.0	31.0	16.5	23.9	18.5	32.8	63.0	21.5	12.9	22.0	20.8	44.1	66.2
LV	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	19.4	12.3	25.1	18.7	45.7	66.8	17.3	10.4	22.1	17.3	47.2	70.7
PL	9.2	3.3	43.0	27.8	n.a	n.a	3.3	1.2	45.4	27.9	39.4	71.4	2.5	1.6	41.8	22.6	45.7	74.7
RO	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	35.1	46.2	30.0	22.9	27.0	29.5	41.1	47.4	23.3	19.9	35.2	31.74
SI	10.3	10.7	51.4	33.7	38.3	55.5	11.2	10.0	42.9	33.9	37.0	54.0	9.6	9.6	37.2	27.3	42.7	61.6
SK	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	11.4	6.4	33.1	26.8	41.2	64.9	8.2	3.7	34.3	24.1	43.8	70.2

Key: Agriculture (NACE 1); Industry (NACE 3,4,5); Services (NACE 7, 8, 9, 10, 11); Public sector (NACE 12, 13, 14, 15)

Table A6 Gender composition of industrial sector, percentage of each NACE sector by gender, 2001

	BG		CZ		EE		HU		LT		LV		PL		RO		SI (2002)		SK		All	
NACE	%M	%F	%M	%F	%M	%F	%M	%F	%M	%F	%M	%F	%M	%F	%M	%F	%M	%F	%M	%F	%M	%F
1. Agriculture	64.7	35.3	67.9	32.1	71.0	29.0	74.9	25.1	61.8	38.2	62.9	37.1	60.9	39.1	49.7	50.3	54.1	45.9	72.0	28.0	63.9	36.1
2. Fishing			81.4	18.6	93.0	7.0			96.2	3.8	79.7	20.3	60.0	40.0	100.0	0.0					85.0	15.0
3. Mining	79.2	20.8	85.3	14.7	76.0	24.0	88.2	11.8	78.6	21.4	73.8	26.2	76.9	23.1	88.5	11.5	93.1	6.9	87.4	12.6	82.7	17.3
4. Manufacture	49.5	50.5	61.6	38.4	56.0	44.0	58.3	41.7	47.5	52.5	53.5	46.5	51.5	48.5	52.5	47.5	60.4	39.6	59.5	40.5	59.4	40.6
5. Elec/Gas/Water	73.6	26.4	74.4	25.6	80.0	20.0	75.8	24.2	82.3	17.7	82.0	18.0	64.9	35.1	74.6	25.4	86.0	14.0	82.7	17.3	77.6	22.4
6. Construction	84.2	15.8	91.1	8.9	92.0	8.0	92.1	7.9	91.6	8.4	91.5	8.5	64.5	35.5	88.8	11.2	90.6	8.5	91.9	8.1	87.8.	12.2
7. Wholesale and retail	49.3	50.7	49.2	50.8	59.0	41.0	49.1	50.9	48.9	51.1	40.6	59.4	39.1	60.9	45.4	54.6	47.9	52.1	42.8	57.2	47.1	52.9
8. Hotels and restaurants	41.6	58.4	43.1	56.9	18.0	82.0	51.0	49.0	22.9	77.1	22.6	77.4	36.9	63.1	31.2	68.8	37.9	62.1	39.9	60.1	34.5	65.5
9. Transport, storage, and communications	71.2	28.8	66.6	33.4	69.0	31.0	72.5	27.5	69.7	30.3	68.9	31.1	52.1	47.9	75.5	24.5	77.1	22.9	69.0	31.0	69.1	30.9
10. Financial	39.4	60.6	38.2	61.8	36.0	64.0	30.8	69.2	48.6	51.4	34.9	69.1	41.4	58.6	32.4	67.6	37.4	62.6	26.6	73.4	36.6	63.4
11. Real estate	52.6	47.4	57.3	42.7	52.0	48.0	55.4	44.6	51.3	48.7	54.4	45.6	52.7	47.3	62.6	37.4	55.5	44.5	59.6	40.4	55.3	44.7
12. Public admin, defence, security	61.4	38.6	39.9	60.1	52.0	48.0	54.2	45.8	54.7	45.3	57.2	43.8	49.8	50.2	76.1	23.9	49.4	50.6	49.2	50.8	54.3	45.7
13. Education	21.6	78.4	25.5	74.6	18.0	82.0	22.5	77.5	21.5	79.5	17.1	82.9	39.1	60.9	28.2	71.8	23.6	76.4	20.4	79.6	23.8	76.2
14. Health and social work	22.1	77.9	21.0	79.0	16.0	84.0	23.4	76.6	12.3	87.7	15.6	84.4	39.2	60.8	21.2	78.8	23.4	76.7	17.7	82.3	21.2	78.8
15. Other community, social and personal services	45.0	55.0	46.8	53.2	n.a	n.a	46.2	53.8	31.6	68.4	38.5	61.5	46.4	53.6	57.9	42.1	48.8	51.2	49.2	50.8	41.8	58.2
Total	52.0	48.0	55.7	44.3	51.0	49.0	55.2	44.8	41.8	58.2	50.6	49.4	54.0	45.0	53.2	46.8	54.2	35.8	54.0	46.0		

Source: national reports, LFS data

Table A7 Sector female representation: Women as percentage of total employment and in four aggregate NACE sectors, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2001

	% sector which female 1985					% sector which female 1990					% sector which female 1995					% sector which female 2001				
	All	Agr.	Ind.	Serv.	Pub.	All	Agr.	Ind.	Serv.	Pub.	All	Agr.	Ind.	Serv.	Pub.	All	Agr.	Ind.	Serv.	Pub.
BG	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	46.8	40.2	44.5	46.1	62.2	48.0	35.3	46.9	46.5	62.6
CZ	46.5	40.1	40.6	54.6	70.0	46.3	36.8	40.7	55.4	70.6	44.5	35.9	38.1	49.1	67.2	44.3	32.1	36.9	46.5	69.2
EE	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	48.0	37.0	47.9	53.1	74.0	47.0	38.0	41.1	48.2	68.8	49.0	n.a	41.1	51.5	71.9
HU	45.6	31.6	36.8	n.a	n.a	45.7	31.2	41.3	55.8	58.9	44.3	25.7	39.0	52.9	58.6	44.8	25.1	40.0	54.5	64.2
LT	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	52.9	41.2	51.7	67.7	66.9	50.2	34.9	43.8	62.6	68.9	58.2	38.2	47.8	47.8	73.6
LV	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	47.9	36.9	40.7	47.9	66.9	49.4	37.1	40.4	51.9	68.5
PL	?	27.1	37.0	n.a	n.a	?	24.2	36.0	n.a	n.a	45.3	45.3	49.2	54.1	63.9	45.4	39.1	47.1	54.8	58.7
RO	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	46.0	52.8	39.4	45.0	49.6	46.8	50.3	43.0	46.3	51.8
SI	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	46.6	43.9	40.8	49.1	65.4	45.8	45.9	38.3	47.3	65.5
SK	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	44.4	30.8	39.3	48.7	63.2	46.0	28.0	37.5	49.0	67.7
All											46.4	38.4	41.6	50.4	63.5	48.0	36.8	41.9	49.6	65.4

Source: national reports, LFS unless otherwise stated

Key: Agr: Agriculture (NACE 1); Ind: Industry (NACE 3, 4, 5); Serv.: Services (NACE 7, 8, 9, 10, 11); Pub: Public service sector (NACE 12, 13, 14, 15).

Notes: Bulgaria: 1997 for 1995; Hungary: 1985 Hungarian Statistical Year Book, Total socialist sector; Latvia: 1996 for 1995; Lithuania: 1992 figures for 1990; Poland: 1985, 1990 Statistical Year Book, GUS, KGN classification (only comparable data included); NACE 1996 figures for 1995. Slovenia: 1990 pre-NACE, not strictly comparable; NACE 1993 for 1995, 2002 for 2001.

Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovenia and Slovakia, Agriculture (NACE 1) and fishing et al (NACE 2) are combined

Table A8 Women's representation in service sector (%), 1990–2001

	7. Wholesale and retail trade			8. Hotels and restaurants			9. Transport, storage and communications			10. Financial intermediation			11. Real estate, renting, business			All services		
	1990	1995	2001	1990	1995	2001	1990	1995	2001	1990	1995	2001	1990	1995	2001	1990	1995	2001
BG	n.a	49.5	50.7	n.a	56.6	58.4	n.a	29.3	28.8	n.a	67.8	60.6	n.a	48.0	47.4	n.a	46.1	46.5
CZ	67.9	56.7	50.8	61.9	55.2	56.9	34.3	32.7	33.4	78.2	70.0	61.8	45.0	42.9	42.7	55.4	49.1	46.5
EE	72.0	57.0	41.0	74.6	74.0	82.0	28.0	33.0	31.0	83.0	n.a	64.0	52.0	44.0	48.0	51.1	48.2	51.5
HU	58.2	54.8	59.9	57.9	55.1	49.0	29.8	25.5	27.5	76.0	71.3	69.2	51.2	47.5	44.6	55.8	52.9	54.5
LT	81.7	74.3	51.1	85.5	78.7	77.1	41.7	32.4	30.3	86.1	85.9	51.4	49.1	52.3	48.7	67.7	62.6	47.8
LV	n.a	54.4	59.4	69.9	69.9	77.4	n.a	33.6	31.1	n.a	65.9	65.1	n.a	42.7	45.6	n.a	47.9	51.9
PL	(67.7)	65.0	60.9	n.a	62.0	63.0	n.a	56.5	47.9	(84.0)	70.7	58.6	(42.5)	38.6	47.3	n.a	54.1	54.8
RO	n.a	52.5	54.6	n.a	66.7	68.8	n.a	25.3	24.5	n.a	62.0	67.6	n.a	52.1	37.4	n.a	45.0	46.3
SI	(61.7)	56.7	52.1	(72.1)	66.2	62.1	(17.9)	24.9	22.9	(54.0)	69.5	62.6	n.a	40.4	44.5	n.a	49.1	47.3
SK	n.a	57.9	57.2	n.a	61.5	60.1	n.a	32.3	31.0	n.a	71.8	73.4	n.a	40.9	40.4	n.a	48.7	49.0
All	68.2	57.0	53.8	69.8	64.6	65.5	30.3	32.6	30.8	76.9	70.5	63.7	48.0	44.9	44.7	57.5	50.4	49.6

Notes: Bulgaria: 1997 for 1995; Hungary: 1985 Hungarian Statistical Year Book, Total socialist sector; Latvia: 1996 for 1995; Lithuania: 1992 figures for 1990; Poland: 1985, 1990 Statistical Year Book, GUS, KGN classification (only comparable data included); NACE 1996 figures for 1995. Slovenia: 1990 pre-NACE, not strictly comparable; NACE 1993 for 1995, 2002 for 2001

Table A9 Women's representation in public sector (%), 1990–2001

	12. Public administration, defence, compulsory social security			13. Education			14. Health and social work			15. Other community social and personal service activities			All		
	1990	1995	2001	1990	1995	2001	1990	1995	2001	1990	1995	2001	1990	1995	2001
BG	n.a	35.9	38.6	n.a	76.6	78.4	n.a	78.5	77.9	n.a	52.1	55.0	n.a	62.2	62.6
CZ	58.6	58.5	60.1	74.5	73.8	74.6	81.7	76.7	79.0	51.9	42.0	53.2	70.6	67.2	69.2
EE	52.0	37.0	48.0	75.0	79.0	82.0	87.0	84.0	84.0	n.a	n.a	n.a	74.0	68.8	71.9
HU	34.7	36.7	45.8	75.8	74.5	77.5	75.1	75.7	76.6	49.0	46.7	53.8	58.9	58.6	64.2
LT	37.1	32.2	45.3	67.2	76.9	79.5	82.4	84.7	87.7	76.1	66.1	68.4	66.9	68.9	73.6
LV	n.a	42.4	43.8	n.a	79.6	82.9	n.a	81.8	84.4	n.a	55.4	61.5	n.a	66.9	68.5
PL	n.a	48.0	50.2	76.2	66.6	60.0	81.2	70.0	60.8	n.a	58.0	53.7	n.a	63.9	58.7
RO	n.a	18.9	23.9	n.a	69.1	71.8	n.a	75.6	78.8	n.a	48.4	42.1	n.a	49.6	51.8
SI	n.a	48.4	50.6	65.9	73.9	76.4	85.2	78.9	76.7	n.a	57.9	51.2	n.a	65.4	65.5
SK	n.a	41.7	50.8	n.a	77.0	79.6	n.a	79.8	82.3	n.a	43.3	58.8	n.a	63.2	67.7
All	45.6	40.0	45.7	72.4	74.7	76.3	82.1	78.6	78.8	59.0	52.2	55.3	67.6	63.5	65.4

Notes: Bulgaria: 1997 for 1995; Hungary: 1985 Hungarian Statistical Year Book, Total socialist sector; Latvia: 1996 for 1995; Lithuania: 1992 figures for 1990; Poland: 1985, 1990 Statistical Year Book, GUS, KGN classification (only comparable data included); NACE 1996 figures for 1995. Slovenia: 1990 pre-NACE, not strictly comparable; NACE 1993 for 1995, 2002 for 2001

Table A10 Female representation in occupations, 1SCO-88, 1995, 2001: percentage occupation who are women

	% of ISCO-88 who are women, 1995									% ISCO-88 who are women, 2001								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
BG	28.5	60.4	60.3	75.5	64.1	50.2	26.2	24.5	51.5	32.9	64.5	58.2	74.9	63.9	43.7	31.2	27.2	46.6
CZ	26.8	53.3	53.9	81.7	67.9	51.2	16.3	24.7	60.1	26.2	52.5	53.0	79.2	64.5	40.6	15.2	25.2	58.6
EE	36.0	62.0	72.0	87.0	77.0	49.0	20.0	21.0	56.0	35.0	71.0	69.0	71.0	80.0	36.0	12.0	27.0	53.0
HU	33.8	55.4	63.6	91.9	55.7	28.8	20.8	19.7	56.9	34.4	57.3	64.5	92.6	54.7	28.3	18.0	28.7	54.4
LT	29.6	71.2	61.9	80.2	70.3	54.2	28.8	10.3	60.6	46.9	70.7	66.3	84.2	70.1	40.1	30.2	14.6	54.7
LV	37.8	71.7	65.3	82.3	73.5	42.4	19.4	17.8	48.8	38.2	74.7	62.7	81.0	74.4	45.2	19.7	18.5	45.9
PL	42.2	66.2	66.0	76.8	69.2	22.8	18.6	18.0	59.0	40.6	63.8	67.0	73.3	57.9	36.5	18.6	16.9	60.4
RO	28.2	46.2	60.2	74.9	71.8	56.1	19.5	27.9	43.1	28.5	50.9	62.6	68.7	69.4	52.4	20.0	30.2	40.7
SI	27.2	57.0	50.4	70.8	68.9	48.1	12.3	38.2	53.0	31.6	59.6	49.5	67.1	62.9	45.9	7.9	38.6	61.0
SK	27.4	59.6	56.3	79.4	63.1	41.3	17.1	23.1	51.1	30.6	62.8	60.6	74.7	67.0	46.3	17.4	22.0	52.0
All	31.8	60.3	61.0	80.1	68.2	44.4	19.9	22.5	54.0	34.5	62.8	61.3	76.7	66.5	41.5	19.0	24.9	52.7

ISCO-88 classification:
1: Legislators, senior officials, managers
2. Professionals
3. Technicians and associated professionals
4. Clerks
5. Service workers
6. Skilled agricultural and fishery workers
7. Craft and related trade workers
8. Plant and machine operators and assemblers
9. Elementary occupations

Table A11 Composition of female workforce by occupations: percentage of women workers in each occupation, 1995, 2001

	% female workforce in ISCO-88, 1995										% female workforce in ISCO-88, 2001									
	All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
BG	100	3.2	13.9	17.8	11.5	15.9	8.5	9.2	7.8	11.9	100	6.2	16.9	15.6	10.3	18.3	5.5	9.4	7.8	9.3
CZ	100	3.8	11.3	22.0	14.2	17.4	2.9	8.1	7.3	13.0	100	3.9	13.0	23.1	14.7	18.1	1.8	7.0	7.7	10.7
EE	100	8.7	15.5	20.1	9.3	17.1	5.0	7.6	5.8	11.0	100	8.0	18.8	19.5	7.7	18.5	1.1	3.9	3.3	14.3
HU	100	4.4	13.5	18.0	16.4	17.9	2.3	10.6	4.7	11.8	100	5.2	14.9	19.2	13.8	19.0	2.2	8.7	7.6	9.1
LT	100	4.3	17.0	10.6	9.0	10.5	24.1	9.8	2.0	12.7	100	6.9	21.7	11.9	7.2	18.1	11.2	10.6	2.9	9.4
LV	100	6.8	17.9	17.9	8.7	15.7	8.6	6.3	4.7	13.3	100	8.0	17.5	15.7	8.4	20.9	7.5	5.7	4.1	12.2
PL	100	4.6	21.9	20.3	17.2	8.7	0.2	9.5	4.9	12.7	100	4.2	24.2	21.9	17.4	8.9	0.3	7.1	4.1	11.9
RO	100	1.5	6.2	11.6	6.0	8.0	45.0	5.7	11.0	5.0	100	1.3	6.9	10.8	5.4	10.0	44.7	10.0	4.3	6.6
SI	100	2.7	11.2	17.6	15.9	16.9	9.8	3.7	15.4	6.1	100	4.8	14.6	15.1	14.6	16.0	8.9	2.2	15.3	7.0
SK	100	3.2	12.5	23.3	14.6	16.3	1.8	7.9	6.8	13.5	100	3.7	14.0	24.6	10.9	19.7	1.1	7.3	6.6	12.1
All		4.3	14.1	17.9	12.3	14.4	10.8	7.8	7.0	11.1		5.2	16.3	17.7	11.0	16.8	8.4	7.2	6.4	10.3

Table A12 Composition of male workforce by occupations: percentage of male workers in each occupation, 1995, 2001

	% male workforce in ISCO-88, 1995										% male workforce in ISCO-88, 2001									
	All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
BG	100	7.0	8.0	10.3	3.0	7.9	7.5	22.8	21.2	9.8	100	11.7	8.6	10.3	3.2	9.6	6.5	19.1	19.2	9.8
CZ	100	8.1	8.0	14.7	2.5	6.4	2.1	32.1	17.3	6.8	100	8.3	9.0	15.8	3.0	7.7	2.2	29.7	17.3	5.7
EE	100	14.0	8.9	7.5	(1.4)	4.9	4.9	28.2	20.9	8.1	100	13.3	8.1	8.2	3.2	4.9	1.3	28.5	21.3	10.2
HU	100	6.9	8.6	8.2	1.2	11.3	4.5	32.0	15.4	7.1	100	8.1	9.0	8.6	0.9	12.8	4.5	32.2	15.4	6.2
LT	100	10.2	6.9	6.5	2.2	4.4	20.3	24.1	17.2	8.2	100	7.9	9.1	6.1	1.4	7.8	17.2	24.7	17.5	7.9
LV	100	10.2	6.5	8.8	1.7	5.2	10.8	24.1	19.7	12.9	100	12.7	5.8	9.1	1.9	7.0	8.8	22.6	17.7	14.0
PL	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a
RO	100	3.2	6.1	6.5	1.7	2.7	29.9	20.1	24.1	5.7	100	2.9	5.9	5.7	2.2	3.9	35.7	14.8	20.4	8.5
SI	100	5.9	7.4	15.0	5.7	6.6	9.1	23.0	21.6	4.7	100	8.9	8.2	12.9	6.0	7.8	8.9	20.7	20.3	3.6
SK	100	6.9	6.8	14.4	3.0	7.6	2.0	30.6	18.2	10.3	100	7.2	7.1	13.7	3.1	8.3	1.1	29.7	19.9	9.6
All																				

Table A13 Women's gross monthly pay as a % of men's gross monthly pay, 1996 and 2001, by sector (NACE)

	BG		CZ		EE*		HU		LT		LV		PL		RO		SI		SK	
NACE	1996	2001	1996	2001	1995	2001	1996	2001	1995	2000	1995	2001	1999	2001	1995	2001	1995	01	96	01
1. Agriculture	72.7	79.3	78.5	79.0	91	92	87.8	86.9	84.9	88.4	92.3	85.8	97.6	88.5	n/a	103.9	n/a	80.4	74.5	81.8
2. Fishing			81.5	81.2	86	89	93.9	96.8	78.4	90.0	77.2	82.2	124.6	110.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	70.5		
3. Mining	67.8	77.9	69.7	72.8	56	52	84.0	99.0	n/a	89.0	81.5	84.4	69.6	67.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	86.7	76.2	81.7
4. Manufacture	71.1	68.3	68.2	68.0	79	73	71.4	72.0	n/a	77.3	82.2	84.3	77.7	78.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	78.5	68.6	68.7
5. Elec/Gas/Water	76.8	81.3	78.1	81.0	77	79	76.2	82.7	91.3	83.6	80.6	83.5	90.1	87.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	93.3	87.5	68.9
6. Construction	66.8	85.2	79.0	88.1	74	74	96.8	103.2	81.7	91.0	82.3	89.8	101.4	104.6	n/a	102.4	n/a	119.5	85.6	82.8
7. Wholesale and retail	69.1	76.1	65.7	60.9	66	59	77.7	81.6	91.1	79.9	92.9	71.4	77.9	75.5	n/a	77.0	n/a	79.0	73.6	71.6
8. Hotels and restaurants	81.2	82.6	75.8	72.4	64	65	73.9	73.2	76.7	89.5	89.1	70.9	78.0	79.7	n/a	74.8	n/a	80.8	82.6	76.8
9. Transport, storage and communications	80.3	91.7	83.2	85.7	69	77	90.0	91.4	79.3	83.9	71.6	86.3	96.6	98.6	n/a	98.9	n/a	92.6	91.2	92.1
10. Financial	85.4	83.8	66.9	52.1	72	52	66.9	58.9	70.2	63.0	70.3	58.3	68.4	67.1	n/a	88.5	n/a	71.4	69.0	49.6
11. Real estate	95.8	93.7	79.7	71.8	72	75	93.4	83.3	81.2	87.1	92.7	79.9	87.3	86.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	85.2	77.3	73.3
12. Public admin, defence, security	78.3	83.3	82.6	81.0	89	87	81.5	74.9	83.5	89.5	93.6	100.4	83.3	86.6	n/a	82.5	n/a	87.3	92.2	63.6
13. Education	78.5	81.1	68.6	69.8	85	82	80.5	79.3	84.7	96.9	90.1	89.0	81.4	86.5	n/a	85.5	n/a	73.1	81.5	87.0
14.Health and social work	138.9	73.1	66.4	68.3	81	69	78.1	83.8	85.8	83.6	85.8	83.7	80.3	80.0	n/a	83.3	n/a	83.0	77.5	75.8
15. Other community, social and personal services	85.6	82.0	87.9	83.5	79	74	83.5	82.4	84.5	85.8	74.9	70.7	85.7	87.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	83.0	94.1	80.4
Average total	68.9	76.7	77.1	74.4	71	73	79.0	80.1	70.3	81.4	78.3	80.2	80.0	81.8	79.0	81.6	85.0	89.2	74.5	74.1

Sources: Bulgaria: specially calculated by National Statistical Institute for this project
Czech Republic: Ženy a muži v číslech (Men and women in figures) MPSV, ČSÚ Praha 2000, Ženy a muži v datech. MPSV, ČSÚ Praha 2003
Estonia: Hourly wages and salaries, October, 1996; Hourly wages and salaries 2001. Statistical Office of Estonia
Hungary: Employment and earnings 1998–2001, KSH 2001 year data
Latvia: CSB, Quarterly Survey of Enterprises and Institutions (1st Quarter)
Lithuania: For 1995, Women and men in Lithuania 1998, Vilnius: Statistics Lithuania, 1999, pp. 87–91
For 2001: calculated on the basis of the quarterly sample surveys of wages, Statistical year book 2002, Vilnius: Statistics Lithuania, 2003, pp. 149–151
Poland: Struktura wynagrodzeń na rynku pracy (Structure of earnings at work) w 1999, 2000, GUS, Warszawa; Struktura wynagrodzeń na rynku pracy w 2001, 2002, GUS, Warszawa
Romania: Statistical Office
Slovenia: SORS (Statistical Office of Republic of Slovenia), ZAP/L (Annual Report on enterprises, companies and organisations on gross earnings by level of professional skill and gender)
Slovakia: Statistical Office (1997 and 2002): Structure of wages of employees in Slovakia, 1996 and 2001
TOTALS CALCULATIONS OF AVERAGE: BG: mathematical; CZ: not clear; EE: mathematical; HU: weighted; LT: not clear; LV: weighted; PL: not clear; RO: not clear (Eurostat method, probably weighted); SI: weighted; SK: weighted

Table A14 Women's gross monthly pay as a % of men's gross monthly pay, by occupation (ISCO-88)

	BG		CZ		EE		HU		LT		LV		PL		RO	SI	SK	
ISCO-88	**1995**	**2001**	**1995**	**2001**	**1995**	**2001**	**1994**	**2001**	**1995**	**2000**	**1997**	**2001**	**1996**	**2001**	**n/a**		**1996**	**2001**
1. Legislators, senior officials and managers	90.7	60.2	63.2	54.9	74.4	83.5	83.7	78.4	n/a	78.2	78.2	77.8	75.5	75.1			70.7	60.5
2. Professionals	76.4	78.8	79.3	70.8	76.2	74.3	82.1	64.3	n/a	79.5	75.7	77.5	73.8	73.6			79.2	74.2
3. Technicians and associated professionals	92.2	71.7	75.0	71.5	72.1	69.6	81.0	75.5	n/a	60.7	67.2	84.4	73.4	73.3			72.5	69.0
4. Clerks	62.9	93.7	82.5	78.9	75.8	74.3	90.3	83.5	n/a	81.9	83.6	84.3	93.5	98.4			85.2	85.7
5. Service workers and shop and sales workers	70.4	57.6	72.0	74.4	61.9	73.0	74.7	79.4	n/a	61.8	65.8	65.6	69.8			73.5	71.1	78.5
6. Skilled agricultural and fishery market workers	97.9	146.2	86.2	86.0	80.8	91.6	87.0	94.7	n/a	87.2	70.9	65.7	86.5	85.7			86.2	91.2
7. Craft and related trade workers	79.5	67.2	68.6	68.6	77.0	78.0	73.9	76.1	n/a	75.1	84.4	77.4	65.1	62.6			66.7	72.6
8. Plant and machine operators and assemblers	68.2	76.3	71.4	74.3	88.5	84.8	72.8	78.3	n/a	96.1	101.4	103.1	84.9	81.2			74.3	76.7
9. Elementary occupations	85.1	109.5	77.2	78.8	72.1	71.6	81.9	85.0	n/a	81.8	77.0	78.1	80.3	84.6			81.3	74.9
10. Armed forces	58.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			n/a	n/a

ISCO sources: Bulgaria: ISSP 1995, ISSP 2001, calculations based on mean

Czech Republic: Mzdová diferenciace zaměstnanců v roce 2001, ČSÚ 2002

Estonia: For 1995: 'Hourly wages and male and female workers by occupation in October 1994', Statistical Office of Estonia. For 2001: 'Hourly wages and salaries 2001', Statistical Office of Estonia

Hungary: Specially calculated by Hungarian Statistical Office for this project

Latvia: Data source: CSB, the surveys on occupations in Latvia. Reference period October of every year

Lithuania: The data are based on the survey on wages and salaries by occupation in October, 2000 (updated: 24 June 2003). The survey is conducted every five years applying sampling methods (individual enterprises excluded)

Poland: Rocznik Statystyczny, GUS, Warszawa, 1997 and 2002

Romania: No ISCO data. See national report for other data

Slovenia: No ISCO data. See national report for other data

Slovakia: Statistical Office (1997 and 2002): Structure of wages of employees in Slovakia, 1996 and 2001

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

Working conditions and gender in an enlarged Europe

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

2005 – VI, 76 p. – 21 x 29.7 cm

ISBN 92-897-0907-3

SALES AND SUBSCRIPTIONS

Publications for sale produced by the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities are available from our sales agents throughout the world.

How do I set about obtaining a publication?

Once you have obtained the list of sales agents, contact the sales agent of your choice and place your order.

How do I obtain the list of sales agents?

- Go to the Publications Office website http://publications.eu.int/
- Or apply for a paper copy by fax (352) 2929 42758

EF/04/138/EN

Working conditions and gender in an enlarged Europe *presents a comparative study of working conditions for women in 10 central eastern European countries. The countries include eight of the 10 new Member States of the European Union, and two of the candidate countries, Bulgaria and Romania. National research teams provided a wealth of material analysing key dimensions of the labour market and work situation for women during a period of economic transition. This report's purpose is threefold: to bring together the findings of the national reports; to explore in greater detail the Foundation data in terms of comparison between its 2001 survey of the acceding and candidate countries and 2000 survey of the EU15; and to use the national reports to evaluate the Foundation findings.*

The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions is a tripartite EU body, whose role is to provide key actors in social policymaking with findings, knowledge and advice drawn from comparative research. The Foundation was established in 1975 by Council Regulation EEC No. 1365/75 of 26 May 1975.

Publications Office

Publications.eu.int

ISBN 92-897-0907-3

9 789289 709071