



HELLENIC REPUBLIC



HELLENIC STATISTICAL AUTHORITY

Reconciliation between work and family life

Labour Force Survey – Ad hoc module 2010

Final Technical Report

Piraeus April 2011

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Target population of Ad hoc module.....	4
3. Sampling design and sample selection.....	5
4. Implementation of survey.....	6
5. Non response and proxies.....	7
6. Weighting and Estimation.....	9
7. Remarks and recommendations.....	9
ANNEX 1 (CODIFICATION SCHEME).....	10
ANNEX 2 (FREQUENCY TABLES).....	13

1. Introduction

In 2009, Grant Agreement N°. 10201.2009.002-2009.492 was signed between the European Community, represented by the Commission of the European Communities and the Hellenic Statistical Authority. Under the rules and conditions of this agreement, Hellenic Statistical Authority will receive a grant from the European Commission in order to implement the 2010 Ad-hoc Module on “Reconciliation between work and family life”.

The variables to be collected in the ad hoc module were laid down in Commission Regulation No 20/2009 of 13 January 2009.

The aim of 2010 ad hoc module is to investigate if, and to what extent, the lack of suitable care services for children and dependant persons affects the participation in the labour force. Additionally, the module had as target to analyse the degree of flexibility offered at work in terms of reconciliation with family life and to estimate how often career breaks occur and how far leave of absence is taken.

In order to accomplish these targets, the ad hoc module was planned to collect information on:

- Care responsibilities for young children or adult dependents
- Volume (in hours per week) of childcare services used by the household
- Impact of availability and affordability of care facilities in labour market participation
- Working time arrangements
- Possibility to change working time arrangements in case of family problems
- Career breaks because of childcare
- Use of parental leave

2. Target population of Ad hoc module on Reconciliation between work and family life.

Target population of the Quarterly LFS comprises of all persons that are living in private households. Therefore, the survey does not cover persons that live in collective households (hospitals, hotels, prisons, etc., or persons doing compulsory military service).

Ad hoc module on Reconciliation between work and family life addressed to a subset of that population, and in particular, persons 15 – 64 years old:

- Questions on care responsibilities were asked to all persons age 15 – 64 years old, while additional filters were used for the rest of characteristics under study: questions on Working time arrangements and the possibility to change working time arrangements in case of family problems were asked to employees, questions on career breaks and parental leave were asked to person having a child 8 years old or less, and questions on impact of availability and affordability of care facilities in labour market participation were asked to persons not working or working part time

3. Sampling design and sample selection

Ad – hoc module's sample was based on LFS sample.

LFS sample is a sample of households that are selected with a two stage procedure. In the first stage, clusters of households are selected from 182 strata. These strata are formed in every NUT III area by allocating municipalities and communes in three different groups (Agglomerations and Municipalities with 10.000 inhabitants or more, Municipalities and Communes with 2.000 to 9.999 inhabitants, and Communes up to 1.999 inhabitants). The exceptions are Athens and Thessaloniki agglomerations, which were divided into 31 and 9 strata, respectively.

During this first stage, 2640 primary sampling units are selected (with probability proportional to their “size” (that is, proportional to the number of households residing in these areas at 2001 census).

During the second sampling stage, in every primary sampling unit of final stratum, a systematic sample of household is selected. All persons, living in these households and satisfying the above described criteria, were interviewed for the ad hoc survey.

The sample size for the ad hoc module was 46,939 persons, belonging to 22,859 different households. Interviews were contacted together with interviews for main Labour Force Survey, during the second quarter of 2010.

4. Implementation of survey

The main tasks which the National Statistical Service faced when creating the ad hoc questionnaire was:

- To transform variables in to questions that could be understood by the respondents, and “translate” the corresponding questions to the Greek situation (that is particular the case for variable PARLEAVE, because the legal framework for parental leave is rather complicated – different regulation for public servants and persons working in the private sector, different regulation depending on the number of persons working in a business, etc)
- To implement complex filtering in a paper questionnaire (especially these referring to the age of children, and to answers in the core questionnaire)

During the creation of the questionnaire, several discussions with interviewers belonging to the permanent staff of ELSTAT took place in order to identify problems and find solutions. A “proper” pilot test did not took place, due to excessive burden at this period. Only a very limited number of questionnaires (about 10) was tested with persons outside the service, while approximately 50 questionnaires were tested in ELSTAT employees.

The survey was conducted during the 2nd quarter of 2010, together with the LFS survey. A separate questionnaire was addressed to the target population (or to a member of their household, after the completion of the core LFS questionnaire).

Two seminars for the interviewers took place in the beginning of March. The first one was addressed to interviewers working in Athens, while the second one was addressed to the persons responsible for the survey in the Regional Statistical offices.

5. Non response and proxies

Total unit non response rate for 2010 module at personal level was 3.7%. Table 1 presents non response rates for the different NUT II areas and Table 2 presents (additional) non response per variable.

Table 1. Unit Non response rates for ad hoc module by NUT II region

NUT II REGION		UNIT NON RESPONSE RATE (person level)
GR11	Anatoliki Makedonia, Thraki	2,7
GR12	Kentriki Makedonia	4,0
GR13	Dytiki Makedonia	4,1
GR14	Thessalia	2,8
GR21	Ipeiros	4,2
GR22	Ionia Nisia	6,0
GR23	Dytiki Ellada	3,6
GR24	Stereia Ellada	3,9
GR25	Peloponnisos	3,9
GR30	Attiki	2,8
GR41	Voreio Aigaio	8,1
GR42	Notio Aigaio	3,5
GR43	Kriti	5,0

Table 2. Non response rates by variable

Variable	Item non-response (%)
<i>Col. 197. REGCARE</i>	2.4
<i>Col. 198. CHILDCAR</i>	2.2
<i>Col. 199. IMPFACIL</i>	2.1
<i>Col. 200. NOWRECHI</i>	4.9
<i>Col. 201. NOWRECAR</i>	11.7
<i>Col. 202. VARHOURS</i>	3.1
<i>Col. 203. POSSTEND</i>	3.3
<i>Col. 204. POSORGWT</i>	4.4
<i>Col. 205. REDWORK</i>	1.8
<i>Col. 206. STOPWORK</i>	2.9
<i>Col. 207. PARLEAVE</i>	1.5

Proxies were allowed in ad hoc module. Total (unweighted) percentage of proxies, for persons interviewed for the ad hoc module, was 44.8%. Proxies percentage is higher for men than women, for unemployed and for persons 15-24 years old .

Table 3. % of proxies be sex, age group and employment status

		Unweighted results			Weighted results		
		Direct Interviews	Proxies	% of proxies	Direct Interviews	Proxies	% of proxies
Employment status	Employed	16,125	12,687	44.0	2,387,905	1,958,951	45.1
	Unemployed	2,030	1,848	47.7	305,019	288,059	48.6
	Inactives	8,849	7,344	45.4	1,221,697	1,068,936	46.7
Gender	Male	11,616	12,344	51.5	1,689,134	1,933,284	53.4
	Female	15,388	9,535	38.3	2,225,487	1,382,662	38.3
Age Group	15-24	2,247	5,349	70.4	319,287	784,110	71.1
	25-34	4,609	4,743	50.7	764,400	797,344	51.1
	35-44	6,535	4,109	38.6	1,031,886	673,515	39.5
	45-54	6,988	4,046	36.7	957,828	574,041	37.5
	55-64	6,625	3,632	35.4	841,219	486,935	36.7

6. Weighting and Estimation

For the estimation of the ad hoc survey results, the same weights as in Quarterly LFS were used. These weights are computed in 3 steps.

In the first step, a design weight is assigned to each person in the data file. This weight is determined by the estimated probability of selection of the particular household where the person lives in.

At the second step, a correction factor is applied at primary sampling unit level to compensate for non-response.

Finally, at the third step, post stratification weights are applied to individual level.

Post-stratification variables are sex, age (5-years groups) and NUT II area.

7. Remarks and recommendations

Apart complex filtering, which was difficult to be implemented in paper questionnaire, most variables posed no significant problems.

Some issues that were identified during fieldwork that could have an effect on the quality of results are:

- IMPFACIL seems not so relevant for persons looking for a full time job, but nevertheless such persons could be included in IMPFACIL filter.
- Persons had a problem to choose between cost and quality (as main reason for not working or working part time): usually services of good quality are expensive and vice versa. Probably a multiple-choice question or different variables would give better results.

ANNEX 1

Transcoding of the national questionnaire to the AHM

COL		National derivation	
REGCARE	197	1	Q8 = 1 & Q9 NE 1
		2	Q8 NE 1 & Q9 = 1
		3	Q8 = 1 & Q9 = 1
		4	Q8 = 2 & Q9 = 2
		9	AGE < 14 OR AGE > 64
		blank	Q8 = 3 OR Q9 = 3
CHLDCARE	198	1	Q4 = 1
		2	Q4 = 2
		3	Q4 = 3
		4	Q4 = 4
		5	Q4 = 5
		6	Q4 = 6
		9	Due to the fact, that the ad hoc is implemented as a paper questionnaire, the filters for the "national" questions were less "restive". For the transmission of data to Eurostat the filters defined in the Regulation were used
		blank	Q4 = 7
IMPFACIL	199	1	Q10 = 1 & Q11 = 1
		2	Q10 = 1 & Q11 = 2
		3	Q10 = 1 & Q11 = 3
		4	Q10 = 2
		9	Due to the fact, that the ad hoc is implemented as a paper questionnaire, the filters for the "national" questions were less "restive". For the transmission of data to Eurostat the filters defined in the Regulation were used
		blank	(Q9 = 3 & Q8 = 3) OR Q10 = 3
NOWRECHI	200	1	Q13 = 1
		2	Q13 = 2
		3	Q13 = 3
		4	Q13 = 4
		9	Due to the fact, that the ad hoc is implemented as a paper questionnaire, the filters for the "national" questions were less "restive". For the transmission of data to Eurostat the filters defined in the Regulation were used
		blank	(Q9 = 3 & Q8 = 3) OR Q10 = 3
NOWRECAR	201	1	Q12 = 1
		2	Q12 = 2
		3	Q12 = 3
		4	Q12 = 4
		9	Due to the fact, that the ad hoc is implemented as a paper questionnaire, the filters for the "national" questions were less "restive". For the transmission of data to Eurostat the filters defined in the Regulation were used
		blank	(Q9 = 3 & Q8 = 3) OR Q10 = 3

VARHOURS	202	1	Q1 = 4
		2	Q1 = 2
		3	Q1 = 3
		4	Q1 = 1
		5	Q1 = 5
		9	AGE < 14 OR AGE > 64 & STAPRO NE '3'
		blank	Q1 = 6
POSSTEND	203	1	Q2 = 1
		2	Q2 = 2
		3	Q2 = 3
		9	Q1 NE 3, 4, 5, 6
		blank	Q2 = 4
POSORGWT	204	1	Q3 = 1
		2	Q3 = 2
		3	Q3 = 3
		9	Due to the fact, that the ad hoc is implemented as a paper questionnaire, the filters for the "national" questions were less "restive". For the transmission of data to Eurostat the filters defined in the Regulation were used
		blank	Q3 = 4
REDWORK	205	1	Q5 = 1
		2	Q5 = 2
		9	Due to the fact, that the ad hoc is implemented as a paper questionnaire, the filters for the "national" questions were less "restive". For the transmission of data to Eurostat the filters defined in the Regulation were used
			Q5 = 4
STOPWORK	206	1	Q6 = 1
		2	Q6 = 2
		3	Q6 = 3
		4	Q6 = 4
		5	Q6 = 5
		6	Q6 = 6
		9	Due to the fact, that the ad hoc is implemented as a paper questionnaire, the filters for the "national" questions were less "restive". For the transmission of data to Eurostat the filters defined in the Regulation were used
		blank	Q6 = 8
PARLEAVE	207	1	Q7 = 1
		2	Q7 = 2
		3	Q7 = 3
		4	Q7 = 4
		5	Q7 = 5
		6	Q7 = 6
		9	Due to the fact, that the ad hoc is implemented as a paper questionnaire, the filters for the "national" questions were less "restive". For the transmission of data to Eurostat the filters defined in the Regulation were used
		blank	Q7 = 8

Col 208-209 NOPLREAS (optional)		1	Not included in the Survey
		2	
		3	
		4	
		5	
		6	
		7	
		8	
		9	
		10	
		11	
		12	
		13	
		99	

ANNEX 2: Frequencies Tables

REGCARE

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	409.233	5,7
1	166.821	2,3
2	323.975	4,5
3	51.600	0,7
4	6.278.938	86,8
Total	7.230.567	100,0

CHILDCAR

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	40.348	0,6
1	67.786	0,9
2	67.453	0,9
3	177.723	2,5
4	80.825	1,1
5	53.495	0,7
6	1.425.597	19,7
9	5.317.339	73,5
Total	7.230.567	100,0

IMPFACIL

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	15.137	0,2
1	31.138	0,4
2	11.915	0,2
3	2.064	0,0
4	583.450	8,1
9	6.586.862	91,1
Total	7.230.567	100,0

NOWRECHI

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	4.756	0,1
1	20.780	0,3
2	71.588	1,0
3	9.723	0,1
4	8.773	0,1
9	7.114.947	98,4
Total	7.230.567	100,0

NOWRECAR

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	3.904	0,1
1	6.493	0,1
2	19.435	0,3
3	3.273	0,0
4	2.912	0,0
9	7.194.550	99,5
Total	7.230.567	100,0

VARHOURS

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	81.213	1,1
1	2.038.965	28,2
2	93.610	1,3
3	581.843	8,0
4	28.290	0,4
5	17.468	0,2
9	4.389.179	60,7
Total	7.230.567	100,0

POSSTEND

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	86.305	1,2
1	831.786	11,5
2	1.184.027	16,4
3	617.372	8,5
9	4.511.078	62,4
Total	7.230.567	100,0

POSORGWT

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	113.363	1,6
1	498.035	6,9
2	827.377	11,4
3	1.402.612	19,4
9	4.389.179	60,7
Total	7.230.567	100,0

REDWORK

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	18.234	0,3
1	120.400	1,7
2	935.921	12,9
9	6.156.011	85,1
Total	7.230.567	100,0

STOPWORK

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	32.056	0,4
1	928.771	12,8
2	52.427	0,7
3	12.525	0,2
4	23.688	0,3
5	16.712	0,2
6	8.376	0,1
9	6.156.011	85,1
Total	7.230.567	100,0

PARLEAVE

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	21.147	0,3
1	1.194.212	16,5
2	29.438	0,4
3	4.129	0,1
4	16.293	0,2
5	1.946	0,0
6	711	0,0
9	5.962.692	82,5
Total	7.230.567	100,0