Is Europe Going Flexy?
Context- and Individual-level Determinants of Work Mobility in the EU (1995-2005)

Ettore Recchi*, Letizia Mencarini,
Emiliana Baldoni and Francesca Francavilla
(University of Florence)

May 2007

Draft,
*please do not quote
without authors' permission*

* Corresponding author: ettore.recchi@unifi.it

Abstract

A higher level of work flexibility was enshrined among the policy goals of the Lisbon Agenda (2000) of the EU as a chief tool to enhance productivity and make European economies more dynamic. The arguments behind this policy outline are as follows: if workers could more easily and frequently switch a) in and out the labour market, b) from one economic sector to another, and c) from one job to another, the economic system would get a better use of human capital and a swifter adaptation to changing market demands. We define these three dimensions of labour flexibility as "employment mobility", "occupational mobility" and "job mobility" respectively. Are these forms of work mobility rising in tune with the EU expectations?

In this paper we use Eurostat data to track down changes in country levels of these three variables from 1995 to 2005. In particular, we resort to a three-points analysis (1995-2000-2005) of the EU Labour Force Survey and to multivariate analyses of the European Community Household Panel (covering the period 1994-2001) for a more detailed inquiry of the context- and individual-level determinants of work mobility in the EU.

Our findings show substantial variation in work mobility as measured by the three different indicators. Over time, employment mobility (i.e., changes of professional status) increased considerably from 1995 to 2000, to drop at its lowest level in 2005. Employment mobility is increasingly associated with temporary work contracts. Occupational mobility (i.e., transitions between occupational groups) almost tripled from 1994 to 2001 in the EU. Large differences persist between countries: in the UK, Belgium and the Netherlands more than half the working population moved at least once from one occupational group to another in seven years, while this was the case for only 17.9% of workers in France. In the whole EU–15, women are less likely than men to change occupational group. Job mobility (i.e., transitions into a new employment contract) fluctuated from 1995 to 2005 without a clear trend. In the entire European Union between 15% and 18% of the working population gets a new job yearly. Persistently Spain and Denmark show the highest rates (job mobility affects 20% of the workforce), while Greece and Luxembourg have the lowest (below 10% in 2005).

1. Introduction

A higher level of work flexibility was enshrined among the policy goals of the Lisbon Agenda (2000) of the EU as a chief tool to enhance productivity and make European economies more dynamic. The arguments behind this policy outline are as follows: if workers could more easily and frequently switch *a)* in and out the labour market, *b)* from one economic sector to another, and *c)* from one job to another, the economic system would get a better use of human capital and a swifter adaptation to changing market demands. We define these three dimensions of labour flexibility as "employment mobility", "occupational mobility" and "job mobility" respectively. Are these forms of work mobility rising in tune with the EU expectations? This paper seeks to answer the question.

In the first section, we will review evidence found in existing studies. In the following section, we will describe the Eurostat data on which our analyses are based. In the third section, we will use these data to track down changes in country levels of these three variables from 1995 to 2005. In particular, we resort to a three-points analysis (1995-2000-2005) of the EU Labour Force Survey and to multivariate analyses of the European Community Household Panel (covering the period 1994-2001) for a more detailed inquiry of the context- and individual-level determinants of work mobility in the EU.

2. Work mobility in Europe: a literature review

Research on job mobility has been revived by the 'end of jobs for life' debate. At the macro level, job mobility, referring to the movement of people between jobs with different employers, can be seen as an important mean of adjustment in the labour market because it facilitates structural changes in the economy. In this sense, job mobility represents a key ingredient of workforce flexibility, measuring the extent to which labour markets are able to create job opportunities and reallocate employment.

Given the standard labour force data available, the length of job tenure is the most important indicator of job mobility, inasmuch as it shows the 'freshness' of employment relations. Eurostat (CEC 2005) estimates that the mean duration of employment in the same workplace is 10.6 years in Europe (against 6.7 years in USA). Italy and Slovenia have the highest level of job tenure with almost half of jobs lasting more than 10 years (45.8% and 45.6% respectively), as opposed to 38.3% in the whole EU–25. Long–term jobs (defined as jobs lasting more than 10 years) are less frequent in Latvia (21%), Estonia (25.1%), Lithuania (28.2%), Denmark (28.6%), Ireland (28.7%) and the United Kingdom (29.3%). In Spain, Denmark, Finland and Latvia the duration of one out of five jobs is less than one year.

In spite of the public interest of the issue, due to data limitations 'very few international comparative studies on actual turnovers exist' (Sousa–Poza and Henneberger 2004, 3). Van Ours (1990) and Burgess (1994, 1999) are possibly the most significant cross–national studies on job shifts. Van Ours (1990) analyses pooled cross–sectional time–series data from various sources in European and Non–European industrialized countries (France, the Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, and Japan). The results are quite similar across these countries and show that workers do not differ in their reaction to cyclical changes and are risk averse: job mobility is positively correlated with economic growth rates and negatively with unemployment rates.

Burgess (1994, 1999) uses pooled data from the OECD International Sectoral Database and different national surveys on job tenure in ten countries (European: France, Germany,

Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom; non–European: United States and Japan). His analysis shows that, in all these countries, an optimal amount of job reallocation is contingent on the trainability of the workforce, the volatility of demand and the cost of contract termination. But significant country–specific factors exist as well, having to do with workforce local trainability and the tightness of employment protection legislation. The impact of the latter factors varies dramatically by age, affecting older workers much more than younger ones.

All these studies are seriously constrained by the fact of employing different national datasets, which makes comparisons possible only at an aggregate level and hinders the use of control variables. Generally speaking, labour force surveys permit to measure jobs with different employers at two points in time, the so–called job–to–job mobility, but provide no information on multiple changes within a year – underestimating actual job mobility – and on possible periods of unemployment. On the other hand, establishment surveys usually gather information on quits, i.e. the number of workers leaving firms voluntarily. Only analyses of homogeneous international datasets (in particular, the European Community Household Panel [ECHP]) permit to circumvent these limits (for instance Davia 2005 and Muffels and Luijkx 2004; see below).

Another way to gauge the micro–level job mobility potential of an existing workforce consists in measuring 'turnover intentions'. A turnover intention reflects the subjective probability that an individual will change his or her job within a certain time period (Souza–Poza and Henneberger 2002). For psychologists turnover intentions are immediate precursors to actual turnover; for economists they are important because suitable microdata to study turnovers are panel data and cross–national panels are very rare. Inasmuch as turnover intentions and actual turnovers are correlated, such an approach presents an interesting alternative for analyzing job mobility in a comparative perspective. Souza–Poza and Henneberger (2002) compare job turnover intentions in 25 countries (half of them EU member states) with microdata from the International Social Survey Program. They show that turnover intentions vary significantly across countries. In Europe there are high turnover intentions in Great Britain, and low intentions in Spain and Eastern European countries. The determinants of turnover intentions are, in a number of cases, the same as those observed in many studies on actual turnovers (see for instance, Booth and Francesconi 1999). Thus, turnover intentions are found to be negatively affected by age, gender (with women less prone to change jobs), marriage, union membership, while they are positively affected by the level of education. However, the main determinants of turnover intentions are subjective in nature. More specifically, job satisfaction, job security, and pride in one's firm play an important role in lowering turnover intentions. Country effects are also significant, showing the influence of nation–based work cultures. Only the level of education, job satisfaction, job security, and pride in one's firm are significant in most countries.

Kristensen and Westergård–Nielsen (2004) examine the role of job satisfaction and actual job change using data of the European Community Household Panel (ECHP). The results for Denmark show that job satisfaction inhibits actual quit behaviours substantially, while satisfaction with job security is found to be insignificant. These results hold across age, gender and education sub–groups and are opposed, for instance, to results for the UK, where a higher job security is found to be the most important reason to move to another job. Such a discrepancy between UK and Denmark is imputed to differences in unemployment insurance benefits and indicates that there are 'invisible' benefits embedded in welfare state characteristics of different countries.

Arguably, institutional factors have a major impact on rates of job mobility. At the EU level, the full implementation of workers' freedom of movement would require the

complete portability of pension rights between countries. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that portability losses are likely to prevent an efficient rate of job mobility in an integrated European labour market. Using data from the European Community Household Panel, Andrietti (2001) assesses the role of occupational pensions on individual job mobility choices for a sample of EU member states (Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom). His results show that the diffusion of pension plans[1], covering a large portion of the private sector workforce, puts a brake on job mobility in Ireland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, whereas it does not significantly deter job mobility choices in Denmark. From a policy perspective, such results cast doubt on the effectiveness of reforms aimed at improving labour market efficiency through portability measures. Still, there is reason to suspect that in the EU case the role of pension portability could be more relevant for international job mobility decisions. However, an empirical analysis at this level is currently prevented by the lack of adequate data.

A crucial debate revolves around the systemic consequences of an increasing job mobility. Two basic views confront themselves on the issue: 'the 'trade–off' hypothesis presumes a negative relationship between flexibility and work security on the labour market and the 'flexicurity' thesis a positive one' (Muffels and Luijkx 2004, 2). These same authors try to adjudicate between these competing theories by measuring the association between job–to–job mobility and the level of security of new jobs compared to old jobs. They find significant country differences depending on welfare regimes that are in line with the famous classification of 'the three worlds of welfare capitalism' (Esping–Andersen 1990), to which a Southern European regime is added (Ferrera 1996). Evidence shows that Liberal regimes (the UK and Ireland) experience higher job mobility but also maintain fairly high levels of work security. In Southern regimes (Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal) flexibility is obtained at the expenses of work security. Corporatist regimes (Germany, France and Belgium) are marked by low levels of mobility without being able to maintain high levels of work security. Finally, Socialdemocratic regimes (Denmark, the Netherlands and Finland) have low mobility but keep work security at a high level.

3. Data

In this paper we use Eurostat data to track down changes in country levels of 'employment', 'occupational' and 'job' mobility in the EU from 1995 to 2005. In particular, we conduct a three-points analysis (1995-2000-2005) of the *EU Labour Force Survey* (hereafter, LFS). The survey is conducted annually, and with statistical reliability at the regional level, for EU member states and also in central and Eastern European countries, specifically in all acceding and candidate countries. Analysis can therefore be carried out at EU–25 level of comparison, at least for the most recent data.

For multivariate analysis we use he *European Community Household Panel* (hereafter, ECHP), a comparative longitudinal study conducted in the EU Member States. ECHP is formed by a set of comparable multi–dimensional and multi–purpose surveys, centrally designed, coordinated and funded by Eurostat. The first wave of the ECHP was collected in 1994 for Germany, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, the UK, Ireland, Italy, Greece, Spain and Portugal. Austria joined in 1995, Finland in 1996 and Sweden in 1997. The sample size and the sampling frame are standardised across

---

[1] Occupational pension plans are employer sponsored plans aiming to supplement retirement income provided by public statutory schemes. In defined contribution plans employer contributions are accumulated into individual accounts and invested on behalf of the employee (Andrietti 2001).

countries, with the only exception of Luxembourg, which has a very small sample and Sweden, where data do not form a panel. Eight waves of the ECHP were collected in total, with the last wave collected in 2001. In this paper, we use ECHP as both a panel source and a pooled dataset.

All the analyses adopt weight schemes to generalise findings to the total population. Limits of reliability were also taken into account on the basis of LFS standards, as occupational mobility is a relatively rare phenomenon affecting small proportions of survey respondents.

4. Data analysis: context and individual determinants of work mobility

We distinguish three different aspects of labour mobility:
1) *employment mobility* (i.e., changes of professional status),
2) *occupational mobility* (i.e., changes of occupational groups),
3) *job mobility* (i.e., changes of employers).

For all these indicators we adopt a conventional 12–months time frame. Moreover, we examine data on *job tenure* (i.e., the average duration of jobs, expressed in months).

4.1. Employment mobility

'Employment mobility' is defined as the rate of transition from one professional status to another – namely, being an employee, a self–employed, or a family worker – in a given time spell (normally, one year). This is a rather crude indicator of mobility in the labour market signalling radical changes in individuals' work–life – like setting up businesses (from employee to self–employed or family worker) or career moves in search of higher security (from self–employed or family worker to employee).

Table 1 compares employment mobility across EU countries in 1995, 2000 and 2005, distinguishing these rates by gender. Over time, employment mobility increased considerably from 1995 to 2000, to drop at its lowest level in 2005. In 2000, switches between different professional statuses were particularly widespread in Southern Europe, and especially among women. In that year, more than 10% of Spanish employed women changed professional status. Possibly by the turn of the century a sensible flexibilization of work relations affected the labour market of these countries, entailing rather common movements from full–time employee status to 'atypical' jobs, formally classified as self–employment (cf. Arum and Müller 2004). Employment mobility has become more homogeneous in the EU at the time of the most recent survey. Interestingly, reverting the past situation, in 2005 it is men who get the upper hand in terms of employment mobility all over Europe. Only in Lithuania, Malta and Luxembourg are women slightly more mobile between professional statuses in the most recently available survey.

While other potentially intervening socio–demographic factors (education, age, employment sector) make little difference, employment mobility seems to be closely inter–related with changes in industrial relations, and particularly with the expansion of short–term work contracts in some EU labour markets. The type of contract (permanent or temporary) signed by employees who have taken a different professional status in the last 12 months is a good indicator of two opposite directions of change: a securitization (from temporary to permanent) or a flexibilization (from permanent to temporary) of employment. Table 2 shows a clear trend in both the EU–15 and the EU–10 (although fewer data are available for the latter area): employment mobility is increasingly associated with temporary work contracts. Overall, in the EU the probabilities of holding a temporary

job were similar for workers who changed professional status and for those who did not in 1995. From 2000 onwards, however, the earlier group has become much more at risk of entering a non–permanent work commitment. This is very strongly the case in Ireland, where in 1995 only 7.8% of the workers who changed professional status were hired on a temporary basis, as opposed to 63.1% in 2005. A similar trajectory and similar figures are found in Italy and Portugal, as well as in the bulk of the other EU–15 countries (although some figures fall below the threshold of statistical reliability and had thus to be omitted). In EU–10, data are available and reliable for the Czech Republic, where the proportion of workers who accepted a temporary contract when changing professional status rose from 15.3% in 2000 to 27.4% in 2005. Interestingly, the only major exception to this trend is the UK, that is the country that is usually described as the 'champion' of flexibility, where workers moving to a different professional status in more recent years are less likely than workers in 1995 to be employed on a temporary basis. This evidence seems to indicate a rising securitization of labour relations in the UK.

4.2. Occupational mobility

'Occupational mobility' is defined as the rate of transition from one occupational group to another in a given time spell (normally, one year). Of course, this rate changes depending on the time frame and the degree of precision with which individual occupations are classified. In the following, reference is made to occupational groups at the level of ISCO–1 digits.
Occupational mobility can be tracked down on a EU–wide scale through ECHP data. Table 3 shows the full matrix of occupational mobility between different occupational groups as classified in the ECHP[2]. In this analysis, mobility is measured as a change in occupational group from the first recorded job to the last one over the duration of the panel – that is, eight years. This is of course different from the first to the last job *ever*, since the ECHP offers only an eight–year window of observations (1994 to 2001 included)[3]. However, the longitudinal nature of the survey gives insights on the evolution of individual careers that remain usually inaccessible with cross–sectional data.
As expected, the diagonal contains the highest figures, implying that most workers (80.9%) stayed in the same occupational group in the 1994–2001 period (table 3). This matrix reveals interesting patterns also in terms of "closeness" of occupational groups (i.e., the easiness with which individuals switch from one group to another). For instance, workers employed in the 'skilled agriculture' group experience very few transitions to any other group. In sharp contrast, there is sizeable mobility between 'craft and trade' jobs and 'machine operation' job or 'elementary occupations'. Similarly, there is significant mobility between 'professionals' and 'technicians'.
As occupational mobility is a context–specific phenomenon, its variation across EU labour markets is considerable (table 4). In the eight–years duration of the panel, in the UK, Belgium and the Netherlands more than half the working population moved at least once from one occupational group to another. As we will see, Great Britain is the homeland of all forms of occupational mobility – upward and downward. In fact, French society seems

---

[2] In our analysis we draw on the classification of occupational groups available in ECHP, which is held to be hierarchically ordered in terms of socio-economic status. Of course, we are aware that alternative rankings of socio-economic status and social class exist and could be possibly more efficient in clustering occupations.

[3] It is also worth noting that not all respondents are recorded in the panel for the entire period 1994-2001. Some entered later than the first wave, others left the panel due to attrition before the 8th wave. Attrition effects are controlled for in the multivariate models presented in the following pages.

to put a brake on occupational mobility like no other in the EU: only 17.9% of French workers experienced some occupational mobility during the period of the ECHP. Occupational mobility rates are also below the EU average in Denmark, Greece, Finland and Luxembourg.

Occupational mobility can imply an upgrading or a downgrading of individuals' socio–economic status. It can therefore be decomposed in 'upward' and 'downward' mobility. Panel surveys like ECHP are particularly suitable to record such career movements in a mid–term perspective. Table 4 highlights the upward and downward mobility rates over the 8–year period of this panel[4]. Overall, upward mobility was experienced more frequently than downward mobility in the panel time frame: 29.7% of respondents moved to a higher rank occupation and 26.3% to a lower level occupational group in eight years. But the probabilities of moving – up or down – are not evenly distributed among different social categories. In both directions, women are less likely than men to change occupational group. Only in Ireland the female workforce exhibits a marginally higher upward mobility rate; on the other hand, only in Portugal women run a modestly higher risk than men to be downgraded over their career.

Similar disparities between men and women and among countries are found in table 5, that presents 'super–mobility' rates, defined as two (or more) movements across occupational groups in the 8–year period examined. In fact, the likelihood of such career jumps turns out to be polarized in the EU more than 'simple' occupational mobility. For instance, in Finland 18.6% of the working age population climbs up the occupational ladder in eight years time, but only 1.1% moves twice upwardly (or more); in Greece 16.4% of respondents had an experience of downward occupational mobility, but only 0.6% dropped twice. Perhaps through several means (labour legislation, trade union protection, credentialism, family solidarity), occupational groups in different countries shield their members from potential incoming competitors from less qualified groups (e.g., unskilled workers aspiring to get technicians' jobs) and create safety nets for outgoing workers (e.g., providing them with lay–off compensations to set up their own small business or funding re–training schemes for jobs of similar status).

As is well known, opportunities of social mobility are also subject to relevant period effects (cf. Chauvel 1998). In the EU, occupational mobility rates varied sharply in the 1990s. Table 6 reports on the yearly rates of occupational mobility (also decomposed in upward and downward mobility) in 1994–95, 1997–98, and 2000–01. From the first point in time to the following, all rates almost tripled in Western Europe. The 1997–98 rates stabilized early in the new century. Spectacular increases took place in Belgium, Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands and Ireland. In Italy such a tremendous growth was experienced in the final period under observation. The only exception to this generalized trend is Luxembourg, where in fact occupational mobility rates declined from 14.2% to 4.4% in the eight years under observation. Nonetheless, the trend is clear: the European labour markets became extremely more fluid in the last decade of the 20th century. Interestingly, changes in upward mobility rates are closely paralleled by changes in downward mobility. This means that the rise of occupational mobility was not an effect of structural changes driven by technological progress creating 'more room at the top', but rather the outcome of a more flexible labour market.

ECHP individual data give us the possibility to run a logit regressions of the odds of upward and downward mobility of the working age population in EU–15 on their

---

[4] It must be noted that the two events are not mutually exclusive during individual careers. Respondents could indeed be both upwardly and downwardly mobile over the duration of the panel.

individual characteristics controlling for country effects[5]. Separate regressions are implemented for upward and downward mobility. Table 7 presents the general models for the entire ECHP sample, whereas tables 8 and 9 show the models run country by country. These latter models permit to single out deviant cases to the overall pattern emerging from table 7.

First of all, we would expect occupational mobility to increase with age, but at a declining rate. In order to control for the latter we included the squared–age of respondents in the model. A positive coefficient on age reflects a positive association, whereas a negative coefficient in squared–age indicates a decline in the otherwise increasing rate. We also include a variable which captures the exposure to the 'risk' of mobility, since there is variation in the number of years respondents are observed in the panel – clearly, individuals observed for eight waves have a higher likelihood of making an occupational move than those observed for only two periods. We also control for household composition using 'single' as a reference category. We then control for the occupational status recorded at the *first* wave at which an individual is observed. By doing this we seek to assess which occupational groups are more open to mobility. Finally we control for educational level, type of industry, and public sector of employment.

The risk of occupational *downward* mobility increases with age, but at a declining rate, as a negative coefficient is associated with age squared. In fact, the reverse is true for *upward* mobility, which becomes progressively less likely as individuals grow old in the panel. This is quite surprising, because we would expect upward mobility to be associated with seniority: as workers accrue their working experience, their human capital should grow and be rewarded accordingly in terms of socio–occupational status. Perhaps, however, seniority is rewarded by upgrades *within* occupational groups and not *across* occupations. In fact, marked disparities are found from one country to another – with Ireland offering the highest chances of upward mobility to the young , while Belgium and Luxembourg tend to stick to a more traditional seniority system.

More in line with our expectations, we find that the longer an individual is observed in the sample, the higher is the likelihood of occupational mobility. We also find that, net of all other effects, women experience definitely lower occupational mobility than men – independent of whether mobility is upward or downward. Possibly, this reflects the association of risk–avoidance with women participation in the workforce among women themselves, their families and their employers. At the country level, exceptions to this pattern are found in Portugal for downward mobility (meaning that women are shielded from descending moves no more than men) and in Ireland, the UK and Finland for upward mobility (meaning that women's chances of going up the occupational scale are not significantly different from men's). Household composition matters as well. Compared to single individuals (i.e., persons not living with a partner and/or children), single mothers and couples with children have lower levels of occupational mobility. Family obligations reduce the risk–taking attitude associated with voluntary occupational mobility. On the other hand, workers with family commitments are also less likely to be subject to involuntary mobility (i.e., lay–offs) compared to singles.

Mobility varies sensibly by occupational sectors and occupational groups. As could be easily predicted, workers in the public sector have much lower probabilities of changing occupation – especially to a less prestigious occupational group. Equally, people employed in agriculture tend to stay in their occupation much more than workers in the industrial and the service sectors. In turn, industrial workers are more likely than service workers to be

---

[5] The dependent variable takes the value '1' if respondents ever moved upwardly in occupational status over the course of the panel, '0' otherwise. The dependent variable for downward moves is constructed similarly.

occupationally mobile. We suspect that this is contingent on downsizing and lay–offs in the transition from industrial to post–industrial economies. Differences in the odds of mobility among occupational groups of respondents at their first observation in the panel are strongly dependent on the specificity of human capital (i.e., skills) and physical investments (i.e., shops) of jobs included in each occupational group. It is therefore no surprise that 'craft and trade' workers rank on top in terms of occupational immobility, as they are 'anchored' to both targeted skills and small business investments (e.g., shoemakers or jewellers), while human capital specificities account for the resistance to mobility of professionals and skilled agricultural workers. In sharp contrast, individuals on top and at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy display the highest probabilities of mobility. This is true of both upward and downward mobility, indicating that respondents starting from these positions are also likely to 'wander' up and down the occupational ladder[6]. In other words, the higher than average odds of upward mobility of managers and of downward mobility of non–qualified workers in elementary occupations attests of the relatively higher volatility of these occupational groups. Finally, 'technicians' are found to be among the most mobile workers in all EU–15 societies. While it could be expected that their specialized skills would not be easily transferred, this finding shows that in fact other occupational groups tend to drain workers from the pool of former technicians (think of managers and the self–employed, both as highly qualified professionals and craft workers). Finally, let us focus on country effects net of individual characteristics. Almost all these effects are significant, attesting persistent country specificities in regimes of occupational mobility. Using Italy as a reference group, four countries have lower occupational mobility: France, Greece, Luxembourg and Denmark. Significantly higher mobility (compared to Italy) is found in the UK, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Ireland, Austria and Portugal. The highest occupational mobility is found in the UK and the Netherlands and the lowest is found in France. This is in line with existing research reviewed in section 2 on mobility regimes in Europe in the late 1990s–early 2000s.

4.3. Job mobility and job tenure

Information on job mobility can be obtained through data on either job separations (that is, voluntary or involuntary terminations of employment contracts) or hires (that is, starts of new employment contracts). Given our EU–wide scope, we have to rely on LFS data which focus on the second aspect – namely, the inception of employment relations in the working age population. More precisely, we define 'job mobility' as the rate of transition of the working age population into a new employment contract in the last 12 months. This definition assumes a purely conventional time frame. Moreover, it combines transitions from one workplace to another as well as transitions from unemployment or inactivity to employment. On the other hand, it is also true that job–to–job movements are usually interrupted by periods of unemployment or inactivity. Finally, the absence of complete work histories as those that could be tracked down by panel data render this the best available measurement of job mobility in the EU economies at present.
Table 10 describes job mobility in the EU from 1995 to 2005. Overall, in the entire European Union between 15% and 18% of the working population gets a new job yearly, with a trendless fluctuation in this range[7]. A similar pattern is found in all countries: a

---

[6] For instance, somebody starting from a managerial job, becoming a self-employed professional (e.g., a consultant) for a few years, and then returning to a managerial employment within the eight years of the panel duration is recorded as being both downwardly and upwardly mobile over his or her career.

[7] The sample analyzed in this section is limited to individuals employed at the time of the survey.

modest rise between 1995 and 2000, and a marked drop from 2000 and 2005. For the latter period, such a drop is also found in EU–10 (with the exception of Slovenia). Persistently Spain and Denmark show the highest rates (job mobility affects 20% of the workforce), while Greece and Luxembourg have the lowest (below 10% in 2005). The Netherlands seem to experience a major change, being among the countries with the top mobility rate in 2000 (20.5%), but with the lowest in the EU–25 five years later (7.4%).

Everywhere in the EU–15 but in Sweden in 1995 women have a higher job mobility rate than men. In fact, the situation in EU–10 is more mixed, since in Poland and the Baltic states men's mobility is higher than women's. What is for sure, gender differences in job mobility do not replicate gender differences in occupational mobility. While women turned out to 'stick' to occupational groups particularly, this does not entail that they are 'trapped' in their workplaces. In fact, their higher exposure to temporary contracts makes them more likely candidates to job mobility.

The fact that short–term employment is more common among the young, and that younger workers are also more often at their first job, accounts for the inverse correlation of age and mobility rates (table 11). Older cohorts of workers are less likely to get a new job in all EU labour markets, with few exceptions. The most striking is Slovakia, where job mobility picks up in the oldest age cohort (55–64 years old), while it is below the continental average in the two youngest cohorts. The British case is also noticeable, since job mobility becomes markedly higher than the EU average only for workers over 35 years old. Overall, however, countries with higher mobility rates tend to have proportionately higher rates in all age groups.

In the EU–25, job mobility declines slightly at higher levels of educational qualification (table 12). However, this is not everywhere the case. In particular, in 2005 Italy, Luxembourg and Portugal do not fit with this rule. Other countries, like France, show more erratic patterns. In fact, there is an individual characteristic that is constantly associated with very high rates of job mobility: being single (table 13). Of course, such an association is largely spurious, as long as singles are in larger numbers among young people. In other words, the life–course effect (being in the early career) is the real cause of the high job mobility rate of singles in the EU–25 (31.0% in 2000, 25.6% in 2005). However, there are reasons to believe that marital status makes some difference independently from its partial overlap with age. The point is that singles *qua* singles can afford to adopt a more explorative attitude in the labour market. Much for the same reason, widows and divorced persons as well have higher job mobility rates than married workers (but not in Portugal and Poland in 2005). All this is consistent with what was found about the relations between marital status and occupational mobility.

More than anything else, the rise of job mobility is a function of the expansion of short–term contracts in European labour markets. Indeed, job mobility rates among workers with temporary employments are 5 to 7 times higher than among their counterparts with permanent contracts (table 14). In the EU–25, 53.4% of temporary workers got their current main job less than 12 months earlier, while this was the case for only 9.4% of workers with unlimited tenure in 2005. Differences in the width of this gap, however, reveal the precariousness of temporary jobs. Such precariousness was presumably at its apex in Spain in 1995, when 86.5% of temporary contracts were signed within the previous 12 months. At the opposite end, in the Netherlands and Austria in 1995, Greece, Austria and Malta in 2000 and 2005, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Cyprus and Poland in 2005, the majority of temporary jobs were older than one year. In these latter instances, the bulk of temporary contracts cannot be equated with 'spot jobs'. Over time (between 1995 and 2005), such a conclusion seems to be warranted for the entire EU–15, as a smaller proportion of temporary jobs entails a change of employer in the last year: 67.5% in 1995,

56.9% in 2000 and 54.0% in 2005[8]. A similar and even more pronounced trend was experienced in the EU–10 between 2000 and 2005: the job mobility rate among workers with temporary contracts dropped from 67.7% to 50.0%. Short–term contracts are becoming less short–term in the EU in the last decade.

On the other hand, a low job mobility rate among workers with permanent employments indicates some rigidity of 'primary labour markets'. At one extreme there are the Netherlands, Portugal, Greece and Poland, where less than 6% of permanent workers took a new job in 2005; at the other Denmark, the UK, Estonia and Latvia where 15–18% changed employers in the last year. Such differences, at comparable levels of protection of the workforce, have significant implications in terms of openness, opportunities, and adaptability of labour markets.

We conclude the analysis of job mobility by modelling the country effects on this variable controlling for the usual social, demographic and employment characteristics of respondents to the LFS of 2005 (table 13). Logistic regression is applied. Interestingly, while the impact of age and gender corresponds to what was shown in tables 11 and 12, once controls are introduced job mobility turns out to be positively albeit modestly associated with post–secondary education – something that was not at all clear from bivariate analysis, where this association was possibly confounded by age effects. Equally, the model reveals that job mobility is found at all levels of the socio–economic hierarchy, but in select occupational groups at each level. More precisely, workers in elementary occupations (lower class), in craft/trade and service/sale occupations (middle class), and professionals (upper class) are particularly exposed to the 'risk' of changing employers. The self–employed, that form a large part of workers in craft, trade and professional activities, are excluded from the analysis. Still this finding indicates that workers with presumably specialized skills (like artisans or highly qualified professionals), whenever they do not work on their own account, are susceptible to 'try out' different employers more than other occupational categories. At the opposite end, managers and senior officials, and even more skilled agricultural workers, are much less likely to switch from one employer to another. Net of all these effects, job mobility is significantly higher in Denmark, Finland, Spain, the UK and Sweden, while it is at its lowest in the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Greece, Belgium, Portugal and Austria. Differently from what emerged from bivariate analysis (table 10), the level of job mobility in Italy (the reference country in the model) is not lower than in Belgium, Portugal and Austria.

Another way of gauging job mobility is by measuring job tenure – that is, the average duration of employments (in months). Clearly job tenure depends strongly on age, but as we will see seniority does not tell the full story. In other words, although the age pattern is strictly positive as expected, we find important country and gender differences (table 14). In general, women tend to have lower job tenure. Childbearing plays an important role here. As a matter of fact, women's and men's tenures are the same for workers in their twenties. The gender gap emerges after the age of thirty, and grows until the late forties, when child–rearing takes its toll on women's life, forcing them out of the workforce or into short–term work arrangements. In fact, some realignment between men and women takes place when individuals enter their fifties: in Belgium, France, Italy and Portugal women catch up men at that stage of their working life (in the UK they even overcome men's tenure). Overall, the largest gender disparity in job tenure is found in Ireland. Country differences are remarkable as well. The by far shortest job tenure is found in the UK,

---

[8] A note of caution is in order due to the lack of reliable data for five countries in 1995, eight in 2000 and four in 2005.

which is not surprising in the light of previous analyses (Booth et al. 1999)[9]. In contrast, in Belgium, France, Italy and Austria more than two thirds of the workforce has stayed in the same workplace for more than four years.

As we did when focusing on occupational and job mobility, we also specify multivariate models taking the log of job tenure as dependent variable. In table 15 we implement a model including all valid cases, whereas in table 16 we estimate country–specific models[10]. OLS regression is applied. The estimates generally make good sense. First, job tenure increases with age, but at a declining rate since the squared–age coefficient is negative, and job tenure is definitely lower among women – in line with the descriptive statistics reported above. However, country–specific models suggest that this effect is not widespread, being non–significant in Belgium, France, Italy, Portugal, Finland and the UK (table 18). Education reflects a non–linear pattern: individuals with post–secondary qualifications tend to have shorter job tenure, but those with secondary level education have longer job tenure than individuals with lower credentials. Couples, both with and without children, have longer tenure, while there is no difference between singles and single parents. The job tenure of workers in the public sector is 35% higher than that of their counterparts in the private sector in the EU–15 (the only exception is Denmark where there is no public–private difference in tenure). Skilled agricultural workers tend to stick to their job for longer than any other occupational group, while the shortest job spells are those of elementary occupations. Significantly lower tenure have also service and sale workers. This is consistent with the fact that jobs in the service sector last significantly less than jobs in agriculture and, especially, in the industrial sector. The rise of post–industrial societies should therefore bring about some structural decline of job tenure, net of all other effects. However, such an argument is countered by the several exceptions to this rule: in Austria, Denmark, and Italy jobs in the service sector have a longer duration than those in agriculture, possibly due to the presence of seasonal workers in the latter sector; in Denmark industrial jobs on average last longer than jobs in the service sector. Overall, *coeteris paribus*, Belgium, Portugal and Italy (the reference country in the model) are the labour markets in Europe where job tenure is the longest. The UK is by far the country with the shortest job tenure even after controlling for other factors. Denmark, Germany, Spain and Luxembourg have a strong negative coefficient as well, indicating a shorter–than–average job duration in the EU–15.

5. Conclusions

The findings illustrated in this paper show that the three different indicators of work mobility that we used – 'employment', 'occupational', and 'job' mobility – do not change consistently. Over time, *employment mobility* increased considerably from 1995 to 2000, to drop at its lowest level in 2005. In 2000, switches between different professional statuses were particularly widespread in Southern Europe, and especially among women. In that year, more than 10% of Spanish employed women changed professional status. Possibly by the turn of the century a sensible flexibilization of work relations affected the labour market of these countries, entailing movements from full–time employee status to 'atypical' jobs, formally classified as self–employment.

---

[9] A very low job tenure is also found in Luxembourg, which is in contrast with data on job mobility from LFS. Possibly this depends on the relatively small size of the ECHP sample for this country and should be regarded with caution.

[10] It must be noted, however, that country-specific estimates are less precise because of smaller sample sizes.

Employment mobility seems to be closely inter–related with changes in industrial relations, and particularly with the expansion of short–term work contracts in some EU labour markets. The type of contract (permanent or temporary) signed by workers who have taken a different professional status in the last 12 months is a good indicator of two opposite directions of change: a securitization (from temporary to permanent) or a flexibilization (from permanent to temporary) of employment. A clear trend in both the EU–15 and the EU–10 (although fewer data are available for the latter area) is found: employment mobility is increasingly associated with temporary work contracts. Overall, in the EU the probabilities of holding a temporary job were similar for workers who changed professional status and for those who did not in 1995. From 2000 onwards, however, the earlier group has become much more at risk of entering a non–permanent work commitment. This is very strongly the case in Ireland, where in 1995 only 7.8% of the workers who changed professional status were hired on a temporary basis, as opposed to 63.1% in 2005. The only major exception to this trend is the UK, that is the country usually described as the 'champion' of flexibility, where workers moving to a different professional status in more recent years are less likely than workers in 1995 to be employed on a temporary basis. This evidence can be interpreted as indicating a rising securitization of labour relations in the UK.

Occupational mobility is a context–specific phenomenon, varying across EU labour markets noticeably. On the basis of ECHP data, between 1994 and 2001 in the UK, Belgium and the Netherlands more than half the working population moved at least once from one ISCO 1–digit occupational group to another. Great Britain is the homeland of occupational mobility. In fact, nowhere is occupational mobility as low as in France: only 17.9% of French workers experienced some occupational mobility in the 1994–2001 period. Occupational mobility rates are also below the EU average in Denmark, Greece, Finland and Luxembourg. In all countries, women are less likely to change occupational group than men. Occupational mobility rates rose sharply in the 1990s, tripling between 1994 and 1998, to stabilize early in the new century. Spectacular increases took place in Belgium, Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands and Ireland. In Italy such a growth was experienced between 1998 and 2001.

From 1995 to 2005, *job mobility* rates fluctuated in the 15–18% range in the EU. A similar pattern is found in all countries: a modest rise between 1995 and 2000, and a marked drop from 2000 and 2005. For the latter period, such a drop is also found in EU–10 (with the exception of Slovenia). Persistently Spain and Denmark show the highest rates (job mobility affects 20% of the workforce), while Greece and Luxembourg have the lowest (below 10% in 2005).

Everywhere in the EU–15 but in Sweden in 1995 women have a higher job mobility rate than men. In fact, the situation in EU–10 is more mixed, since in Poland and the Baltic states men's mobility is higher than women's. It is worth noting that gender differences in job mobility do not replicate gender differences in occupational mobility. While women 'stick' to occupational groups particularly, this does not entail that they are 'trapped' in their workplaces. In fact, their higher exposure to temporary contracts makes them more likely candidates to job mobility.

Older cohorts of workers are less likely to get a new job in all EU labour markets, with few exceptions. The most striking is Slovakia, where job mobility picks up in the oldest age cohort (55–64 years old), while it is below the continental average in the two youngest cohorts. The British case is also noticeable, since job mobility becomes markedly higher than the EU average only for workers over 35 years old. Generally speaking, however, countries with higher occupational mobility rates tend to have proportionately higher job mobility rates in all age groups.

Job mobility rates are 5 to 7 times higher among employees with temporary contracts than among their counterparts with permanent contracts. Nonetheless, between 1995 and 2005 a smaller proportion of temporary jobs entails a change of employer in the last year: 67.5% in 1995, 56.9% in 2000 and 54.0% in 2005. A similar and even more pronounced trend was experienced in the EU–10 between 2000 and 2005: the job mobility rate among workers with temporary contracts dropped from 67.7% to 50.0%. Temporary contracts are becoming less short–term in the EU in the last decade.

On the other hand, a low job mobility rate among workers with permanent employments indicates some rigidity of 'primary labour markets'. At one extreme there are the Netherlands, Portugal, Greece and Poland, where less than 6% of permanent workers took a new job in 2005; at the other Denmark, the UK, Estonia and Latvia where 15–18% of their counterparts changed employers in the last year. Such differences, at comparable levels of protection of the workforce, have significant implications in terms of openness, opportunities, and adaptability of labour markets.

Findings on job mobility were corroborated by analyses of job tenure carried out with ECHP data. Such findings are consistent with those on job mobility. However, although job tenure depends strongly on age, sizeable gender and country differences are also found. In general, women tend to have lower job tenure. Childbearing plays an important role here. As a matter of fact, women's and men's tenures are the same for workers in their twenties. The gender gap emerges after the age of thirty, and grows until the late forties, when child–rearing takes its toll on women's life, forcing them out of the workforce or into short–term work arrangements. In fact, some realignment between men and women occurs when individuals enter their fifties: in Belgium, France, Italy and Portugal women catch up men at that stage of their working life (in the UK they even overcome men's tenure). Overall, the largest gender disparity in job tenure is found in Ireland. Country differences are remarkable as well. Workers in the UK have by far the shortest average job tenure. In contrast, in Belgium, France, Italy and Austria more than two thirds of the workforce has stayed in the same workplace for more than four years.

In addition to its substantial findings, this study highlights the growing homogenization and accessibility of EU–wide statistical sources on the issues at stake, but also the persistence of significant limitations – some of which are arguably very hard to overcome. We would also mention some inefficiencies in the current format of the LFS – namely, the lack of information on the occupation of respondents at earlier times (but for the unemployed and the inactive population). This information would in fact be very helpful to map out occupational mobility in greater details. ECHP is definitely more useful in this regard, but it is becoming rather out–dated – at least if it is employed for policy–oriented analyses. Hopefully more recent information will be available with the release of the EU–SILC dataset – the panel successor of ECHP. However, even this precious, additional source is likely to be insufficient to get in–depth information on the issues at stake. Given the relative paucity of mobile populations, as well as their strategic interest as spearheads of social and economic change, *ad hoc* surveys are strongly recommended as major future research efforts on a EU–wide scale.

References

Andrietti, V. (2001) *Occupational Pensions and Interfirm Job Mobility in the European Union. Evidence from the ECHP Survey*, CeRP, Working Paper 5/0, Turin.

Arum, R. and Müller, W. (2004) (eds) *The Re–emergence of Self–Employment: A Comparative Study of Self–Employment Dynamics and Social Inequality*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Booth, A.L. and Francesconi, M. (1999) *Job Mobility in 1990s Britain: Does Gender Matter?*, mimeo.

Booth, A.L., Francesconi, M. and Garcia–Serrano, C.G. (1999) 'Job Tenure and Job Mobility in Britain', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 53, 43–70.

Burgess, S. (1994) *The Reallocation of Employment and the Role of Employment Protection Legislation*, CEPR, Discussion Paper No. 193, LSE, London.

Burgess, S. (1999) *Reallocation of Labour: An International Comparison Using Job Tenure Data*, CEPR, LSE, London.

CEC (2005) *2006 – European Year of Workers' Mobility, the Importance of the Mobility of Workers to the Implementation of the Lisbon Strategy*, MEMO/05/229, Brussels.

Chauvel, L. (1998) *Le destin des générations. Structure sociale et cohortes en France au XX siècle*, PUF, Paris.

Davia, M.A. (2005) *Job Mobility and Wage Mobility at the Beginning of Working Career: a Comparative View across Europe*, Working Papers of the Institute Social and Economic Research 2005–03, University of Essex, Colchester.

Esping–Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Polity Press, Oxford.

Ferrera, M. (1996) 'The 'Southern Model' of Welfare in Social Europe', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6, 17–37.

Johnson, W. (1978) 'A Theory of Job Shopping', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 92, 261–77.

Kristensen, N. and Westergård–Nielsen, N. (2004) *Does Low Job Satisfaction Lead to Job Mobility?* IZA DP No. 1026, Bonn.

Muffels, R.J.A. and Luijkx, R. (2004) J*ob Mobility and Employment Patterns across European Welfare States. Is there a 'Trade–off' or a 'Double Bind' between Flexibility and Security?*, paper for the TLM.Net Conference "Quality in Labour Market Transitions: A European Challenge", at the Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam, November.

Naticchioni, P. and Panigo, D. (2004) *Employment Protection, Job–Tenure and Short Term Mobility Wage Gains. An application to the Italian Case*, CEPREMAP working paper No. 0402, CEPREMAP, Paris.

OECD (1999) *Employment Outlook 1999 – Giving Youth a Better Start*, OECD Paris.

Sousa–Poza, A. and Henneberger, F. (2002) Eine empirische Analyse won Stellenwechseln in der Schweiz unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Maschinen, Elektro– und Metallindustrie. Diskussionspapiere, Universität St. Gallen, St. Gallen.

Sousa–Poza, A. and Henneberger, F. (2004) *Analyzing Job Mobility with Job Turnover Intentions: An International Comparative Study*, Discussion Paper No 82, Department of Economics and Research Institute for Labor Economics and Labor Law, University of St. Gallen, St. Gallen.

Van Ours, J. C. (1990) 'An International Comparative Study on Job Mobility', *Labour*, 4, 33–55.

Appendix:
descriptive tables and models

Tab. 1 - Employment mobility: employed respondents with a different professional status the year before 1995-2000-2005 (cell %)

COUNTRY	1995			2000			2005		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
BE	40.1	26.2	31.7	2.7	1.8	2.2	0.4	0.7	0.6
DK	0.2	0.4	0.3	2.0	1.6	1.8			
DE	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.5	2.6	1.9	2.3	2.2
EL	1.4	1.4	1.4	4.7	3.0	3.6	1.0	1.3	1.2
ES	1.3	1.8	1.6	10.1	6.7	7.9	1.6	1.5	1.6
FR	1.3	1.6	1.4	5.4	4.8	5.1			
IE	1.1	1.5	1.4						
IT	3.1	3.3	3.3	7.3	6.8	7.0	1.2	1.4	1.3
LU	1.2	0.8	0.9	1.3	0.7	1.0	0.4	0.4	0.4
NL	1.0	1.1	1.0						
AT	3.3	3.1	3.2						
PT	2.4	2.7	2.6	2.7	1.8	2.2	0.9	1.2	1.0
FI				4.0	3.1	3.5	0.7	1.0	0.8
UK	1.3	2.3	1.9	1.8	2.2	2.0	1.4	2.6	2.0
EU15	**2.9**	**2.9**	**2.9**	**4.4**	**4.0**	**4.2**	**1.4**	**1.9**	**1.7**
CZ				3.1	2.2	2.6	0.7	1.2	1.0
EE				3.5	4.2	3.9	0.3	1.4	0.9
CY				3.8	2.6	3.1	1.2	2.6	2.0
LV							1.4	1.9	1.6
LT							3.7	3.3	3.5
HU				3.5	4.4	4.0	1.1	1.9	1.5
MT				3.2	1.8	2.3	1.5	1.2	1.3
PL							1.9	2.4	2.2
SI				4.1	4.2	4.1	0.3	0.7	0.5
SK							1.6	3.7	2.8
EU10				**3.4**	**3.3**	**3.3**	**1.6**	**2.2**	**1.9**
EU25							**1.4**	**1.9**	**1.7**

Source: Labour Force Survey

Tab. 2 - Employment mobility: change in professional status in the last year by current type of contract (row %, only employees)

COUNTRY OF RESIDENCE	Employment mobility	1995 Permanent	1995 Temporary	1995 Total	2000 Permanent	2000 Temporary	2000 Total	2005 Permanent	2005 Temporary	2005 Total
BE	No	95.4	4.6	100	93.8	6.2	100	93.6	6.4	100
	Yes	97.4	2.6	100	81.0	19.0	100	96.4		100
	Total	**96.2**	**3.8**	**100**	**93.7**	**6.3**	**100**	**93.6**	**6.4**	**100**
DE	No	92.5	7.5	100	91.1	8.9	100	89.8	10.2	100
	Yes	89.8	10.2	100	87.0	13.1	100	85.9	14.2	100
	Total	**92.4**	**7.6**	**100**	**91.1**	**8.9**	**100**	**89.8**	**10.2**	**100**
EL	No	92.1	7.9	100	89.2	10.8	100	90.2	9.8	100
	Yes	78.6	21.4	100	71.5	28.5	100	74.8	25.2	100
	Total	**92.0**	**8.0**	**100**	**89.0**	**11.0**	**100**	**90.1**	**10.0**	**100**
ES	No	74.3	25.8	100	76.2	23.8	100			
	Yes	46.5	53.5	100	36.5	63.5	100			
	Total	**74.0**	**26.0**	**100**	**76.0**	**24.0**	**100**			
FR	No	92.8	7.3	100	89.7	10.3	100			
	Yes	78.5	21.5	100	74.8	25.2	100			
	Total	**92.7**	**7.3**	**100**	**89.7**	**10.4**	**100**			
IE	No	94.0	6.1	100				75.8	24.2	100
	Yes	92.2	7.8*	100				36.9	63.2	100
	Total	**93.9**	**6.1**	**100**				**75.6**	**24.4**	**100**
IT	No	95.3	4.7	100	92.7	7.4	100	90.6	9.4	100
	Yes	92.6	7.4	100	86.4	13.6	100	54.8	45.2	100
	Total	**95.3**	**4.7**	**100**	**92.6**	**7.4**	**100**	**90.4**	**9.6**	**100**
NL	No	92.1	7.9	100						
	Yes	69.6	30.4*	100						
	Total	**92.0**	**8.0**	**100**						
AT	No	95.2	4.8	100						
	Yes	95.1	4.9*	100						
	Total	**95.2**	**4.8**	**100**						
PT	No	93.0	7.1	100	84.2	15.8	100	85.13	14.87	100
	Yes	75.0	25.0	100	49.2	50.9	100	29.03	70.97	100
	Total	**92.7**	**7.3**	**100**	**83.7**	**16.3**	**100**	**84.78**	**15.22**	**100**
FI	No							88.11	11.89	100
	Yes							64.1*	35.9*	100
	Total							**88.0**	**12.0**	**100**
UK	No	94.9	5.1	100	94.8	5.2	100	95.9	4.1	100
	Yes	82.0	18.0	100	83.3	16.7	100	89.5	10.5	100
	Total	**94.8**	**5.2**	**100**	**94.7**	**5.3**	**100**	**95.8**	**4.2**	**100**
EU15	No	92.1	7.9	100	90.1	9.9	100	91.2	8.8	100
	Yes	91.6	8.4	100	78.6	21.4	100	77.8	22.3	100
	Total	**92.1**	**7.9**	**100**	**90.0**	**10.0**	**100**	**91.1**	**8.9**	**100**
CZ	No				95.3	4.7	100	94.7	5.3	100
	Yes				84.7	15.3	100	72.6	27.4	100
	Total				**95.2**	**4.8**	**100**	**94.5**	**5.5**	**100**
EE	No							98.0	2.0	100
	Yes							89.6*	10.3*	100
	Total							**98.0**	**2.0**	**100**
CY	No				91.4	8.6	100	88.0	12.0	100
	Yes				84.0	16.0*	100	80.7	19.3*	100
	Total				**91.3**	**8.8**	**100**	**87.9**	**12.1**	**100**
LT	No							96.7	3.3	100
	Yes							67.5	32.5	100
	Total							**96.4**	**3.6**	**100**
HU	No				95.4	4.7	100			
	Yes				86.6	13.4	100			
	Total				**95.2**	**4.8**	**100**			
PL	No							81.6	18.4	100
	Yes							55.6	44.4	100
	Total							**81.3**	**18.7**	**100**
EU10	No							89.1	10.9	100
	Yes							63.9	36.1*	100
	Total							**88.9**	**11.1**	**100**
EU25	No				90.5	9.6	100	90.7	9.3	100
	Yes				79.3	20.7	100	74.0	26.0	100
	Total				**90.4**	**9.7**	**100**	**90.6**	**9.4**	**100**

Source: Labour Force Survey
* Figures with low reliability

Tab.3 - Occupational mobility from first to last job in EU-15 in a eight-years time frame (% working age population, 1994-2001)

1st occupation	Managers	Professionals	Technicians	Clerks	Service	Skilled agr.	Craft & trade	Machine op.	Elementary	Total
					Last occupation					
Managers, senior officials	74.7	5.1	5.4	3.4	4.7	1.2	3.3	1.2	1.0	100
Professionals	3.8	84.2	7.0	2.3	1.3	0.1	0.7	0.3	0.3	100
Technicians	2.9	5.9	77.1	6.0	3.6	0.2	2.1	1.1	1.0	100
Clerks	2.0	2.0	6.9	82.0	3.3	0.1	1.1	1.0	1.6	100
Service and sale workers	2.6	1.2	3.6	3.5	80.8	0.5	2.2	1.1	4.7	100
Skilled agricultural workers	1.5	0.3	0.6	0.5	1.2	88.8	1.7	1.0	4.4	100
Craft and trade workers	1.5	0.4	1.8	0.9	1.6	0.8	84.8	4.4	3.7	100
Machine operators	1.4	0.3	1.7	2.1	1.9	0.8	8.4	78.6	5.0	100
Elementary occupations	0.9	0.5	1.6	2.3	6.0	2.8	5.3	3.7	77.0	100
Total	8.2	11.9	14.0	13.2	13.1	6.2	14.9	8.1	10.4	100

Source: European Community Household Panel

Tab. 4 - Occupational (upward and downward) mobility by gender in the EU-15 between 1994 and 2001 (working age population, %)

	Upward mobility			Downward mobility			Total mobility		
	Total	*Men*	*Women*	*Total*	*Men*	*Women*	*Total*	*Men*	*Women*
Denmark	23.0	24.2	21.6	17.3	20.2	14.2	30.1	32.3	27.8
Netherlands	40.4	42.6	37.7	35.0	37.9	31.5	50.9	53.2	48.0
Belgium	39.6	44.9	33.1	38.1	41.6	33.9	52.8	58.4	45.9
France	11.6	13.3	9.5	8.9	10.1	7.6	17.9	20.3	15.1
Ireland	33.8	33.1	34.7	27.8	30.6	24.2	43.7	44.0	43.2
Italy	27.9	30.2	24.6	25.0	28.5	19.8	41.8	45.8	35.8
Greece	17.1	18.7	14.9	16.4	18.3	13.8	27.8	30.1	24.6
Spain	39.4	44.6	31.8	35.4	39.3	29.5	48.5	53.1	41.5
Portugal	36.2	36.8	35.6	36.2	35.5	37.0	48.5	47.6	49.5
Austria	32.4	35.1	29.1	29.8	32.3	26.8	43.5	46.6	39.8
Finland	18.6	19.9	17.3	13.8	14.8	12.7	27.6	30.1	24.9
UK	46.4	48.0	44.8	41.9	44.8	39.0	55.6	57.1	54.2
Germany	28.3	29.3	27.0	25.1	25.8	24.3	38.4	40.0	36.6
Luxembourg	17.8	18.6	16.6	10.9	12.8	8.2	24.2	25.6	22.1
Total	**29.7**	**31.7**	**27.3**	**26.3**	**28.4**	**23.7**	**39.8**	**42.2**	**36.9**

Source: European Community Household Panel

Tab. 5 - Proportion of working age population with at least two episodes of upward or downward occupational mobility in the EU-15 between 1994 and 2(

	Super-mobiles (upward)			Super-mobiles (downward)		
	Tot	*Men*	*Women*	*Tot*	*Men*	*Women*
Denmark	3.4	4.4	2.3	1.6	1.9	1.2
Netherlands	7.0	8.2	5.7	4.9	5.9	3.8
Belgium	5.4	7.4	3.3	4.0	4.6	3.4
France	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.3
Ireland	4.5	5.0	3.9	3.1	4.0	2.3
Italy	1.7	2.2	1.2	1.3	1.8	0.8
Greece	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.4
Spain	6.3	9.1	3.5	4.9	7.5	2.4
Portugal	6.2	6.9	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.6
Austria	4.8	6.2	3.3	4.8	6.2	3.4
Finland	1.1	1.0	1.1	0.5	0.5	0.6
UK	12.8	14.5	11.2	9.8	11.7	8.1
Germany	4.4	4.9	4.0	3.7	4.3	3.1
Luxembourg	1.0	1.3	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.2
Total	4.2	5.1	3.2	3.2	4.0	2.5

Source: European Community Household Panel

Tab. 6 - *Yearly* rates of occupational mobility in the EU-15 (%, working age population, 1994-2001)

	Total mobility			Upward mobility			Downward mobility		
	1994-95	1997-98	2000-01	1994-95	1997-98	2000-01	1994-95	1997-98	2000-01
Denmark	7.6	8.5	10.5	4.4	5.6	6.2	3.2	2.9	4.3
Netherlands	6.0	23.0	23.1	2.5	12.4	12.0	3.5	10.5	11.1
Belgium	4.6	31.4	29.3	2.1	15.6	14.9	2.5	15.9	14.4
France	2.0	6.1	4.7	0.8	3.5	2.7	1.2	2.6	2.0
Ireland	6.8	19.4	18.8	3.5	10.8	9.9	3.3	8.6	8.9
Italy	3.4	5.0	22.0	2.0	2.7	12.0	1.4	2.3	10.1
Greece	2.9	9.6	3.4	1.7	4.5	1.6	1.2	5.1	1.8
Spain	5.4	22.7	25.7	2.7	12.4	14.1	2.7	10.3	11.6
Portugal	3.6	22.2	15.1	1.5	9.9	9.3	2.1	12.3	5.8
Austria	6.0	17.5	12.2	3.2*	9.5	6.7	2.8*	8.0	5.5
Finland		7.8	3.3		4.1	1.9		3.7	1.4
UK	11.4	21.8	21.2	6.2	11.7	11.4	5.2	10.1	9.8
Germany	6.3	15.5	7.4	3.5	8.1	3.7	2.8	7.3	3.7
Luxembourg	14.2	4.8	4.4	9.8*	3.0	3.0	4.4*	1.8	1.4
Total	5.2	15.2	14.6	2.7	8.0	8.0	2.5	7.3	6.6

* 1995-96
Source: European Community Household Panel

Tab.7 - Effects of selected independent variables on likelihood of experiencing upward or downward occupational mobility in the EU-15 (working age population, 1994-2001)

	Upward	Downward
Age	-0.004	0.032***
	0.006	*0.006*
Agesq	-0.000***	-0.001***
	0.000	*0.000*
Exposure	0.310***	0.298***
	0.005	*0.005*
Female	-0.282***	-0.270***
	0.023	*0.024*
EDUCATION (reference category: low level)		
High	0.059**	0.022
	0.026	*0.026*
Medium	0.035*	-0.017
	0.020	*0.021*
HOUSEHOLD TYPE (reference category: single)		
Single parent	-0.101**	-0.053
	0.043	*0.044*
Couple no children	-0.006	-0.025
	0.034	*0.036*
Couple with children	-0.127***	-0.117***
	0.030	*0.032*
Other	-0.077*	-0.046
	0.040	*0.041*
SECTOR OF OCCUPATION (reference category: private)		
Public	-0.169***	-0.252***
	0.022	*0.023*
OCCUPATION OF FIRST JOB (reference category: clerks)		
Managers, senior officials	0.565***	0.534***
	0.035	*0.036*
Professionals	-0.104***	-0.117***
	0.034	*0.036*
Technicians	0.490***	0.419***
	0.029	*0.030*
Service and sale workers	0.132***	0.160***
	0.029	*0.031*
Skilled agricultural workers	-0.116**	-0.097**
	0.046	*0.048*
Craft and trade workers	-0.291***	-0.235***
	0.032	*0.033*
Machine operators	0.083**	0.267***
	0.036	*0.037*
Elementary occupations	0.363***	0.337***
	0.031	*0.032*
MAIN ACTIVITY (reference category: agriculture)		
Industry	0.435***	0.472***
	0.027	*0.028*
Services	0.276***	0.325***
	0.023	*0.024*
COUNTRY (reference category: Italy)		
DK	-0.251***	-0.450***
	0.047	*0.052*
NL	0.619***	0.576***
	0.036	*0.036*
BE	0.590***	0.673***
	0.042	*0.043*
FR	-1.174***	-1.303***
	0.043	*0.047*
IE	0.405***	0.296***
	0.040	*0.042*
EL	-0.651***	-0.486***
	0.042	*0.043*
ES	0.518***	0.525***
	0.033	*0.034*
PT	0.246***	0.429***
	0.036	*0.036*
AT	0.321***	0.419***
	0.042	*0.043*
FI	-0.024	-0.140***
	0.046	*0.049*
UK	0.623***	0.555***
	0.037	*0.037*
DE	-0.068**	-0.032
	0.034	*0.035*
LU	-0.310***	-0.633***
	0.051	*0.059*
Constant	-2.268***	-3.260***
	0.115	*0.120*
Observations	89543	89543

Logistic regressions; standard errors in italics
* Significant at 10%; ** Significant at 5%; *** Significant at 1%
Source: European Community Household Panel

Tab. 8 - Effects of selected independent variables on likelihood of experiencing *upward* occupational mobility in the EU-15 (country specific models, WAP, 1994-2001)

	NL	BE	FR	IE	IT	GR	ES	PT	AT	FI	UK	DE	LU
Age	-0.004	0.078***	-0.009	-0.115***	-0.015	-0.030	0.032*	-0.020	0.035	0.018	-0.027	0.045**	0.121***
	0.020	*0.029*	*0.031*	*0.023*	*0.018*	*0.026*	*0.018*	*0.018*	*0.025*	*0.030*	*0.020*	*0.018*	*0.037*
Agesq	0.000	-0.001***	-0.001	0.001***	0.000	0.000	-0.001***	0.000	-0.001*	-0.001	0.000	-0.001***	-0.002***
	0.000	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*
Exposure	0.323***	0.414***	0.240***	0.400***	0.305***	0.205***	0.383***	0.338***	0.307***	0.259***	0.304***	0.307***	0.116***
	0.014	*0.022*	*0.022*	*0.018*	*0.015*	*0.020*	*0.014*	*0.018*	*0.024*	*0.031*	*0.017*	*0.017*	*0.026*
Female	-0.342***	-0.602***	-0.473***	0.039	-0.263***	-0.292***	-0.544***	-0.170***	-0.349***	-0.023	-0.052	-0.200***	-0.393***
	0.056	*0.077*	*0.082*	*0.076*	*0.052*	*0.077*	*0.053*	*0.056*	*0.079*	*0.082*	*0.059*	*0.055*	*0.105*
EDUCATION (reference category: low)													
High	0.213**	0.098	0.002	-0.090	0.262**	0.238*	0.392***	-0.053	0.512***	-0.192	0.182***	0.074	0.095
	0.086	*0.104*	*0.107*	*0.113*	*0.104*	*0.123*	*0.074*	*0.132*	*0.169*	*0.122*	*0.063*	*0.089*	*0.161*
Medium	-0.056	0.029	-0.053	0.030	0.166***	-0.010	0.259***	0.095	0.191**	-0.094	-0.006	0.061	0.096
	0.058	*0.091*	*0.087*	*0.078*	*0.059*	*0.088*	*0.065*	*0.084*	*0.092*	*0.105*	*0.083*	*0.065*	*0.107*
HOUSEHOLD TYPE (reference category: single)													
Single parent	-0.289*	-0.138	0.049	0.096	-0.043	0.100	0.148	-0.090	-0.211	0.163	0.052	-0.087	0.079
	0.157	*0.190*	*0.188*	*0.205*	*0.147*	*0.213*	*0.153*	*0.199*	*0.180*	*0.191*	*0.135*	*0.129*	*0.209*
Couple no children	-0.204**	0.214	0.025	0.122	-0.013	0.031	0.522***	0.286	-0.265*	0.029	0.058	-0.100	0.025
	0.086	*0.150*	*0.145*	*0.198*	*0.135*	*0.204*	*0.145*	*0.188*	*0.152*	*0.133*	*0.101*	*0.091*	*0.169*
Couple with children	-0.377***	-0.128	0.128	-0.015	0.098	-0.154	0.092	0.125	-0.282**	0.022	-0.034	-0.140*	-0.131
	0.081	*0.132*	*0.125*	*0.169*	*0.114*	*0.176*	*0.129*	*0.174*	*0.130*	*0.123*	*0.095*	*0.081*	*0.150*
Other	-0.693*	0.101	0.143	-0.023	-0.089	-0.075	0.088	0.258	-0.105	-0.093	0.113	0.032	-0.016
	0.359	*0.234*	*0.209*	*0.196*	*0.137*	*0.192*	*0.142*	*0.181*	*0.152*	*0.296*	*0.133*	*0.138*	*0.187*
OCCUPATION OF FIRST JOB (reference category: clerks)													
Managers, senior officials	0.433***	0.731***	0.635***	0.208	0.386**	0.137	0.426***	0.826***	0.547***	1.033***	0.269***	0.921***	0.655***
	0.100	*0.170*	*0.177*	*0.147*	*0.156*	*0.143*	*0.115*	*0.135*	*0.164*	*0.158*	*0.095*	*0.125*	*0.192*
Professionals	0.105	-0.228*	0.126	-0.454***	0.159	-0.504***	-1.211***	0.286*	0.682***	0.404***	-0.216**	-0.059	-0.460**
	0.096	*0.123*	*0.172*	*0.143*	*0.115*	*0.169*	*0.120*	*0.161*	*0.192*	*0.153*	*0.102*	*0.107*	*0.219*
Technicians	0.297***	0.726***	0.384***	0.470***	0.684***	0.616***	0.421***	0.833***	0.377***	0.802***	0.392***	0.310***	0.503***
	0.084	*0.121*	*0.128*	*0.142*	*0.090*	*0.158*	*0.104*	*0.118*	*0.122*	*0.137*	*0.098*	*0.082*	*0.148*
Service and sale workers	0.065	0.591***	0.263*	-0.472***	0.628***	0.043	-0.215**	-0.008	0.186	0.268*	-0.191**	0.139	0.194
	0.095	*0.133*	*0.140*	*0.125*	*0.089*	*0.130*	*0.090*	*0.105*	*0.121*	*0.157*	*0.092*	*0.093*	*0.171*
Skilled agricultural workers	0.101	-0.145	-0.556**	-0.281	1.038***	-0.320**	0.018	0.195*	-0.600***	-0.662***	-0.235	0.109	-0.737**
	0.225	*0.376*	*0.266*	*0.177*	*0.138*	*0.162*	*0.131*	*0.118*	*0.186*	*0.213*	*0.308*	*0.232*	*0.371*
Craft and trade workers	-0.606***	0.294**	0.003	-0.597***	0.297***	-0.200	-0.707***	-0.446***	-0.349**	0.003	-0.423***	-0.538***	-0.496***
	0.122	*0.149*	*0.149*	*0.151*	*0.090*	*0.146*	*0.100*	*0.110*	*0.139*	*0.171*	*0.117*	*0.093*	*0.188*
Machine operators	-0.191	0.742***	0.148	-0.357**	0.894***	-0.245	-0.326***	0.059	0.109	-0.126	-0.142	-0.056	-0.035
	0.130	*0.174*	*0.148*	*0.146*	*0.108*	*0.167*	*0.113*	*0.126*	*0.163*	*0.193*	*0.119*	*0.105*	*0.205*
Elementary occupations	-0.060	0.354***	0.853***	0.361***	1.241***	0.087	-0.049	0.340***	0.112	0.386**	0.253**	0.268***	-0.509**
	0.114	*0.132*	*0.145*	*0.123*	*0.089*	*0.162*	*0.088*	*0.101*	*0.147*	*0.179*	*0.117*	*0.101*	*0.205*
SECTOR OF OCCUPATION (reference category: private)													
Public	-0.134*	-0.301***	-0.369***	-0.190*	0.044	-0.102	-0.290***	0.022	0.001	-0.259***	-0.181**	-0.358***	-0.351***
	0.069	*0.100*	*0.105*	*0.098*	*0.068*	*0.106*	*0.079*	*0.080*	*0.094*	*0.096*	*0.073*	*0.072*	*0.127*
MAIN ACTIVITY (reference category: agriculture)													
Industry	0.381***	0.504***	0.046	0.881***	0.598***	0.761***	0.998***	0.504***	0.610***	0.245**	0.797***	0.263***	0.002
	0.091	*0.112*	*0.121*	*0.119*	*0.081*	*0.138*	*0.086*	*0.097*	*0.136*	*0.115*	*0.097*	*0.073*	*0.155*
Services	0.278***	0.370***	0.001	0.733***	0.455***	0.611***	0.644***	0.246***	0.606***	-0.019	0.625***	0.041	-0.032
	0.069	*0.094*	*0.105*	*0.104*	*0.075*	*0.118*	*0.072*	*0.086*	*0.125*	*0.092*	*0.082*	*0.069*	*0.102*
Constant	-1.201***	-3.918***	-2.212***	-0.536	-3.080***	-1.998***	-3.241***	-2.364***	-2.812***	-2.576***	-1.452***	-3.132***	-3.732***
	0.373	*0.560*	*0.538*	*0.440*	*0.368*	*0.516*	*0.354*	*0.384*	*0.481*	*0.560*	*0.374*	*0.350*	*0.706*
Observations	7371	3959	8087	4897	9745	6360	8817	7242	4481	5498	6484	9019	3689

Logistic regressions; standard errors in italics
* Significant at 10%; ** Significant at 5%; *** Significant at 1%
Source: European Community Household Panel

Tab. 9 - Effects of selected independent variables on likelihood of experiencing *downward* occupational mobility in the EU-15 (country specific models, WAP, 1994-2001)

	NL	BE	FR	IE	IT	GR	ES	PT	AT	FI	UK	DE	LU
Age	0.069***	0.076***	0.023	-0.002	0.031	0.078***	0.083***	-0.019	0.060**	0.039	0.023	0.025	0.035
	0.020	*0.029*	*0.034*	*0.024*	*0.019*	*0.027*	*0.018*	*0.018*	*0.026*	*0.032*	*0.020*	*0.019*	*0.044*
Agesq	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.001**	0.000	-0.001**	-0.001***	-0.001***	0.000	-0.001***	-0.001	-0.001**	-0.000*	-0.001
	0.000	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.001*
Exposure	0.265***	0.365***	0.269***	0.419***	0.255***	0.229***	0.383***	0.321***	0.309***	0.184***	0.294***	0.322***	0.121***
	0.014	*0.022*	*0.026*	*0.020*	*0.015*	*0.021*	*0.014*	*0.017*	*0.024*	*0.033*	*0.017*	*0.019*	*0.032*
Female	-0.374***	-0.286***	-0.187**	-0.174**	-0.419***	-0.325***	-0.409***	0.018	-0.358***	-0.157*	-0.143**	-0.195***	-0.729***
	0.056	*0.076*	*0.092*	*0.080*	*0.054*	*0.078*	*0.054*	*0.055*	*0.080*	*0.090*	*0.059*	*0.056*	*0.129*
EDUCATION (reference category: low)													
High	0.008	-0.063	-0.096	-0.109	-0.028	0.102	0.251***	-0.078	-0.011	0.204	0.065	-0.058	-0.443**
	0.085	*0.103*	*0.123*	*0.119*	*0.106*	*0.120*	*0.074*	*0.135*	*0.169*	*0.128*	*0.063*	*0.091*	*0.220*
Medium	-0.038	0.101	-0.009	0.088	-0.067	0.015	0.069	0.118	0.024	-0.210*	-0.044	-0.078	0.009
	0.058	*0.091*	*0.096*	*0.082*	*0.060*	*0.088*	*0.066*	*0.084*	*0.097*	*0.111*	*0.084*	*0.066*	*0.124*
HOUSEHOLD TYPE (reference category: single)													
Single parent	-0.154	-0.108	-0.073	-0.008	0.062	-0.053	0.099	-0.042	-0.081	-0.166	0.014	0.248*	-0.295
	0.157	*0.187*	*0.192*	*0.216*	*0.149*	*0.217*	*0.154*	*0.193*	*0.185*	*0.224*	*0.136*	*0.132*	*0.259*
Couple no children	-0.143*	0.013	-0.137	0.033	-0.016	-0.061	0.314**	0.039	-0.260*	0.041	0.103	-0.059	-0.128
	0.086	*0.147*	*0.151*	*0.209*	*0.138*	*0.206*	*0.146*	*0.184*	*0.157*	*0.146*	*0.102*	*0.096*	*0.205*
Couple with children	-0.369***	-0.167	-0.338***	-0.002	0.007	-0.175	0.014	-0.001	-0.07	-0.014	0.024	0.026	-0.199
	0.081	*0.129*	*0.131*	*0.178*	*0.117*	*0.176*	*0.130*	*0.169*	*0.133*	*0.135*	*0.095*	*0.085*	*0.177*
Other	-0.656*	-0.335	0.17	-0.013	0.134	-0.14	0.042	0.153	-0.117	-0.3	0.113	0.115	-0.036
	0.375	*0.241*	*0.209*	*0.206*	*0.139*	*0.193*	*0.142*	*0.175*	*0.158*	*0.322*	*0.135*	*0.144*	*0.215*
OCCUPATION OF FIRST JOB (reference category: clerks)													
Managers, senior officials	0.181*	0.730***	0.775***	0.829***	1.054***	0.439***	0.555***	0.804***	0.148	0.256	0.208**	0.816***	0.384
	0.099	*0.167*	*0.195*	*0.150*	*0.144*	*0.145*	*0.115*	*0.134*	*0.170*	*0.174*	*0.095*	*0.126*	*0.247*
Professionals	-0.095	-0.014	0.056	-0.267*	0.298**	-0.484***	-0.884***	-0.204	0.203	-0.400**	-0.195*	-0.016	-0.130
	0.096	*0.121*	*0.202*	*0.156*	*0.119*	*0.174*	*0.170*	*0.196*	*0.173*	*0.104*	*0.104*	*0.111*	*0.278*
Technicians	0.104	0.829***	0.137	0.579***	0.778***	0.751***	0.504***	0.518***	0.394***	0.340**	0.385***	0.207**	-0.034
	0.084	*0.119*	*0.152*	*0.149*	*0.092*	*0.165*	*0.105*	*0.119*	*0.123*	*0.150*	*0.098*	*0.086*	*0.194*
Service and sale workers	-0.179*	0.388***	0.311**	-0.235*	0.416***	0.502***	-0.102	0.283***	0.206*	0.230	-0.115	0.162*	0.349*
	0.097	*0.131*	*0.154*	*0.134*	*0.093*	*0.133*	*0.093*	*0.102*	*0.123*	*0.168*	*0.093*	*0.096*	*0.200*
Skilled agricultural workers	0.106	0.114	0.034	-0.323*	0.555***	-0.473***	0.328**	0.207*	-0.763***	-0.272	0.203	0.002	-0.303
	0.224	*0.362*	*0.256*	*0.190*	*0.145*	*0.171*	*0.131*	*0.117*	*0.202*	*0.206*	*0.302*	*0.244*	*0.380*
Craft and trade workers	-0.804***	0.014	0.24	-0.178	0.06	-0.117	-0.379***	-0.214**	-0.522***	-0.071	-0.237**	-0.494***	-0.480**
	0.125	*0.150*	*0.167*	*0.155*	*0.093*	*0.152*	*0.101*	*0.109*	*0.143*	*0.184*	*0.117*	*0.096*	*0.224*
Machine operators	0.327**	0.581***	0.515***	0.078	0.961***	0.429***	-0.124	0.231*	0.056	0.146	0.073	0.125	0.670***
	0.131	*0.171*	*0.161*	*0.151*	*0.107*	*0.160*	*0.114*	*0.125*	*0.165*	*0.192*	*0.118*	*0.106*	*0.214*
Elementary occupations	0.214*	-0.105	1.015***	0.340***	0.532***	0.741***	-0.038	0.568***	0.386***	0.714***	0.396***	0.282***	0.357*
	0.115	*0.134*	*0.157*	*0.131*	*0.094*	*0.157*	*0.090*	*0.100*	*0.146*	*0.180*	*0.116*	*0.103*	*0.206*
SECTOR OF OCCUPATION (reference category: private)													
Public	-0.086	-0.254**	-0.427***	-0.308***	-0.244***	-0.274**	-0.297***	-0.191**	0.094	-0.449***	-0.242***	-0.547***	-0.186
	0.070	*0.099*	*0.120*	*0.104*	*0.071*	*0.108*	*0.080*	*0.081*	*0.095*	*0.108*	*0.074*	*0.077*	*0.151*
MAIN ACTIVITY (reference category: agriculture)													
Industry	0.442***	0.505***	0.054	0.690***	0.533***	0.554***	1.032***	0.458***	0.725***	0.446***	0.707***	0.252***	-0.254
	0.092	*0.112*	*0.136*	*0.123*	*0.083*	*0.134*	*0.087*	*0.096*	*0.141*	*0.125*	*0.098*	*0.074*	*0.190*
Services	0.226***	0.456***	0.06	0.628***	0.385***	0.298***	0.686***	0.336***	0.619***	0.217**	0.563***	0.099	0.104
	0.070	*0.093*	*0.117*	*0.109*	*0.077*	*0.115*	*0.074*	*0.084*	*0.130*	*0.104*	*0.083*	*0.071*	*0.122*
Constant	-2.691***	-3.978***	-3.349***	-2.911***	-3.386***	-4.368***	-4.479***	-2.450***	-3.749***	-3.182***	-2.763***	-3.264***	-2.279***
	0.383	*0.559*	*0.599*	*0.469*	*0.383*	*0.543*	*0.363*	*0.378*	*0.500*	*0.624*	*0.380*	*0.362*	*0.814*
Observations	7371	3959	8087	4897	9745	6360	8817	7242	4481	5498	6484	9019	3689

Logistic rgressions; standard errors in italics
* Significant at 10%; ** Significant at 5%; *** Significant at 1%
Source: European Community Household Panel

Tab.10 - Job mobility: proportion of individuals working with the same employer from less than one year by gender in the EU-25 (cell %)

COUNTRY OF RESIDENCE	1995			2000			2005		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
BE	11.0	9.6	10.2	14.7	12.8	13.6	12.7	10.8	11.6
DK	24.6	20.9	22.5	25.6	20.8	23.1	22.0	19.6	20.7
EL	9.5	7.8	8.4	11.2	8.9	9.8	8.7	7.3	7.9
ES	31.6	26.3	28.1	24.4	18.9	21.0	24.0	20.0	21.6
FR	13.8	13.4	13.5	15.8	15.7	15.7	13.8	13.1	13.4
IT	17.5	12.0	14.1	12.8	10.1	11.1	12.3	10.0	10.9
LU	13.4	8.0	9.9	13.5	10.3	11.6	10.9	8.9	9.7
NL	15.2	11.8	13.2	24.0	18.2	20.5	7.9	7.1	7.4
AT	11.9	10.3	11.0	4.0	3.1	3.5	14.9	13.6	14.2
PT	16.9	10.4	10.6	13.7	13.3	13.5	11.5	10.8	11.1
FI	16.9	15.5	16.2	22.9	20.4	21.6	21.4	19.2	20.2
SE	12.9	15.3	14.1	15.8	15.6	15.7	17.5	17.2	17.4
UK	19.8	16.2	17.8	20.6	18.1	19.2	19.1	17.0	18.0
EU15	17.7	15.9	16.7	20.1	17.0	18.3	16.4	14.4	15.3
CZ							11.8	10.1	10.8
EE				17.4	18.7	18.1	14.5	18.8	16.6
CY				20.6	15.3	17.5	17.6	13.0	15.0
LV							16.2	17.3	16.8
LT				12.3	15.5	13.9	11.5	15.8	13.7
HU				11.7	11.6	11.6	10.9	11.8	11.4
MT				17.0	10.7	12.6			
PL				12.9	15.3	14.2	12.6	13.7	13.2
SI				11.4	12.2	11.8	13.3	13.3	13.3
SK							13.0	12.5	12.7
EU10				12.8	14.6	13.8	12.5	13.0	12.8
EU25				18.0	16.3	17.1	15.6	14.1	14.8

Source: Labour Force Survey

Tab. 11 - Job mobility: proportion of individuals working with the same employer from less than one year by age in the EU-25 (cell %)

COUNTRY OF RESIDENCE	1995						2000						2005					
	15-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	Total	15-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	Total	15-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	Total
BE	39.8	12.4	5.8	3.2	1.3	10.2	52.5	17.5	7.9	4.3	2.6	13.6	47.8	15.8	7.9	4.2	1.9	11.6
DK	51.2	29.3	15.5	9.0	4.8	22.5	54.5	29.2	17.2	11.5	7.6	23.0	50.5	27.0	17.6	11.3	6.6	20.7
EL	30.4	11.7	5.3	3.8	2.1	8.4	31.5	13.4	6.2	4.1	3.0	9.8	28.0	10.7	5.7	3.7	3.4	7.8
ES	71.8	37.1	17.7	13.7	7.8	28.1	54.6	26.6	14.0	9.0	6.3	20.9	54.4	28.1	16.2	10.7	6.5	21.6
FR	50.2	16.9	8.8	5.9	2.9	13.5	56.7	21.3	10.1	6.4	3.6	15.7	48.4	17.2	9.7	5.9	4.5	13.4
IT	32.9	11.9	6.0	3.5	2.7	9.4	38.4	15.3	7.6	4.4	3.7	11.1	36.4	16.3	8.1	5.0	3.3	10.9
LU	29.9	13.0	5.3	3.2	1.4	9.9	40.4	15.9	7.8	3.4	0.5	11.6	41.9	12.7	7.0	4.0	1.8	9.7
NL	33.7	15.3	8.0	4.6	2.8	13.2	53.4	23.9	14.7	9.9	8.0	20.5	28.9	9.9	5.2	2.8	1.5	7.4
AT	27.8	12.1	6.7	4.7	2.6	11.0	17.3	2.7	0.8	0.5	0.3	3.5	38.8	17.8	10.0	5.4	4.3	14.2
PT	31.8	13.5	7.2	5.0	2.9	10.6	40.2	17.9	9.8	5.5	3.1	13.5	35.2	15.7	8.5	5.3	3.3	11.1
FI	56.4	23.8	11.3	7.6	2.9	16.2	67.6	27.6	14.8	9.5	5.9	21.6	65.4	28.1	13.5	9.7	5.6	20.2
SE	45.3	20.3	10.2	6.5	3.9	14.1	49.4	21.5	13.4	7.5	4.7	15.7	58.8	24.2	12.2	8.3	5.1	17.3
UK	43.4	19.4	13.3	9.3	7.7	17.8	48.4	21.5	15.1	10.3	7.6	19.2	46.6	21.0	13.7	10.1	8.0	18.0
EU15	42.2	18.6	10.3	6.9	4.7	16.7	46.2	20.1	11.4	7.4	5.2	18.3	44.1	19.5	10.8	7.0	5.0	15.3
CZ													36.8	12.4	8.2	5.6	6.4	10.8
EE							45.8	24.9	13.4	11.7	8.1	18.1	49.8	20.6	10.7	11.8	5.9	16.6
CY							51.2	21.0	12.4	8.8	7.7	17.5	45.2	17.8	12.0	7.9	6.7	15.0
LV													50.7	19.4	10.6	11.5	8.9	16.8
LT							34.9	17.3	11.9	8.7	6.2	13.9	38.4	16.8	12.6	9.6	3.7	13.7
HU							29.4	13.9	8.9	5.6	4.5	11.6	36.7	14.3	9.1	6.9	4.0	11.4
MT							34.1	10.6	6.9	4.1	3.6	12.6						
PL							44.7	18.0	10.0	7.3	6.2	14.2	43.9	17.8	8.0	6.4	3.9	13.2
SI							43.7	14.3	7.2	4.1	3.5	11.8	44.3	18.4	9.4	5.2	5.4	13.3
SK													35.6	14.1	9.0	6.8	10.1	12.7
EU10							40.6	17.2	9.9	7.1	5.9	13.8	41.5	16.2	8.8	6.7	5.2	12.8
EU25							45.6	19.8	11.3	7.4	5.3	17.1	43.8	18.9	10.5	7.0	5.0	14.8

Source: Labour Force Survey
Missing data exceed 10% for Germany (1995), Luxembourg (1995), Finland (1995), Austria (2000), Ireland (2005) and Netherlands (2005)

Tab. 12 - Job mobility: proportion of individuals working with the same employer from less than one year by education in the EU-25 (cell %)

COUNTRY OF RESIDENCE	1995				2000				2005			
	Low	Medium	High	Total	Low	Medium	High	Total	Low	Medium	High	Total
BE	8.9	10.9	10.7	10.2	12.7	15.0	13.0	13.6	11.5	11.9	11.4	11.6
DK	30.7	21.9	17.5	22.5	29.0	23.0	17.4	22.9	29.4	19.3	17.8	20.7
EL	6.6	11.2	8.9	8.4	8.0	12.0	9.3	9.8	7.5	8.5	7.2	7.8
ES	29.3	30.0	23.1	28.1	22.1	21.1	18.6	20.9	23.2	23.4	18.0	21.6
FR	12.9	13.7	14.2	13.5	15.4	15.7	16.1	15.7	13.6	14.0	12.4	13.4
IT	9.5	9.6	7.8	9.4	10.4	11.6	11.1	11.0	10.6	11.0	11.5	10.9
LU	10.2	9.6	9.6	9.9	12.7	11.2	10.9	11.6	10.1	8.8	10.8	9.7
NL					24.7	19.1	17.9	20.4	8.8	7.0	6.9	7.4
AT	12.0	10.7	9.7	11.0	8.0	2.4	2.5	3.5	19.4	13.9	10.7	14.2
PT	10.1	14.5	9.2	10.5	12.6	18.2	14.3	13.5	10.2	13.5	13.6	11.1
FI	13.0	18.7	14.8	16.2	23.7	24.9	15.7	21.6	25.1	23.6	13.1	20.2
SE	11.3	15.9	13.5	14.1	15.5	15.8	15.5	15.7	20.9	17.0	15.2	17.1
UK	18.7	18.2	15.6	17.8	17.1	20.9	17.2	19.3	15.8	19.1	16.6	18.0
EU15	16.1	17.8	14.2	16.7	17.6	19.1	17.7	18.3	15.8	14.8	14.5	15.3
CZ									15.9	10.8	8.8	10.8
EE					28.0	16.9	16.9	18.1	25.1	18.2	11.9	16.6
CY					18.5	18.0	15.8	17.5	16.1	14.6	14.4	15.0
LV									28.5	16.8	10.4	16.8
LT					12.1	15.9	12.4	13.9	17.8	15.0	9.9	13.7
HU					14.8	11.8	7.8	11.6	16.9	11.2	8.2	11.4
MT					12.4	13.4	12.6	12.6				
PL					11.9	15.0	12.6	14.2	13.8	13.4	12.3	13.2
SI					7.8	13.0	12.2	11.8	10.8	14.0	13.2	13.3
SK									17.1	12.4	12.8	12.7
EU10					12.7	14.5	12.0	13.8	15.5	12.9	11.2	12.8
EU25					16.3	15.8	14.5	15.7	15.8	14.4	14.0	14.8

Source: Labour Force Survey
Missing data exceed 10% for Germany (1995), Luxembourg (1995), Finland (1995), Austria (2000), Ireland (2005) and Netherlands (2005)

Tab. 13 - Effects of selected independent variables on job mobility in the EU-15 (only employees, 2005)

	B
Age	-0.159***
	0.003
Agesq	0.001***
	0.000
Female	0.088***
	0.014
EDUCATION (reference category: low level)	
High	0.062*
	0.020
Medium	-0.028
	0.016
OCCUPATIONAL GROUP (reference category: clerks)	
Managers, senior officials	-0.248***
	0.031
Professionals	0.118***
	0.025
Technicians	-0.009
	0.025
Service and sale workers	0.432***
	0.023
Skilled agricultural workers	-0.803**
	0.257
Craft and trade workers	0.339***
	0.023
Machine operators	0.038
	0.030
Elementary occupations	0.582***
	0.024
MAIN ACTIVITY (reference category: agriculture)	
Industry	-0.222**
	0.047
Low qualified services	0.080
	0.047
Mid-high qualified services	-0.072
	0.046
COUNTRY (reference category: Italy)	
DK	0.651***
	0.044
NL	-0.676***
	0.033
BE	-0.271**
	0.043
FR	0.050
	0.030
EL	-0.349***
	0.036
ES	0.341***
	0.025
PT	-0.259**
	0.038
AT	-0.162**
	0.035
FI	0.455***
	0.034
UK	0.319***
	0.026
SE	0.265**
	0.031
LU	-0.553***
	0.053
Constant	2.399
	0.076
Observations	210,704

Logistic regression; standard errors in italics
* Significant at 10%; ** Significant at 5%; *** Significant at 1%
Source: Labour Force Survey

Tab. 14 - Median job tenure (in months) by gender and age classes in the EU-15 (only employed)

Country	Men				Women			
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59
Denmark	23	44	97	180	20	44	84	168
Netherlands	23	60	132	192	26	48	72	132
Belgium	26	96	180	228	26	84	180	228
France	23	84	180	204	22	84	156	204
Ireland	23	84	180	192	23	50	65	72
Italy	28	81	192	228	29	72	180	228
Greece	25	68	180	216	23	60	144	180
Spain	22	48	156	192	19	45	120	180
Portugal	27	84	156	204	32	79	144	204
Austria	34	96	192	216	37	66	132	192
Finland	21	58	144	204	17	56	144	192
Sweden	24	60	144	216	24	72	132	204
Germany	24	53	84	180	26	39	73	132
Luxembourg	24	30	31	40	27	25	27	21
Uk	15	20	32	34	15	22	29	53
Total	24	64	156	192	24	57	108	180

Source: European Community Household Panel

Tab. 15- Effects of selected independent variables on (log) job tenure in the EU-15 (1994-2001)

	β
Age	0.177***
	0.004
Agesq	-0.002***
	0.000
Exposure	1.463***
	0.013
Female	-0.095***
	0.011
EDUCATION (reference category: low	
High	-0.056***
	0.016
Medium	0.066***
	0.013
HOUSEHOLD TYPOLOGY (reference category: single)	
Single parent	0.005
	0.025
Couple no child.	0.091***
	0.019
Couple with ch.	0.091***
	0.017
Other	0.053**
	0.023
SECTOR OF OCCUPATION (reference category: private)	
Public	0.349***
	0.012
OCCUPATION OF CURRENT JOB (reference category: clerks)	
Managers, senior officials	0
	0.022
Professionals	-0.043**
	0.020
Technicians	-0.013
	0.018
Service and sale workers	-0.098***
	0.019
Skilled agricultural workers	0.262***
	0.031
Craft and trade workers	-0.019
	0.020
Machine operators	-0.035
	0.022
Elementary occupations	-0.354***
	0.022
MAIN ACTIVITY (reference category: agriculture)	
Industry	0.057***
	0.021
Services	-0.079***
	0.019
COUNTRY (reference category: Italy)	
DK	-0.483***
	0.027
NL	-0.220***
	0.024
BE	0.065**
	0.028
FR	-0.017
	0.022
IE	-0.219***
	0.025
EL	-0.127***
	0.024
ES	-0.278***
	0.022
PT	0.047**
	0.023
AT	0.036
	0.026
FI	-0.253***
	0.026
UK	-1.014***
	0.024
SE	-0.027
	0.031
DE	-0.452***
	0.023
LU	-0.250***
	0.042
Constant	-0.313***
	0.074
Observations	81612
R-Squared	0.24

OLS regression models; standard errors in italics
* Significant at 10%; ** Significant at 5%; *** Significant at 1%
Source: European Community Household Panel

Tab. 16 - **Effects of selected independent variables on (log) job tenure in the EU-15 (country-specific models, 1994-2001)**

	DK	NL	BE	FR	IR	IT	EL	ES	PT	AT	FI	UK	LU
Age	0.143***	0.139***	0.265***	0.220***	0.214***	0.232***	0.222***	0.185***	0.199***	0.145***	0.173***	0.064***	0.173***
	0.017	*0.011*	*0.019*	*0.010*	*0.014*	*0.012*	*0.011*	*0.012*	*0.012*	*0.015*	*0.012*	*0.012*	*0.020*
Agesq	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.000***	-0.001***
	0.000	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*
Female	-0.052	-0.155***	0.011	-0.007	-0.229***	-0.038	-0.233***	-0.168***	-0.011	-0.121***	-0.020	-0.038	-0.168***
	0.048	*0.031*	*0.048*	*0.027*	*0.049*	*0.032*	*0.032*	*0.037*	*0.035*	*0.045*	*0.034*	*0.036*	*0.060*
EDUCATION (reference category: low level)													
High	-0.140*	-0.005	-0.156**	-0.054	0.010	-0.373***	0.058		-0.158**	-0.168*	-0.098*	-0.104**	-0.103
	0.075	*0.065*	*0.068*	*0.035*	*0.069*	*0.060*	*0.052*		*0.076*	*0.096*	*0.051*	*0.041*	*0.098*
Medium	0.015	0.198***	0.009	0.093***	0.223***	-0.019	0.134***		-0.138***	0.005	-0.006	-0.108**	-0.102
	0.062	*0.051*	*0.061*	*0.032*	*0.052*	*0.036*	*0.039*		*0.051*	*0.059*	*0.044*	*0.048*	*0.075*
HOUSEHOLD TYPE (reference category: single)													
Single Parent	-0.252**	-0.051	-0.026	-0.031	-0.185	0.103	0.036	-0.039	-0.026	0.151	-0.100	-0.027	0.148
	0.114	*0.087*	*0.116*	*0.059*	*0.115*	*0.085*	*0.084*	*0.092*	*0.114*	*0.100*	*0.083*	*0.082*	*0.142*
Couple no children	0.104	0.129***	0.133	-0.030	0.048	0.040	0.116	0.042	0.008	0.159*	0.017	0.125**	0.267***
	0.068	*0.047*	*0.089*	*0.045*	*0.108*	*0.076*	*0.077*	*0.083*	*0.107*	*0.085*	*0.054*	*0.060*	*0.095*
Couple with children	0.141**	0.110**	0.215***	0.027	-0.037	0.056	0.159**	0.057	0.053	0.178**	0.072	0.058	0.069
	0.063	*0.045*	*0.076*	*0.039*	*0.089*	*0.066*	*0.064*	*0.074*	*0.098*	*0.071*	*0.051*	*0.056*	*0.086*
Other	-0.129	-0.008	0.300**	-0.099	-0.069	-0.006	0.136*	-0.061	0.012	0.253***	-0.085	-0.044	0.171
	0.163	*0.169*	*0.149*	*0.065*	*0.104*	*0.079*	*0.072*	*0.084*	*0.103*	*0.086*	*0.106*	*0.069*	*0.151*
OCCUPATION OF CURRRENT JOB (reference category: clerks)													
Managers, senior officials	-0.402***	0.095*	0.021	-0.125**	0.268***	0.141	0.110*	-0.007	-0.183**	-0.026	0.570***	-0.252***	-0.278**
	0.098	*0.052*	*0.102*	*0.056*	*0.093*	*0.090*	*0.064*	*0.082*	*0.083*	*0.098*	*0.063*	*0.057*	*0.138*
Professionals	-0.253***	-0.131***	0.127*	-0.086*	0.133	0.063	-0.040	-0.094	-0.240**	-0.221*	0.381***	-0.212***	-0.339***
	0.081	*0.050*	*0.076*	*0.052*	*0.085*	*0.063*	*0.060*	*0.074*	*0.094*	*0.113*	*0.054*	*0.060*	*0.112*
Technicians	-0.362***	0.023	-0.007	0.003	-0.072	-0.121**	-0.095	-0.061	-0.110	-0.021	0.431***	-0.158***	-0.035
	0.070	*0.046*	*0.076*	*0.041*	*0.089*	*0.054*	*0.067*	*0.070*	*0.074*	*0.071*	*0.053*	*0.059*	*0.088*
Service and sale workers	-0.429***	-0.115*	-0.172*	-0.104**	-0.008	-0.155***	-0.261***	-0.234***	-0.372***	-0.174**	0.492***	0.059	-0.077
	0.080	*0.059*	*0.089*	*0.045*	*0.081*	*0.053*	*0.057*	*0.067*	*0.067*	*0.071*	*0.061*	*0.059*	*0.106*
Skilled agricultural workers	0.251	-0.016	0.065	0.252***	0.011	0.192*	0.688***	0.361**	-0.169	0.890***	0.716***	-0.099	-0.526*
	0.169	*0.150*	*0.228*	*0.088*	*0.161*	*0.103*	*0.148*	*0.144*	*0.121*	*0.207*	*0.071*	*0.182*	*0.273*
Craft and trade workers	-0.171*	-0.027	-0.138	-0.051	-0.090	-0.064	-0.034	-0.314***	-0.135*	0.034	0.440***	0.030	-0.012
	0.092	*0.064*	*0.095*	*0.048*	*0.094*	*0.055*	*0.065*	*0.074*	*0.070*	*0.081*	*0.062*	*0.070*	*0.098*
Machine operators	-0.351***	-0.095	-0.083	-0.010	-0.072	-0.195***	-0.055	-0.227***	-0.317***	-0.204**	0.575***	0.147**	0.037
	0.099	*0.073*	*0.111*	*0.050*	*0.093*	*0.066*	*0.070*	*0.080*	*0.079*	*0.099*	*0.069*	*0.074*	*0.115*
Elementary occupation	-0.657***	-0.232***	-0.212**	-0.314***	-0.558***	-0.479***	-0.596***	-0.741***	-0.488***	-0.456***	0.290***	-0.002	-0.105
	0.094	*0.076*	*0.094*	*0.054*	*0.097*	*0.063*	*0.071*	*0.073*	*0.068*	*0.091*	*0.079*	*0.082*	*0.126*
SECTOR OF OCCUPATION (reference category: private)													
Public	-0.013	0.207***	0.334***	0.497***	0.442***	0.213***	0.432***		0.431***	0.505***	0.250***	0.420***	0.501***
	0.051	*0.035*	*0.054*	*0.029*	*0.055*	*0.039*	*0.039*		*0.047*	*0.053*	*0.037*	*0.042*	*0.071*
MAIN ACTIVITY (reference category: agriculture)													
Industry	0.293***	0.284***	-0.170*	0.153**	-0.567***	0.222***	0.515***		-0.171	0.722***	-0.503***	0.105	0.507***
	0.073	*0.051*	*0.091*	*0.069*	*0.134*	*0.073*	*0.146*		*0.105*	*0.201*	*0.049*	*0.085*	*0.110*
Services	0.461***	0.072*	-0.358***	-0.061	-0.821***	0.154**	0.450***		-0.251**	0.573***	-0.649***	-0.030	0.195*
	0.060	*0.040*	*0.082*	*0.066*	*0.132*	*0.069*	*0.144*		*0.102*	*0.197*	*0.036*	*0.080*	*0.106*
Constant	-0.295	0.074	-1.933***	-1.335***	-0.388	-1.591***	-1.831***		-0.136	-0.335	-0.453*	1.339***	-0.934**
	0.324	*0.220*	*0.368*	*0.194*	*0.305*	*0.244*	*0.261*		*0.261*	*0.342*	*0.237*	*0.237*	*0.377*
Observations	3834	6790	3505	7455	5180	8136	5759		6570	4181	5120	5592	7108
R-squared	0.25	0.24	0.26	0.39	0.24	0.26	0.33		0.22	0.23	0.38	0.11	0.10

OLS regression models; standard errors in italics
* Significant at 10%; ** Significant at 5%; *** Significant at 1%
Source: European Community Household Panel