

## COL\_237 (2005)

---

◆ Description	: Main type of childcare used for own/spouse children up to 14 while person is working (apart from compulsory school; normal week omitting school holidays and emergency arrangements).
◆ Required variables	: H_LFT, H_KIND, COL_24, PLHH, WERKOPV, W1_VASTWRKA, OPVFORM
◆ Filter / Remarks	: col.24 = 1,2 and at least one own/spouse child up to 14 living in the household

---

### Explanatory notes

- “While person is working” = during his/her working hours.

- The reference period is a current and normal week outside :

\* holidays (parents, children, services, ...)

\* other particular arrangements (sick child or other problems).

If the person can not decide because childcare changes from a week to another, the reference period should be the reference week if not distorted or the first week before the reference week that is not distorted.

- Children concerned : own (including adopted) or spouse/partner up to 14 living in the same household that the person interviewed. Children aged 14 years old should be included.

- Main organisation outside compulsory school hours if only school-going children. Besides, as existence and definition of pre-school vary from a country to another, pre-school is coded in the same code as childcare services (including free pre-school).

- Childcare services : creche, day care centre, organised family care (e.g. family creches, home-based care by childminders affiliated to a child minding service), after school centre, paid carers, ... Paid childcare is included. Childcare services subsidised by state/employers are also included.

- As sometimes persons are using several childcare arrangements for a child or different childcare arrangements from one child to another, the carer (codes 1 to 3) who spends the highest number of hours/week caring for one or several children should be coded. If it is impossible to choose, the first code that applies in the order of the list should be recorded.

- Code 3- “Relatives/neighbours/friends (unpaid)” : including grandparents, father/mother living outside the household, ... These persons can live inside or outside the household.

- Code 4 : If the children up to 14 always take care of themselves/each other OR if person works at home/cares for the child at the work place OR if no childcare is used at all (e.g. compulsory school hours correspond to working hours)

- Particular cases : if the person says that he/she can not answer because he/she is currently temporary absent from work (e.g. maternity/paternity leave, parental leave, ...) or has work exceptionally during the reference week but has no usual work, this person should be coded blank.

## Code Description

1	Childcare services (including paid childminders), preschool
2	Partner who is living in the household
3	Relatives/neighbours/friends (unpaid)
4	No childcare used
9	Not applicable (not included in the filter)
Blank	No answer

## Specification

### OwnChildInHH

1	One or more own/spouse children in household
blank	No own/spouse children in household

On household level (CAPI-vragenlijstbestand met EBB 2005A)

For Regelnr := 1 to 8

OwnChildInHH	H_KIND[regelnr]	H_LFT[regelnr]	OwnChildInHH
<>1, empty	1	<=14	1

On personal level

COL_24	H_LFT	OwnChildInHH	PLHH	WerkOpv	OpvForm	W1_VastWrkA	COL_237	Number of persons (jan-dec 05)
1,2	15..64	1	1..4	1,2	-	-	1	2105
				3	-	-	3	1607
				4	-	-	2	7539
				5	-	-	4	2909
				6	1	-	1	16
					2, dk, rf, empty	3	4	61
						1,2, dk, rf, empty	Blank	309
				dk, rf, empty	-	3	4	2
						1,2, dk, rf, empty	blank	9
			5..13	-	-	-	9	1331
		empty	-	-	-	-	9	24009
	>64	-	-	-	-	-	9	282
3,4,5,9	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	35499

## Frequencies and percentages of COL\_237, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
Childcare services (including paid childminders), preschool	2121	392	14.6	15.0
Partner who is living in the household	7539	1363	51.8	52.2
Relatives/neighbours/friends (unpaid)	1607	277	11.0	10.6
No childcare used	2972	509	20.4	19.5
Blank	318	68	2.2	2.6
Total	14557	2 609	100.0	100.0

## Frequencies and percentages of COL\_237 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

This table is the same as above (see General comments).

## General comments

January – June 2005 the questions about this adhoc-module are only asked to a quarter of the respondents (in case the first number of Adresidentificatie is '2'). From July on there is no selection anymore.

Unexpectedly the questions used for col\_237 are asked to all persons in stead of only a quarter. Although this variable can be made for all persons, to be consistent, the same selection is used for all adhoc variables (Adresidentificatie <> '1').

This variable only concerns Capi.

Anybody outside the core of the household will get code 9 (outside filter) because of them it is unknown whether they have own/spouse children living in the household (this information is not available in the questionnaire of LFS Netherlands).

The question WerkOpv is only asked to members of the core of the household because about them information is available about any own/spouse children.

If the childcare is different than the ones mentioned (codes 1,2,3) there is no possibility to code the person right. In case WerkOpv = 6 ("different") and the person doesn't work at home (W1\_VastWrkA not 3) the person is coded blank although he gave an answer. Code 4 is not sufficient because then the person would have chosen WerkOpv = 5.

The category "different" is analysed based on the remarks given by the pollsters. Up to and including november 53 remarks were made with WerkOpv.

10 out of the 53 persons have been coded "different" while they should have been coded 1,2,3 or 4.

29 out of the 53 persons wanted to answer that during the working time the child(ren) is (are) at school. They should have been coded 4 but apparently this was not clear.

In the new version of the questionnaire an extra remark was added to the question to make sure that such persons would have been coded 4 in the future. So from may on it should not occur as often that a person is coded "different" while the child is at school. Further analysis corresponds to our expectation; From may on only 3 persons answered WerkOpv = "other" with the remark that the child is at school while before may 26 persons did.

2 out of the 53 were coded 6 correctly because they had maternity leave in the reference week

The remaining 12 out of the 53 had a kind of child care other than mentioned in the categories 1 – 4, for example in case the ex-partner (father of the child) is taking care of the child or the respondent herself/himself takes care of the child (because the child is brought along to the place of work).

WerkOpv is not only asked to persons with "adresidentificatie not 1" so can be determined for everyone. However to be consistent with the other adhoc-variables all adhoc-figures are based on persons with "adresidentificatie not 1" (in accordance with the figures for SZW).

## Differences with standard eurostat

In the questionnaire, questions on reconciliation between work and family life are only asked to persons who belong to the household core.

### **Recommendation**

Now there was no possibility to code other types of childcare than codes 1, 2 or 3, both in the eurostat codification as in the LFS questionnaire. They were coded blank although the person gave an answer. Furthermore respondents didn't know what to answer if a child staying at school during the lunch break also has to be considered as child care.

If this question ever returns the pollsters must be instructed better;

## Aandachtspunten

### WERKOPV = ANDERS

309 van de 318 (jan-dec 2005) legen hebben werkopv = 6 (anders). Het vermoeden bestond dat dit de gevallen zijn waarvan de kinderen schoolgaand zijn. Daarom is bij de nieuwe vragenlijst (versie 2005 B per mei 2005) specifiek vermeld dat schoolgaande kinderen met 5 gecodeerd moeten worden. Indien de meerderheid van werkop = 6 mensen met schoolgaande kinderen zou bevatten zouden vanaf juni bijna geen legen meer voor moeten komen. Het idee was om, indien het vermoeden bevestigd zou worden de blanks bij categorie 5 te voegen. Echter, uit de volgende tabel blijkt dat het vermoeden onjuist is en personen die “anders” antwoorden vaak een andere reden hebben dan schoolgaande kinderen.

```
USE ALL.  
COMPUTE filter_$=(sysmis(col_237) | col_237 ~= 9).  
VARIABLE LABEL filter_$ 'sysmis(col_237) | col_237 ~= 9 (FILTER)'.  
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.  
FORMAT filter_$ (f1.0).  
FILTER BY filter_$.  
EXECUTE .  
CROSSTABS  
  /TABLES=werkopv BY s_period  
  /FORMAT= AVALUE TABLES  
  /CELLS= COUNT COLUMN .
```

	Jan	Feb	Maart	April	Mei	Juni	Juli	Aug	Sept	Okt	Nov	Dec
1 Kinderdagverblijf, buitenschoolse opvang of gastouderopvang	10.8	7.9	8.3	10.0	10.7	10.1	10.0	11.4	10.1	11.0	10.1	10.4
2 Betaalde oppas of peuterspeelzaal	5.1	3.6	4.0	4.6	3.2	4.2	3.6	5.0	4.1	4.4	3.7	4.6
3 Onbetaalde kinderopvang door familie/vrienden/buren	10.3	9.9	11.6	10.4	12.0	10.2	11.3	10.7	10.6	11.3	10.9	11.9
4 Partner in het huishouden	54.6	57.9	55.4	52.1	54.9	48.9	52.5	53.1	50.5	50.3	51.4	50.5
5 Geen opvang	14.6	15.3	16.3	19.6	16.8	23.4	19.5	17.6	21.9	20.8	21.6	20.8
6 anders	4.4	5.4	4.4	3.4	2.5	3.3	3.1	2.2	2.8	2.1	2.2	1.7
8 Refusal												0.1
9 Don't Know	0.3							0.1		0.2	0.1	0.1
Totaal	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Zie ook General comments.**

## COL\_238 (2005)

---

◆ Description	: Person takes regularly care of other children up to 14 or to ill, disabled, elderly relatives/friends aged 15 or more in need of care.
◆ Required variables	: REGNR_OP, ACTKINDOP, ACTKINDHHOP, H_KIND, ALTKINDZORG, PLHH, ACTPARTOP, ACTOUDEROP, ACTFAMOP, REGNR_PART, ACTKINDPART, ACTKINDHHPART, ACTOPPART, ACTOUDERPART, ACTFAMPART, H_LFT,
◆ Filter / Remarks	: Everybody aged 15-64

---

### Explanatory notes

- « Caring, care, carer » : the variable focuses on the carers and not on the persons who are cared for (employment perspective linked with care responsibilities). Carers are defined as people who look after or provide regular help -on a fixed pattern- to children or to friends/relatives in need of care because sick/elderly/incapacitated/disabled (help, assistance, support, surveillance). The carer has to be responsible for the care.

Examples of caring tasks for other children up to 14 : personal care, homework, playing games, reading, taking out, surveillance

Examples of caring tasks for friends/relatives in need of care aged 15 or more : personal care (e.g. dressing, washing) ; physical help (e.g. walking) ; helping with paperwork or financial matters ; domestic help (e.g. housework, laundry) ; company, talking, visiting

- “Other children” correspond to other than (own/spouse children living in the household) that is to say to :

\* own/spouse children living outside the household

\* other children (not own/spouse) living inside or outside the household

Children aged 14 years old should be included.

- The dependant adults helped can live inside or outside the household.

- “Regularly” is defined as on a fixed pattern (every day, every week, ...). The reference period is the current situation.

- If the care consists only of financial support or if the care is a volunteer work for a charity or for an other organisation, then it should not be considered as care.

- Care as a job should be excluded (it means that care done in a professional capacity is excluded)

- Persons who receive allowances to take care of disabled relatives should be considered as carers (codes 2 or 3).

- For children up to 14 who have a handicap, a disability or a health problem : they are considered as “children” (code 1, or 3 if also care of dependant adults).

- Care for children aged 15 or more who are not ill/disabled is out of the scope of this variable.

### Code Description

- 1 Yes, of other children up to 14
- 2 Yes, of relatives/friends aged 15 or more in need of care
- 3 Yes, of other children up to 14 and of relatives/friends aged 15 or more in need of care
- 4 No
- 9 Not applicable (person aged less than 15 or more than 64)
- Blank No answer

### Specification

On household level (CAPI-vragenlijstbestand met EBB 2005A and from may on EBB 2005B)

### OtherChild[i] “Care for other child by person i”

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- blank Unknown

### Concerning interviewed person

Regnr_OP	ACTKINDOP	ACTKINDHHOP	H_Kind[RegelnrKnd[1]]	H_Kind[RegelnrKnd[2]]	ALTKINDZORG	OTHERCHILD[Regnr_OP]
1,2	1	-	-	-	-	1
	2, empty	1	2	-	-	1
			1,empty	2	-	1
				1,empty	1,3	1
					2, 4	2
					empty <sup>1</sup> , dk, rf	Blank
		2, empty	-	-	1,3	1
					2, 4	2
					empty <sup>1</sup> , dk, rf	Blank
empty	-	-	-	-	-	Blank

<sup>1</sup>Person for who information about caring for an “other” healthy child is missing (due to the routing of the questionnaire) because in the household there was a need for an ill child.

Regnr_OP	ACTPARTOP	ACTOUDEROP	ACTFAMOP	ILLADULT[Regnr_OP]
1,2	1	-	-	1
	2, empty	1	-	1
		2, empty	1	1
			2, empty	2
empty	-	-	-	blank

*Concerning partner of interviewed person*

Regnr_Part	ACTKINDPART	ACTKINDHHPART	H_Kind[RegelNrKnd[1]]	H_Kind[RegelNrKnd[2]]	ALTKINDZORG	OTHERCHILD[Regnr_Part]
1,2	1	-	-	-	-	1
	2, empty	1	2	-	-	1
			1,empty	2	-	1
				1,empty	2,3	1
					1, 4	2
					empty <sup>1</sup> , dk, rf	Blank
		2, empty	-	-	2,3	1
					1, 4	2
					empty <sup>1</sup> , dk, rf	Blank
empty	-	-	-	-	-	blank

<sup>1</sup>Person for who information about caring for an “other” healthy child is missing (due to the routing of the questionnaire) because in the household there was a need for an ill child.

Regnr_Part	ACTOPPART	ACTOUDERPART	ACTFAMPART	ILLADULT[Regnr_Part]
1,2	1	-	-	1
	2, empty	1	-	1
		2, empty	1	1
			2, empty	2
empty	-	-	-	blank

On personal level

H_LFT	PLHH	OTHERCHILD[regelnr]	ILLADULT[regelnr]	COL_238	Number of persons (jan-dec 05)
15..64	1..4	1	1	3	473
			2	1	3 946
		2	1	2	2 599
			2	4	37 638
		empty	1	2	58
			2, empty	blank	1 112
	5..13	-	-	Blank <sup>2</sup>	8 757
<15, >64	-	-	-	9	21 095

<sup>2</sup>In the questionnaire, questions on reconciliation between work and family life are only asked to persons who belong to the household core. Therefore, persons who belong outside the household core are coded blank (almost all blanks, about 16% for January-december 2005).

**Frequencies and percentages of COL\_238, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight**

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
Yes, of other children up to 14	3946	821	7.2	7.5
Yes, of relatives/friends aged 15 or more in need of care	2657	502	4.9	4.6
Yes, of other children up to 14 and of relatives/friends aged 15 or more in need of care	473	95	0.9	0.9
No	37638	7512	69.0	68.9
No answer	9869	1972	18.1	18.1
Total	54583	10903	100.0	100.0

**Frequencies and percentages of COL\_238 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight**

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight	UnWeight	Weight

		(x1000)		
Yes, of other children up to 14	3946	821	8.6	9.0
Yes, of relatives/friends aged 15 or more in need of care	2657	502	5.8	5.5
Yes, of other children up to 14 and of relatives/friends aged 15 or more in need of care	473	95	1.0	1.0
No	37638	7512	82.1	81.9
No answer	1112	239	2.4	2.6
Total	45826	9170	100.0	100.0

## General comments

This variable only concerns Capi.

16% of the 18,1 blanks is due to persons outside the household core.

In the period jan-dec. 2005 it concerns 1112 persons (569 proxi, 543 answered by respondent) for which no information is gathered about regularly care for other children up to 14 or of ill, disabled, elderly relatives/friends aged 15 or more in need of care.

In case the first person who answered the questionnaire was a member outside the household this information about care was not gathered while it should have been. Regnr\_OP is the row number of the first respondent of the household but should have been the first respondent of the household *belonging to the household core*. If Regnr\_OP is not 1 or 2 then COL\_238 is coded blank (persons outside the household core). This concerns 472 persons.

Furthermore, the variable AltKindZorg (care for other healthy children) is only asked in case the respondent didn't already answer that in the household care was needed for an ill child (either in- or outside the household) no matter whether the respondent or his/her partner is regularly taking care for the child. Due to this decision 636 persons the information is missing. So in case in the household there was a need for care for an ill child but neither the respondent nor his/her partner is taking care for the child (jan-dec: 96 persons), information about care for a healthy "other" child is not asked, so missing (for example in january the household 14414880) while it could have been asked.

The remaining 4 blanks are due to a "don't know" to AltkindZorg.

## Differences with standard eurostat

In the questionnaire, questions on reconciliation between work and family life are only asked to persons who belong to the household core.

## Recommendation

See also General comments!

Concerning AltKindZorg, more logical would be to exclude only persons who are taking care for an ill child in stead of persons for who there is a need for care in the household for an ill child.

It seemed that persons who don't have any child in the household (nkindtot = 0) have answered that care for a child in the household was necessary (wienodig = 3). So, a check for WieNodig (related to Nkindtot) is better (for example in january 2005 household 14389080 and 14399400).

### Calculations concerning general comments

In the period jan-dec. 2005 it concerns 1112 persons (569 proxi, 543 answered by respondent) for which no information is gathered about regularly care for other children up to 14 or of ill, disabled, elderly relatives/friends aged 15 or more in need of care.

```
USE ALL.
COMPUTE filter_$=((h_lft >= 15 & h_lft <= 64 ) & (plhh >= 1 &
plhh <= 4) &
  (SYSMIS(COL_238)|COL_238=0)).
VARIABLE LABEL filter_$ '(h_lft >= 15 & h_lft <= 64 ) & (plhh
>= 1 & plhh <=' +
  ' 4) & ...(FILTER)'.
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.
FORMAT filter_$ (f1.0).
FILTER BY filter_$.
EXECUTE .
FREQUENCIES
  VARIABLES=a_op_pro
  /ORDER= ANALYSIS .
```

In case the first person who answered the questionnaire was a member outside the household this information about care was not gathered while it should have been. Regnr\_OP is the row number of the first respondent of the household but should have been the first respondent of the household *belonging to the household core*. If Regnr\_OP is not 1 or 2 then COL\_238 is coded blank (persons outside the household core). This concerns 472 persons.

```
USE ALL.
COMPUTE filter_$=(sysmis(col_238) & plhh <= 4).
VARIABLE LABEL filter_$ 'sysmis(col_238) & plhh <= 4
(FILTER)'.
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.
FORMAT filter_$ (f1.0).
FILTER BY filter_$.
EXECUTE .
FREQUENCIES
  VARIABLES=regnr_op
  /ORDER= ANALYSIS .
```

Furthermore, the variable AltKindZorg (care for other healthy children) is only asked in case the respondent didn't already answer that in the household care was needed for an ill child (either in- or outside the household) no matter whether the respondent or his/her partner is regularly taking care for the child. Due to this decision 636 persons the information is missing.

```
USE ALL.
COMPUTE filter_$=((regnr_op = 1 | regnr_op = 2) & (wienodi1 = 3
| wienodi1=4
  | wienodi2 = 3 | wienodi2 = 4 | wienodi3 = 3 | wienodi3 = 4 |
wienodi4 = 3 |
  wienodi4 = 4 | wienodi5 = 3 | wienodi5 = 4 | wienodi6 = 3 |
wienodi6 = 4) &
  (sysmis(col_238) | col_238 = 0)).
VARIABLE LABEL filter_$ '(regnr_op = 1 | regnr_op = 2) &
(wienodi1 = 3 | '+
```

```

' wienodi1=4 | wienodi2 = 3 | wienodi2 = 4 | wienodi3 = 3 |
wi... (FILTER)'.
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.
FORMAT filter_$ (f1.0).
FILTER BY filter_$.
EXECUTE .
FREQUENCIES
  VARIABLES=altkindz
  /ORDER= ANALYSIS .

```

So in case in the household there was a need for care for an ill child but neither the respondent nor his/her partner is taking care for the child (jan-dec: 96 persons), information about care for a healthy "other" child is not asked, so missing (for example in january the household 14414880) while it could have been asked.

```
USE ALL.
```

```

COMPUTE filter_$=((h_lft >= 15 & h_lft <= 64 ) & (plhh >= 1 &
plhh <= 4) &
  (regnr_op = 1 | regnr_op = 2) & SYSMIS(altkindz) & (nodigkin
~= 1| missing
  (nodigkin)) & (nodigkin ~= 3 | missing(nodigkin))& (nodigand
~= 1| missing
  (nodigand)) & (nodigand ~= 3| missing(nodigand)) &
  (SYSMIS(COL_238) |COL_238=0)).
VARIABLE LABEL filter_$ '(h_lft >= 15 & h_lft <= 64 ) & (plhh
>= 1 & plhh <='+
  ' 4) & (regnr_op = 1 | regnr_op = 2) & SYSMIS(altkindz) & ...
(FILTER)'.
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.
FORMAT filter_$ (f1.0).
FILTER BY filter_$.
EXECUTE .
FREQUENCIES
  VARIABLES=altkindz
  /ORDER= ANALYSIS .

```

## COL\_239 (2005)

- 
- ◆ Description : Wish to change the organisation of his/her working life and his/her care responsibilities
  - ◆ Required variables : H\_LFT, H\_KIND, COL\_238, Z\_WILWERK, Z\_REDENEN05, Z\_MEERMIND, Z\_KANDAT, Z\_REDENVER, TIJDZORG, KINDZORG\_OP, FAMZORG\_OP
  - ◆ Filter / Remarks : Everybody aged 15-64 and ((has at least one own/spouse child up to 14 living in the household) or (C238 = 1,2,3))
- 

### Explanatory notes

- “Care responsibilities” include care for children and care of ill/disabled/elderly relatives/friends (see C237 and C238)
- We want to know the current wish of the person independently of the constraints (e.g. even if she/he can not work because of lack of childcare services or other constraints). Therefore, what we are interested in is : would the person wish to change the organisation of his/her working life and his/her care responsibilities ?
- Particular cases : if person says that she/he wishes to work more and care more OR that she/he wishes to work less and care less, then code 1 (No) should be used.
- Code 3 includes “wish not to work at all in order to have more time for caring”.

### Code Description

- 1 No
- 2 Wish to work or to work more (and reduce caringtime)
- 3 Wish to work less to have more time for caring
- 9 Not applicable (not included in the filter)
- Blank No answer

### Specification

#### OwnChildInHH

- 1 One or more own/spouse children in household
- blank No own/spouse children in household

On household level (CAPI-vragenlijstbestand met EBB\_2005A)

For RegelNr := 1 to 8

OwnChildInHH	KIND[regelNr]	LFT[regelNr]	OwnChildInHH
<>1, empty	1	<=14	1

On personal level

H_LFT	OwnChildInHH	COL_238	Z_WilWerk	Z_Redenen_05	KindZorg_OP	FamZorg_OP	Z_MeerMind	Z_Kandat	Z_RedenVer_05	TijdZorg	COL_239	Number of persons Jan-dec 05
15..64	1 and plhh=1..4	-	2,3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1 795
			1	1,5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	96
				2,3,4,6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	23
				dk,rf,empty	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1 440
			4, dk,rf	1,5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	169
				2,3,4,6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	342
				dk,rf,empty	-	-	-	-	-	-	blank	18
			empty	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	34
					-	-	-	1,2,dk,rf,empty	-	-	2	966
					-	-	2	3	-	-	1	58
					-	-	-	1,2,dk,rf,empty	-	1	3	734
					-	-	-	-	-	2	1	238
					-	-	-	-	-	Dk,rf	Blank	2
					-	-	3,4	-	-	-	1	11 399
					-	-	5	-	1,7	-	3	9
					-	-	-	-	2..6,8,dk, rf, empty	-	1	33
					-	-	Dk,rf	-	-	-	blank	66
					-	-	Empty <sup>1</sup>	-	-	-	1	67
	Empty or plhh=5..13	1,2,3	2,3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1 591
			1	1,5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	10
				2,3,4,6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	53
				dk,rf,empty	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	212
					2,empty	1	-	-	-	-	2	153
						2,empty	-	-	-	-	1	1
			4, dk,rf	1,5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	18
				2,3,4,6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	322
				dk,rf,empty	-	-	-	-	-	-	blank	13
			empty	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	4
					-	-	-	1,2,dk,rf,empty	-	-	2	158
					-	-	2	3	-	-	1	21
					-	-	-	1,2,dk,rf,empty	-	1	3	75
					-	-	-	-	-	2	1	175
					-	-	-	-	-	Dk,rf	Blank	0
					-	-	-	-	-	empty	1	1
					-	-	3,4	-	-	-	1	1 970
					-	-	5	-	1,7	-	3	1
					-	-	-	-	2..6,8,dk, rf, empty	-	1	60
					-	-	Dk,rf	-	-	-	blank	12
					-	-	Empty <sup>1</sup>	-	-	-	1	28
		4,9,blank	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	32 216
<15, >64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	21 095

<sup>1</sup>Persons younger than 75 years old and Z\_MeerMind = empty and Z\_Wilwerk = empty are WSW-ers.



### Frequencies and percentages of COL\_239, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
No	18214	3364	81.4	80.7
Wish to work or to work more (and reduce caringtime)	3222	629	14.4	15.2
Wish to work less to have more time for caring	819	151	3.7	3.6
No answer	112	23	0.5	0.6
Total	22367	4167	100.0	100.0

### Frequencies and percentages of COL\_239 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

This table is the same as above (see General comments).

#### General comments

This variable only concerns Capi.

This variable is not applicable in case Col\_238 = blank. Persons outside the household core are coded blank for Col\_238. therefore Col\_239 is also only applicable for persons belonging to the household core.

#### The following assumptions are made (according to the developers of the questionnaire):

The persons who want to work more (MeerMind = 1) are assumed to reduce caring time (code 2) except those who already have arranged it; it is assumed that they don't want to change anything because they already have arranged it (code 1).

The persons who want to work or more than 12 hours a week (WilWerk = 1) and who have caring responsibilities (taking care of ill persons or having young children up to and including 14 years old) are assumed to reduce caring time.

The persons who don't want to work (more within 6 months) (MeerMind = 3/WilWerk=2) are assumed not wishing to change the balance between work and care, although they might wish to change it after 6 months. Persons who work less than 12 hours/week probably don't want to work less because their working time is already less than 12 hours/week.

The persons who already found a job of more or less hours (MeerMind = 4/WilWerk=3/(MeerMind=2&Kandat=3)) than the current job are assumed not wishing to change the balance between work and care. The reason for this assumption is that, after all, it already has been arranged.

The persons who want to work (more) but cannot.

Persons younger than 75 years old and Z\_MeerMind = empty and Z\_Wilwerk = empty are WSW-ers. It is assumed that they don't want to change the organisation of his/her working life and his/her care responsibilities.

#### Differences with standard eurostat

This variable doesn't measure exactly what Eurostat wants. Eurostat wants to measure the wish of the person independently of the constraints, but the used variable Z\_meermind indeed contain restrictions (amount of salary, certain period namely within 6 months)

### **Recommendation**

None

## COL\_240 (2005)

---

◆ Description	: Main reason (linked with childcare) for not working or not working more
◆ Required variables	: COL_238, COL_239, REDMEERWERK, OPVTEKORT, H_KIND, H_LFT, MEEROPV, OPVPROB, OPVTEKORT2
◆ Filter / Remarks	: C239 = 2 and (has at least one own/spouse child up to 14 living in the household) or (C238 = 1,3))

---

### Explanatory notes

- Childcare services : creche, day care centre, organised family care (e.g. family creches, home-based care by childminders affiliated to a child minding service), after school centre, paid carers, ... Paid childcare is included. Childcare services subsidised by state/employers are also included.

- The main reason should be interpreted as the main current reason. For example, if a mother quit a job because of the lack of childcare services 2 years ago and if now, she finds it too expensive in relation to the expected salary, then code 3.

- Code 1 : This code should be used when the care would be needed approximately from 7h00 to 19h00. Means that there is no childcare service for the children in the area at all OR no childcare service available (no place available, ...) OR not enough care service for children who need more care (e.g. a child is cared for in the morning but lack of care services in the afternoon).

- Code 2 : this code should be used only if the care would be needed at special times, that is to say approximately before 7h00 in the morning, at night, after 19h00 in the evening, during the week-end or during school holidays ...

- Code 3 : a person who is not working and who might expect a salary which is not high enough compared to the cost of the care should be also coded here (the salary can be higher than the cost of the care but not high enough to encourage the person to work).

- Code 4 : «quality not sufficient» from the person's point of view includes educational contents not sufficient, too many children and not enough carers, person not confident (does not trust), ... Should also be used in case of lack of suitable childcare services for children with special needs (up to 14).

- The main reason is asked for. Even if there is a combination of reasons (e.g. quality not sufficient and cost too high), the person has to choose the main one. If it is impossible to choose, the first code that applies in the order of the list should be recorded.

- Code 5 : e.g. can not find a job, want the child to be cared for only by relatives but there is no relative who can do that, could work more if partner worked less, ...

## Code Description

1	Lack of childcare services during the day
2	Lack of childcare services at special times
3	Lack of childcare services during the day or at special times
4	Childcare services are too expensive
5	Available childcare services are not of sufficient quality
6	Other reason not linked with the lack of suitable childcare services
9	Not applicable (not included in the filter)
blank	No answer

## Specification

### OwnChildInHH

1	One or more own/spouse children in household
blank	No own/spouse children in household

### On household level (CAPI-vragenlijstbestand met EBB 2005A)

For Regelnr := 1 to 8

OwnChildInHH	H_KIND[regelnr]	H_LFT[regelnr]	OwnChildInHH
<>1, empty	1	<=14	1

### On personal level

COL_239	COL_238	OwnChildInHH	RedMeerWerk	OpvTekort	MeerOpv	OpvProb	OpvTekort2	COL_240	Number of persons jan-dec 2005
2	1,3	-	4	1	-	-	-	1	5
				2	-	-	-	2	1
				3,dk,rf	-	-	-	3	2
			2	-	-	-	-	4	16
			3	-	-	-	-	5	0
			1,5..8	-	-	-	-	6	533
			Dk,rf,empty	-	1	1	1	1	0
							2	2	0
							3,dk,rf	3	0
						2	-	4	6
						3	-	5	1
						Dk,rf,empty	-	blank	0
					2	-	-	6	26
					dk,rf,empty	-	-	blank	23
	2,4,9,blank	1 and plhh=1..4	4	1	-	-	-	1	20
				2	-	-	-	2	4
				3,dk,rf	-	-	-	3	0
			2	-	-	-	-	4	94
			3	-	-	-	-	5	12
			1,5..8	-	-	-	-	6	1 943
			Dk,rf,empty	-	1	1	1	1	1
							2	2	1
							3,dk,rf	3	2
						2	-	4	29
						3	-	5	5
						Dk,rf,empty	-	blank	2
					2	-	-	6	188
					dk,rf,empty	-	-	blank	75

1,3,9,blank	-	Empty or plhh=5..13	-	-	-	-	-	9	233
	-		-	-	-	-	-	9	72 456

### Frequencies and percentages of COL\_240, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
Lack of childcare services during the day	26	4	0.9	0.7
Lack of childcare services at special times	6	2	0.2	0.3
Lack of childcare services during the day or at special time	4	1	0.1	0.1
Childcare services are too expensive	145	29	4.9	5.1
Available childcare services are not of sufficient quality	18	5	0.6	0.8
Other reason not linked with the lack of suitable childcare	2690	525	90.0	90.1
No answer	100	17	3.3	2.9
Total	2989	584	100.0	100.0

### Frequencies and percentages of COL\_240 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

This table is the same as above (see General comments).

### General comments

This variable only concerns Capi.

Because Col\_239 is only applicable for persons belonging to the household core, so also Col\_240 is only applicable for persons belonging to the household core.

If the persons has said that the main reason for not working is a lack of chilcare services (RedMeerWerk = 4) but he doesn't know or refuses to answer whether this concerns childcare during the day or at special times, it is assumed that it concerns lack of childcare during the day.

In different versions of the explanatory notes the number of categories for this variable different. In this variable the categorie "Lack of childcare services during the day or at special time" is taken into account.

## **Differences with standard eurostat**

None

## **Recommendation**

In the LFS questionnaire concerning the calculation of KindOpvang and FamOpvang the line is drawn for persons working  $>12$  hours in stead of what is usual, namely  $\geq 12$  hours per week. In developing the questionnaire for 2007 this has to be taken into account.

## COL\_241 (2005)

- 
- ◆ Description : Person took days off or reduced the number of hours worked or took other special arrangements at work over the last 12 months to care for the children
  - ◆ Required variables : COL\_24, H\_LFT, H\_KIND, PLHH, VAKOPV, GEENALT, PROBVAK
  - ◆ Filter / Remarks : Everybody aged 15-64 with at least one own/spouse child up to 14 living in the household and C24 = 1,2
- 

### Explanatory notes

- Childcare services : creche, day care centre, organised family care (e.g. family creches, home-based care by childminders affiliated to a child minding service), after school centre, paid carers, ... Paid childcare is included. Childcare services subsidised by state/employers are also included.

- “Alternative” = substitute to the usual childcare (services, relatives, ...). By definition, we are in the case where the usual childcare arrangements are not available because closed, caring persons on holidays, ...

- Codes 2 to 5 should be used if person had problems with alternative childcare services (at least once) during these periods. In between codes 2 to 5, the main problem should be recorded. If it is impossible for the person to choose between codes 2 to 5, the first code that applies in the order of the list (2 to 5) should be recorded.

- Code 6 should be used if person had no problem at all with alternative childcare services during these periods.

- Particular cases : if the person is coded 1 or 2 in C24 but had not worked over the last 12 months during these kinds of periods (e.g. in maternity/paternity/parental leave, ...) or if there were no special periods for the person (e.g. has only one child going to day care centre and the day care centre was opened all over the last 12 months without any interruption), code 1 (No) should be used.

### Code Description

- |       |   |
|-------|---|
| 1     | No  |
| 2     | Yes, because of lack of alternative childcare services during the day   |
| 3     | Yes, because of lack of alternative childcare services at special times |
| 4     | Yes, because alternative childcare services too expensive               |
| 5     | Yes, because alternative childcare services not of sufficient quality   |
| 6     | Yes, always because of other reasons                                    |
| 9     | Not applicable (not included in the filter)                             |
| blank | No answer   |

### Specification

## OwnChildInHH

1 One or more own/spouse children in household

blank No own/spouse children in household

On household level (CAPI-vragenlijstbestand met EBB\_2005A)

For Regelnr := 1 to 8

OwnChildInHH	H_KIND[regelnr]	H_LFT[regelnr]	OwnChildInHH
<>1, empty	1	<=14	1

On personal level

COL_24	H_LFT	OwnChildInHH	PLHH	VakOpv	GeenAlt	ProbVak	COL_241	Number of persons Jan-dec 2005
1,2	15..64	1 and plhh=1..4	1..4	1	1	1	2	342
						2	3	54
						3	4	138
						4	5	30
						Dk	6	53
						Rf	blank	2
					2	-	1	1 276
					Dk,rf,empty	-	blank	289
				2	-	-	1	12 362
				Dk,rf	-	-	blank	11
			5..13	-	-	-	9	1 331
		Empty or plhh=5..13	-	-	-	-	9	24 009
	>64	-	-	-	-	-	9	282
3,4,5,9	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	35 499

## Frequencies and percentages of COL\_241, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
No	13638	2432	93.7	93.2
Yes, because of lack of alternative childcare services during the day	342	66	2.3	2.5
Yes, because of lack of alternative childcare services at special times	54	10	0.4	0.4
Yes, because alternative childcare services too expensive	138	26	0.9	1.0
Yes, because alternative childcare services not of sufficient quality	30	8	0.2	0.3
Yes, always because of other reasons	53	10	0.4	0.4
No answer	302	58	2.1	2.2
Total	14557	2610	100.0	100.0

## Frequencies and percentages of COL\_241 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

This table is the same as above (see General comments).

### General comments

This variable only concerns Capi.

Anybody outside the core of the household will get code 9 (outside filter) because of them it is unknown whether they have own/spouse children living in the household (this information is not available in the questionnaire of LFS Netherlands).

The questions GeenAlt and ProbVak are only asked to one member of the household core, the respondent. After all, if one person in the household has a problem with alternative childcare services, it is assumed that the other person has the same problem. Therefore on household level the following has been added

In.VakOpv[1]	In.VakOpv[2]	In.GeenAlt[1]	Out.GeenAlt[1]	Out.ProbVak[1]	Out.GeenAlt[2]	Out.ProbVak[2]
On household level			On personal level			
1	1	<>empty	In.GeenAlt[1]	In.ProbVak[1]	In.GeenAlt[1]	In.ProbVak[1]
		empty	In.GeenAlt[2]	In.ProbVak[2]	In.GeenAlt[2]	In.ProbVak[2]

The assumption by developing the questionnaire was that the answers to GeenAlt and ProbVak of both partners should be the same. However these questions also are dependent of the question VakOpv and that can be different for both partners. If for the respondent VakOpv = no and for his/her partner = yes, then GeenAlt en ProbVak are empty, so those empty's are copied for the partner while the partner has VakOpv=yes. This caused 286 persons coded blank.

## Differences with standard eurostat

None

## Recommendation

It is recommended to change the selection of GeenAlt.

Now, the person has to answer the questions him/herself to get this question (OP\_Proxi = OP), and it was assumed that it could be copied for the partner but everybody with VakOpv = yes must get GeenAlt. See also "General comments".

## Calculations concerning general comments

The assumption by developing the questionnaire was that the answers to GeenAlt and ProbVak of both partners should be the same. However these questions also are dependent of the question VakOpv and that can be different for both partners. If for the respondent VakOpv = no and for his/her partner = yes, then GeenAlt en ProbVak are empty, so those empty's are copied for the partner while the partner has VakOpv=yes. This caused 286 persons coded blank.

```
USE ALL.
COMPUTE filter_$=(sysmis(col_241) & vakopv = 1 &
sysmis(geenalt)).
VARIABLE LABEL filter_$ 'sysmis(col_241) & vakopv = 1 &
sysmis(geenalt)'+
' (FILTER)'.
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.
FORMAT filter_$ (f1.0).
FILTER BY filter_$.
EXECUTE .
FREQUENCIES
  VARIABLES=a_op_pro
  /ORDER= ANALYSIS .
```



## COL\_242 (2005)

---

◆ Description	: Main reason (linked with care of ill, disabled, elderly relatives/friends aged 15 or more in need of care) for not working or not working more
◆ Required variables	: COL_238, COL_239, REDMEERWERK, ZORGTEKORT, MEERZORG, ZORGPROB, ZORGTEKORT2
◆ Filter / Remarks	: C239 = 2 and C238 = 2,3

---

### Explanatory notes

- In the term “care services”, paid carers are also included. Care services includes care services at home and/or care in institution, including institutions where persons can go only during the day.

- The main reason should be interpreted as the main current reason. For example, if the person quit a job because of the lack of care services 2 years ago and if now, the cost of an external care is too expensive for the person helped OR for her, then code 3.

- The main reason is asked for. Even if there is a combination of reasons (e.g. quality not sufficient and cost too high), the person has to choose the main one. If it is impossible to choose, the first code that applies in the order of the list should be recorded.

- Code 1 : This code should be used when the care would be needed approximately from 7h00 to 19h00. Means that there is no care service for the person at all OR no care service available (no place available, ...) OR not enough care (need of a prolongation of the care service).

- Code 2 : this code should be used only if the care would be needed at special times that is to say approximately before 7h00 in the morning, at night, after 19h00 in the evening, during the week-end, during holidays, 24 hours/24 hours.

- Code 3 : too expensive for the person helped OR for the person who helps. A person who could expect a salary which is not high enough compared to the cost of the care she would have to support should be coded here (the salary can be higher than the cost of the care but not high enough to encourage the person to work).

- Code 4 : « quality not sufficient » from the person’s interviewed point of view OR from the helped person’s point of view. Includes persons not confident (do not trust), ...

- Code 5 : e.g. can not find a job, person helped does not want to be helped by someone else, ...

### Code Description

1	Lack of care services during the day
2	Lack of care services at special times
3	Lack of care services during the day or at special times

- 4 Care services are too expensive
- 5 Available care services are not of sufficient quality
- 6 Other reason not linked with the lack of suitable care services
- 9 Not applicable (not included in the filter)
- blank No answer

## Specification

COL_238	COL_239	RedMeerWerk	ZorgTekort	MeerZorg	ZorgProb	ZorgTekort2	COL_242	Number of persons jan-dec 05
2,3	2	4	1	-	-	-	1	0
			2	-	-	-	2	0
			3, dk,rf				3	0
			Empty <sup>1</sup>	-	-	-	blank	1
		2	-	-	-	-	4	6
		3	-	-	-	-	5	1
		1,5,8	-	-	-	-	6	385
		Dk,rf,empty	-	1	1	1	1	0
						2	2	0
						3, dk,rf	3	1
					2	-	4	4
					3	-	5	1
					Dk,rf,empty	-	Blank	1
				2	-	-	6	17
				Dk,rf, empty <sup>2</sup>	-	-	blank	41
1,4,9,blank	1,3,9,blank	-	-	-	-	-	9	2672
	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	72548

<sup>1</sup>In case the person has KindOpvang = 1 and FamOpvang = 1 and RedMeerWerk = Tekort then it is asked if this concerns the childcare or care of family/friend. The routing of the following questions are dependant of that answer. About the other care no questions are asked.

<sup>2</sup>This concern (a) persons with famzorg\_OP = yes but FamOpvang = no because they don't want or cannot work at least 12 hours a week because of other reasons then the care for family/friends. 14 persons during jan-dec should have been coded famopvang = 1 but are coded famopvang = 0 because in the specifications FamOpvang = 1 in case WilWerk = yes and Wil\_urwk >12 and FamZorg = yes in stead of case WilWerk = yes and Wil\_urwk ≥12 and FamZorg = yes and (b) persons with Famzorg\_OP = yes but FamOpvang = no because they don't want or cannot work at least 12 hours a week because of daily care for family/household (z\_redenken = 1). (see also recommendation).

## Frequencies and percentages of COL\_242, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
Lack of care services during the day	0	0	0.0	0.0
Lack of care services at special times	0	0	0.0	0.0
Lack of care services during the day or at special times	1	0	0.2	0.1
Care services are too expensive	10	2	2.2	2.3
Available care services are not of sufficient quality	2	0	0.4	0.3
Other reason not linked with the lack of suitable care services	402	77	87.8	88.2
No answer	43	8	9.4	9.1
Total	458	87	100.0	100.0

## Frequencies and percentages of COL\_242 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

This table is the same as above (see General comments).

## General comments

This variable only concerns Capi.

Because COL\_238 = 2,3 always concerns persons inside the household core, all persons for who COL\_242 is applicable belong to the household core.

In different versions of the explanatory notes the number of categories for this variable different. In this variable the categorie “Lack of care services during the day or at special time” is taken into account.

#### **Differences with standard eurostat**

None

#### **Recommendation**

For the developers of the questionnaire: 14 persons (jan-dec) should have been coded famopvang = 1 but are coded famopvang = 0 because in the specifications FamOpvang = 1 in case WilWerk = yes and Wil\_urwk >12 and FamZorg = yes in stead of case WilWerk = yes and Wil\_urwk ≥12 and FamZorg = yes.

In case the person has KindOpvang = 1 ánd FamOpvang = 1 and RedMeerWerk = Tekort then it is asked if this concerns the childcare or care of family/friend. The routing of the following questions are dependant of that answer. About the other care no questions are asked and is missing. Next time these questions are asked this has to be taken into account.

FamOpvang = 2 is only based on z\_redenen = 5 and not z\_redenen = 1. Persons who take care of an ill partner, parent or family in the household and have answered that they don't want to or cannot work for at least 12 hours a week because of caring tasks concerning the household/family (z\_redenen = 1) don't get the questions about the main reason linked with care for not working at least 12 hours a week. Because the justification of the questions says that persons with z\_wilwerk = 1 and (z\_redenen = 1 or 5) have to be coded col\_239 = 2 the persons with z\_wilwerk and z\_redenen = 1 also have to get famopvang = 2 else no information for col\_242 is available while they do belong to the filter of col\_242.

## COL\_243 (2005)

◆ Description	: Possible to vary start or/and end of working day for family reasons (at least one hour)
◆ Required variables	: H_LFT, COL_24, W1_FLEXTIJD, DIENSTVER1
◆ Filter / Remarks	: Everybody aged 15-64 and C24 = 1,2

### Explanatory notes

- Formal or informal working arrangements should be taken into account.
- Code 1 : the person can generally start later and/or finish earlier for family reasons (outside particular periods of urgent work, ...).
- Code 2 : the person can exceptionally start later and/or finish earlier for family reasons.
- Codes 1 and 2 : the possibility exists without using special leaves.
- “For family reasons” includes also care for children and dependants.
- Persons who have the general possibility to vary start or/and end of working day or a general possibility for working time banking should be coded 1 because they can do it in particular for family reasons when they want to.
- Hours taken off are normally made up later/earlier. But they are not always necessary compensated in terms of hours done : the fact that the job is done is enough and this should be included.

### Code Description

1	Yes, generally possible
2	Yes, exceptionally possible
3	Not at all possible
9	Not applicable (not included in the filter)
blank	No answer

### Specification

H_LFT	COL_24	W1_FlexTijd	DienstVer1	COL_243	Number of persons Jan-dec 05
15..64	1,2	1	-	1	25561
		2	-	2	1221
		3	-	3	2652
		Dk,rf, empty	5 <sup>1</sup>	1	4848
			<>5	blank	5615
	3..5,9	-	-	9	14686
<15, >64	-	-	-	9	21095

<sup>1</sup>These persons concern persons who help to run their own/partners/families business or freelancers

### Frequencies and percentages of COL\_243, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
Yes, generally possible	30409	6043	76.2	76.3
Yes, exceptionally possible	1221	256	3.1	3.2
Not at all possible	2652	526	6.6	6.6
No answer	5615	1091	14.1	13.8
Total	39897	7915	100.0	100.0

### Frequencies and percentages of COL\_243 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
Yes, generally possible	30194	5990	87.8	87.5
Yes, exceptionally possible	1221	256	3.5	3.7
Not at all possible	2652	526	7.7	7.7
No answer	341	71	1.0	1.0
Total	34408	6843	100.0	100.0

#### General comments

This variable only concerns Capi.

W1\_FlexTijd and ArbRel1 only concern the main job, so this variable also concerns the main job.

It is assumed that for persons who work in an own (or partners/families) business it is generally possible to vary start or/and of working day for family reasons.

In the questionnaire, questions on reconciliation between work and family life are only asked to persons who belong to the household core. Therefore, persons who belong outside the household core are coded blank.

Persons who have answered that they don't work as an employee (W1\_Wrkner = 2, dk,rf) don't get the question W1\_FlexTijd so they are also coded blank.

#### Differences with standard eurostat

None

#### Recommendation

Now the questions FlexTijd and OrgVerlf are based on the variable W1\_Wrknermer to select employees. Better is to use the variable ArbRel1.

## COL\_244 (2005)

---

◆ Description	: Possible to organise working time in order to take whole days off for family reasons (without using holidays and special leaves)
◆ Required variables	: H_LFT, COL_24, W1_ORGVRLF, DIENSTVER1
◆ Filter / Remarks	: Everybody aged 15-64 and C24 = 1,2

---

### Explanatory notes

- Formal or informal working arrangements should be taken into account.
- “Organise working time in order to take whole days off” : it includes working time banking with the possibility to take whole days off, persons who have free working time who can be absent from work for a day without any special arrangement, .... The person plans to arrange the working time in order to take whole days off (e.g. plans to make the hours on beforehand or after, changes shifts, ...).
- Code 1 : the person can generally organise the working time in order to take whole days off for family reasons (outside particular periods of urgent work, ... ; even if a limit for the number of days exists).
- Code 2 : the person can exceptionally organise the working time in order to take whole days off for family reasons.
- “For family reasons” includes also care for children and dependants.
- “To take whole days off” = without using holidays and special leaves
- Persons who have the general possibility to organise working time in order to take whole days off should be coded 1 because they can do it in particular for family reasons.
- Days taken off are normally made up later/earlier. But they are not always necessary compensated in terms of hours/days done : the fact that the job is done is enough and this should be included.

### Code Description

1	Yes, generally possible
2	Yes, exceptionally possible
3	Not at all possible
9	Not applicable (not included in the filter)
blank	No answer

### Specification

---

H_LFT	COL_24	W1_OrgVerif	DienstVer1	COL_244	Number of persons Jan-nov 2005
-------	--------	-------------	------------	---------	-----------------------------------

---

15, 64	1,2	1	-	1	16192
		2	-	2	1615
		3	-	3	10153
		Dk,rf, empty	5 <sup>1</sup>	1	4848
			<>5	blank	7089
	3, 5, 9	-	-	9	14686
<15, >64	-	-	-	9	21095

<sup>1</sup>These persons concern persons who help to run their own/partners/families business or freelancers

### Frequencies and percentages of COL\_244, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
Yes, generally possible	21040	4182	52.7	52.8
Yes, exceptionally possible	1615	329	4.0	4.2
Not at all possible	10153	2014	25.4	25.4
No answer	7089	1391	17.8	17.6
Total	39897	7915	100.0	100.0

### Frequencies and percentages of COL\_244 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
Yes, generally possible	20825	4129	60.5	60.3
Yes, exceptionally possible	1615	329	4.7	4.8
Not at all possible	10153	2014	29.5	29.4
No answer	1815	371	5.3	5.4
Total	34408	6843	100.0	100.0

### General comments

This variable only concerns Capi.

W1\_OrgVerlf and ArbRel1 only concern the main job, so this variable also concerns the main job.

It is assumed that for persons who work in an own (or partners/families) business it is generally possible to organise working time in order to take days off for family reasons.

In the questionnaire, questions on reconciliation between work and family life are only asked to persons who belong to the household core. Therefore, persons who belong outside the household core are coded blank.

Persons who have answered that they don't work as an employee (W1\_Wrkner = 2, dk,rf) don't get the question W1\_FlexTijd so they are also coded blank.

The same amount of persons get the question W1\_OrgVlf (column 244) as W1\_FlexTijd (column 243). However, the amount of “no answer” is larger for Column 243 because more persons cannot answer (don’t know or refuse) the question W1\_OrgVerlf compared to W1\_FlexTijd. Concerning W1\_orgverlf 5 times more persons don’t know the answer compared to w1\_flextijd (1571 to 295 persons in the period jan-nov 2005))

## Differences with standard eurostat

None

## Recommendation

Now the questions FlexTijd and OrgVerlf are based on the variable W1\_Wrknemer to select employees. Better is to use the variable ArbRel1.

## COL\_245 (2005)

- 
- ◆ Description : Time off from work taken over the last 12 months in case of family sickness or emergencies (without using holidays)
  - ◆ Required variables : H\_LFT, COL\_24, W1\_VERLOFREG, W1\_WERKVERLOF[1], W1\_BETCAL, DIENSTVER1
  - ◆ Filter / Remarks : Everybody aged 15-64 and C24 = 1,2
- 

## Explanatory notes

- “Time off from work in case of family sickness or emergencies” includes the cases of sickness of child/relative (even not serious like a cold) or accident of a child/relative but also other family emergencies (childminder ill or having own urgent reasons, nursery closed because of flu epidemic, house burning, ...). Most of the time, it refers to unplanned situations but it can also be planned in advance in some cases of sickness for example (e.g. operation of a family member, ...). Own sickness or accident are excluded.

- “Special leave” days are often provided in case of sick child or other family problems. They are remunerated in some countries, fully or partly. There is sometimes a limit in the number of days per year persons are allowed to take or they might be given examining each case/reason of absence. If the “special leave” days were fully or partly remunerated, code 2 should be used. Code 3 is only used if all “special leave” days taken were not at all remunerated.

- Code 4 : no “special leave” days were used but person used other arrangements (time banking, ...).

- Particular cases “not relevant” should be coded 1 (e.g. person on maternity/paternity/parental leave over the last 12 months, ...).

## Code Description

1	No
2	Yes, "special leave" days remunerated
3	Yes, "special leave" days not at all remunerated
4	Yes, other arrangements always used
9	Not applicable (not included in the filter)
blank	No answer

## Specification

### On household level

Only one person of the household core has gotten the question about combining work and care, so information about this is stored on household level. Because the deduced variables KindZorg, FamZorg, StrucVerlof and IncVerlof depend on both this information as information dependant of the particular person, these variables are also stored on household level. They differ between persons, although their household situation is the same, because their personal life situation can differ. The variable KindZorg\_OP refers to the person who answered the questions about combining work and care. The variable KindZorg\_Part refers to the partner of that person. To store this information (KindZorg\_OP and KindZorg\_Part) on personal level the variable KindZorg is made. For the same reason, the variables FamZorg, StrucVerlof and IncVerlof have been made.

FOR HHBINDEX:=1 TO MIN(InF1.NEW\_HHB.AantalIPP,8) DO

PLHH[HHBINDEK]	HHBINDEK	KindZorg	FamZorg	StrucVerlof	IncVerlof
On household level		On personal level			
1.4	RegNr_OP	KindZorg_OP	FamZorg_OP	StrucVerlof_OP	IncVerlof_OP
	RegNr_Part	KindZorg_Part	FamZorg_Part	StrucVerlof_Part	IncVerlof_Part
5.13	-	empty	empty	empty	empty

### On personal level

H_LFT	COL_24	PLHH	IncVerlof_OP	W1_VerlofReg [blok incidverlof]	W1_WelkVerlof[1] [blok incidverlof]	W1_BetCal	DienstVer1	COL_245	Number of persons Jan-dec 2005
15.64	1,2	1.4	1	1	3,4	-	-	2	256
					2	1	-	2	77
						2,dk,rf	-	3	3
					5	-	-	3	27
					1,6,7	-	-	4	419
					Dk,rf,empty	-	-	blank	5
				2	-	-	-	1	1787
				dk,rf,empty	-	-	5	1	370
							<>5	blank	186
			Dk,rf,empty	-	-	-	-	1	31278
		5.13	-	-	-	-	-	blank	5489
	3.5,9	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	14686
<15, >64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	21095

## Frequencies and percentages of COL\_245, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
No	33435	6657	83.8	84.1
Yes, "special leave" days remunerated	333	62	0.8	0.8
Yes, "special leave" days not at all remunerated	30	7	0.1	0.1
Yes, other arrangements always used	419	80	1.1	1.0

No answer	5680	1109	14.2	14.0
Total	39897	7915	100.0	100.0

**Frequencies and percentages of COL\_245 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight**

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
No	33435	6657	97.2	97.3
Yes, "special leave" days remunerated	333	62	1.0	0.9
Yes, "special leave" days not at all remunerated	30	7	0.1	0.1
Yes, other arrangements always used	419	80	1.2	1.2
No answer	191	36	0.6	0.5
Total	34408	6843	100.0	100.0

**General comments**

This variable only concerns Capi.

The variable IncVerlof\_OP is only available for members of the core of the household because about them information is available about any own/spouse children which is used for this variable. So for persons outside the household core col\_245 is blank.

W1\_VerlofReg is only existent in case the person work as an employee for at least 12 hours a week. For other working persons (less than 12 hours or not an employee) COL\_245 is coded blank (this concerns 185 persons inside the household core).

It is assumed that persons who work in an own (or partners/families) business don't take time off from work in case of family sickness or emergencies because they often can easy arrange their working hours.

**Differences with standard eurostat**

None

**Recommendation**

Now the question W1\_VerlofReg is based on the variable W1\_Wrknemer to select employees. Better is to use the variable ArbRel1.

## COL\_246 (2005)

---

◆ Description	: Parental leave (Council Directive 96/34/EC of 3.6.1996, OJ L145) taken over the last 12 months for own children living inside the household
◆ Required variables	: H_LFT, W1_STARTOUD, W1_JROUD, W1_OPNOUD, W1_BETOUD
◆ Filter / Remarks	: Everybody aged 15-64

---

### Explanatory notes

- Definition of Parental leave as based on the minimum requirements stipulated in the Council Directive 96/34/EC :

- A leave in addition to maternity leave or paternity leave to take care of children
- Available until the age of 8 for both natural and adopted children - it excludes leave taken for the care of adults.
- It is a minimum of 3 months in length.
- Depending on Member State/employer, it can be taken full time/part time/piecemeal way/time credit system.
- It is an individual right for both parents and thus in principal granted on a non-transferable basis.
- It can be postponed by employers for justifiable reasons.
- Entitlements may be subject to a period of work qualification and/or length of service which shall not exceed one year.
- For workers : at the end of parental leave, workers shall have the right to return to the same job or, if that is not possible, to an equivalent or similar job consistent with their employment contract or employment relationship.

Relevant national leaves will be selected by the countries according to the definition. Note that :

\* the leave has to be an individual right for both parents regardless of their sex.

\* if the countries are doing more than the minimum requirements, these leaves have to be taken into account (e.g. if the leave can be taken after the age of 8, if the length is more than 3 months)

- As far as possible, the official national designations for parental leave should be presented to the interviewed person in order to avoid misunderstandings.

- The person has to be at least one day on parental leave for his/her own children (living inside the household) over the last 12 months to be considered as having been on parental leave, whatever the duration of the leave and whatever the leave was remunerated or not.

- If the person was on parental leave in part-time job, then she/he should be coded as having taken parental leave in part-time. Not all part-time jobs are parental leave.

- "Another arrangement" : peacemeals (e.g. parental leave taken during school holidays periods) or time credit system (e.g. days or hours off taken)

- “Combinations” of arrangements : means that the person had mixed the ways of taking parental leave over the last 12 months (e.g. had taken the parental leave in one block and then in part-time job over the last 12 months).

- Code 2 to 5 : should be understood as the parental leave was only taken that way over the last 12 months (e.g. code 2, parental leave was only taken in one block full-time and remunerated ; if mixed, then other codes should be used).

- “Remunerated” : the leave was remunerated. All remunerations of the leave are included that is to say :

- \* even if the leave was partially remunerated in relation to the salary over the last 12 months
- \* even if the leave was remunerated only for one part of the duration of leave over the last 12 months
- \* the remuneration of the leave could have been provided by the state or by the employer.

- Code “Not applicable” refers to persons not aged 15-64. For the countries who filter on the age of the children inside the household according to the national legal age of children for taking a parental leave : the persons not asked should be coded 1 (No).

N.B. : the “maximum” legal age of the children to be allowed to take a parental leave for them is often the one which corresponds to parental leave for adopted children.

#### Code Description

1	No
2	Yes, taken in one block full-time and remunerated
3	Yes, taken in one block full-time and not at all remunerated
4	Yes, taken in part-time and remunerated
5	Yes, taken in part-time and not at all remunerated
6	Yes, taken in another arrangement or combinations and remunerated
7	Yes, taken in another arrangement or combinations and not at all remunerated
9	Not applicable (person aged less than 15 or more than 64)
blank	No answer

#### Specification

H_LFT	W1_StartOud	W1_JrOud	W1_OpnOud	W1_BetOud	COL_246	Number of persons Jan-dec 2005
15..64	2,dk,rf	2	-	-	1	1031
		dk,rf, empty	-	-	Blank	10
		1	1	1,2	2	6
				3, dk, rf	3	102
			2	1,2	4	86
				3, dk, rf	5	19
			3	1,2	6	16
				3, dk, rf	7	1
			Dk,rf	-	blank	6
	1	-	1	1,2	2	62
				3, dk, rf	3	39
			2	1,2	4	175
				3, dk, rf	5	137

			3	1,2	6	31
			Dk,rf	3, dk, rf	7	19
	empty	-	-	-	blank	1
<15, >64	-	-	-	-	1	52842
					9	21095

### Frequencies and percentages of COL\_246, jan-nov 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
No	53873	10779	98.7	98.9
Yes, taken in one block full-time and remunerated	72	14	0.1	0.1
Yes, taken in one block full-time and not at all remunerated	45	10	0.1	0.1
Yes, taken in part-time and remunerated	277	50	0.5	0.5
Yes, taken in part-time and not at all remunerated	223	33	0.4	0.3
Yes, taken in another arrangement or combinations and remunerated	50	9	0.1	0.1
Yes, taken in another arrangement or combinations and not at all remunerated	35	6	0.1	0.1
No answer	8	1	0.0	0.0
Total	54583	10903	100,0	100.0

### Frequencies and percentages of COL\_246 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
No	45116	9047	98.5	98.7
Yes, taken in one block full-time and remunerated	72	14	0.2	0.1
Yes, taken in one block full-time and not at all remunerated	45	10	0.1	0.1
Yes, taken in part-time and remunerated	277	50	0.6	0.5
Yes, taken in part-time and not at all remunerated	223	33	0.5	0.4
Yes, taken in another arrangement or combinations and remunerated	50	9	0.1	0.1
Yes, taken in another arrangement or combinations and not at all remunerated	35	6	0.1	0.1
No answer	8	1	0.0	0.0
Total	45826	9170	100.0	100.0

### General comments

This variable only concerns Capi.

Because W1\_StartOud, W1\_JrOud, W1\_OpnOud and W1\_BetOud only concern the main job, Col\_246 also only *concern the main job*.

W1\_OpnOud and W1\_BetOud are only existent in case the person has a job of *at least 12 hours a week*. For other working persons (less than 12 hours) COL\_246 is coded blank.

It is assumed that persons who work in an own (or partners/families) business don't take time off from work in case of family sickness or emergencies because they often can easily arrange their working hours. They are coded 1.

NB. Persons who don't have a job are coded 1 ("no").

### **Differences with standard eurostat**

None

### **Recommendation**

None

## COL\_247 (2005)

---

◆ Description	: Main reason for not having taken a parental leave for own children living inside the household over the last 12 months
◆ Required variables	: COL_246, W1_KINDOUD, NKIND9, REDOUD, URENWERK, W1_BEHOEFTOUD, DIENSTVER1
◆ Filter / Remarks	: C246=1

---

### Explanatory notes

- Code 1 : « had no legal right » means « according to the law = to the conditions of being able to be on parental leave in the country ». Most of the time, it will be linked with the age of the children, with the past working situation of the person interviewed and with the duration of parental leave already taken by the person. E.g. coded 1 : if person has no child living in the household, or has children who were too old to grant her/him parental leave over the last 12 months or if person had used all possible days of parental leave before the last 12 months.

N.B. : Persons who had no possibility in term of time to take a parental leave over the last 12 months because is/was on maternity/paternity leave should be coded 1 (a special code for these cases makes no sense for a lot of countries where in these cases, the person has no right yet to take it or can not cumulate the leaves).

- If the person did not know if he/she had right to take a parental leave over the last 12 months, it should be coded blank.

- Code 3 : e.g. parental leave in part-time job not possible, months of the leave can not be chosen

- It is the individual reason for not taking parental leave that should be recorded (the fact that the partner was still in maternity/paternity/parental leave is not an individual reason).

- For the countries who filter C246 on the age of the children inside the household according to the national legal age of children for taking a parental leave : the persons not asked should be coded 1 (No) in C246 and coded 1 (Had no legal right to take a parental leave) in C247.

### Code Description

1	Had no legal right to take a parental leave
2	No remuneration or too low
3	Not enough flexibility in choice of the parental leave period
4	Negative effects on social security
5	Negative effects on the career/negative perception from the employer
6	Preference to work for other reasons than codes 2 to 5
7	Other reason
9	Not applicable (not included in the filter)
blank	No answer

## Specification

COL_246	UrenWerk	W1_KindOud	Nkind9	W1_BehoeftOud	RedOud	DienstVer1	COL_247	Number of persons Jan-dec 2005
1	<>empty	0..7	<=KindOud >KindOud	- 2,dk,rf 1	- - 1	- - -	1 6 2	196 276 16
					2, 5, 6, 8	-	7	27
					7	-	6	1
					3	-	3	2
					4	-	5	20
					Dk,rf	-	blank	0
	Dk,rf,empty	>1	2,dk,rf	-	-	-	6	2436
			1	1	-	-	2	139
					2, 5, 6, 8	-	7	122
					7	-	6	5
					3	-	3	2
					4	-	5	117
					Dk,rf	-	blank	1
			empty	-	-	5 <sup>1</sup>	7	694
			<=1, empty	-	-	<>5, empty	blank	313
	empty	-	-	-	-	-	1	34820
2..7,9,blank	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	14686
							9	21805

## Frequencies and percentages of COL\_247, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
Had no legal right to take a parental leave	49702	10063	92.3	93.4
No remuneration or too low	155	24	0.3	0.2
Not enough flexibility in choice of the parental leave period	4	0	0.0	0.0
Negative effects on social security	0	0	0.0	0.0
Negative effects on the career/negative perception from the employer	137	21	0.3	0.2
Preference to work for other reasons than codes 2 to 5	2718	468	5.0	4.3
Other reason	843	145	1.6	1.3
No answer	314	58	0.6	0.5
Total	53873	10779	100.0	100.0

## Frequencies and percentages of COL\_247 of persons inside the household core, jan-dec 2005, weight and unweight

	Frequencies		Percentages	
	UnWeight	Weight (x1000)	UnWeight	Weight
Had no legal right to take a parental leave	40982	8339	90.8	92.2
No remuneration or too low	155	24	0.3	0.3
Not enough flexibility in choice of the parental leave period	4	0	0.0	0.0
Negative effects on social security	0	0	0.0	0.0
Negative effects on the career/negative perception from the employer	137	21	0.3	0.2
Preference to work for other reasons than codes 2 to 5	2718	468	6.0	5.2
Other reason	843	145	1.9	1.6
No answer	277	49	0.6	0.5
Total	45116	9055	100.0	100.0

## **General comments**

This variable only concerns Capi.

Code 4 is not existent.

Code 1 is inclusive persons who has the legal right to take a parental leave but are not asked because they are in the pay of the company for *less than one year* or because they are working at a company with a *Collective Labour Agreement different* from laid down by law. It is expected to be a few persons.

Because COL\_246 is always blank for persons working less than 12 hours a week, they always coded 9 for COL\_247.

Only persons who have a job of at least 12 hours a week are asked whether they have taken parental leave during the past 12 months, so for the persons who work less than 12 hours a week or don't work col\_247 is blank.

It is assumed that persons who work in an own (or partners/families) business don't take time off from work in case of family sickness or emergencies because they often can easy arrange their working hours. They are coded 7 (other reason)

NB. Persons who don't have a job are coded 1 ("Had no legal right to take a parental leave").

## **Differences with standard eurostat**

None

## **Recommendation**

None