

Flexible Work Arrangements in Greece

Ioulia Bessa, Lilian M. de Menezes, David Sims

City University, Cass Business School, Department of Management

March 30th 2009

Abstract

Interest in Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs) has grown significantly in recent years due to the social, financial and work-life balance pressures. This study concentrates on FWAs in Greece through the lens of dual economy theory. One of the main issues highlighted is the lack of FWAs in Greece compared to the rest of the European countries and its predominance in specific social groups, namely: females, students, carers and newcomers to the labour market. The paper uses two surveys from the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound): the fourth European Work Conditions Survey (EWCS) and the second European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS). Four forms of FWAs are studied: part-time, temporary, teleworking and work from home. Careful examination of the data suggests a hybrid category that is worth further exploring, the no-contract category, which includes all forms of FWAs and full-time employment. Consistent with dual economy theory, evidence from the data suggests that part-time, temporary and no contract employees fell in the secondary labour market, whereas interestingly teleworking and work from home demonstrate different characteristics and fall in the primary sector.

Keywords: Flexible Work Arrangements, Greece, Europe, part-time employment, temporary employment, teleworking, work from home, no-contract, dual economy theory

1. Introduction

There is a growing body of literature on Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs) (e.g. Allan, Brosnan and Walsh, 1998; Connelly and Gallagher, 2004; Berg, Kalleberg and Appelbaum, 2003, 2005; Francesconi and Garcia-Serrano, 2004; Raghuram, London and Larsen, 2001; Gunnigle, Turner and Morley, 1998; Jenkins, 1998; Ramon and Ortiz, 2000; Kalleberg, 2003; Origo and Pagani, 2008; Tsegaskis et al, 1998; Wood, de Menezes and Lasasosa, 2003), which covers the extent and the variety of ways by which employees may work more flexibly, e.g. remote working, reduced hours, compressed working weeks in different industries, countries or regions.

In Europe, several studies analyse the use and implementation of FWAs in individual countries (e.g. Dex and Smith, 2002; Kauffeld, Jonas and Frey 2004; Kelliher and Anderson, 2009). Other studies compare FWAs use among EU members (e.g. Costa et al, 2004; Tregaskis

et al, 1997). A large body of literature provides descriptions, or definitions for FWAs, typologies, facts per country, trends in the European continent, whereas a more complex analyses concentrate on wages, work-life balance, maternal employment and male/female discrepancies (e.g. Ortega, 2009; Costa et al, 2004; Maning and Petrogolo, 2008; Gregory and Conolly, 2008).

Among the EU, northern members (Britain, the Netherlands, and Scandinavian countries) implemented FWAs policies in their labour market earlier than other European countries (especially Mediterranean ones). The Netherlands have been described as “the first part-time economy of the world” (Freeman, 1998, p.2; Visser, 2002, p.23). The British Government’s policy on FWAs is illustrated through the introduction of the Employment Rights Act of 1996 and, as a step further, by encouraging equality among part-time and full-time employees’ via the Employment Act of 2002¹.

In contrast, studies on Mediterranean countries such as Spain and Greece have shown low use of FWAs, especially of part-time employment², and share common labour market characteristics with respect to flexible working: e.g. the predominance of a “female flexible employment” and the use of FWAs as a *potential treatment* for unemployment. Moreover, female unemployment is considerably high in both countries [Greece (2007): 8.5% total unemployment and 13% for females, Spain (2007): 8.5% total and 11% female³], and thus the provision of FWAs becomes an instrument to decrease the unemployment rate (Employment in Europe, 2008; Ramon and Ortiz, 2000; Kouzis, 2001).

The Greek case requires a nuanced analysis. First, it has been neglected in the research literature. Few studies have been conducted. Papalexandris (1997, 2001) argued the positive impact of FWAs on employee motivation, productivity and competitiveness. Mihail (2003) also suggested that FWAs have a positive effect on productivity and employment; he though illustrates a more pessimistic point: all power for enhancing, regulating and negotiating FWAs use lies on the discretion of trade unions. In a similar vein, Kouzis (2001) explains that FWAs over-utilisation and the potential leniency of unions may increase job insecurity and violation

¹ Employment Rights Act 1996 and Employment Act 2002, Available from: Office of Public Sector Information; www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1996/Ukpga_19960_018_en_1 (Accessed 10 June 2009)

² In Spain part-time employment covers the 8.7% of the total work force (Garcia-Ramon and Ortiz, 2000)

³ Employment in Europe, 2008

of employees' rights. Voudouris (2004) suggests that firms require few specialized tasks and opt for FWAs to reduce costs. Moreover, the Greek Labour Observatory and annual publications of INE-GSEE⁴ shed light on the negative sides of FWAs, i.e. low wages.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate further the reasons for such low rates of FWAs in Greece, the characteristics and the reasons of those social groups who are flexibly employed.

2. Definition of Flexible Work Arrangements

Many labels have been associated with FWAs e.g.: flexibility in work environment (Hill, J. et al., 2008), flexible employment (Abraham, 1990), atypical employment (Mihail, 2003; European Commission, 2000a), non-standard employment or contingent employment (Polivka and Nardone, 1989). According to Eurofound⁵ and Voudouris (2004) the term flexible employment refers to a system where the hours worked within a day (along with starting and finishing point) are not permanently fixed (Eurofound) and includes all contracts that differ from the 'typical' ones that relate the employee to a company for an undetermined duration and a normal working schedule (Voudouris, 2004). The Greek Labour Law (Papadimitriou, 2007) defines "atypical" work arrangements as: those contracts that do not link an employee permanently to a company, or fixed-term contracts that do not correspond to the full-time and permanent employment and do not necessarily have to take place within the company.

Trade unions in Greece (INE-GSEE) define FWAs as practices that mainly aim at the control of the labour cost (quantitative labour flexibilities), usually by underestimating those factors which contribute substantially to the productive process of the company (qualitative labour flexibilities), such as technology, organisational structure, personnel training. Accordingly, flexibility has a multidimensional conceptualisation with both social and economic, in micro and macro levels, and with long-term and short-term consequences (Kouzis, 2001).

⁴ INE-GSEE: Institute of Employment (Institouto Ergasias)- General Association of Greek Employees (GENIKH SYNOMOSPONDIA ELLHNWN ERGATWN)

⁵ EMIRE, European Glossary of Industrial Relations, Available from: [http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/emire/ GREECE/ FLEXIBLEWORKING HOURS-GR.htm](http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/emire/GREECE/FLEXIBLEWORKING HOURS-GR.htm), Accessed 15 May 2009)

In this paper, consistent with labour law regulations (Georgetown University Law Centre on FWAs 2010), FWAs are work structures that alter the time and/or place that work gets done on a regular basis and add the existence of flexibility in the scheduling of hours worked, in the amount of hours worked and in the place of work.

3.Theoretical Background

Through the use of dual economy theory (Wachter, 1974) the study attempts to interpret characteristics of the Greek labour market and gain insights into possible explanations for the use of FWAs in Greece.

According to Wachter (1974), there are two labour markets within one economy, based on which he developed a number of hypotheses that describe economic dualism (Fields, 2004). First, the economy is dichotomised into two sectors: a primary and a secondary. Wage and employment mechanisms are different among these two sectors, the first is a high-wage whereas the second is low-wage, and therefore different explanations for their existence are required. The most important distinction between the two sectors is in regards to jobs: there are good and bad jobs, rather than good versus bad employees (skilled versus unskilled employees). Employees in the secondary market are caught in a vicious circle of job insecurity, and are in and out of unemployment and labour participation. Finally, the secondary sector shows several negative characteristics such as: high rates of underemployment, job instability, and trapped employees in either unskilled jobs or continuous unemployment.

The focal point of dual economist theorists is the discrimination between good and bad jobs. That is: good jobs have relatively high wages, good working conditions and opportunity for advancement, and are thus categorised in the primary sector (Dickens and Lang, 1985); by contrast jobs in the secondary sector are characterised by low wages, bad working conditions and rare opportunities for advancement, instability, and unattractive jobs. In particular, the primary sector is considered to include industries and firms that have a structured and strong internal labour market, which is characterised by structured employment relationships, solid sets of rules, promotion ladders for efficient advancement of internal mobility of the employees, as well as careful concentration of and investment and improvement policies on the already existing work force, such as training (Wachter, 1974).

Flexible employment in Greece show strong characteristics of a secondary sector. The four hypotheses, as suggested by Wachter (1974), will be here considered to examine the use of FWAs in Greece. Wachter (1974) identifies four “sub-hypotheses” which characterise the secondary sector; first, a secondary sector *actually* exists, with lower wages. Second, wage determination in the secondary market is different from the one in the primary. Third, there is little mobility between the two sectors. Fourth, the most pervasive characteristic of the secondary sector is underemployment.

Furthermore, Wachter (1974) argues that what characterises the secondary market is unstructured and undeveloped labour markets, low wages and the *segmentation* of the jobs around specific occupations, i.e. wholesale and retail. Another characteristic is the employment of specific social groups, such as women, black people, employees under flexible schedule, teenagers, children with few career advancement opportunities and reduced motivation for advancement or attachment.

Under the theoretical framework of dual economy theory certain issues need to be highlighted. Probably, the most important emerging characteristic of economic dualism in this study is the occurrence of a *bipolarised market* and of some kind of *occupational segmentation* (Wachter, 1974). Another important issue is the fact that the secondary market appears to accommodate those who “could not make it” to the primary sector, i.e. those either with low educational background or with high educational background but unsuccessful enough to be removed from the primary sector.

The sections that will follow scrutinise FWAs in Greece and identify characteristics of a secondary market. Most importantly, as Wachter (1974) maintains, the central claim of the dualist model is that there is a mismatch between employees’ skills and job allocation, a fact that generates a high degree of underemployment in the secondary market. Examples are educated females interested in part-time employment and employees who take jobs involuntarily or jobs unrelated to their skills.

4.Flexible Working Arrangements in the European Union

FWAs constitute a central policy of the European Union and the Maastricht Treaty (1992) is a reference point⁶ that shaped the orientation of the European labour market. In 1994, the White Paper⁷ introduced policies aiming to promote Development-Competitiveness-Employment. One step further, the Green Book in 1997 for the Organisation of Work⁸ introduced the vitality of the association between enhancement of flexible employment on one hand and employee security on the other (flexi-curity).

Part-time employment covers 17% of all jobs in the EU27, which are mainly occupied by women (31.1% versus 7.7%) (fourth European Work Conditions Survey; Employment in Europe, 2008). Over half of the part-time employees are satisfied with their employment status, since they appear to feel that they have more balanced and satisfied work and life conditions (fourth Work European Conditions Survey). Part-time employment is mainly encountered in services, health, hotels and restaurants and is more obvious in the private sector. In the Netherlands 48.6 % of total employment is part-time, whereas eastern European countries, including new EU members, show low levels of part-time employment (Fourth European Conditions Survey and Employment in Europe, 2008).

Unlike part-time employment, temporary work does not show significant differences between females and males (Fourth European Conditions Survey and Employment in Europe, 2008). An increase of 1.6% of total employment (from 12.3% to 13.9%) during the period 2000-2005 indicates a stable use and increase of this type of employment, across all ages (Annual Review of Working Conditions in the EU, 2006-2007). Similarly to part-time, notable differences and variations in the use of temporary employment occur among the EU members. Unlike part-time employment, eastern countries have the highest proportion of fixed-term contracts than continental countries (Fourth European Conditions Survey and Employment in Europe, 2008). The most common sectors for temporary employees are hotels and restaurants, education, agriculture and health (Fourth European Conditions Survey).

⁶ Maastricht Treaty document, Available from: http://europa.eu/abc/treaties/index_en.htm (Accessed on 15 June 2009)

⁷ White Paper, Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/white_paper/index_en.htm (Accessed on 15 June 2009)

⁸ The Green Book document, Available from the website: website: <http://www.jussempir.org/Resources/Corporate%20Activity/greenbookeu.htm> (Accessed on 30 May 2009)

FWAs are most prevalent in the Netherlands, United Kingdom and the Scandinavian countries, whereas it is least prevalent in eastern and southern European countries (Employment in Europe, 2008). Three labour flexibility models represent the EU countries: the United Kingdom represents the quantitative model, which is mainly oriented towards the use of FWAs for the reduction of labour cost and labour management in case of crises (Kouzis, 2001). The Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries seem to follow the qualitative model, mainly concentrating on the human paragon and human capital (Kouzis, 2001). Finally, a third-hybrid model is predominantly observed in the Mediterranean countries (i.e. South Italy, Greece, Spain) and is characterised by illegal flexibility (Kouzis, 2001) that is associated with corruptive political systems or side-economy effects (Mitsopoulos and Pelagidis, 2009; Kouzis, 2001).

5. Flexible Work Arrangements in Greece

In Greece temporary employment is common under fixed-term contracts. For many years one out of four employees under temporary employment was employed in the public sector (Annual Report 2007, INE-GSEE). In contrast, part-time employment in Greece is noticeably low (less than 10%) and is mostly in an involuntarily basis (Employment in Europe, 2008), which supports the argument that it is mainly “dependent” family members that work part-time and not those family members who are “the bread winners”.

We note that past studies have concluded that other forms of FWAs were almost inexistent in the Greek labour market (Mihail, 2003, Lampousaki, 2008, Employment in Europe, 2008). Yet this fact has changed, as shown by more recent statistics. An intriguing form of flexibility encountered in Greece and is illegal flexibility, whose high rate is strongly associated with the high rates of corruption in the Greek market (Kouzis, 2001). This phenomenon applies equally to both Greek and non-Greek employees.

FWAs in Greece are instantly associated with very low wages for two reasons: a. Flexitime wages are so low that are considered to be either complimentary sources of income, for a short period of time, only when temporarily needed (i.e. seasonal work, additional shifts, overtime, temporary job before something else) or b. associated with specific social groups, such as students, women, young people, who need “pocket money”, do not earn a proper leaving, are

not the main provider of the household and are considered to be the *dependents* (Economic Bulletin, 2005).

Second, the role of the unions in the configuration of the market forces (such as wages and unemployment) is not only an indicator of their power on the decision making process in regards to labour issues, but is in fact a determinant. Greek unions fervently oppose FWAs and highlight their negative consequences (Kouzis, 2001; Reilly, 1998; Visser, 2002), and thus have hindered the spread of FWAs in Greece.

In this study we explore the characteristics of the use of part-time employment, temporary employment, work from home and teleworking in Greece, by using data from two European surveys of employees: the fourth European Work Conditions Survey and the second quality of life survey. In the subsequent sections we describe our empirical study, its data, the analysis procedures and findings. Finally, we draw our conclusions and implications for further research.

6. The Empirical Study

Data

Two surveys are used: the fourth European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) and the second European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS). The former was conducted in the period September-November 2005 by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Condition (Eurofound). In total, 29,766 workers were interviewed in 31 countries. More specifically, around 1,000 workers were interviewed per country, with the exception of Estonia, Cyprus, Luxemburg, Malta and Slovenia, where the number of persons interviewed was 600 on average. The survey sample is representative of the population in employment (employees and self-employed), aged 15 years and over, resident in each of the surveyed countries. The questionnaire included various questions that are also found in previous editions. The response rate is 48%. In most countries, the response rates are around this average of 50% (more specifically in Greece, the country of main interest in the current study is 49%).

EQLS covers 31 countries (the 27 Member States, Croatia, Turkey, Macedonia and Norway). The survey sample is representative of people aged 18 and over who have lived in the surveyed country for at least six months in a private household and are able to speak the national language(s) well enough to respond to the questionnaire. For 24 countries, the sample size was around 1,000, whereas for Greece it was exactly 1,000. The questionnaire was based in older versions of EQLS, but also included new questions that had been successfully used in other similar national surveys. Similarly to EWCS, the survey was carried out by TNS-Opinion for Eurofound. It started on 20th September and finished, in most countries, on 20th November 2007. The overall response rate was 57.9%, but in Greece it was lower than 40% (as in France and the Netherlands).

Measures

We considered various factors (independent variables) that are suggested by dual economy theory in order to examine their association with the FWAs (dependent variables). These factors are grouped below:

- a) Demographic factors: age, sex, education (level and duration), household members, area, marital status. This group was vital in order to examine the suggestions of dual economy theory that it is in fact the dependent members of household (in this case women and students) mainly employed in the secondary sector.
- b) Financial factors: income, economic status, run out of money, household makes ends meet. As expected financial situation would be vital to be examined, since dual economy theory suggests that it is the lower incomes which are associated with the secondary market.
- c) Job characteristics: type of contract, occupation, job title, employed/self-employed. This group was vital in order to examine potential existence of occupational segregation in the secondary market, as suggested by Wachter (1974) and the characteristics that apply both to the secondary and primary market as suggested by our data.
- d) Overall satisfaction: well paid, opportunity to grow, satisfied with present life/job, might lose job in six months. Consistent with the suggestion of the founders of dual economy theory that job instability and uncertainty are some of the main characteristics of the secondary

labour market, this group was aiming at exploring to what extent these variables were associated to the four forms of FWAs studied.

Based on each survey, we now define the variables that we used in order to conduct the statistical analysis.

EWCS

The use of four forms (part-time, temporary, teleworking, and work from home) is analysed. Moreover, we paid extra attention to a special category of employees, namely employees under no-contract, which appears at a substantial rate in Greece (28.2%). These variables are coded as binary, and are described below

Part-time: The survey question, as shown in the Table 1, was directly asking the employees whether they were working part-time or full-time.

Temporary employment: This variable was created by combining multiple answers from a survey question about the kind of contract the respondents had. The categories were: indefinite contract, definite contract (apprenticeship /training period, training, temporary agency or just fixed term contract) and no contract. The three categories that refer to temporary work arrangements were grouped to create an indicator variable of temporary employment.

No-contract: Similarly, the variable no-contract was created from the same survey question.

Teleworking and Work from home: The survey included direct questions for both teleworking and work from home, which asked participants for their frequency of teleworking and work from home (i.e. a range from always to never). While the occurrence of such employment forms seems to be increasing over the last years (for example, when compared with the Third EWCS), the number of people who telework/work from home in Greece remains very low. Hence, in order to explore the relationship between these FWAs and other factors using regression models and avoid sparseness problems, we regrouped the responses creating binary variables, i.e. employees who telework / work from home and employees who do not.

We considered a number of potential factors aiming to unveil various features of FWAs. First, countries were categorised based on cultural/geographic criteria into six categories: a. North_EU (Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Norway, and the Netherlands), b. South_EU (Cyprus, Malta, Spain, Italy, and Portugal), c. Central_EU (Germany, France, UK, Ireland, Belgium,

Luxemburg, Austria, and Switzerland), d. East_EU (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, Turkey) e. other and f. Greece.

EQLS

Fewer forms of FWAs were available in the EQLS, and are the following:

Part-time: Unlike the fourth EWCS, the question regarding part-time employment in the second EQLS was indirect. The respondents were asked to give their working hours per week. According to the Greek Labour Law (Douka, 2004) the working hours per week in part-time employment could be up to 21 hours (4 hours per day). However, in practice part-timers seem to reach up to around 30 hours (6 hours per day) (Dendrinou, 2008). We constructed two part time indicator variables and studied both cases separately.

Temporary employment: The relevant question was “in your job are you...?”, thus asking participants the status of their contract, namely definite, indefinite and no-contract. Similarly to the EWCS, a binary variable was created grouping temporary employment categories in one value and the rest of the categories under another value (permanent employment). The same question was used to create a *No-contract* employment indicator variable.

The categorisation in regards to EU members that was used in the EWCS was replicated in the analysis of the EQLS (i.e. North_EU, Central_EU, Greece and all the rest). East European countries and future EU members were not grouped in a separate category, since they demonstrated similarities to Greece that did not facilitate comparative analysis.

Finally, a group of factors, namely Work/Life Balance variables (maternity/paternity leave, family reasons leave, social/family fit, household share, housework involvement, contact outside normal work hours, child care, elder care) was also considered in both surveys in order to acquire an intergraded idea of employees under flexible schedules.

Analysis Procedure

Our analysis may be divided into three steps. We first explored the distribution of the various forms of FWAs across different EU regions. Contingency tables, together with Chi-Square tests were used to assess the statistical significance of differences between EU countries. The second and third steps of the analysis focused on exploring factors that may

explain the use (lack of use) of FWAs in Greece. Our dependent variables consisted of binary indicators of the use of FWAs and a number of explanatory factors containing demographic and socioeconomic information, job characteristics, health issues, Work-Life Balance issues. Secondly, we assessed the correlations between each FWA and the factors using the Spearman correlation coefficient (the variables were measured on a binary, ordinal or continuous scale), together with Chi-Square tests of independence.

Finally, logistic regression models were estimated. Forward and Backward (Likelihood Ratio) stepwise procedures were used as a model building strategy. In most cases these procedures returned the same model, when they disagreed the final model from the backward procedure was chosen.

TABLE 1
Definitions of the Measures

A. Fourth European Work Conditions Survey

Measures	Code	Question
Part-time employment	Q15a	Do you work part-time or full-time?
Temporary Employment	Q3b	What kind of employment contract do you have? a. indefinite b. fixed-term c. temporary employment d. fixed: apprenticeship, training scheme e. no contract
Teleworking	Q11g	Does your main paid job involve - teleworking from home with a PC?
Work from home	Q11h	Does your main paid job involve - working at home, excluding telework?
No-contract employment	Q3b	What kind of employment contract do you have? a. indefinite b. fixed-term c. temporary employment d. fixed: apprenticeship, training scheme e. no contract

B. Second Quality of Life Survey

Measures	Code	Question
Part-time employment	Q6	How many hours do/ did you normally work per week (in your main job), including any paid or unpaid overtime?
Temporary Employment	Q4	In your job, are/ were you...? a. indefinite b. fixed-term c. temporary employment d. fixed: apprenticeship, training scheme e. without written contract
No contract	Q4	In your job, are/ were you...? a. indefinite b. fixed-term c. temporary employment d. fixed: apprenticeship, training scheme e. without written contract

7. Results

EWCS -Bivariate Associations

In the Fourth European Working Conditions Survey 2007 (EWCS 07), the percentages of each of the four forms of FWAs and the no-contract category differ significantly across Europe (p-values from Chi-Square tests < 0.001). In regards to the FWAs, part-time employment is approximately 25% in Central and Northern European countries as opposed to 9.7% in Greece, 13% in South EU members and 10% in East Europe. Part-time employment in Greece is predominantly female (p<.001) and more frequent in people with less stable economic status (p<.001), namely unemployed, housemakers and students and more frequent in the cases of those who are being employed, contrary to self-employed individuals who are predominantly working full-time. It is more frequently encountered to individuals with less years in the company (p<.001) and with employees who feel that there are less opportunities for them to grow (p<.001) in their current job.

These factors also hold for other EU countries that have higher part-time employment rates. However, in these countries other factors related to part-time employment can be also

identified, such as work on evenings and weekends (outside normal work hours), health affected factors and dissatisfaction with salary.

Temporary employment seems to be less dispersed ranging from 10% in Central Europe to 17% in South EU members, with Greece exhibiting 14.5%. It is more frequent among females ($p=.001$), younger ages ($p=.006$), employees that have fewer years in the organisation ($p<.001$), and those with lower paid employees (lower income levels) ($p<.001$). Also, temporary employees appear to work more on Sundays ($p=.003$).

Teleworking and work from home (at least on an occasional basis) reach 6.6% and 7.8% respectively, contrary to prior results (Mihail, 2003) which indicated that these two FWA forms were inexistent in Greece. This percentage however, although close to the rest of Central and North EU members, does in fact remain relatively low. These two forms of FWAs seem to be highly associated with each other, in the sense that “teleworkers” seem to work from home ($p<.001$) and those who work from home seem to use computer and other technological facilities (telework) in order to discuss, deliver and fulfil projects ($p<.001$). Contrary to the two previous categories, telework and work from home forms are used by employees who are skilled/high-skilled ($p<.001$), work mainly in the public field ($p<.001$), report high income ($p<.001$), state that they feel well paid for what they are doing ($p=.005$), and believe that there is opportunity for them to grow ($p<.001$).

Finally, the percentage of employees under no contract is extremely high in Greece, 28.2%, in comparison to 17.8% in south EU members, 7.8% in Central Europe and only 3% in North Europe. Employees under no contract in Greece are: more likely to work in the private sector ($p<.001$), predominantly in unskilled jobs ($p<.001$), newer in the labour market ($p=.007$) and to high numbers part-timers ($p<.001$). They also seem to work less on weekends ($p<.001$).

As it would be expected, having no contract is associated with disadvantageous work conditions: lower incomes ($p<.001$) and the belief of lacking opportunities to advance in the job ($p<.001$).

When compared with employees under no contract in the other countries, the results were similar (less satisfied with salary, lower income), except for one big difference: they were much less in number. Overall, we note low rates of part time employment, teleworking and

working from home, and a high rate of employees under no-contract in Greece, as illustrated in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Percentages (%) of FWAs across different EU region as found in EWCS

	<i>Teleworking</i>	<i>Work from Home</i>	<i>No contract</i>	<i>Temporary employment</i>	<i>Part-time employment</i>
North EU	29.7	31.4	3.0	87.7	25.0
South EU	8.9	12.9	17.9	82.6	13.1
Central EU	17.0	22.9	7.8	89.1	23.8
East EU	16.7	19.2	7.3	85.0	10.0
Greece	12.2	14.4	28.2	85.5	9.7
Total	17.8	21.2	8.6	86.3	16.7

EWCS - Regression Models

Results of the regression models are summarised in Table 3. Part-timers seem to be higher in lower incomes through an odds ratio of 10.424 (p-value <.001). As for temporary employment, we observe an association with gender, as the odds of temporary employment for female employees are .52 times higher than for male employees and the temporary employment rates in employees with lowest income are much higher than those corresponding to employees with highest income. Specifically, the odds of temporary employment in the former are 6.791 times higher than those in the latter (p-value <.001). Furthermore, work on Sunday has a significant effect (p-value=.002). The odds in employees who don't work on Sundays are less likely to be employed on a temporary contract than employees who work on Sundays; the relevant odds ratio is 0.468.

Teleworking and working from home are similar. Both forms are associated with the employment sector (public vs. private). Also, they are 1.557 and 1.713 times higher in skilled jobs as opposed to unskilled jobs respectively. Contact outside normal work hours seems to be associated with temporary employment as relative odds ratios are 9.233 and 9.702 (p-values .001 and <.001). Finally, employees who work from home tend to have more stress as the

relevant odds is 0.486 (p-value .002), and employees who telework tend to be temporary and involved in some kind of unions or political activity (odds ratio 2.239, p-value=0.012).

The predictors of the absence of contract in Greece are whether one is employed in the private sector (sector), the level of skills required by the job (Job title), the level of income and the level of stress. More specifically, the odds of no contract are 2.557 times higher in the private sector compared to the public sector (p-value .006) and 0.379 times lower in skilled jobs as opposed to unskilled jobs (p-value .007). Furthermore the odds of no contract in employees with lowest income are more than five times those in people with highest income employees (odds ratio 5.009), whereas the odds ratio between people with low and highest income through an odds ratio of 3.091.

TABLE 3
Fourth European Work Conditions Survey Regression Result
Part-time Employment

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp (B)	95.0% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Work obligations fit well family responsibilities			6.702	3	0.082			
Work obligations fit well family responsibilities(1)	0.295	0.438	0.453	1	0.501	1.343	0.569	3.167
Work obligations fit well family responsibilities(2)	0.012	0.392	0.001	1	0.975	1.012	0.47	2.181
Work obligations fit well family responsibilities(3)	-0.713	0.445	2.566	1	0.109	0.49	0.205	1.173
Housework(1)	0.685	0.337	4.128	1	0.042	1.984	1.024	3.841
Income			77.305	3	0			
Income(1)	2.344	0.379	38.159	1	0	10.424	4.955	21.93
Income(2)	-0.611	0.678	0.812	1	0.368	0.543	0.144	2.049
Income(3)	-1.007	0.675	2.224	1	0.136	0.365	0.097	1.372
Constant	-3.7	0.514	51.918	1	0	0.025		

Temporary Employment

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I.for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Age	-0.654	0.264	6.158	1	0.013	0.52	0.31	0.872
Work on Sundays	-0.759	0.249	9.322	1	0.002	0.468	0.288	0.762
Income			16.085	3	0.001			
Income(1)	1.916	0.509	14.167	1	0	6.791	2.504	18.413
Income(2)	1.62	0.532	9.272	1	0.002	5.054	1.781	14.342
Income(3)		0.497	14.798	1	0	6.767	2.554	17.925
Constant	-2.553	0.509	25.16	1	0	0.078		

No Contract employment

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I.for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Sector	0.939	0.343	7.509	1	0.006	2.557	1.306	5.003
Job title			7.358	2	0.025			
Job title(1)	-0.054	0.351	0.024	1	0.878	0.948	0.476	1.885
Job title(2)	-0.97	0.361	7.237	1	0.007	0.379	0.187	0.768
Income			17.208	3	0.001			
Income (1)		0.408	15.56	1	0	5.009	2.249	11.153
Income (2)	1.129	0.421	7.184	1	0.007	3.091	1.354	7.057
Income (3)	0.713	0.392	3.306	1	0.069	2.04	0.946	4.401
Stress	0.774	0.429	3.247	1	0.072	2.168	0.934	5.029
Constant	-2.915	0.563	26.819	1	0	0.054		

Telework

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I.for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Sector	-0.574	0.29	3.927	1	0.048	0.563	0.319	0.994
Job title			7.606	2	0.022			
Job title(1)	0.925	0.336	7.599	1	0.006	2.522	1.307	4.869
Job title(2)	0.442	0.347	1.629	1	0.202	1.557	0.789	3.071
Contact outside normal work hours			25.071	4	0			
Contact outside work hours(1)		0.648	11.766	1	0.001	9.233	2.593	32.88

Contact outside work hours(2)	1.941	0.555	12.244	1	0	6.966	2.349	20.661
Contact outside work hours(3)	0.598	0.542	1.217	1	0.27	1.819	0.629	5.264
Contact outside work hours(4)	0.911	0.396	5.29	1	0.021	2.487	1.144	5.406
temps	-0.415	0.468	0.786	1	0.375	0.66	0.264	1.652
unionization(1)	0.806	0.324	6.2	1	0.013	2.239	1.187	4.224
Constant	-2.301	0.334	47.403	1	0	0.1		

Work from home

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Sector	-0.696	0.277	6.317	1	0.012	0.499	0.29	0.858
Job title			7.527	2	0.023			
Job title(1)	0.765	0.279	7.508	1	0.006	2.15	1.243	3.716
Job title(2)	0.538	0.378	2.027	1	0.154	1.713	0.817	3.594
Contact outside work hours			45.34	4	0			
Contact outside work hours(1)		0.499	20.706	1	0	9.702	3.646	25.82
Contact outside work hours(2)	1.735	0.53	10.711	1	0.001	5.672	2.006	16.036
Contact outside work hours (3)	-0.329	0.768	0.184	1	0.668	0.72	0.16	3.241
Contact outside work hours (4)	1.663	0.362	21.092	1	0	5.274	2.594	10.723
Stress	-0.721	0.31	5.395	1	0.02	0.486	0.265	0.893
Constant	-1.526	0.391	15.257	1	0	0.217		

EQLS - Bivariate Associations

Three forms of FWAs were considered: part-time (two variables as explained in the section above, i.e. up to 31 hours and up to 21 hours) and temporary employment. Employees without written contract were examined as well.

In regards to FWAs types: EQLS (similarly to EWCS) indicates that part-time (up to 31 hours) employment is approximately 21% and 19% in Central and Northern European countries respectively as opposed to 7.5% in Greece and 11.7% in South EU members. According to the data, part-time employment in Greece is predominantly female ($p < .001$), encountered in older rather than younger ages ($p < .001$) and associated with not likely to be

married ($p=.002$). Part-timers seem to be associated with temporary ($p<.001$) rather than permanent positions. They are also likely to have reached an adequately good educational level ($p<.001$), either fulfilling their full-time education in the age of twenty years old and more, or still being in education, fact that reveals that a number of part-timers is still students. The data demonstrates that part-time employment can be predominantly found in big cities in the Greek region ($p=.009$). Consistent with the results of the fourth EWCS part-timers are not the ones who contribute the most in the household ($p<.001$). In regards to part-time employment up to 21 hours there is only one differences found: it is younger rather than older ages that seem to work part-time up to 21 hours ($p=.004$)

Temporary employment demonstrates a bit more diversified results that the results of EWCS. EQLS indicates that temporary employment is in fact predominantly female ($p=.001$) and attracts younger ages ($p<.001$). It seems to be positively associated with part-time jobs ($p<.001$) and it demonstrates similar characteristics to part-time employment, since temporary employees, are not the main contributors in the household ($p=.001$), they are not married ($p<.001$), they appear to have fewer number of children ($p<.001$), and they also have an adequately good level of education (completed full-time education by the age of twenty or more or are still studying) ($p<.001$). As it would be expected the main concern of temporary employees is the possibility of losing their job in 6 months ($p=.001$).

No-contract employees, similarly to the EWCS, they seem to demonstrate the more diversified characteristics. Employees with no contract appear to be in older ages ($p<.001$) compared to the rest categories and mainly in the private sector ($p<.001$). They are more likely to be employed in low-skilled positions ($p<.001$), since they do not seem to have reached an adequately good level of education, completing full-time education relatively young (around 16 years old) ($p<.001$). No-contract employment is found more in smaller/medium size towns ($p<.001$), contrary to part-time and temporary employment which is found in bigger cities. Interestingly, in this category financial concerns seem to be the most significant ones. As found, no-contract employees encounter difficulties for their household to make ends meet ($p<.001$). They do not seem to be satisfied with their standard of living ($p<.001$), and they feel that their no professional prospect/career advancement in what they are doing ($p=.007$).

EQLS- Regression Models

The results of the regressions on the EQLS data are summarised in Table 4. In Greece, part-time work is positively associated with gender (females), where the odds of part-time for female employees are 0.129 times compared to those for male employees (p-value =.001). Temporary employees are more likely to lose their job within six months (p<.001 and odds ratio 0.516) and to employed with lower skills jobs (p<.001 and adds ratio 13.355). Finally, the absence of contract is related to: whether one is employed in the private sector (sector), or whether one will lose his/her job in six months, the number of children they have and to their perceived standard of life. It is additionally linked to the occupations of both of the respondent and of the main contributor to the household income. In regards to occupations, no-contract employees are in unskilled or lower skilled jobs (p<.001 and odds ratio .052), whereas the main contributor of the household in which no-contract employees live are more likely to be self-employed or in high-skilled jobs (odd ratios .0572 and p=.002).

TABLE 4
Second Quality of Life Survey Regression Results
Temporary Employment

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Current occupation			18.667	2	0			
Current occupation(1)	2.592	0.601	18.603	1	0	13.355	4.113	43.369
Current occupation(2)	1.422	0.531	7.168	1	0.007	4.147	1.464	11.746
Might lose job in 6 months	-0.661	0.16	17.026	1	0	0.516	0.377	0.707
Constant	-1.176	0.695	2.867	1	0.09	0.308		

Part-time Employment

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I.for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
gender	-2.044	0.79	6.702	1	0.01	0.129	0.028	0.609
age			5.64	3	0.13			
age(1)	-0.991	1.206	0.675	1	0.411	0.371	0.035	3.946
age(2)	-1.144	1.026	1.242	1	0.265	0.319	0.043	2.381
age(3)	0.525	0.923	0.324	1	0.569	1.691	0.277	10.321
Difficult to fulfil family responsibilities		0.529	9.42	1	0.002	0.197	0.07	0.556
Occupation of main contributor	0.404	0.194	4.349	1	0.037	1.498	1.025	2.189
Married or living with partner/not married or living alone	-1.794	0.741	5.86	1	0.015	0.166	0.039	0.711
Constant	-0.864	1.347	0.412	1	0.521	0.421		

No Contract Employment

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I.for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Current occupation			21.801	2	0			
Current occupation(1)	-0.994	0.808	1.515	1	0.218	0.37	0.076	1.802
Current occupation(2)	-2.96	0.635	21.755	1	0	0.052	0.015	0.18
Sector	2.58	1.17	4.859	1	0.027	13.198	1.331	130.854
Occupation of main contributor	-0.558	0.181	9.506	1	0.002	0.572	0.401	0.816
Number of children		0.278	3.242	1	0.072	1.649	0.957	2.843
Satisfaction/dissatisfaction of present standard of living	-0.991	0.418	5.627	1	0.018	0.371	0.164	0.842
Might lose my job in the next 6 months	0.559	0.301	3.442	1	0.064	1.749	0.969	3.157
Constant	-1.605	2.04	0.619	1	0.431	0.201		

8. Discussion

The study concentrates on the use of flexible working in Greece, which has been rarely addressed in the academic literature. The initial view that these four forms of FWAs (part-time,

temporary, teleworking and work from home) are less frequently used in Greece, compared to the rest of Europe, is strongly supported by data from both surveys that together comprise over 2000 employees. The results also support the view that dual economy theory may explain the spread of FWAs in Greece, since part-time and temporary employment show characteristics of a secondary market, while telework and work from home, despite low levels, may be linked to a primary labour market. Consistent with the conceptualisation of FWAs in a growing body of Greek literature (Kouzis, 2001; Voudouris, 2004; Papalexandris, 1997; Douka, 2004) part-time and temporary employment *are in fact* a form of secondary employment and may illustrate the numerical flexibility of the Greek labour market. Indeed, Greek employees under flexible schedule are considered to be second class employees, who mainly do clerical, manual or routine work, thus lacking basic elements of primary employment, namely commitment, security and rights.

An interesting result suggested by the data in regards to FWAs is the fact that employees under flexible schedule are likely to be satisfied in the Work-Life Balance (WLB) front. In particular both surveys indicated that both part-time and temporary employees in Greece seem to express a rather balanced work-life model and to have settled this issue. teleworkers and employees who work from home mention feel that their social and family responsibilities fit adequately with their work obligations. Unfortunately, things are not the same for no-contract employees, since most of them having a full-time ‘without contract’ job, which means having all the obstacles of the full-time employees in the WLB area.

Taking into consideration dual economy theory and the data, the results in each form of FWAs suggest that:

Part-time employment

In congruence with Wachter (1974) who mentions that there two are sectors within one economy: a primary one and a secondary, the results of both surveys tend to support that part-time employment demonstrates characteristics of the secondary sector.

EQLS illustrates the relationship between part-timers and their role in the household. As indicated part-timers are not likely to be the main contributors in the household, but they are dependent members. Two social groups seem to fell into this category: females and students.

In regards to the first group, similarly to most European countries, both surveys highlighted the female predominance among part-timers in Greece. One possible reason shedding light on female predominance around part-time jobs could be the issue of Work-Life Balance that would introduce another perspective of part-time employment: part-time jobs as a matter of choice. Women could probably choose part-time employment in order to combine successfully family obligations and work responsibilities.

Making a step further though, another possible reason would be the one argued by Hesselink and van Vuuren (1999) that women who decide either to enter the market for the first time, coming from the non-work labour force or re-entering after a certain period (marriage or childbirth) may be likely to get part-time positions. This argument though cannot be supported since evidence from the data did not indicate a positive relationship neither between part-time employment and marriage nor with children.

Probably the most convincing reason as explained by dual economy theory is the concept of underemployment, supported by the positive relationship demonstrated between unskilled/semi-skilled jobs and part-time employment in both surveys. This fact reveals a certain degree of occupational segregation of part-time opportunities around specific low-skilled jobs and thus limits the options of these social groups regardless of their educational background and most importantly educational level. Additionally, the low income, less opportunities to grow and the temporary character of the job as indicated in the surveys further supports Wachter's (1974) argument that part-time positions in fact accommodate those who "could not make it" to the primary sector, such as employees with high educational background, but unsuccessful enough to be transmitted and employed in the primary sector.

Towards the same direction, it is vital to mention the high rates of involuntary basis of part-timers. Employment in Europe of 2008 includes a figure, where these facts are graphically provided. As indicated Greece scores the third highest percentage of involuntary part-time (45% of all part-time employees) employment after Bulgaria and Romania (Employment in Europe, 2008, p. 35)

The second group appearing by the data to cover part-time positions is people who are still studying, i.e. students. This group, which holds or is about to hold at least an undergraduate degree and therefore being in an adequately good educational level finds part-time options only

around specific low skilled jobs demonstrating a mismatch between employees skills and job opportunities. Consistent with Dickens and Lang (1985) statement that the focal point of dual economy theory is the discrimination between good and bad jobs and not between good and bad employees, further support is offered by the data to the concept of underemployment as main reason for part-time employment to be categorised in the secondary sector.

Temporary employment

Temporary employment, as expected seems to be revolving around the element of uncertainty as the main concern for temporary employees, which was expressed in the data by the significant relationship between temporary employment and the concern of losing one's job in six months. Additionally, and similarly to part-time employment, Employment in Europe, 2008 (p. 35) indicates that approximately 82% of the temporary employees have chosen it due to the difficulties encountered in finding a permanent, full-time position. These two facts are indicative of the fact that like part-time employment temporary employment demonstrates secondary labour characteristics. In a similar vein, the correlation between lack of job satisfaction, job instability, trapped employees to unskilled jobs, maintenance of underemployment, few career advancement opportunities and especially uncertain future with temporary employment gives further reasoning to why temporary employment falls in the secondary sector.

Teleworking and Work from home

Interestingly, employees who telework and who work from home appear to be in a sector than the one their part-time and temporary equivalents are in Greece.

The novelty in our results is the actual existence of teleworkers and employees who work from home in Greece, since evidence from previous studies (Mihail, 2003) illustrates that these two forms were practically inexistent until 2004. The numbers, although very small, intrigue academic interest and are therefore worth mentioned.

Employees who fell in these two categories appear to have completely different characteristics and behaviour compared to their part-timers and temporary employees. They are likely to be employed in skilled/high-skilled jobs, report high income, feel well paid for what they are doing and believe that there is opportunity for them to grow fact that demonstrates that

both these categories and also jobs offered under these two FWAs form are different than the ones available for part-time and fixed-term contracts, since their characteristics fit closer to the primary sector, rather than the secondary.

Positive results are also demonstrated as it would be expected in regards to Work-Life balance, since they demonstrate a successful fit between work obligations and family responsibilities. The fact also that there was no association with gender highlights the lack of either male or female predominance as indicated in previous FWAs forms and therefore annuls the existence of gender gap.

The quality of the skilled jobs offered, the satisfactory wages reported, the potential for future growth, the career opportunities and the quality in the life confessed from employees under these two FWAs forms demonstrate that these two categories fell in the primary sector as those described by dualist economists (Wachter, 1974; Kuznets, 1971; Lewis, 1954) and although in small percentages would be an interesting future employment option.

No-contract employment

The no-contract category, although actually being neither a FWAs form nor directly included as a question in the surveys, needs to be mentioned and examined for two reasons: first, it includes a surprisingly large percentage of the total work force and second it covers a large portion of employees under FWAs. Undoubtedly, the no-contract phenomenon constitutes an intriguing characteristic of the Greek labour market and thus be considered as such.

No-contract employees seem to be the less privileged and therefore placed in the secondary market. Evidence indicates that they are employed in unskilled and lower income jobs and these jobs lack opportunities for career development; it is mainly encountered in older ages, it is not associated with adequately good levels of education, and it is predominantly found in smaller/medium size towns (contrary to part-time work that is more common in larger cities).

The distinctiveness of this category lies on the fact that no-contract employees are associated with financial obstacles. As indicated by the data their household has difficulties to make ends meet, they are dissatisfied with their standard of living and professional life status,

since they do not have a formal written contract connecting them to their job and they feel that there is no future prospect/career advancement in what they are doing.

The low wages, the scarcity of jobs in *segmented* occupations, i.e. wholesale and retail, predominantly around low or no skilled jobs which constitute the main characteristics of no-contract employees as indicated by the data are mainly found in unstructured and undeveloped labour markets and are the characteristics of the secondary sector. No-contract jobs under the framework of the secondary labour market appear to attract specific categories of employees (i.e. older people, where gender is significant, with low educational level, in rural areas, probably employed to self-employed individuals and small companies) without offering career advancement opportunities, but stigmatised by reduced motivation for advancement and attachment within the work environment (Wachter, 1974).

Probably most of the contribution of the paper lies on the future potentials for examining the association that seems to exist between no-contract and part-time employment. Both the results of EWCS and EQLS demonstrate that a significant number of no-contract employees are part-timers. The lack of evidence though between no-contract part-time employees and females and/or students points out the limitation of this paper and makes suggestions for future research. Future research and most probably primary data collection would show which are the social groups that fell in the category of part-timers without written contracts, which are the jobs offered in this category and which are the factors that turn these employees to ill-paid, unsecure and also insecure employment and for what reasons.

Future research concerning primary data collection could also concentrate on the nature of part-time employment and on other forms of FWAs, posing the question: is it a choice? It would be very interesting for one to see part-time intention both in the primary and the secondary market of one economy. Table 5 below gives an idea of part-time intention in Greece as given by the data from EWCS and ESQL.

Last but not least, the financial crisis that has severely affected Greece this year (2009-2010) and the compulsory intervention of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) will influence FWAs use. One of the main terms of the IMF is the flexibility of the labour market. In that sense, FWAs are imposed and their future is open to be studied. Longitudinal data (i.e. data before the crisis, data during the crisis and post-crisis data) would shed light on FWAs use

in Greece during the period of certain time on one hand and in crises circumstances on the other. More importantly, a group of labour economists suggest that FWAs will be imposed and therefore used in higher percentages compared to the ones before.

TABLE 5

Percentages (%) of part-time intention across different EU region

	pt_intention		Total
	Full time	Part time	
North EU	15.5%	84.5%	100.0%
South EU	31.9%	68.1%	100.0%
Central EU	12.8%	87.2%	100.0%
East EU	34.6%	65.4%	100.0%
Greece	48.3%	51.7%	100.0%

8. Conclusion

Evidence till now has indicated that compared to the rest of the EU, FWAs use is low in Greece and it is constrained to specific social groups. Part-time employment, similar to rest of EU, is predominantly female and mainly is oriented to students, namely dependent members of households, since either the wages are very low or it can be offered in an involuntary basis demonstrating that part-time falls in the secondary labour market. Secondary sector characteristics are common to temporary employment, since this form is used by employees either as a temporary solution before having a permanent job, or as a last solution when not being able to find a job, as a solution to unemployment, fact that raises uncertainty and dissatisfies employees.

Unlike part-time and temporary in Greece and similarly to the rest of EU, telework and work from home demonstrate primary labour market characteristics, but unfortunately these two forms are still very low in most European countries, but particularly in Greece.

Finally, an interesting result of the paper seems to be the no-contract category that seems to cover both full-time and employees under flexible schedules. This category, falling in the secondary labour market as well, seems to reach the highest percentages in Greece compared to the rest EU countries and also be the less privileged, since it includes all the negative characteristics of all FWAs, i.e. uncertainty, low wages, employee dissatisfaction, lack of career advancement.

There is much potential for future research on the FWAs in Greece and most importantly the use of FWAs since now is a critical point. The intervention of the IMF, the imposition of crucial financial and labour terms (including the flexibility of the labour market) and the crisis circumstances of the current year will alter the use of FWAs and would indicate that both Greece and the use of FWAs are now entering a new phase- positive or negative, only the future can show.

References

Allen, C, Brosnan, P., Walsh, P. (1998), "Non-standard working time arrangements in Australia and New Zealand", in Harbridge, R., Gadd, C, Crawford, A. (Eds), Current Research in Industrial Relations, Proceedings of the 12th AIRAANZ Conference, Wellington, pp.30-9.

Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organisational perceptions, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 58, 414–435

Anderson, Robert; Mikulić, Branislav; Vermeylen, Greet; Lyly-Yrjanainen, Maija; Zigante, Valentina, Eurofound Publishes European Quality of Life Survey Results, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Accessed on 13, January 2009, Available from: <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2009/02/en/1/EF0902EN.pdf>

European Working Conditions Observatory (EWCO), Annual review of working conditions in the EU 2006–2007, <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/ewco/index.htm>

Appelbaum, E., Bailey T., Berg T. and Kalleberg A., (2005), "Organisations and the Intersection of Work and Family: A Comparative Perspective." *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Organisation* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University), Pp. 52-73

Bardasi E. and Gornick J. C. (2008), Working For Less? Women' S Part-Time Wage Penalties across Countries, *Feminist Economics* 14(1), January 2008, 37 – 72

- Batt R., and Valcour M.P. (2003) Human Resources Practices as Predictors of Work-Family Outcomes and Employee Turnover, *Industrial Relations*, 42,2,189-220
- Becker, G. (1974) A Theory of Social Interactions *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 82, no. 6
- Berg P., Kalleberg A.L., and Appelbaum E. (2003) Balancing Work and Family: The Role of High Commitment Environments, *Industrial Relations*, 42, 2, 168-188
- Bloom, N., Kretchmer, T. and Van Reenen (January 2006) Work-Life Balance, Management Practices and Productivity (Working Paper), Centre for Economic Performance
- Bohen H. and Viveros-Long, A. (1981) *Balancing Jobs and the Family: Do flexible work schedules help?*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press
- Bond, S., Hyman, J., Summers, J., Wise, S. (2002), *Family-friendly Working? Putting Policy into Practice*, York Publishing Services, York
- John W. Budd & Karen Mumford, 2004. "[Trade unions and family-friendly policies in Britain](#)," [Industrial and Labor Relations Review](#), ILR Review, ILR School, Cornell University, vol. 57(2), pages 204-222
- Budd, J. and Mumford K. (2005), *Family-Friendly Work Practices in Britain: Availability and Perceived Accessibility*, IZA Discussion Paper, No. 1662, Bonn.
- Canny, A. (2002), Flexible Labour? The Growth of Student Employment in the UK, [Journal of Education and Work](#), Volume 15, Number 3, 1 September 2002, pp. 277-301(25), [Routledge](#)
- Capelli, P. (1995), "Rethinking Employment.", *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 33, pp.563-602
- Christensen, O. (2007), Study on the EU policies on flexicurity and secure employment, www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef//TEXT+REPORT+A6.htm, Date published: 15/11/2007, Date accessed: 20/02/2009
- Connelly E. and Gallagher D. (2004), Emerging Trends in Contingent Work Research, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 30, No. 6, 959-983 (2004)
- Correction Regulation in Europe and Greece: The Implementation of the Lisbon Treaty Strategy, *Economic Bulletin* June 2005, Athens: Alpha Bank Publications, 94, 15-27
- Costa G, A ° kerstedt T, Nachreiner F, et al. (2004) Flexible working hours, health and well-being in Europe: some considerations from a SALTSA project. *Chronobiol Int* 21:831–844
- Coverdill J., (1988), The Dual Economy and Sex Differences in Earnings, *Social Forces*, Vol. 66

Crosbie T. and Moore J. (2004), Work–life Balance and Working from Home, *Social Policy & Society* 3:3, 223–233, Cambridge University Press

Crosby, F., Williams, J. and Biernat, M. (2004), The Maternal Wall, *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(4): pp 675-682

David E., Blundell R., Freeman R. (2004), Seeking a premier economy: the economic effects of British economic reforms, 1980-2000, London School of Economics and Political Science. Centre for Economic Performance, University of Chicago Press

Davis, A. E. and Kalleberg, A. L. (2006). Family-Friendly Organisations? Work and Family Programs in the 1990's, *Work and Occupations*, 33, 191-223

D'Addio, R (2005) Exits from temporary jobs in Europe: A competing risks analysis, *Labour Economics* (12)4

De Menezes, L. and Wood S. (2006), The reality of flexible work systems in Britain, *Int. J. of Human Resource Management* 17:1 January 2006 106–138

Economic Bulletin June 2005, Athens: Alpha Bank Publications, 94, 3-14

Dex, S. and Scheibl (1999) Business Performance and Family-friendly Policies, *Journal of General Management*, 24, 22-37

Dex, S., Smith, C., and Winter S (2001) Effects of Family-Friendly policies on Business Performance, The Judge Institute of Management, University of Cambridge

Dickens W. and Lang K. (1985), A Test of Dual Labor Market Theory, *The American Economic Review*, 75 (4): 792-805

Dorantes, C. (2000) Work Transitions into and out of Involuntary Temporary Employment in a Segmented Market: Evidence from Spain *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 309-325

Dorchai S. and Plasman R. (2007), The part-time wage penalty in European countries: how large is it for men?, *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 28 No. 7, 2007

Douka, V. (2004) Part-time Employment: Employment Status in the Private Sector, Athens: Sakkoulas Publications

Employment Act 2002 document, Available from: Office of Public Sector Information website www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2002/ukpga_20020022_en_1 (Accessed 10 June 2009) and from: EUROFOUND website www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2002/10/feature/uk0210103f.htm (Accessed 5 April 2002)

Employment in Europe 2008, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Annual review of working conditions in the EU 2006–2007, European Commission, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Employment Protection: The Road of Unemployment is based on Good Intentions, Economic Bulletin December 2005, Athens: Alpha Bank Publications, 95, 29-44

Evandrou, M. and Gkaser, K. (2003) Combining Work and Family Life: the pension penalty of caring, *Ageing & Society*, 23, 581-601

Fields, G. (2004). 'Dualism in the Labour Market: A Perspective on the Lewis Model firms, *Int. J. of Human Resource Management* 15:1 February 2004 131–146

Fourth European Working Conditions Survey, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Francesconi M. And Garcia-Serrano C. (2004), Unions and Flexible Employment in Britain and Spain: A Descriptive Note. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 43, No. 4

Freeman, R. (1998), 'War of the models: Which labour market institutions for the 21st century?', *Labour Economics*, 5 (1), 1-24

Fukuda, N. Comparing Family-Friendly Policies in Japan and Europe, *Journal of Population and Social Security (Population)*, Supplement to Volume 1

Gannon B., Plasman R., Rycx F., Tojerow I. (2007), Inter-Industry Wage Differentials and the Gender Wage Gap: Evidence from European Countries by, *Economic and Social Review*, 38 (1), 135-155

García Ramon, M.D. and Ortiz, A. 2000. The fixed term contract, the Spanish route to flexibility? Women in the retail field in Barcelona region. *Economic and Industrial Democracy: An International Journal* 21(3)

Gerhards J., Schafer M. and Kampfer S., (2009), Gender Equality in the European Union: The EU Script and its Support by European Citizens, *Sociology*, 43(3): 515-534

Gittleman, M., Horrigan, M. and Joyce, M. (1998), Flexible Workplace Practices: Evidence from a Nationally Representative Survey, *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 52, 1 99-115

Golden , L. (1996), The expansion of temporary help employment in the US, 1982-1992:a test of alternative economic explanations, *Applied Economics*, 1996, 28, 1127-1141, Penn State University, Delaware County Campus, Media, PA, USA

Goodstein, J. (1995). Employer involvement in eldercare: An organisational adaptation perspective, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 6: 1657-1671

Gray H (2002) “Family Friendly Working: What a Performance! An Analysis of the Relationship Between the Availability of Family Friendly Policies and Establishment Performance”, Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics, Discussion Paper No 529.

Gregory M. and Connolly S. (2008), The Feature: The Price Of Reconciliation: Part-Time Work, Families And Women’s Satisfaction, *Economic Journal*, 118 (February), F1–F7

Guest D. (2004), Flexible employment contracts, the psychological contract and employee outcomes: An analysis and review of the evidence *International Journal of Management Reviews*, March 2004, Volume 5/6 Issue 1 pp. 1–19

Gunnigle P., Turner T. and Morley M. (1998), Employment flexibility and industrial relations arrangements at organisation level. A comparison of five European countries. *Employee Relations*, Vol. 20 No. 5, 1998, pp. 430-442

Hantrais, L. and Ackers, P. (2005) Women’s choices in Europe, *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 11, 2, 197-212

Healy, G (2004), Work-life balance and family friendly policies-in whose interest?, *Work employment and society* (18)1

Hesselink and van Vuuren T. (1999), Job Flexibility and Job Insecurity: The Dutch Case *European, Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 8 (2), 273–293

Heywood, J. and Jirjahn, U (2009), Family-Friendly Practices and Worker Representation in Germany. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, Vol. 48, Issue 1, pp. 121-145

Hill, E. J., J. G. Grzywacz, S. Allen, V. Blanchard, C. Matz-Costa, S. Shulkin, and M. Pitt-Catsouphes. (2008) “Defining and conceptualizing workplace flexibility.” *Community, Work & Family*, 11,149-163

Holmlund B. and Storrie D. (2002), Temporary Work In Turbulent Times: The Swedish Experience, *The Economic Journal*, 112 (June), F245–F269, Royal Economic Society 2002. Published by Blackwell

Houseman, S. (2001), Why Employers Use Flexible Staffing Arrangements: Evidence from an Establishment Survey, *Industrial and Labour Relations Review* 55 1 149-170

INE/GSEE-ADEDY (2007) Part 3, Wages, Report 2007.

INE/GSEE-ADEDY (2007) Part 4, Employment, Report 2007.

- Jeffrey H. et al (2008), Defining and conceptualizing workplace flexibility, *Community, Work & Family*, Vol. 11, No. 2, May 2008, 149_163
- Jenkins A. (1998), Flexibility, “Individualization” and Employment Insecurity in France. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 7 (1), 23–38
- Kalleberg A., Reskin B., Hudson K., (2000), Bad jobs in America: Standard and nonstandard employment relations and job quality, *American Sociological Review*; Apr 2000; 65, 2; ABI/INFORM Complete, pg. 256
- Kalleberg, A., Rasell, E., Cassirer, N., Reskin, B., Hudson, K., Webster, D., Appelbaum, E., Spalter. R. (1997), *Nonstandard Work, Substandard Jobs. Flexible Work Arrangements in the U.S*, Economic Policy Institute, p.p 119
- Kalleberg, A. (2003), Flexible firms and labour market segmentation: Effects of workplace restructuring on jobs and workers. *Work and Occupations* 30, (2): 154-175.
- Kalleberg, Arne L. 2003. “Flexible Firms and Labour Market Segmentation: Effects of Workplace Restructuring on Jobs and Workers.” *Work and Occupations* 30 (May): 154-175.
- Kalleberg, Arne L., (2000), ‘Non-standard Employment Relations: Part-Time, Temporary and Contract Work’, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), pp. 341-65
- Kanellopoulos C. and Mavromaras, K., (2002), Male-Female Labour Market Participation and Wage Differentials in Greece. *Labour*, Vol. 16, pp. 771-801
- Kauffeld, S., Jonas, E., & Frey, D. (2004). Effects of a flexible work-time design on employee- and company-related aims, *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 13(1), p. 79-100
- Kelliher C. and Anderson D. (2009), Flexible working and engagement: the importance of choice, *Strategic HR Review*, 8 (2) 13-18
- Kelly, E. L. & Moen, P. (2007), Rethinking the clockwork of work: Why schedule control may pay off at work and home. *Advances in Developing Human Resources* (Special Issue on Work-Life Integration). 11(9): 487-506
- King, E. (2008), The effect of bias on the advancement of working mothers: Disentangling legitimate concerns from inaccurate stereotypes as predictors of advancement in academia, *Human Relations*, Vol. 61, No. 12, 1677-1711
- Konrad, A. M. & Mangel, R. (2000), The impact of work-life programs on firm productivity, *Strategic Management Journal*, 21: 1225-1237.
- Kouzis, G. (2001) *Industrial Relations and European Union: Flexibility and deregulation or enhancement of the employment?*, Athens: Studies, Institute of Labour, GSEE

Kuznets, S. 1955. Economic growth and income inequality. *American Economic Review*. 45, 1–28.

Lahiri, S. (2005), *Economic Theory In A Changing World, Policy-making for Growth*

Lampousaki, S. (2007), Study examines employment trends in Greece, www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2008/01/articles/gr0801079i.htm, Date published: 04/03/2008, Date accessed: 16/03/2009

Lampousaki, S. (2008), Permanent and Temporary Employment in Public and Private Sector-Greece, www.eurofound.europa.eu/ewco/2007/09/GR0709019.htm, Date published: 14/01/2008, Date accessed: 16/01/2009

Lewis, W. A., (1954). “Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour,” London.

Maher J., Franzway S. (2008) ‘Time, caring labour and social policy: understanding the family time economy in contemporary families’ *Work, Employment, and Society*, 22, 3 547-558
Manchester School, 22: 139-191

Manning A. and Petrongolo B. (2008), The Part-Time Pay Penalty For Women In Britain, *The Economic Journal*, 118 (February), F28–F51.

Mavromaras, K., Kanellopoulos, C. (2002) Male-Female Labour Market Participation and Wage Differentials in Greece *Labour: Review of Economics and Industrial Relation* Vol. 16, No 4, December, pp. 771-801 2002

Metzitakos, A. (2005) Managing the work time, *Employment Law Bulletin*, 61, 1449, 662-665

Michie J. and Sheehan M., (2005), Business strategy, human resources, labour market flexibility and competitive advantage, *Int. J. of Human Resource Management* 16:3 March 2005 445-464 13

Mihail D., (2003) Atypical working in corporate Greece, *Employee Relations*, Vol. 25 No. 5, 2003, pp. 470-489

Mihail, D. (2004) Labour flexibility in Greek SMEs, *Personnel Review* 33 (5): 549-560

Mitsopoulos, M. and Pelagidis, T. (2009), [Economic and social turbulence in Greece: the product markets are a no-brainer, the labour market is not](#). *Intereconomics*, Jul2009, Vol. 44 Issue 4, p246-254

Moore, J. and Crosbie T. (2004) Work-Life Balance and Working from Home, *Social Policy and Society*, 3, 3 223-233

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley

Morgan, H. and Milliken, F.J. (1992) Keys to action: Understanding differences in organisations' responsiveness to work-and-family issues, *Human Resource Management*, 31, 3: 227-248

Mumford, K.A. and Budd, J.W. (2006) Family-friendly work practices in Britain: availability and perceived accessibility, *Human Resource Management*, 45, 91-110

Ogbonna, H., and Harris, L. (2004), Work intensification and emotional labour among UK university lecturers: an exploratory Study *E Organisation Studies*, 25(7): 1185-1203, Sage Publications

Origo F. and Pagani L.(2008), Workplace flexibility and job satisfaction: some evidence from Europe, *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 29 No. 6, 2008, pp. 539-566

O'Reilly Cully, M and Woodland S., A, Dix, G., Millward, N., Bryson, Al. and Forth, J (1998) The 1998 workplace employee relations survey: first findings. Department of Trade and Industry, Great Britain

Ortega, J. (2009), "Why do Employers give Discretion? Family versus Performance Concerns." [Industrial Relations](#) Vol. 48, No. 1: 1-26

Osterman, P. (1995). Work/family programs and the employment relationship, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 681-700

Papadimitriou, K. (2004) Temporary employment in the public sector, *Employment Law Bulletin*, 60, 1436, 1505-1530

Papadimitriou, K. (2007) *The temporary agency work*, Athens: Sakkoulas Publications

Papalexandris N. and Kramar K. (1997), Flexible working patterns: towards reconciliation of family and work, *Employee Relations*, Vol. 19 No. 6, 1997, pp. 581-595

Papalexandris, N. and Nikandrou, I. (2000) Benchmarking employee skills: results from best practice firms in Greece (Research Paper), *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 24, 7 391-402

Participation of Women in the Labour market: Precondition for Development over disappointing Performance". CEP Discussion Paper No. 529

- Poelmans, S. and Sahibzada K. (2004) A multi-level model for studying the context and the impact of work-family policies and culture in organisations, *Human Resource Management Review*, 14, 409-431
- Polivka A. E. and Nardone T.(1989), On the definition of “Contingent Work”, *Monthly Labor Review*, December 1989, pp. 571-603
- Raghuram S., London M. and Larsen H. (2001), Flexible employment practices in Europe: country versus culture. *Int. Journal of Human Resource Management* 12:5 738–753
- Relationship between the Availability of Family Friendly Policies and Establishment, Research Series 76, Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform
- Robinson O. and Wallace J. (1981), Relative Pay And Part-Time Employment In Great Britain. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 43(2), pages 149-71
- Sands, J., Harper, T. (2007), "Family-friendly benefits and organisational performance", *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 2 pp.107-26
- Sappey, R.B., Maconachie, G., Sappey, J., Teo, S.(1999) Industry, *International Journal of Employment Studies*, Apr1999, Vol. 7 Issue 1, p105-124
- Smith-Perry J.E., and Blum T.C. (2000) Work-Family Human Resource Bundles and Perceived Organisational Performance, *The Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 6, 1107-1117
- Staines, G. and Pleck, J. (1983) *The impact of Work Schedules on the Family*, Michigan, Ann Arbor: Survey Research Centre, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan
- Stavrou, E.T. (2005), "Flexible work bundles and organisational competitiveness: a cross-national study of the European work context", *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, Vol. 26 pp.923-47
- Sullivan C. and Smithson J. (2007), Perspectives of homeworkers and their partners on working flexibility and gender equity, *Int. J. of Human Resource Management* 18:3 March 2007,pp. 448–461
- Sundstrom, M. (1991), Part-Time Work in Sweden: Trends and Equality Effects, *Journal Of Economic Issues* Vol. XXV
- Taplin, T., (1996), [Rethinking Flexibility: The Case of the Apparel Industry](#). *Review of Social Economy*, Vol. 54 Issue 2, p191-220
- Thomas, T.L. and Ganster, D.C. (1995) ‘Impact of Family-Supportive Work Variables on Work-Family Conflict and Strain: A Control Perspective’. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 6-15

Tikos S., (2009), Public and private sector strikes against economic policy, <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2008/11/articles/GR0811019I.htm>, Eurofound

Tregaskis O., C. Brewster, L. Mayne and A. Hegewisch (1998), Flexible Working in Europe: The Evidence and the Implications European Journal Of Work And Organisational Psychology, 7 (1), 61–78

Uzzi, B. and Barsness, Z. (1998), Contingent Employment in British Establishments: Organisational Determinants of the use of Fixed-term hires and Part-time Workers. Social Forces, 76(3): 967-1007

Villagómez E. (2005) Increasing the Employment of Women through Flexible Work Arrangements. Statements and Comments, May 2005, Peer Review

Visser, J (2002), The first part-time economy in the world: a model to be followed? Journal of European Social Policy.2002; 12: 23-42

Von Hippel C., Mangum S., Greenberger D., Heneman R. and Skoglund, J. (1997) Temporary Employment: Can Organizations and Employees Both Win?, Academy of Management Executive, 1997 Vol. 11 No, 1, Executive Overview

Voudouris I., (2004), The use of flexible employment arrangements: some new evidence from Greek firms, Int. J. of Human Resource Management 15:1 February 2004 131–146

Wachter, M., (1974). “Primary and Secondary Labor Markets: A Critique of the A Critique of the Dual Approach, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Vol. 1974, No. 3 (1974), pp. 637-693

Wax, A. (2002), Economic Models of the Family-Friendly Workplace: Making the Case for Change, The Law and Economics Workshop, The University of Michigan, Law School

Wenger, Jeffrey B., Kalleberg, Arne L. (2006), Employers’ Flexibility and *Employment* Volatility, American Journal of Economics & Sociology; Apr2006, Vol. 65 Issue 2, p347-382, 36p

Whitehouse, G., Haynes M., MacDonald F. and Dionne A. (2007) Reassessing the 'family-friendly workplace': Trends and influences in Britain, Industrial and Labor Review 57 (2): 204-222

William T. D, and Lang K. (1985), A Test of Dual Labor Market Theory, American Economic Association.

Williams, P., Pocock, B and Skinner, N. (2008) “Clawing back time”: expansive working time and implications for work-life outcomes in Australian workers’, *Work, Employment, and Society*, 22, 2 737-748

Williams, J.C and Segal, N. (2003), Beyond the maternal wall: Relief for family caregivers who are discriminated against on the Job, *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender*, 26, pp 77-107

Wood S., and Albanese M.T. (1995), Can we speak of a High Commitment Management on the Shop floor? *Journal of Management Studies*, 32, 2, 215-247

Wood, S. and de Menezes, L. (2006) The Reality of flexible work systems in Britain, *International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 17, 1 106-138

Wood, S., de Menezes, L. and Lasasosa, A. (2003), Family-Friendly Management In Great Britain: Testing Various Perspectives, *Industrial Relations*, 42/2: 221-250

Wood, S. and de Menezes, L. (forthcoming 2009/2010) Family-friendly management, organizational performance and social legitimacy, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*

Zeytinoglu I., Denton M., Davies S., Baumann A., Blythe, J. and Boos, L., (2007), Associations between Work Intensification, Stress and Job Satisfaction: The Case of Nurses in Ontario, *Industrial Relations*, 62, (2), p. 201-225

Zeytinoglu, I.U (1994) 'Part-Time and Other Nonstandard Forms of Employment: Why Are They Considered Appropriate For Women?' in Niland, J., R. D. Lansbury, and C. Verevis eds, *The future of industrial relations: global change and challenges / Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications*

Zeytinoglu, I.U. and J.K Muteshi (2000) 'Gender, Race and Class Dimensions of Nonstandard Work', *Relations Industrielles*, Vol. 55, No.1: 133-16