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**Abstract**

*Modern labour market imposes flexibility as an essential prerequisite for success but organizational productivity depends mostly on its employees who usually strive for security. This paper examines the organization of working time and that which is considered “normal exertion” in eight continental counties of Croatia in order to determine work intensity, the most frequent model of working time organization, the position of employees, as well as the position of Croatian labour legislation in terms of contemporary challenges and trends.*
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Introduction

The EU supranational guidelines as regards working time (Europe 2020) should be taken as a signal to aim for a more flexible labour market at a national level. It is clear that in developing and transition economies, interest in working time flexibility, its benefits and risks, and the most effective ways to realize it, has emerged more recently than in industrialized countries (Lee et al., 2007:124). In the new EU Member States, for example, part-time work is limited, mainly involuntary, and taken up primarily by the retired, the disabled, young entrants to the labour market, and the unemployed, who receive social security payments but are in need of additional income (Vaughan-Whitehead, ed., 2005, in: Lee et al., 2007:128). Croatian labour market reforms must follow the mainstream economics call for flexibilisation of European labour markets. There is increasing emphasis on labour market flexibility aimed at increased employment, but also at improved conditions and equal rights of workers in atypical, or non-standard, employment arrangements. Fixed-term employment patterns allow employers to cut costs and have more flexibility in planning their operations. This in turn creates pressure on the labour market, which is marked by almost perfect competition: it is much easier to dismiss and to hire new people. In Croatia, reforms of labour legislation are painfully slow, there is worrisome political turmoil and lack of consensus about urgent issues, and experts keep warning about labour market inflexibility (in both narrow and broader senses) and relatively lower productivity in comparison to the CEEC countries, and particularly to the most developed EU members.

This paper explores the theoretical and empirical aspects of working time and its organization, especially in non-traditional work practices, and determines the prevalent patterns of working time organization in business practices in eight counties of continental Croatia. The paper proposes a measurement approach for new ways of working research and synthesizes the existing literature on work time and identifies some key prerequisites and restrictions that should be taken into account when measuring the impacts of working time on labour productivity. At the end of the paper there is a summary of key results of this particular study, a summary of the issues covered here, and implications for future research.

Why labour productivity matters?

Growth in labour productivity is a key aspect of economic performance and a change instigator in the rising standards of living in a country (OECD, 2013a, 2013b; Freeman, 2008; Gomez-Salvador et al., 2006; Pilat, 1996). Labour productivity is a straightforward measure of the efficiency of engaged labour on the output (goods or services produced) or a measure of real added value per one hour of work.Comparisons of productivity growth are a standard tool of economic analysis, but comparisons of productivity levels are less frequently made, although they can indicate the relative standing of a country and yield useful insights in the potential for further productivity growth and catch-up (Pilat, 1996). At the microeconomic level, when only labour is considered as a production factor, this is a single-factor productivity measure designating the productivity of the labour employed. In this case, labour productivity is a key indicator of company performance, given that it has direct influence on the production costs, which determine cost-effectiveness and profitability (Avelini Holjevac and Vrtodušić Hrgović, 2012). Comparisons of labour productivity on a micro-level are much more difficult than in the case of examining the productivity of entire national economies. It should be noted that there is a range of other productivity measures, which should be considered in combination, rather than come to conclusions based on a single measure. The complexity of measuring methodology becomes even more evident when one reviews the literature on this topic. A number of authors have analysed the interdependence of particular sectoral factors, intersectoral differences and their impact on total productivity and labour productivity (Lucidi and Kleinknecht, 2009; Gomez-Salvador et al., 2006; Van der Wiel, 2001; Lowe, 1995). Apart from this macroeconomic approach, there are numerous studies that investigated the impact of the relative cost of labour (Lowe, 1995), of FDI (spillover) and MNEs (ownership and spillover) (Oulton, 1998; Doms and Jensen, 1998; Davies and Lyons, 1991) and the impact of work intensity on productivity (Roca-Puig et al., 2012). The microeconomic approach is more directed towards the relationship between Human Resource Management and productivity (Bloom and Van Reenen, 2010), the impact of working time and job insecurity on labour productivity (Dekker and van der Veen, 2015; Osuna, 2014; Laihonen et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2007; De Cuyper and De Witte, H., 2005; De Witte and Näswall, 2003; Tippins and Stroh, 1993), job satisfaction (Rollinson et al., 1998), and even differences in labour productivity between the public and private sectors (Vaughan-Whitehead, 2012; Lee et al., 2007; Moreton, 1999). Since this paper is focused on working time and working time organization as important factors of labour productivity, the following chapter will deal with the basic notions and trends that explain the meaning of “normal exertion”.

Working time and working time organization: new (or old) challenges

During the twentieth century the number of working hours decreased, primarily due to increasing wages, economic growth as well as growing roles of unions and collective bargaining. Estimates of annual working time put forward by Maddison (in: Boulin et al. 2006:14) trace the path covered since the early twentieth century: from roughly 2,600 hours per person in the years before the Second World War to between 1,400 and 1,800 hours now, depending on the country. Lee et al. (2007:16) provide an overview of weekly working hours that were considered “normal” in the period from 1967 to 2005, showing a decreasing trend in the number of working hours, from the usual 48 hours per week in 1967 toward the 40-hour working week in many of the most developed countries since 2005. The proportion of workers with long working week (more than 48 hours per week) ih the EU27 has been reduced: it fell from 15% in 2000 to 12% in 2010 (Eurofound, 2012). However, others may argue that the 48-hour working week and the 40- hour working week are no more than ‘paper tigers’, as they are stipulated in the law but their enforcement in practice is weak. Concerns are often expressed in phrases such as ‘time squeeze’, ‘time poverty’ and ‘karoshi’ (death from overwork) (Lee et al., 2007:2). Also as emphasized by Galić and Plećaš (2012:6), paradoxically, during a recession, the government, employers and the whole society expect from employees to show more work engagement and put in more effort, in many cases for lower rewards and in more unfavourable working conditions in comparison to the time before crisis.

An interesting observation was made by, for example, Carver (1936) who emphasizes that “a man who works short hours generally spends more money than a man who works long hours”. Family-friendly working time, flexi-time, informal flexi-time, non-standard working time, unusual working hours, part-time work, but also weekend work – all these terms have been joined together into “something” called flexibility and they are considered to be so-called atypical forms of work. Flexibility is most readily achieved by fostering an environment of maximum competition. A key element in creating this environment is ﬂexible labour markets. Many working people, regrettably, equate labour market ﬂexibility with job insecurity. Some authors emphasize that flexible working time negatively affects job satisfaction, the level of worker’s commitment to the company, and work productivity, whereas it confirms the “job stress” theory (Sverke et al., 2000, u: De Witte and Näswall, 2003). However, a study by De Witte and Näswall (2003) on the sample of 1,120 workers in three Belgian regions confirmed the following: in none of the samples was flexible working time shown to be a “stress factor” resulting in the lower level of commitment to the company. On the contrary, in four out of eight tests conducted during the research, workers with flexible working time achieved better business results. Flexible working time arrangements such as flexitime and compressed work-weeks have also shown positive effects on employee attitudes and morale. Some studies indicate that perhaps the most important factor is not the working time arrangement per se, but rather workers’ ability to choose their arrangement – often referred to as “time sovereignty” – that shows the strongest impact on employees’ job performance, and hence on firms’ productivity (Boulin, et. al., 2006:431). Osuna (2014) emphasizes the scenario in which the full flexibility scenario preserves employment and generates a substantial increase in productivity (2.6%). Bahrijarević-Šiber (1999:702) emphasizes that flexible working time has many advantages, such as flexibility of working parents or higher productivity due to undisturbed work, but there are also disadvantages, such as, lack of supervision during working hours and workers forgetting obligations towards the company. According to data gathered by the OECD on the average annual number of hours actually worked per worker in the period from 2009 to 2013, a decrease in work intensity may be observed. Research shows that high work intensity is related to worker’s health, work safety, but also with sovereignty of workers (Eurofound, 2012; 2009). As pointed out by Bilić (2009: 922), the advantages of a secure job are felt by both employers and employees. For employers, this means that workers are there at his disposal, capable of doing the job as requested. The skills acquired at work are preserved, and the tasks performed by workers can be adapted to current market needs. This kind of stability has a positive impact on production volumes, investments in human capital and worker motivation. Nevertheless, stable employment does not necessarily mean indefinite work contract – stability can be manifested in good interpersonal relations, high quality internal HR management, awards and promotions, or on a macro level, in stable macroeconomic environment with a good entrepreneurial climate and fully functional institutions.

Garnero et al. (2014) find a positive gap between the added-value and wage effect for female full-timers and both male and female long part-timers, but the origin of these gaps differs: for the group of male workers in long part-time jobs it is related to increases in firm productivity without increasing hourly wages, while changes in the share of female full-timers and long part-timers are associated with lower wages without decreasing productivity. Regarding employees’ control over overtime work, Beckers, et al. (2008) found that in original sample of 1612 overtime workers, approximately 15% worked overtime exclusively involuntarily and about 20% of these involuntary overtime workers did not receive rewards for their extra work hours. Moreover, about 30% of the respondents worked overtime exclusively voluntarily, and 50% of these voluntary overtime workers were not rewarded for their overtime. The results of this study imply that moderate overtime work does not have to be a major problem as long as employees have the freedom to decide whether or not to work overtime. The negative effects of involuntary overtime work may, to some extent, be reduced by fair compensation for extra work efforts. Stated differently, this study shows that proper working conditions (e.g., high work time control and/or fair rewards) are not only vital during contractual work hours but also (and maybe even more important) during overtime work. Good working conditions can be achieved through legislative initiatives as well as constructive initiatives from the employer. With respect to the former, every EU country has now issued general legislation on maximum work hours and minimum rest breaks. Work time laws in EU countries all follow the general European Work time Directive, stating that the average working week (including overtime, as calculated over a 17-week reference period) should not exceed 48 hours per week. Furthermore, workers should have non work periods of at least 11 hours per day, and 35 hours a week. From the viewpoint of worker protection, such general regulations are important; however, they more or less ignore the complex nature of the relationship between overtime and well-being (Beckers et al., 2008).

**Data sources, methodological issues and empirical results**

The study of working time and work organization was carried out by means of a questionnaire whose formulation was based on numerous scientific resources in a related field. However, the questions in the questionnaire were primarily created based on a questionnaire of the Eurofound for the Fourth research carried out in 2005, intended to explore work conditions in Europe (EWCS) of employed and self-employed people with regard to key topics related to their work and employment in the EU27 states as well as in Norway, Croatia, Turkey, and Switzerland (Parent-Thirion et al., 2007:109, in: Burchell et al., 2007). In a structured questionnaire consisting of 15 pages, closed-ended questions were prepared with variable modalities and there were a certain number of dichotomous questions. The PAPI method was used, i.e. interviewing “face-to-face” at the respondent’s home. The selection of samples was entirely random, made in layers according to geographical regions and urban categories. The sample comprised of respondents from eight continental counties in the Republic of Croatia, who were guaranteed anonymity. The analyzed indicators were presented as aggregate results. The following counties were included: Vukovar-Srijem, Bjelovar-Bilogora, Brod-Posavina, Karlovac, Požega-Slavonija, Sisak-Moslavina, Virovitica-Podravina and Osijek-Baranja.

250 respondents were used as sample points with the aim of obtaining a minimal sample of 125 sampling units, resulting in gathering 194 sampling units (77.6%), which presents a very satisfactory rate of the gathered sampling units (see Appendix, Table 1.). As mentioned above, the sample consists of 194 people, 105 males (54.1%) and 89 females (45.9%). The respondents‘ age ranges from 18 to 63 years of age (M=39.24; SD=10.95), but most respondents belong to the age groups up to 30 years of age (28.9%) and from 41 to 50 years of age (33.5%). Most respondents stated secondary education (67.4%) as their education level, whereas 14% respondents completed a four-year college /university. In terms of the economic status, almost all respondents stated that they work for employers or that they are employees/self-employees (97.9%). Most respondents have monthly income up to the amount of average monthly salary in the Republic of Croatia (69.5%). Following the completion of the survey, the data from questionnaires were entered into SPSS database, and a detailed analysis was carried out by means of Statistical Package for Social Science, version 17.0. The importance of work intensity for employees was pointed out as well as the influence of overtime work on the employees. Questions were asked about the frequency of ten-day/hour work and results have shown that, according to the Croatian labour laws, overtime work is excessively present. Almost 92% of respondents stated that they work a ten-hour shift up to 10 times within a single month, whereas as much as 3% work ten-hour shifts almost daily. This is very worrisome information, particularly if considered together with frequent violation of employer’s obligations in terms of overtime work. However, when asked about the working time pattern they would prefer, respondents answered that they would like to work the same number of hours (60% of respondents), assuming that employers’ violation of overtime regulations was eliminated, whereas 20% of respondents stated that they would like to work no longer than full working time or a smaller number of working hours. Almost 44% of respondents work in shifts, confirming a high level of shift work, whereas 56% respondents answered that they do not work in shifts. As 44% respondents answered that they work in shifts, an interesting question was about the most common type of shifts. Respondents stated that they most often (45.2%) work rotating shifts. 41.7% of respondents stated that they work constant shifts (morning, afternoon or night shifts), and the smallest number of respondents, only 7.1%, stated that they work daily split shifts, which may indicate high level of absence from home.

Table 2 (see Appendix) shows answers to the question about working time complexity according to different variables and it can be concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in the complexity of working time schedule related to respondents’ educational level (*χ²=42.21, df=15, p<0.01*)***.*** The possibility for more sovereign organization of working time is growing with person’s educational level. Of 129 respondents with secondary school education, 79.1% of them claim that their working time schedule is defined by their organization and that they cannot make any changes to it, whereas people with a doctoral degree can independently organize up to 50% of their working time. A statistically significant difference in the complexity of working time schedule is detected in relation to the type of respondents’ job (*χ²=85.60, df=9, p<0.01*)**.** Namely, people with indefinite employment contract have more flexible organization of working time. Of 132 respondents having an indefinite employment contract, 83.3% of them claim that their working time schedule is defined by their organization and that they cannot make changes to it, whereas 6.8% of such permanent employees have flexible working time (*χ²=37.89, df=12, p<0.01*)*.* A conclusion can be made that this is a “more relaxed” model for employees, whereas this possibility is almost non-existent for workers with fixed-term contract (90% of workers with fixed-term contract or 100% of temporary workers), which is also confirmed by past research described in previous chapters.

A statistical difference was detected in terms of the ownership type (*χ²=25.85, df=9***,** *p<0.05*), pointing to higher flexibility of the private sector in comparison with the public sector. Namely, of 102 respondents working in the private sector, 66.7% of them claim that their working time schedule is defined by the organization and that they cannot make changes to it, whereas 19.6% of them claim that they define their own working hours. In public companies 88.5% of respondents claim that their working time schedule is defined by the organization and that they cannot make changes to it. There is a statistically significant difference in the complexity of working time schedule in terms of company size (*χ²=49.24, df=21, p<0.01*)*.*Micro companies are more flexible in working time organization. Of 26 respondents working in a company with 2 to 4 employees, 38.5% of them stated that they have a possibility of more flexible organization of working time. It is interesting to notice that in companies with 250 to 499 employees 20% of workers have the possibility for more flexible organization of working time, but this is not the case with companies having more than 500 employees. It would be interesting to additionally explore the reasons for these differences on a greater sample. Survey results focused on work intensity are given below (see Appendix, Table 3). Respondents were asked about the number of hours they work on their main job. There were significant differences determined in terms of the type of job (*χ²=69.26 df=15, p<0.01*), type of ownership (*χ²=57.68, df=35, p<0.05*)and a somewhat lower difference was detected in terms of company size (*χ²=29.04 df=15, p<0.01*). There is a statistically significant difference in weekly working hours, depending on the type of job**.** Of 167 respondents who are employed, 80.8% of them work from 31 to 50 hours per week, whereas this percentage is different for entrepreneurs. Namely, in the case of a self-employed person and employees it can be observed that working time organization from 31 to 50 hours is reported in 55.6%, and additional work (51 to 70 hours of work) is found in a significant percentage of 22.2%. A significant difference is detected between different types of employment. In terms of ownership, of 99 respondents working in the private sector, 71.7% of them work from 31 to 50 hours per week, whereas as much as 10.1% work from 51 to 70 hours per week (*χ²=29.04 df=15, p<0.01*)*.* The private sector therefore records a higher percentage of additional work (51 to 70 hours of work) in comparison with the public sector. Similarly as with conclusions about the flexibility of working time organization, micro-entrepreneurs and companies with 250-499 employees have recorded increased, more intensive work, compared to other companies.

**Final Remarks**

A frequent consequence of neoliberal ideology and insecurity frequently is a crisis of the “social contract”, which indicates some negative aspects of globalization on workers’ living conditions. Technological changes that go hand-in-hand with globalization require a wide-ranging restructuring of business and society in general. The traditional working time organization has been put under review by sectoral changes, demographic challenges (depopulation, changing role of women and the “modern family”), and a growing need to improve living conditions. Whether changes such as more flexible organization of working time will be more of a threat or an opportunity depends largely on the institutional functionality in a particular country. Failing economic policies can no longer be blamed on the sins of the past or on “institutional deficit”. Some countries have introduced working time boundaries as a way of fighting unemployment. The tasks of economic policy makers are very complex, and negotiations of social partners are frequently burdened with petty political interests. Numerous studies point out the problem of decision making and management in the quest for the optimal solution in working time organization in the public sector. Hasty decisions can cause long-term demographic consequences with harmful effects on economic growth and development. “State management” needs to be entrepreneurial, at the same time preserving the sense of the public sector and public services. On the other hand, private sector players have to protect their individual interests and thus strive to manage their assets in the best possible way on a daily basis. One of the crucial assets is the human capital. It is still highly disputed whether fewer working hours per worker drives the need for a larger number of employees. The Croatian economy, and thus the Croatian labour market, is strongly influenced by EU directives, and more importantly, by global economic and political trends. We need to study working time organization within our country and make comparisons with similar countries,­ not only because this might be an interesting area of economic analysis, but rather to help define future development and assist entrepreneurs, managers and policy makers in making their own decisions. From the research presented above the following conclusions can be derived:

1. With the growing level of education there is more flexibility in creating one’s working time, which can be a great “selling point” when promoting the importance of education to young people.
2. A high proportion of overtime work, accompanied by employers’ disregard for obligations that refer to overtime work, indicates that Croatia is still a country in transition, like most CEE countries.
3. There is still a significant proportion of work in shifts, which can be explained by the structure of Croatian economy, dominated by more traditional industries.
4. Small businesses, i.e. entrepreneurs (with or without additional employees) are more flexible regarding working time, but on average they work longer hours, which indicates the challenges faced by today’s entrepreneurs and different starting positions in comparison to state-owned companies and large private companies.
5. If one considers the type of ownership and readiness to adapt working hours, private sector is more flexible than public sector.

It is important to emphasize that labour laws are often rigid and inflexible, particularly in specific cases, which are not minor at all. For example, situation is not made easy for seasonal workers in construction, tourism or agriculture. Namely, employee who wishes to work longer than contracted working time can do so only for four months, and knowing the nature of most of projects that mostly last longer than expected, the law could cause indirect suspension of such work. Although practice in most of the EU countries is developing toward more flexible work models, the Croatian labour law is still facing numerous challenges and in the following periods amendments can be expected. After two years of negotiations and although including many changes, the Labour Act, which came into effect on 7 August 2014, still has not provided conditions for easier shifting between employment and unemployment (in times of long lasting economic crisis); changed almost nothing to reduce the differences between the private and the public sectors; and it still shows no sensitivity for micro entrepreneurs (particularly with provisions on unequal distribution of working time and easier dismissal). What is positive in terms of flexibility is regulation of the period of notice that is interrupted with sick leave, possibility for having workers “on loan” within associated companies, possibility for workers to work for other employer, with previous consent of their original employer, and open possibility for more flexible agreement between the worker and the employer about using the annual leave. What has been possibly left out is the extension of the limitation period and extreme inflexibility related to termination of collective agreements, which will result in collective agreements becoming almost interminable.
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**Appendix**

*Table 1. Sample description*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | n | % |
| Sex  | 194 | 100 |
|  | Male | 105 | 54.1 |
| Female  | 89 | 45.9 |
| Age | 194 | 100 |
|  | Up to 30 years | 56 | 28.9 |
| 31-40 years | 43 | 22.2 |
| 41-50 years | 65 | 33.5 |
| 51-60 years | 27 | 13.9 |
| Over 61 years of age | 3 | 1.5 |
| Educational level | 193 | 100 |
|  | Preschool education | 0 | 0 |
| Primary school– grades 1-4 | 4 | 2.1 |
| Primary school – grades 5-8 | 10 | 5.2 |
| Secondary school graduates | 130 | 67.4 |
| Two-year college | 20 | 10.4 |
| Four-year college (University of Applied Sciences) | 27 | 14.0 |
| Doctors of Science | 2 | 1 |
| Economic status | 194 | 100 |
|  | Working as an employer or employee/self-employee | 190 | 97.9 |
| Employed, on maternity leave or other kind of leave | 2 | 1 |
| Unemployed for less than 12 months | 1 | 0.5 |
| In school (school, university, etc.)/ student | 1 | 0.5 |
| Monthly income from the main job | 177 | 100 |
|  | Up to the amount of the average salary in the Republic of Croatia | 123 | 69.5 |
| Above the amount of the average salary in the Republic of Croatia | 54 | 30.5 |

Source: Calculated by authors

*Table 2. Complexity of working time and differences in the working time organization*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Who creates your working time schedule? |
| n | % | Company/ organization defines the schedule, without possibility for change | You can choose among several fixed working time schedules defined by the company/ organization | You can adapt your working hours within the set limits (i.e. flexible working time) | You define your working hours completely on your own | χ² | df | sig. |
| Educational level | 192 | 100 | 75.5 | 3.6 | 8.9 | 12 | 42.21 | 15 | p<0.01 |
|  | Preschool education | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Primary school – grades 1-4 | 4 | 2.1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 75 |  |  |  |
|  | Primary school – grades 5-8 | 10 | 5.2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 |  |  |  |
|  | Completed secondary school | 129 | 67.2 | 79.1 | 3.1 | 9.3 | 8.5 |  |  |  |
|  | Two-year college | 20 | 10.4 | 70 | 10 | 20 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Four-year college (University of Applied Sciences) | 27 | 14.1 | 81.5 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 11.1 |  |  |  |
|  | Doctor of Science | 2 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 |  |  |  |
| Type of employment | 192 | 100 | 75 | 3.6 | 8.9 | 12.5 | 85.60 | 9 | p<0.01 |
|  | Self-employed without employees | 13 | 6.8 | 7.7 | 0 | 23.1 | 69.2 |  |  |  |
|  | Self-employed with employees | 9 | 4.7 | 11.1 | 0 | 33.3 | 55.6 |  |  |  |
|  | Employed | 166 | 86.5 | 84.3 | 4.2 | 6.6 | 4.8 |  |  |  |
|  | Other | 4 | 2.1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 |  |  |  |
| Employment contract | 167 | 100 | 83.8 | 4.2 | 6.6 | 5.4 | 37.89 | 12 | p<0.01 |
|  | Indefinite contract | 132 | 79 | 83.3 | 5.3 | 6.8 | 4.5 |  |  |  |
|  | Fixed-term contract | 30 | 18 | 90 | 0 | 6.7 | 3.3 |  |  |  |
|  | Temporary work agency contract | 2 | 1.2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Apprenticeship or other training scheme | 1 | 0.6 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | No contract | 2 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Type of ownership | 192 | 100 | 75 | 3.6 | 8.9 | 12.5 | 25.85 | 9 | p<0.05 |
|  | Private sector  | 102 | 53.1 | 66.7 | 2.9 | 10.8 | 19.6 |  |  |  |
|  | Public sector | 78 | 40.6 | 88.5 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 2.6 |  |  |  |
|  | Mixed public and private organization | 10 | 5.2 | 70 | 0 | 20 | 10 |  |  |  |
|  | Other | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 |  |  |  |
| Company size | 183 | 100 | 74.3 | 3.3 | 9.3 | 13.1 | 49.24 | 21 | p<0.01 |
|  | Respondent works alone | 14 | 7.7 | 28.6 | 0 | 21.4 | 50 |  |  |  |
|  | 2-4 people | 26 | 14.2 | 61.5 | 0 | 15.4 | 23.1 |  |  |  |
|  | 5-9 people | 20 | 10.9 | 65 | 0 | 15 | 20 |  |  |  |
|  | 10-49 people  | 54 | 29.5 | 79.6 | 5.6 | 3.7 | 11.1 |  |  |  |
|  | 50-99 people | 26 | 14.2 | 73.1 | 7.7 | 15.4 | 3.8 |  |  |  |
|  | 100-249 people  | 23 | 12.6 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 250-499 people | 5 | 2.7 | 80 | 0 | 20 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 500 and more people | 15 | 8.2 | 93.3 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |

Source: Calculated by authors

*Table 3. Working time and work intensity*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | How many hours per week do you usually work in your main job? |
| n | % | Not an hour | Up to 10 hours | From 11 to 30 hours | From 31 to 50 hours | From 51 to 70 hours  | From 71 to 178 hours | χ² | df | sig. |
| Type of employment | 190 | 100 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 5.8 | 76.3 | 6.8 | 1.6 | 69.26 | 15 | p<0.01 |
|  | Self-employed without employees | 11 | 5.8 | 36.4 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 36.4 | 9.1 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Self-employed with employees | 9 | 4.7 | 22.2 | 0 | 0 | 55.6 | 22.2 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Employed | 167 | 87.9 | 0.6 | 4.8 | 6 | 80.8 | 6 | 1.8 |  |  |  |
|  | Other | 3 | 1.6 | 66.7 | 0 | 0 | 33.3 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Type of ownership | 190 | 100 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 6.3 | 75.8 | 6.8 | 1.6 | 29.04 | 15 | p<0.01 |
|  | Type of ownership | 99 | 52.1 | 8.1 | 5.1 | 4 | 71.7 | 10.1 | 1 |  |  |  |
|  | Private sector  | 79 | 41.6 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 8.9 | 83.5 | 1.3 | 2.5 |  |  |  |
|  | Public sector | 10 | 5.3 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 60 | 20 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Mixed public and private organisation | 2 | 1.1 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Company size | 180 | 100 | 4.4 | 5 | 5.6 | 76.1 | 7.2 | 1.7 | 57.68 | 35 | p<0.05 |
|  | Respondent works alone | 12 | 6.7 | 33.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 41.7 | 0 | 8.3 |  |  |  |
|  | 2-4 people | 25 | 13.9 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 68 | 12 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 5-9 people | 20 | 11.1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 80 | 10 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 10-49 people  | 54 | 30 | 0 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 77.8 | 5.6 | 1.9 |  |  |  |
|  | 50-99 people | 26 | 14.4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 11.5 | 73.1 | 7.7 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 100-249 people  | 23 | 12.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 250-499 people | 5 | 2.8 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 60 | 20 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | 500 and more people | 15 | 8.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 13.3 | 6.7 |  |  |  |

Source: Calculated by authors