

Is work in Europe decent? A study based on the 4th European survey of working conditions 2005

Tangian, Andranik S.

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Monographie / monograph

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

SSG Sozialwissenschaften, USB Köln

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Tangian, A. S. (2007). *Is work in Europe decent? A study based on the 4th European survey of working conditions 2005*. (WSI-Diskussionspapier, 157). Düsseldorf: Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftliches Institut in der Hans-Böckler-Stiftung. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-219237>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

**Is work in Europe decent?
A study based on the 4th European
survey of working conditions 2005**

Andranik Tangian¹

Diskussionspapier Nr. 157

Dezember 2007

Privatdozent Dr. Dr.Sc. Andranik Tangian
WSI in der Hans Böckler Stiftung
Hans-Böckler-Straße 39
D-40476 Düsseldorf
Tel: +49 211 7778-0
Fax: +49 211 7778-190
Andranik-Tangian@Boeckler.De

WSI-Diskussionspapiere (Print) ISSN 1861-0625
WSI-Diskussionspapiere (Internet) ISSN 1861-0633
http://www.boeckler.de/pdf/p_wsi_diskp_157_e.pdf

Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftliches Institut
in der Hans-Böckler-Stiftung, Düsseldorf

¹The author thanks Hartmut Seifert for his advices on the selection and grouping of variables for the empirical analysis and Christiane Lindecke for her suggestions on the content and style used in the final version of the paper.

Abstract

Composite indicators of *Decent work* for 31 European countries are constructed with the data of the Fourth European Working Conditions Survey 2005 (EWCS 2005). Partial indices reflect 15 aspects of working conditions as in the recently published German DGB-index *Gute-Arbeit*. In a sense, the German indicator is extended to European data. Two methodologies, of the OECD and of the Hans Böckler Foundation, differing in scaling, give very similar results. The main findings are as follows:

1. **Evaluation of working conditions.** Working conditions are evaluated on the average with 61 conditional % (= low medium level), ranging from 51 in Turkey (inferior level) to 67 in Switzerland (upper medium level). A good evaluation (> 80) is inherent only in the meaningfulness of work (81). Two aspects got a bad evaluation (< 50): qualification and development possibilities (33) and career chances (49).
2. **Importance of different aspects of working conditions.** Stepwise regression reveals that job stability is the most important factor for the satisfaction with working conditions. Strains, career chances, meaningfulness of work go next. Income and collegiality are ranked 5th or 6th, depending on the evaluation method. Creativity and industrial culture make no statistically significant impact. Learning and good management are regarded as shortcomings rather than as advantages.
3. **Disparities among countries and social groups.** The evaluation shows significant disparities among European countries and social groups. Those who work in finances have *by far* better working conditions, even comparing with the next best group of business people, women have worse working conditions than men with respect to 9 of 15 aspects, and all types of atypical employees (other than permanent employees) have working conditions below the European average, to say nothing of those with permanent contract.
4. **Insufficient quality of work.** The evaluation reveals bad qualification possibilities (33) and career chances (49), low transparency (51), emotional strains (52), inconvenient time arrangements (55), and modest income (55) show how far is Europe from creating 'more and better jobs' for the Agenda 2010. In particular, poor qualification and development possibilities mean that the European Employment Strategy oriented towards flexible employment and life-long learning is not yet consistently implemented.
5. **Role of strong trade unions for job stability.** A high job stability is observed in some countries with relaxed employment protection and strong trade unions. At the same time, a low job stability is inherent in some countries with strict employment protection but weak trade unions. It means that the institutional employment protection alone does not guarantee job stability, and other factors, like strong trade unions, can be even more important.

To stimulate employers to equalize working conditions it is proposed to introduce a workplace tax for bad working conditions which should protect 'the working environment'

in the same way as the green tax protects the natural environment. Indexing working conditions at every workplace developed in our study can be regarded as prototype measuring the 'social pollution' and used to determine the tax amount.

Keywords: Composite indicators, quality of work, European Union, statistical indices, processing qualitative and ordinal data.

JEL Classification:

C43 — Index Numbers and Aggregation, C51 — Model Construction and Estimation, J21 — Labor Force and Employment, Size, and Structure, J88 — Public Policy.

Contents

1	Introduction	7
1.1	Political background	7
1.2	Monitoring European decent work	9
1.3	About the given study	13
2	Operational model	14
2.1	Idea of composite indicators	14
2.2	Data structure	14
2.3	Re-coding	22
2.4	Scaling	23
2.5	Weighting	24
2.6	Aggregation	25
2.7	Methodological reservations	26
3	Analysis	27
3.1	Overview of working conditions in Europe	27
3.2	General satisfaction with working conditions	33
3.3	Importance of different aspects of working conditions	36
3.4	Working conditions by occupation, gender, and some other classifiers	41
4	Reform proposal: Workplace tax	43
5	Conclusions	43
6	Annex 1: 1st-, 2nd-, and 3rd-level indicators of working conditions by country	60
6.1	Evaluating countries with respect to survey questions	60
6.2	Evaluating countries with respect to partial indices (1st-level aggregate indices)	61
6.3	Evaluating countries with respect to aggregate indices	61
7	Annex 2: Importance of aspects of working conditions by country	118
8	References	150

Decent work means productive work in which rights are protected, which generates an adequate income, with adequate social protection. It also means sufficient work, in the sense that all should have full access to income-earning opportunities. It marks the high road to economic and social development, a road in which employment, income and social protection can be achieved without compromising workers' rights and social standards. Tripartism and social dialogue are both objectives in their own right, guaranteeing participation and democratic process, and a means of achieving all the other strategic objectives of the ILO. The evolving global economy offers opportunities from which all can gain, but these have to be grounded in participatory social institutions if they are to confer legitimacy and sustainability on economic and social policies.

Decent Work, Report of Mr. Juan Somavia, ILO Director-General, 87th session of the International Labour Conference, 1999 (ILO 1999)

In September 2005, the United Nations Summit on the follow-up to the Millennium Declaration endorsed the need for fair globalisation. It resolved to include the promotion of productive employment and decent work for all among the objectives of national and international policies.

Promoting decent work for all, Communication from the European Commission on May 24, 2006 (European Commission 2006)

Decent work and fair wages are a fundamental objective for trade unions in Europe, and key to the European Social Model. Decent work makes a vital contribution to reducing poverty, both in Europe and beyond, and to achieving sustainable development and a just and inclusive society.

Decent Work, European Trade Union Confederation, November 26, 2007 (ETUC 2007)

1 Introduction

1.1 Political background

Working conditions permanently remain in the focus of attention of the European Commission, national governments, and trade unions. In particular, it is one of the issues of the European Employment Strategy (EES) launched in 1997 in Luxembourg. The EU Lisbon Summit 2000 called for “more and better jobs and greater social cohesion by 2010”. Four years later, on March 2004, the European Council again emphasized “the urgency to take effective action in creating more and better jobs”; see European Commission (2001a, 2003, and 2004).

International level Worldwide, working conditions are supervised by the United Nations, particularly by the *International Labour Organisation* (ILO), Geneva. It was founded in 1919 through the negotiations of the Treaty of Versailles, and was initially an agency of the League of Nations. It became a member of the UN system after the demise of the League and the formation of the UN at the end of World War II. Its Constitution, as amended to date, includes the Declaration of Philadelphia (1944) on the aims and purposes of the Organization. In the late 1990s the ILO initiated the program *Decent Work*. As stated by its Director-General, 'the primary goal of the ILO today is to promote opportunities for women and men to obtain decent and productive work, in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity'(ILO 1999). In working towards this goal, the organization seeks to promote employment creation, strengthen fundamental principles and rights at work - workers' rights, improve social protection, and promote social dialogue as well as provide relevant information, training and technical assistance. At present, the ILO's work is organized into four thematic groupings or sectors: (1) Standards and fundamental principles and rights at work; (2) Employment; (3) Social Protection; and (4) Social Dialogue.

European policy Within Europe, the supervision of working conditions is institutionalized in the *European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions*, Dublin. It is a European organization, one of the first to be established to work in specialized areas of EU policy. It was set up by the European Council (Council Regulation EEC No. 1365/75 of 26 May 1975) and since then carries out research and development projects, providing data and analysis for informing and supporting the formulation of EU policy. The Foundation has a network of experts throughout Europe who conduct research on its behalf including assessing the current national situations, the preparation of case studies and national reports and the conducting of surveys; see European Foundation (2007a).

Position of European trade unions The European Trade Union Confederation supports decent work by having outlined its five basic principles (ETUC 2007):

- An end to precarious jobs, which are not only bad for workers but also damage the labour market and the economy. They undermine working conditions and health and safety, generate poverty wages and damage social cohesion;
- Better work organisation, to create environments where workers are fully informed and consulted, able to balance the demands of work and home life, and have opportunities for lifelong learning to boost skills and qualifications;
- Strong employment protection legislation, which far from being an obstacle to a dynamic labour market can foster investment in human capital and innovation;
- Social welfare systems that offer security to the 14 million Europeans who change jobs each year;
- Social dialogue and collective bargaining, and the full involvement of the social partners in decisions on labour market reform.

German perspective Germany has contributed to these initiatives as early as in the 1970s by a research program *Humanisierung des Arbeitslebens (HdA)* (= Humanization of Working Life) followed by programs *Arbeit und Technik* (= Work and Techniques), and *Innovative Arbeitsgestaltung* (= Innovative Work Structuring); see the Editorial to *Arbeit*, 2004/3. The actual program of this type, *Initiative Neue Qualität der Arbeit (INQA)* (= Initiative New Quality of Work), is complemented with the political initiative *Gute Arbeit* (= Good Work) of the leading German trade union IG Metall; see IG Metall Projekt Gute Arbeit (2007).

1.2 Monitoring European decent work

European Working Condition Surveys (EWCS) One of major monitoring instruments of European decent work are European Working Conditions Surveys performed by the European Foundation since 1990 with a five-year periodicity. The report on the fourth European Working Conditions Survey 2005 is recently published by the European Foundation (2007). It is based on a questionnaire with over 200 questions related to

- personal situation (country, nationality, age, family status, number of dependent members of the household, etc.)
- occupation (position, industry branch, type of contract, size of enterprise, etc.)
- physical environment (vibrations, noise, painful positions, etc.)
- time (evening, weekend, and shift-work, schedule of working time, etc.)
- organizational issues (monotonicity of work, unforeseen tasks, independence and subordination, etc.)
- social climate (possibility to discuss working conditions, cases of violence, discrimination, etc.)
- health (different professional diseases, accidents, sick leaves, etc.), and
- income (basic, bonus, sharing profits, compensations for overtime, etc.)

Totally, 29860 persons from 31 European countries (EU-27, Croatia, Turkey, Norway, and Switzerland) were interviewed in the period from 19th September to 30th November 2005 by national institutes (Ibid.: 93, 107–108). Each country was represented by ca. 1000 interviews, except for Cyprus, Estonia, Malta, Luxembourg, and Slovenia with about 600 interviews each. The interviewed persons were selected by the method of random walk (Ibid.: 94). The European figures were derived from the national averages accounted with weights proportional to the size of active population in the given country according to the *Labour Force Survey* of EuroStat (Ibid.: 3, 97).

It should be mentioned that the *Survey* has a certain bias in the data collected. It is explained by the difficulty in accessing some persons and by the inapplicability of the Eurostat definition of employment ‘to real-life situations, especially in less standard-industrial types of employment such as agricultural work, family business, etc.’ (Ibid.: 95). In particular, the bias manifests itself in income which national means deviate significantly from official statistical figures. The *Survey* uses harmonized units — income

of deciles (10%-population groups ordered by income, Ibid.: 99), so that every national average should be close to 5.5. However, the Belgian national average of respondents is 7.63; see Sheet Z19 of Table 3 in the Annex. For as many as 798 respondents, such a high figure is very unlikely to occur by chance alone. It rather results from underrepresenting low-income groups.

The report of the European Foundation cited provides a comprehensive outlook at single countries and the whole of Europe with respect to all the questionnaire items. For instance, one can find the percentage of teleworkers working at home with computers at least 1/4 of the time or all the time (Ibid.: 41), or the percentage of machine operators who are regularly consulted on work organization (Ibid.: 70). It enables tracing the evolution of certain European and national trends since the very first survey of 1990.

EWCSs from the viewpoint of the EU policy goals: missing evaluation The EWCSs exhaustively represent a large number of aspects of working conditions but avoid to evaluate them in ‘worse–better’ terms. In several cases such an evaluation follows from questions by default, like from the ones about disturbing factors (noise, vibration, etc.) but in other cases it appears to be quite ambiguous. For instance, one can learn almost everything about the variability of working hours (Ibid.: 21), but nothing is said on whether time flexibility is desirable, or evening work is voluntary, or overtime is fairly rewarded.

Neither countries, nor industrial branches are classified with respect to the quality of work in general or with respect to any partial composite factor like scheduling working time, physical environment, or social climate. It stems from the lack of *inter-question* aggregation. For instance, there are over 20 questions on different professional diseases but no integral characterization of health at work. The only exception is the composite indicator of working time (Ibid.: 26–27) which summarizes the total hours in main and secondary occupations, including unpaid working hours.

Another survey-based dedicated report *Working Time Preferences in Sixteen European Countries* by the European Foundation (2002) also suggests no inter-question aggregation of answers. At most, the answers on factual and preferable situations are compared. For instance, answers like “I work 19 hours a week but would prefer to work 21 hours” are processed to obtain conclusions like “50% employees would prefer to work fewer hours, 11% would like to work more, and the rest 38% are satisfied” (p. 43, Table 16). An implicit inter-question aggregation of answers is made in pp. 62–79, and 158. The preferable increment/decrement in working time is explained with a regression model in variables ‘managerial duties’, ‘blue/white collar’, ‘small child’, etc. The regression equation is in fact an aggregate indicator of working time preference of all workers. However, this methodological potential is not elaborated and the model is only used for finding most influential factors.

In spite of vast information provided by the surveys it is hard to judge which countries offer better working conditions, or which social groups are privileged. If a young European asks himself “In which country would I like to work?” the surveys mentioned will be of little help. Even an expert can have difficulties in finding the countries with most favorable/most critical working conditions.

The lack of aggregate evaluation results in the following oversimplified approach (European Communities, 2001b: 6):

In the new list an indicator **quality of work** has been added in response to the emphasis put on this issue by the Stockholm European Council. The particular indicator on accidents at work has been chosen.

That is, the richness of European statistics is little used and political judgements are made with respect to a one-sided partial index.

Necessity of aggregate indices for policy monitoring Taking into account the EU's aiming at 'better jobs' and that policy makers operate with aggregated data, a 'worse-better' integral evaluation of working conditions is quite urgent. The necessity of synthetic indices for working conditions has been emphasized as early as in the report of European Foundation (1997), where a heuristic approach to constructing synthetic indices has been mentioned, however, with no mathematical model, or specific examples.

Integral evaluation is usually made by constructing composite indicators which are increasingly propagating during the last decade. They appear in numerous world-wide documents (United Nations 2001-, International Institute for Management Development 2000-, World Economic Forum 2002-, OECD 2002, 2003, 2004a). For instance, in the PISA-2006 (OECD 2007) the level of school education was evaluated with a composite indicator. As early as in October 2001 the European Commission recommended to develop composite indicators for certain purposes within the Structural Indicators Exercise (European Commission 2001b) which was followed by the report (European Commission 2002). As emphasized by the OECD (2003, p. 3),

Composite indicators are valued for their ability to integrate large amounts of information into easily understood formats for a general audience. . . . Despite their many deficiencies, composite indicators will continue to be developed due to their usefulness. . . .

Composite indicators are highly appreciated in international comparisons, where it is often required to surmount national particularities and to bring the consideration to the common denominator. As noted by Munda and Nardo (2003, p. 2),

Composite indicators stem from the need to rank countries and benchmarking their performance whenever a country does not perform strictly better than another. Composite indicators are very common in fields such as economic and business statistics (e.g., the OECD Composite Leading Indicators) and are used in a variety of policy domains such as industrial competitiveness, sustainable development, quality of life assessment, globalization and innovation (see Cox and others 1992, Huggins 2003, Wilson and Jones 2002, Guerard 2001, Färe et al. 1994, Lovell et al. 1995, Griliches 1990 and Saisana and Tarantola 2002, among others). . . . A general objective of most of these indicators is the ranking of countries according to some aggregated dimensions (see Cherchye 2001 and Kleinknecht 2002).

Monitoring working conditions with composite indicators An evaluation of working conditions in 15 European countries with composite indicators derived from EWCS 2000 is performed by the Hans Böckler Foundation (Tangian 2004, 2005, 2007a). Besides evaluation various aspects of working conditions and benchmarking countries, the main findings are as follows:

- (a) The most critical aspects of European work are social climate, career prospects, and work-life balance,
- (b) European countries differ with respect to working conditions statistically more significantly than with respect to earnings which should be taken into account in the European integration, and
- (c) earnings play no essential role in subjective estimations, including job satisfaction, which mainly depends on working conditions; consequently, more attention should be paid to improving the latter.

Next, the Hans Böckler Foundation (HBS) published reports on indexing precariousness of work in Germany (Bremer and Seifert 2007), and in 31 European countries derived from the EWCS 2005 (Seifert and Tangian 2007 and Tangian 2007). The latter indicator enabled to establish:

- (a) statistically significant dependence between flexibility and precariousness of work,
- (b) drastic difference between institutional regulation of work and actual practices, and
- (c) the negative impact of flexibilisation on employability, putting in question the implementation of flexicurity policy in the form promoted by the European Commission.

In September 2007, the German composite indicator *Gute Arbeit* (= Good Work) has been presented by DGB (= German Confederation of Trade Unions). It is based on a dedicated survey with about 6000 persons interviewed (DGB-Index Gute Arbeit 2007). The indicator is hierarchically constructed in three aggregation steps. At first, the interview answers, covering 31 selected items (some important aspects like health and safety are not considered), are transformed into 15 *first-level aggregate indicators*. Then the latter are processed to obtain three second-level aggregate indicators **A. Resources (= professional aspects)**, **B. Strains**, and **Income and job security**. Finally, the third-level total indicator is constructed. The main findings are as follows:

- (a) German average working conditions are low-medium, getting 58 points of 100. Only 12% of persons interviewed attained the good level with over 80 points, and 34% have bad working conditions with less than 50 points (the calibration thresholds are normatively defined by the designers of the index).
- (b) There are significant differences between working conditions in East and West Germany, of men and women, as well as in different branches.
- (c) 70% of persons interviewed evaluate professional training as one of most important aspects of working conditions.

The composite indicators mentioned are less detailed than specific statistical indices of the ILO (Anker et al., 2003) or of the European Foundation (2007), which highlight specific differentials. On the other hand, the aggregate indicators reveal some quite general trends, enabling to "see the forest behind the trees", being thereby complementary to usual partial indices.

1.3 About the given study

The goal of the given study is three-fold:

1. Comprehensively evaluating working conditions in Europe with a composite indicator derived from the EWCS 2005. The benchmarking countries will be used to reveal national particularities. The estimated influence of different factors on the general satisfaction with working conditions will help to understand the most urgent needs of European employees.
2. Extending the German DGB *Gute Arbeit* indicator to European data. For this purpose, the partial criteria and the structure of the new composite indicator are as as in the *Gute-Arbeit* indicator, except for 2 (of 31) items, since they are not reflected in the EWCS: Self-planning of the overwork, and expected sufficient pension.
3. Comparing two methodologies for constructing composite indicators, differing in scaling, of the OECD and of the Hans Böckler Foundation. The conclusions backed up by both methodologies can be considered more reliable than the ones obtained with a single methodology.

2 Operational model

2.1 Idea of composite indicators

Recall that a *composite indicator* is a weighted sum of several low-level indicators which weights reflect their relative importance (= substitution rates). For example, in education written tests are evaluated by the sum of points for single tasks, school-leavers get the (weighted) average score of their records (*Abiturnote* in Germany), etc. A similar method is widespread in multi-discipline sport competitions, in testing consumption goods, in selecting best projects, and in many other situations.

The mathematical reason for summarizing factors is as follows. In the most general form, a composite indicator can be imagined as a function f in n variables which to each set of input values x_1, \dots, x_n puts into correspondence the indicator value $y = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Usually a composite indicator is not expected to abruptly change its *behavior*, meaning the differentiability of f . Then its Taylor expansion in a neighborhood of some reference point (x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0) gives the *first-order approximation* of f :

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(x_1, \dots, x_n) &\approx \underbrace{f(x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0)}_{\substack{\text{Function value} \\ \text{at } (x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0)}} + \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{\frac{\partial f(x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0)}{\partial x_i}}_{\substack{\text{Partial derivative} \\ \text{of } f \text{ at } (x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0)}} \underbrace{(x_1 - x_1^0)}_{\substack{\text{Argument} \\ \text{increment}}} \\
 &= \underbrace{f(x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f(x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0)}{\partial x_i} x_i^0}_{\text{Constant } C} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f(x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0)}{\partial x_i} x_i}_{\substack{\text{Weighted sum of variables} \\ \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^0 x_i}} .
 \end{aligned}$$


Since composite indicators are primarily designed for relative comparisons, the constant C is omitted. The remaining weighted sum of variables is, consequently, the general composite indicator to within its first-order approximation.

Note the difference between composite indicators and composite statistical indices obtained by prime component analysis; see Jackson (1988), Kraznowski (1988) and Seber (1984). To be specific, consider five persons plotted in the plane “Job stability–Earnings” as in Figure 1. The prime component analysis approximates the cloud of observations with an ellipse. Its largest diameter (= prime component) is the largest standard deviation in the observation set. Then the statistical index identified with the prime component grows along the “South–Eastern” diagonal. If the working conditions should be evaluated then the statistical index is inadequate. The desired indicator should be a utility function which is preference-driven rather than data-driven and should increase in the orthogonal North–East direction. Regretfully, the use of composite statistical indices as policy monitoring indicators (= policy utility functions) is quite frequent, and this type of misinterpretation can be found even in high-level official publications.

2.2 Data structure

The given study is based on indices of decent work derived from the EWCS 2005 restricted to employees. Trainees, self-employed, and unemployed are excluded from consideration. It is done according to the interview questions q3a and q3b on the employment status. The number of persons retained in the model is reduced to 23788.

Figure 1: Difference between composite statistical indices and composite indicators



The data structure for the model can be imagined as the large Table 1. The answers of individuals constitute the rows of the table numbered from 1 to 23788. The columns, regarded as variables, contain coded answers of individuals to the survey questions relevant to our study. The questions are grouped in several sections.

Classifiers. This section consists of the questions which are not used in constructing the indices but are necessary to classify individuals by country, by industrial branch, by gender, etc., for comparative analysis of countries and social groups.

- Country (variable `countcod` of the data set): BE—Belgium, CZ—Czech Republic, DK—Denmark, DE—Germany, etc.
- Occupation by a simplified ISCO classification into 10 groups (variable `isco` of the data set): L—Legislators and senior officials and managers, P—Professionals, T—Technicians and associated professionals, C—Clerks, etc.
- Industry by a simplified NACE classification into 11 brunches (variable `nace11` of the data set): A+B—Agriculture, hunting, forestry, and fishing, C+D—Mining and manufacturing, E—Electricity, gas and water supply, F—Construction, etc.
- Size of local unit (question `q6`): One employee, 2–4 employees, 5–9 employees, 10–49 employees, etc.

2. Second-level aggregate indices labelled **A**, **B**, **C** shown in **bold**
3. Third-level aggregate index of working conditions.

Besides, the survey question **q36** *General satisfaction with working conditions* is used as another top-level indicator of working conditions to reveal which 'objective' factors are decisive for the general 'subjective' satisfaction with working conditions.

We continue the list of variables included into the model; the missed DGB items are mentioned with a corresponding remark. For details of coding conventions see Table 3 in the Annex.

A. Resources (professional aspects):

1. *Qualification and development possibilities*
 - (a) Training opportunities
 - Training paid for or provided by employer (by oneself for self-employed) during the past 12 months, in number of days (q28a)
 - On-the-job training (co-workers, supervisors) during the past 12 months, Y/N (q28c)
 - Other forms of on-site training and learning (e.g. self-learning, on-line tutorials etc) during the past 12 months, Y/N (q28d)
 - Educational leave over the past 12 months, Y/N (q34ab)
 - (b) Training-requiring working conditions
 - Complex tasks, Y/N (q23e)
 - Learning new things at work, Y/N (q23f)
 - Necessity of different skills (in rotating tasks) Y/N (q26a.1)
 - Necessity of further training, in 3 grades (q27)
2. *Creativity (possibilities to develop own ideas)*
 - Non-repetitive tasks, Y/N (q20aa-ab)
 - Solving unforeseen problems by oneself, Y/N (q23c)
 - Non-monotonous tasks, Y/N (q23d)
 - Ability to apply own ideas, in 5 grades (q25j)
 - Intellectually demanding work, in 5 grades (251)
3. *Career chances (in the enterprise)*
 - Career perspectives, in 5 grades (q37c)
 - Opportunities to learn and grow at work, in 5 grades (q37e)
4. *Possibilities for influence and initiative*
 - (a) Own planning and arranging work
 - Choosing the order of tasks, Y/N (q24a)
 - Choosing the method of work, Y/N (q24b)
 - Influence over the choice of working partners, in 5 grades (q25d)
 - The opportunity to do what you do best, in 5 grades (q25h)

- Influence on the division of rotating tasks, Y/N (q26a2)
 - Division of tasks by the members of the team, Y/N (q26b1–q26b1a)
 - Selection of the head of the team by the team, Y/N (q26b1b)
- (b) Influence on the amount/quality of work
- Assessing the quality of own work, Y/N (q23b)
 - Ability to change the speed or rate of work, Y/N (q24c)
- (c) Influence on the working time arrangements
- Number of working hours per week: as one will or not as one will (derivative from q15a and q15b)
 - Working time arrangements: set by the company, choice from several option, reasonable adaptability to individual wishes, or full adaptability (q17a)
 - Ability to take breaks on one’s choice, in five grades (q25e)
 - Ability to take holidays on one’s choice, in five grades (q25g)
5. *Communication and transparency*
- (a) Availability of necessary information
- Information about healthy and safety risks, in 4 grades (q12)
 - Consultations about changes in the work organisation/working conditions during the past 12 months, Y/N (q30b)
 - Discussions about work-related problems with an employee representative during the past 12 months, Y/N (q30e)
- (b) Clear formulation of tasks and requirements
- Numerical production targets or performance targets, Y/N (q21c)
 - Meeting precise quality standards, Y/N (q23a)
 - Regular formal assessment of work performance during the past 12 months, Y/N (q30c)
 - Payments based on the overall performance of the company based on a predefined formula, Y/N (ef6g_1)
 - Payments based on the overall performance of the group/team based on a predefined formula, Y/N (ef6h_1)
6. *Quality of management/leadership*
- (a) Appreciation and attention of the boss
- Frank discussion with boss about work performance during the past 12 months, Y/N (q30a)
 - Discussions about work-related problems with the boss during the past 12 months, Y/N (q30d)
- (b) Good planning of work by the boss
- Working time planning: on the same day, the day before, several days in advance, several weeks in advance, no changes of schedule (q17b)
 - Contacts related to the main job outside normal working hours, like telephone, email, etc., in five grades (q19)

- (c) Appreciation of training by superiors (already considered in Item 1)
7. *Industrial culture*
- (a) Support of cooperative work
 - Rotating tasks between colleagues, Y/N (q26a)
 - Team work, Y/N (q26b)
 - (b) Competent/appropriate management
 - Direct control of the work by boss, Y/N (q21e)
 - Possibility to get assistance from the superiors, in 5 grades (q25b)
 - Possibility to get external assistance, in 5 grades (q25c)
8. *Collegiality (possibility to get assistance from colleagues)*
- Possibility to get assistance from colleagues, in 5 grades (q25a)
 - Feeling at home at the enterprise, in 5 grades (q37d)
 - Good friends at work, in 5 grades (q37f)
9. *Meaningfulness of work (social usefulness)*
- Feeling of doing a good work, in 5 grades (q25i)
 - Feeling of doing useful work; in 5 grades (q25k)
10. *Working time arrangements*
- (a) Own adjustments of overwork (No relevant questions in EWCS 2005)
 - (b) Reliable (advanced) planning of working time
 - Working time planning: on the same day, the day before, several days in advance, several weeks in advance, no changes of schedule (q17b)
 - (c) Consideration of individual needs while planning the working time
 - Compatibility of working hours with family or social commitments, in 4 grades (q18)
 - Absence from work due to maternity/paternity leave over the past 12 months, days (q34aa)
 - Absence from work due to family-related leave over the past 12 months, days (q34ac)
 - Absence from work due to "other reasons" over the past 12 months, days (q34ad)
 - (d) General working time issues (additional to the DGB-index)
 - Surpassing 42 hours a week in the main job, Y/N (q8a)
 - Number of minutes per day to get to the workplace and back (q13)
 - Night work between 22:00 and 5:00, in number of days per month (q14a)
 - Overwork (more than 10 hours a day), in number of times a month (q14e)
 - Shift work, Y/N (q16ad)

B. Strains

11. *Intensity/exhaustiveness of work*
 - (a) Disturbing by undesirable interruptions
 - Unpleasant interruptions for unforeseen tasks, in 4 grades (q22a-b)
 - (b) Hectic and tight deadlines
 - Working at high speed, in 7 grades (q20aa)
 - Working to tight deadlines, in 7 grades (q20bb)
 - Dependence on the speed of machines, Y/N (q21d)
 - (c) Insufficiency of time for a high quality work
 - Insufficiency of time to make the work, in 5 grades (q25f)
12. *Physical strains*
 - (a) Heavy physical work
 - Lifting or moving people, in 7 grades (q11b)
 - Carrying or moving heavy loads, in 7 grades (q11c)
 - (b) Physically one-sided work
 - Tiring or painful positions, in 7 grades (q11a)
 - Repetitive hand or arm movements, in 7 grades (q11e)
 - (c) Noise and other disturbing /unhealthy factors
 - Vibrations, in 7 grades (q10a)
 - Noise, in 7 grades (q10b)
 - High temperatures, in 7 grades (q10c)
 - Low temperatures, in 7 grades (q10d)
 - Smoke, fumes, powder, or dust, in 7 grades (q10e)
 - Vapours such as solvents and thinners, in 7 grades (q10f)
 - Contact with chemicals, in 7 grades (q10g)
 - Radiation, welding light, or laser beams, in 7 grades (q10h)
 - Tobacco smoke from other people, in 7 grades (q10i)
 - Contact with infectious materials such as waste, bodily fluids, laboratory materials, in 7 grades (q10j)
 - (d) Health and safety (additional to the DGB-index)
 - Feeling of risks to health or safety, Y/N (q32)
 - Bad influence of work on health Y/N (q33)
 - Hearing problems, Y/N (q33aa)
 - Vision problems, Y/N (q33ab)
 - Skin problems, Y/N (q33ac)
 - Backache, Y/N (q33ad)
 - Headaches, Y/N (q33ae)
 - Stomach ache, Y/N (q33af)
 - Muscular pains in shoulders, neck and/or upper/lower limbs, Y/N (q33ag)

- Respiratory difficulties, Y/N (q33ah)
- Heart disease, Y/N (q33ai)
- Injury(ies), Y/N (q33aj)
- Overall fatigue, Y/N (q33a1)
- Allergies, Y/N (q33an)
- Other health problems due to work Y/N (q33aq)
- Absence from work due to health problems over the past 12 months, Y/N (q34ad)
- Absence from work due to health problems over the past 12 months, in number of days (q34b)
- Absence from work due to accident at work over the past 12 months, days (q34c1)
- Absence from work due to health problems CAUSED BY WORK over the past 12 months, days (q34c2)

13. *Emotional strains*

(a) Restraining/suppressing own emotions

- Dealing directly with customers, passengers, pupils, patients, etc., in 7 grades (q11j)
- Dependence on the work by colleagues, Y/N (q21a)
- Dependence on non-colleagues, customers, pupils, Y/N (q21b)
- Emotionally demanding work, in 5 grades (q25m)
- Stress, Y/N (q33ak)
- Sleeping problems, Y/N (q33am)
- Anxiety, Y/N (q33ao)
- Irritability, Y/N (q33ap)

(b) Inappropriate attendance

- Threats of physical violence, Y/N (q29a)
- Physical violence from people from your workplace, Y/N (q29b)
- Physical violence from other people, Y/N (q29c)
- Bullying / harassment, Y/N (q29d)
- Sexual discrimination / discrimination linked to gender, Y/N (q29e)
- Unwanted sexual attention, Y/N (q29f)
- Age discrimination during the past 12 months, Y/N (q29g)
- Discrimination against nationality during the past 12 months, Y/N (q29h)
- Discrimination against ethnic background during the past 12 months, Y/N (q29i)
- Discrimination against religion during the past 12 months, Y/N (q29j)
- Discrimination against disability during the past 12 months, Y/N (q29k)
- Discrimination against sexual orientation during the past 12 months, Y/N (q29l)

C. Employment security and income

14. *Job stability and job security (Fear of the uncertain future)*

- Ability to do the work after 60: yes, no will, no (q35)
- Risk of losing the job in the next 6 months: very high, rather high, moderate, rather low, very low (q37a)
- Uncomfortable feeling at work: very high, rather high, moderate, rather low, very low (q37d); see also Item 8

15. *Income*

(a) Fair performance/income ratio

- Fair pay, comparing to payment standards: fair, rather fair, moderate, rather not fair, not fair (q37b)

(b) Sufficient income

- Basic salary, Y/N (ef6a)
- Net monthly income harmonized, in 10 harmonized levels (ef5). The survey uses ten income deciles, that is, 10
- Net monthly income non-harmonized, in EUR (ef5 recalculated). For each country, the 10 income deciles are given by 9 income delimiters in the national currency (Ibid.: 100). For low-earners (1st group) the income is taken as 2/3 of the 1st delimiter. For top-earners (10th group) it is the last (9th) delimiter enlarged by the distance to the next to last delimiter ($= 2 \cdot 9\text{th delimiter} - 8\text{th delimiter}$). For all other groups their income is approximated by the mean of its delimiters. Finally, all the values are expressed in EUR rated on 1st November 2005 (recall that the Survey has been performed from September 19 to November 30, 2005).

The next sections of Table 1 contains first-level aggregate indices numbered 1–15, three second-level aggregate indices labelled A,B,C, and the third level aggregate index. These indices are obtained for every individual by the procedure described in the next sections. Then the individual indices are used to obtain national indicators, or indicators for social groups by taking the corresponding average values.

2.3 Re-coding

Individual answers to every question (column $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)'$ of Table 1) are re-coded to reflect the quality of working conditions with respect to the given question. For example, consider the following EWCS 2005 question and the codes of allowed answers (European Foundation 2007a: 127)

q35 Do you think you will be able to do the same job you are doing now when you are 60 years old?

1. Yes, I think so
2. No, I don't think so
3. I wouldn't want to

This question is included in the topic 14. *Job stability and job security (Fear of the uncertain future)*. Therefore, 'No' is the worst evaluation but coded by the medium value 2. To reflect the order of preference, the codes are interchanged and the direction of preference with regard to the code value is indicated:

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Yes, I think so | → | (decreasing) |
| 2. No, I don't think so | | 1. Yes, I think so |
| 3. I wouldn't want to | | 2. I wouldn't want to |
| | | 3. No, I don't think so |

Another important correction is made, because a situation can be inadequately evaluated because of too many specific questions. For example, EWCS 2005 contains 19 questions on particular professional diseases (vision problems, hearing problems, headache, etc.). Since every *given* disease appears relatively seldom in individual answers, the totality of answers on professional diseases looks quite optimistically, even if every person suffers from *some* professional disease. The same problem emerges while evaluating emotional strains with 12 questions on different types of discrimination. Suffering from one discrimination type is sufficient to experience serious emotional strains, which is however cannot be adequately captured by the evaluation based on all the variables.

To make the evaluation more adequate, the 19 questions on particular diseases and 12 questions on types of discrimination are replaced by one question on any physical disease, one question on any nervous problem and one question on any form of discrimination. Besides, 10 questions on noise and different disturbing factors like vibrations, high or low temperatures, etc., are grouped into one question on disturbing factors. The individual estimate of the grade of disturbance is taken for the most disturbing factor.

For details of final coding the variables see Table 3. The variable names are given as in the EWCS 2005, for instance q3. Re-coded variables are distinguished by adding R, for instance q3R.

2.4 Scaling

Normalizing (HBS methodology) The next step is scaling re-coded variables (columns of codes in Table 1) in a commensurable way. Every variable is either *normalized* or *standardized*, depending on the methodology. The HBS methodology uses the normalization, that is, bringing the range of every variable x to $[0; 100]$:

$$y = \frac{x - x_{\min}}{x_{\max} - x_{\min}} \cdot 100\% .$$

The effect of this procedure is that the re-scaled indicator takes values between 0 and 100, so that y means the percentage of the absolute maximum. For instance, the answers 1, 2, and 3 to the above cited question q22a are normalized to values 0, 50, and 100%. This scale allows to interpret values of the indices in absolute terms "good–bad working conditions".

Normalization is not applicable to data with outliers — occasional deviations from 'typical' values. In this case normalization makes the 'typical' values almost indistinguishable. For instance, suppose that numerous 'typical' observations are all located around 0 and a single outlier is equal to 1. Then the normalization clusters the 'typical' observations, attributing them almost equally low values.

The data of the EWCS 2005 do not contain outliers, because the codes of answers to survey questions are restricted to a few given values. Continuous variables of large range are calibrated. For instance, income is restricted to 10 deciles (European Foundation 2007a: 99). Therefore, normalization can be consistently applied.

Standardizing (OECD methodology) An alternative scaling is recommended by the OECD. Every column of Table 1 considered as variable $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)'$ is *standardized*, that is, reduced to the zero-mean and re-scaled to make its standard deviation equal to 1, and (optionally) expressed in %:

$$y = \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \cdot 100\% \quad (\text{standardized variable expressed in \%}) \quad (1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \quad (\text{empirical mean}) \\ \sigma &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2} \quad (\text{unbiased empirical standard deviation}) . \end{aligned}$$

The 0 value of y corresponds to the mean of the variable x , and 100% — to its ‘average deviation from the mean’.

Unlike normalization, this method can well discriminate between closely located ‘typical’ values even in the presence of outliers. In this case the small standard deviation factually enlarges the min–max range and ‘moves’ the ‘typical’ values from each other. As a consequence, atypical values are ‘moved’ far away and thereby emphasized.

At the same time, standardization relativizes ‘good’ and ‘bad’ values. For example, the indicator of qualification possibilities has low values in all the countries. After standardization, all the values are no longer low but rather medium, so that it is impossible to say that the situation is critical. The only conclusion could be that some countries offer better possibilities than others. Therefore standardization is adapted for benchmarking rather than for evaluation.

The advantages and disadvantages of both methods makes it useful to apply both of them in parallel.

2.5 Weighting

Taking into account advantages and limitations of normalization and standardization, it makes sense to construct indices by both methods. Under both methods, low-level individual indices are summarized with or without weights. It should be emphasized however that standardization, changing the effective range of variables, always introduces equalizing weights.

In our model, the summation of recoded normalized or standardized individual answers is performed with equal weights of questions (with reservations for the standardization which implicitly imposes equalizing weights). The reasons are threefold. Firstly, unequal weights need special motivation, and we have none.

Secondly, if certain questions get higher weights then the opinions of those for whom these questions are of particular importance are overrepresented. For instance, a young

women with a small child may pay more attention to time factors, a middle-aged man may be most interested in career prospects, and a disable worker may be more concerned with physical strains. Therefore, assigning a higher weight to career prospects we favor the middle-aged man and discriminate both the woman and the disable worker. It means that unequal question weights result in inequality of individuals, and the problem of weighting questions is linked to weighting individuals. Since individual weights are usually assumed equal (= one voter one vote), regardless of education, experience, or intelligence, the question weights should be likely assumed equal as well. Any deviation from equal weights is a source of debate, and to avoid it equal weights are accepted whenever possible.

Thirdly, it is a statistical tradition to accept the equal distribution (weights) by default, unless no other information is available; such an assumption satisfies the principle of maximal likelihood; see Kendall and Moran (1963). According to OECD–JRC (2005: 21), ‘most composite indicators rely on equal weighting, i.e., all variables are given the same weight’. Taking into account the large number of questions (125), one can expect that even if in actuality the weights are unequal, the deviations from equal weights statistically annihilate each other so that the equally-weighted composite indicator provides a reasonable approximation.

The DGB indicator *Gute Arbeit* is designed in a different way. The first section of the DGB-questionnaire is devoted to individual opinions on the importance of different aspects of working conditions. These information is used in weighting individual answers while aggregating individual indices.

In our work, this approach is not implemented, first of all because there is no data on individual preferences in the EWCS 2005. It should be also mentioned that individual weighting leads to inconsistencies in global figures if they are computed in different ways. For instance, national second-level aggregate indices computed from individual second-level aggregate indices can significantly differ from the national second-level aggregate indices computed from national first-level aggregate indices. Therefore, using variable individual weights in multi-level aggregation needs reservations.

2.6 Aggregation

The first-level aggregate indices are collected in the second to last section of Table 1. Its every column is the mean (= weighted sum with equal coefficients) of the columns of low-level indices from the corresponding table section. In case of the OECD method the first-level aggregate indices are additionally standardized column-by column.

The second-level aggregate indices constitute the next to last section of the fifth section of Table 1. They are constructed from relevant first-level individual indices exactly in the same way as partial indices are constructed from low-level indicators.

The third-level total index of working conditions occupies the last section of Table 1. It is constructed from second-level aggregate individual indices exactly in the same way.

The interpretation of the individual aggregate indices is as follows. Under the HBS method, a partial index means the average (coded) response of the individual to the questions of the corresponding section of Table 1. They attain 0 and 100 if *all* the questions are answered in the most extreme way.

Under the OECD method, a composite indicator is interpreted as a weighted sum of low-level variables, with the weights being inversely proportional to their standard

deviations. Those with smaller deviations get higher weights and thereby become commensurable with the variables with large deviations.

2.7 Methodological reservations

Standardization is a nonlinear non-monotonic transformation. It can happen that answers to a question improve (= the codes increase) but the standardized codes do not. For example assume that four individuals answer to a question with possible answers 0, 1, or 2 and afterwards *all* improve their answers:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 0 & & 1 \\
 0 & \text{all answers} \xrightarrow{\text{improve}} & 2 \\
 0 & & 2 \\
 1 & & 2
 \end{array}$$

After the standardization by formula (1), these codes in % look as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \boxed{-50} & & \boxed{-150} \\
 -50 & \text{some codes} \xrightarrow{\text{decrease}} & 50 \\
 -50 & & 50 \\
 \boxed{150} & & \boxed{50}
 \end{array}$$

The mean does not grow either (the standardized mean is always equal to 0), so no improvement can be detected but rather a decline.

Under multiple aggregation, standardization performs indirect weighting of intermediate aggregates. Due to the non-monotonicity, smaller partial indices (intermediate aggregates) can result in a greater final index, and greater partial indices — in a smaller final index. This effect is visualized in Tangian (2007b: 25) with explanations (Ibid: 20).

Such misleading effects occur under significant variations of individual answers (e.g. in different countries). If variables do not change much then the standardization can be approximated by its first-order Taylor expansion which is a linear function. Linear functions are monotonic, and indices with linear properties are free from the inconsistencies mentioned. Therefore, the OECD method can be well used *locally* under one-level aggregation. *Under multi-level aggregation with successive standardizations, as in our model, results of the OECD method can be difficult to interpret.*

3 Analysis

3.1 Overview of working conditions in Europe

The tabular Figure 2 shows the composition of the aggregate indicator of working conditions constructed with the HBS and OECD methods. The figure is a hybrid of bar graph, table, and map: the tabular values are emphasized by colors of geographic maps used to show the relief: low–medium–high altitude levels are shown by blue–green–brown.

In both sheets A–B of Figure 2, the countries are arranged in the decreasing order of the third-level aggregate indices displayed at the right-hand side of each row. Both methods give very similar country rankings with minor differences in 1–2 ranks except for 3 ranks for the United Kingdom; for explicit rankings see Sheets Z29–Z30 of Table 3.

We conclude the following:

Compatibility with the DGB indicator *Gute Arbeit*


The HBS method in Sheet A of Figure 2 evaluates working conditions in ‘absolute’ scales ranging from 0 to 100, making applicable the conventions of the DGB-indicator which values below 50 are interpreted as bad and over 80 as good. The third-level aggregate indices computed by the HBS method range from 51 for Turkey to 67 in Switzerland. Germany is evaluated with 61 points, which is close to 58 of the DGB indicator.

Table 2 shows particular advantageous and disadvantageous aspects of working conditions in European countries, classified according to the conventions of the DGB indicator.

Positive trends

- **(Top aspect of working conditions—meaningfulness of work)** The corresponding 9th column in Sheet A of Figure 2 is brown, meaning that this aspect gets either good or superior evaluation in all the countries. It is well in agreement with the worldwide high reputation of European products.
- **(Second best aspect of working conditions—collegiality)** The corresponding 8th column in Sheet A of Figure 2 is colored by brown or green, meaning that the evaluation is medium, superior, or good. The only exception is Turkey evaluated with 57 points (inferior level). The high evaluation of this aspect can be explained by European social traditions and developed solidarity.
- **(Affordable intensity of work and physical strains)** The aspects 11. *Intensity of work* and 12. *Physical strains* get superior or medium evaluation, meaning affordable conditions. Greece, where physical strains are evaluated with 55 points (inferior level), is the only exception.
- **(High job stability in nordic countries)** The highest job stability is inherent in nordic countries. It is somewhat surprising, because these countries have a relaxed employment protection legislation. Our empirical study shows that the *institutional* flexibility in these countries does not imply job insecurity *in practice*. In other words, the easiness of hiring and firing is not practiced as it is imagined.

Figure 2: Sheet A. Composition of aggregate indices 'Total quality of work (A+B+C)' by country computed with the HBS method



Indices scaled by the HBS method (0-abs.min, 100-abs.max)

Figure 2: Sheet B. Composition of aggregate indices 'Total quality of work (A+B+C)' by country computed with the OECD method

	1. Qualification and development possibilities	2. Creativity	3. Career chances	4. Possibilities for influence	5. Communication and transparency	6. Quality of management/leadership	7. Industrial culture	8. Collegiality	9. Meaningfulness of work	10. Time arrangements	11. Intensity/ exhaustiveness	12. Physical strains	13. Emotional strains	14. Job stability and job security	15. Income	Total (A+B+C)
Switzerland	245	208	92	136	125	81	-13	46	134	111	-28	160	-55	109	202	66
Norway	92	127	112	126	166	-102	29	152	67	45	-81	84	-103	181	195	58
Denmark	123	92	197	223	79	-18	105	173	149	81	-98	46	-154	179	110	50
Ireland	32	30	130	65	42	-9	80	118	19	-32	57	160	-47	78	92	39
Netherlands	57	108	17	103	49	51	66	15	122	57	9	164	-55	105	59	37
Luxemburg	9	68	85	56	-49	-26	-56	-43	93	64	38	38	-40	13	159	27
Belgium	53	109	42	32	30	-19	-45	0	26	70	6	86	-21	53	99	26
Sweden	126	208	89	221	52	-52	16	158	42	120	-114	-37	-134	122	48	26
United Kingdom	22	-72	130	21	98	-21	94	102	-106	19	-2	169	-90	122	34	26
Finland	186	-24	173	141	270	22	28	105	-72	51	-135	-64	-98	102	56	22
Austria	88	34	4	15	18	-56	18	16	11	44	-93	30	-73	44	73	10
Cyprus	-111	-83	73	-76	30	93	-10	78	134	82	-85	-11	27	63	44	9
Malta	-20	168	79	55	-117	149	132	122	141	284	-94	-69	-5	55	-46	9
EUROPE - 31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	-8	-10	-18	-74	-81	-180	-52	-79	-76	-6	-64	101	14	28	73	-1
Croatia	41	-20	-1	-37	-75	6	70	49	-25	-60	214	-79	-110	-37	-24	-5
Spain	-200	-132	-17	-80	-170	-64	-111	-42	-73	-63	80	13	46	2	34	-12
Bulgaria	-97	-79	-118	-171	4	223	48	-36	59	-19	214	-21	168	-101	-85	-12
Latvia	22	43	-93	54	57	61	111	8	10	-205	169	-84	-10	-26	-128	-13
Slovakia	53	-24	-84	-124	-80	-23	92	-6	-61	-87	48	39	158	-75	-73	-16
Hungary	-61	-54	-153	-95	8	99	27	74	-43	45	4	-78	263	-9	-127	-17
France	-117	-48	6	18	-89	-23	-214	-168	30	-15	38	-26	-22	-51	10	-21
Italy	-115	-143	-64	-49	-141	-74	-258	-164	-45	20	29	96	110	-4	-42	-23
Portugal	-125	-60	83	-70	-102	-194	-165	-67	39	-25	70	-20	30	-49	-28	-23
Slovenia	34	42	-90	-46	-58	52	140	-7	83	-38	-75	-121	-42	-104	-18	-24
Romania	-56	39	-37	-39	74	-18	22	-15	84	-243	-53	-17	84	-22	-120	-24
Estonia	61	-56	-131	15	38	34	12	-6	-91	-82	51	-82	6	-24	-124	-26
Poland	-51	-18	-101	-67	-7	-56	7	-56	43	-130	131	-67	110	-141	-107	-32
Czech Republic	-26	-103	-130	-79	-6	-84	38	-95	-164	36	-49	74	126	-135	-61	-33
Lithuania	-33	-152	-94	-76	82	222	11	-130	-193	-94	97	-78	-78	-147	-137	-48
Greece	-108	-129	-46	-127	-67	88	-29	-79	-126	-57	-111	-235	-103	-124	-3	-52
Turkey	-114	-69	-135	-71	-181	-162	-196	-220	-213	27	-172	-171	99	-208	-165	-91

Indices scaled by the OECD method (0=mean, 100=std.deviation)

Table 2: Sheet A. Particular observations by country according to the conventions of the DGB indicator *Gute Arbeit* (computations by the HBS method)

		Index values	
		Bad (< 50)	Good (> 80)
BE Belgium	(798)	1. Qualification and development possibilities	9. Meaningfulness of work
CZ Czech Republic	(749)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances	
DK Denmark	(865)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 13. Emotional strains	8. Collegiality 9. Meaningfulness of work
DE Germany	(877)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 5. Communication and transparency	
EE Estonia	(555)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 15. Income	
EL Greece	(629)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 4. Possibilities for influence 5. Communication and transparency 13. Emotional strains	
ES Spain	(786)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 5. Communication and transparency 7. Industrial culture	
FR France	(878)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 5. Communication and transparency 7. Industrial culture	9. Meaningfulness of work
IE Ireland	(768)	1. Qualification and development possibilities	9. Meaningfulness of work
IT Italy	(691)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 5. Communication and transparency 7. Industrial culture	
CY Cyprus	(482)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 4. Possibilities for influence	9. Meaningfulness of work
LV Latvia	(903)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 15. Income	9. Meaningfulness of work
LT Lithuania	(873)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 13. Emotional strains 15. Income	6. Quality of management/leadership
LU Luxemburg	(520)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 5. Communication and transparency	9. Meaningfulness of work
HU Hungary	(810)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 4. Possibilities for influence 15. Income	
MT Malta	(507)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 5. Communication and transparency	9. Meaningfulness of work

Table 2: Sheet B. Particular observations by country according to the conventions of the DGB indicator *Gute Arbeit* (computations by the HBS method)

		Index values	
		Bad (< 50)	Good (> 80)
NL Netherlands	(877)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances	9. Meaningfulness of work
AT Austria	(842)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 13. Emotional strains	9. Meaningfulness of work
PL Poland	(793)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 5. Communication and transparency 15. Income	9. Meaningfulness of work
PT Portugal	(788)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 5. Communication and transparency 7. Industrial culture	9. Meaningfulness of work
SI Slovenia	(500)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 5. Communication and transparency 13. Emotional strains	9. Meaningfulness of work
SK Slovakia	(860)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 4. Possibilities for influence 5. Communication and transparency	
FI Finland	(911)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 13. Emotional strains	
SE Sweden	(951)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 13. Emotional strains	8. Collegiality 9. Meaningfulness of work
UK United Kingdom	(876)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 13. Emotional strains	
BG Bulgaria	(954)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 4. Possibilities for influence 15. Income	6. Quality of management/leadership 9. Meaningfulness of work 11. Intensity/ exhaustiveness
HR Croatia	(816)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 5. Communication and transparency 13. Emotional strains	9. Meaningfulness of work 11. Intensity/ exhaustiveness
RO Romania	(798)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 15. Income	9. Meaningfulness of work
TR Turkey	(454)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 3. Career chances 5. Communication and transparency 7. Industrial culture 14. Job stability and job security 15. Income	
NO Norway	(846)	1. Qualification and development possibilities 13. Emotional strains	8. Collegiality 9. Meaningfulness of work 14. Job stability and job security
CH Switzerland	(831)	1. Qualification and development possibilities	9. Meaningfulness of work

- **(Decisive impact of trade unions on job stability)** The highest job stability in countries with flexible employment relations be explained by strong trade unions. Indeed, Denmark, Sweden and Finland (80, 76, 74 points for job stability) had in 2004 the highest trade union density in Europe with 80, 77, and 71%, respectively (European Foundation 2007b: 6). Similarly, the job stability is high in Cyprus and Malta (71 and 70 points), where the employment protection has a limited applicability (according to EWCS 2005, in Cyprus and Malta 42 and 40% of employees work with no contract). At the same time, the trade union density in these two countries is as high as 70 and 63%, respectively (European Foundation 2007b: 6).

On the other hand, Greece with one of strongest employment protection legislations in the OECD countries (OECD 2004b: 117) is evaluated as having an inferior job stability with 55 points. It has the trade union density as low as 20% (European Foundation 2007b: 6), which agrees with the hypothesis that job stability is influenced by trade unions rather than by institutional norms of employment protection.

Negative trends

- **(Insufficient quality of European working conditions)** The aggregate indicator of working condition to the right from country bars shows that working conditions in European countries range from inferior to medium quality. It does not meet the European Agenda 2010, claiming for 'more and *better* jobs'.
- **(Bad qualification and development possibilities all over Europe)** The corresponding first column in Sheet A of Figure 2 is dark blue, meaning a bad evaluation. It is a serious warning signal for the European Employment Strategy oriented towards flexible employment which requires life-long learning.
- **(Poor career chances all over Europe and modest income)** The third column in Sheet A of Figure 2 exhibits a bad or inferior evaluation with respect to career chances of all countries except Denmark with 61 points (lowest medium level). It reflects the current trend of social split into top and low classes with increasing difficulties to bridge the gap. The income evaluation does not surpass the medium threshold as well. It also does not meet the claims for 'better jobs' in the European Agenda 2010.
- **(Emotional strains are quite critical.** As shown by the 13th column, 10 of 31 countries have the indicator value below 50, and another 20 countries below 60. Only Hungary with 62 points attains the low-medium level. It means that the emotional background of work should be urgently improved.
- **(Inconvenient time arrangements)** The 10th column in Sheet A of Figure 2 is hell blue, meaning inferior evaluation of time arrangements for all the countries. This aspect of work is primarily devoted to the adaptability of working time to personal wishes. Its low evaluation all over Europe means that the current flexibilisation of employment relations, which is often presented as a reciprocal advantage for employers and employees, does not provide real advantages for workers even for time arrangements.

- **(Limited possibilities for influence and insufficient transparency)** The corresponding 4-5th columns in Sheet A of Figure 2 exhibit low evaluations, meaning a low role of workers in the management of enterprises. In particular, the German co-determination looks insufficiently efficient, if these aspects of working conditions in Germany are evaluated with 51 and 46 points, respectively.
- **(Disparities among European countries)** As already mentioned, the standardization of variables in the OECD method 'relativizes' the evaluation. Therefore, the values in Sheet B of Figure 2 can be interpreted only as 'relative good', or 'relative bad'. Respectively, 'good' and 'bad' are not mentioned in the legend to the graph. Since all the estimates are reduced to the mean, it is no longer possible to detect critical aspects of working conditions as in the graph based on the evaluation with the HBS method.

On the other hand, the graph based on the evaluation by the OECD method clearly shows the inequality of working conditions and disparities among European countries, which is important for monitoring European integration processes. Generally, the countries with better working conditions at the top of the chart have superior evaluations of their particular aspects (brown color is predominating). The countries with poorer working conditions at the bottom of the chart have inferior evaluations (blue color is predominating). For example, most aspects of working conditions in Turkey are far below the European average.

At the same time there are striking exceptions. For instance, emotional strains are especially strong in the countries with best working conditions, like Denmark, Sweden and Norway, whereas many countries with working conditions below the European average (negative total evaluation) are most wealthy with regard to the emotional aspect (Bulgaria, Slovakia, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Czech Republic, and Turkey).

3.2 General satisfaction with working conditions

Up till now working conditions have been evaluated with using answers to specific survey questions like the number of days in professional training over the last 12 months, ability to apply own ideas, etc. Now we investigate the influence of these specific factors on the general satisfaction with working conditions. Additionally to the specific questions, Table 3 contains the following section with a single question

16. *Satisfaction*

- General satisfaction with working conditions: very satisfied, satisfied, not very satisfied, not at all satisfied (q36)

Figures 3 and 4 display the location of European countries on the plane 'Working conditions – Satisfaction with working conditions', basing on the indices computed by the HBS and OECD methods, respectively. Both graphs are similar and exhibit a clear dependence between 'objective' and 'subjective' evaluation of working conditions (the regression lines have the goodness of fit $R^2 = 0.59$ and $R^2 = 0.72$, respectively).

Figure 3: Dependence of satisfaction with working conditions on the index of working conditions computed by the HBS method for European countries: BE—Belgium, CZ—Czech Republic, DK—Denmark, DE—Germany, EE—Estonia, EL—Greece, ES—Spain, FR—France, IE—Ireland, IT—Italy, CY—Cyprus, LV—Latvia, LT—Lithuania, LU—Luxemburg, HU—Hungary, MT—Malta, NL—Netherlands, AT—Austria, PL—Poland, PT—Portugal, SI—Slovenia, SK—Slovakia, FI—Finland, SE—Sweden, UK—United Kingdom, BG—Bulgaria, HR—Croatia, RO—Romania, TR—Turkey, NO—Norway, CH—Switzerland

Regression on 31 European countries: $Satisf = 5.99 + 0.87 * WorkCond$ $R^2 = 0.5936$ $F = 42.3625$ $P_F = 0.0000$





Figure 4: Dependence of satisfaction with working conditions on the index of working conditions computed by the OECD method for European countries: BE—Belgium, CZ—Czech Republic, DK—Denmark, DE—Germany, EE—Estonia, EL—Greece, ES—Spain, FR—France, IE—Ireland, IT—Italy, CY—Cyprus, LV—Latvia, LT—Lithuania, LU—Luxemburg, HU—Hungary, MT—Malta, NL—Netherlands, AT—Austria, PL—Poland, PT—Portugal, SI—Slovenia, SK—Slovakia, FI—Finland, SE—Sweden, UK—United Kingdom, BG—Bulgaria, HR—Croatia, RO—Romania, TR—Turkey, NO—Norway, CH—Switzerland

Regression on 31 European countries: $Satisf = 5.33 + 2.43 * WorkCond$ $R^2 = 0.7154$ $F = 72.8944$ $P_F = 0.0000$



3.3 Importance of different aspects of working conditions

The questionnaire for constructing the DGB indicator *Gute Arbeit* contains a number of questions on the importance of different aspects of working conditions. The EWCS 2005 has no questions of this type, but its question q36 on the general satisfaction with working conditions makes it possible to estimate the role of each aspect by statistical methods.

We apply the stepwise regression. At first the independent variable is found which provides alone the best fit (= the partial index 1–15 which has the greatest impact on the satisfaction with working conditions) and includes it into the regression model. Then the next variable is found which, being included into the model, improves the fit best (= the partial indicator which has the next greatest impact on the satisfaction with working conditions), and so on.

The results of analysis for the whole of Europe are collected in Figure 5. The importance of each aspect of working conditions is estimated by the stepwise regression applied to

1. Indices computed by the HBS method; the resulting estimate is depicted by the upper bar in each triplet of bars in Figure 5. The regression coefficient and the rank of its absolute value are shown at the right-hand side of the bar. The grey font shows the regression coefficients which differ from 0 non-significantly (for the significance level 5%).
2. Indices computed by the HBS method and then standardized; the estimate is shown by the middle bar in each triplet. The standardization of indices makes the estimates obtained with the HBS and OECD methods better comparable with each other. Since the slope of the regression plane depends on axes scaling, comparisons of regression coefficients should be done in the same scales. The standardization just eliminates the stretching effects of scaling.
3. Indices computed by the OECD method; the estimate is shown by the lower bar in each triplet. Recall that regression coefficients in standardized scales are equal to correlation coefficients (Prohorov 1984: 930), Korn and Korn (1968 formulas 18.4-21 and 18.4.23). Therefore the regression coefficients for the index sets computed with the HBS method and then standardized, or with the OECD method are all correlation coefficients.

The three sets of estimates are quite similar, especially the second and third sets (for the indices obtained with the HBS method and standardized and obtained with the OECD method). The same is valid for the graphs computed for each country; see Annex 1. For better comparability of the results, we shall consider only the estimates described in Items 2 and 3.

Figure 6 provides an overview of the importance of different aspects of working conditions under the approaches described in Item 2–3. The numerical values are the ranks of importance of different aspects of working conditions for the whole of Europe and for each country. For instance, the top Europe-rows in Sheets A–B consist of ranks of, respectively, middle and lower bars of bar triplets in Figure 5. The country rows display the corresponding ranks taken from country graphs in Annex 2.

Similarly to Figure 2, the colors in Figure 6 show the relief, following the standards of geographic maps: the ranks of positive regression coefficients are brown as mountains—the higher the altitude, the more luscious the color, and negative regression coefficients

Figure 5: Sheet A. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)






Figure 6: Sheet A. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for general satisfaction with working conditions by country computed with the HBS method



Importance estimated with the HBS method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)

Figure 6: Sheet B. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for general satisfaction with working conditions by country computed with the OECD method



Importance estimated with the OECD method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)

are shown by blue as the ocean depth. The non-significant positive aspects of working conditions are shown by hell green as the plane, and the non-significant negative aspects are shown by hell blue as the shallow water. Which conclusions can we derive from Figure 6?

- **(Most important aspect: job stability)** The aspect 14 — Job stability gets the top European rank and is also highly ranked in all the European countries, including Germany. Comparing to Figure 2, some countries with a high job stability (nordic countries like Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Norway, as well as Malta) do not show the top interest in job stability. It can be the manifestation of the common indifference to what one already has.
- **(Next most important aspects: physical strains and career opportunities)** Physical strains and career opportunities are ranked 2 and 3 in the whole of Europe, but single countries are not unanimous in their estimation. For example, Germany ranks them 4 and 5–6, respectively, putting after collegiality and meaningfulness of work. Physical strains are moderately ranked also in countries with low physical strains like Ireland, United Kingdom, Norway, or Switzerland, but these countries are rather concerned with career chances. It is noteworthy that career opportunities are not significant in Denmark and Luxembourg.
- **(Collegiality and meaningfulness of work are quite important)** These two aspects of work are of prime importance in several countries, but a few countries show indifference (= non-significance of estimation).
- **(Income is relatively low important)** The income is ranked only as the 6th important aspect of working conditions. The general satisfaction with working conditions in 10 of 31 countries, including Germany, does not significantly depend on income, although many Europeans find it insufficient (see Figure 2).
- **(Negative attitude to qualitative management, training, and creativity)** The quality of management and qualification and development possibilities have a negative, although not strong, impact on the general satisfaction with working conditions all over Europe (often non-significant, as in Germany). Creativity is also perceived rather as a disadvantage, and possibilities for influence are ranked quite low.

At the same time, training is highly desired by 70% persons in the direct German inquiry (DGB Index Gute Arbeit 2007: 24). It means that there is a difference between rational understanding shown in answers to explicit questions and unconscious reaction revealed in our indirect analysis. It looks that Europeans are stressed by managerial attention, learning, and necessity to show initiative rather than enjoy them. A latent resistance to learning can be the cause its low efficiency, and, consequently, of low motivation of employers to invest in training, resulting in poor training possibilities demonstrated by Figure 2. Another cause of negative impact of learning on the satisfaction with working conditions can be an uncomfortable feeling of insufficient skills and low job stability.

3.4 Working conditions by occupation, gender, and some other classifiers

Figures 7–18 display the results of analysis of working conditions by different social groups. Let us outline the major observations derived from our evaluation.

Analysis by occupation (simplified ISCO classification) Figures 7–8

- **Working conditions are best by senior officials and professionals** As most privileged groups, senior officials and professionals occupy the top positions in both Sheets A and B of Figure 7. They have top meaningfulness of work, superior job stability, and highest qualification possibilities. At the same time, they have strongest emotional strains, although they are almost indifferent to this aspect of working conditions.
- **Agriculture workers: Lowest income, top emotional background, and indifference to most aspects of working conditions** As follows from the evaluation with the HBS method, agricultural workers constitute the only group with a 'bad' income which is according the relative evaluation with the OECD method is *by far* the lowest among all the groups. At the same time, this group has *by far* the most relaxed emotional background. However, as follows from Figure 8, agricultural workers are rather indifferent to most aspects of working conditions.

Analysis by industry (simplified NACE classification), Figure 9–10

- **Privileged group: Financial intermediation** Sheet B of Figure 9 demonstrates that those who work in finances have *irreproachably best* working conditions, especially regarding qualification possibilities, career chances, possibilities for influence, qualitative management, physical strains, and income. This group leaves far behind the next best group of business people.
- **(Most disadvantageous group: Hotels and restaurants** Those who work in hotels and restaurants have the worst working conditions. They have all aspects of working conditions significantly below the average and suffer most of all from bad qualification possibilities, career chances, emotional strains, and the worst time arrangements among all the groups considered. Their income is second worst, with the worst being inherent in agriculture workers.

Analysis by the size of local unit, Figures 11–12

- **Big units: Best working conditions, best qualification possibilities, but worst time arrangements** The evaluation of quality of work in big and small units based on the HBS method shows quite minor differences. The evaluation based on the OECD method reflects some *relative* differences between best conditions in big units and worse conditions in small ones. For instance, big units have best qualification possibilities (although they are still bad) but worst time arrangements for workers.

- **One-employee unit: Most contrasting evaluation of aspects of working conditions** Micro-units with one employee have the worst or next to worst working conditions, depending on the evaluation method. As shown with the OECD method, one-employee unit have most contrasting aspects of working conditions which get either top or bottom evaluation among all unit sizes.

Analysis by the company status, Figures 13–14

- **Best conditions in public sector and non-profit organisations** This type of classification exhibits even lower differences in working conditions. However, better conditions are inherent in the public sector and non-governmental organisations which outperform other sectors in almost all aspects of working conditions, except emotional strains which are the most weak among all the groups.
- **Worst conditions in the private sector** The worst conditions are observed in the private sector which shows no advantageous aspect of working conditions.

Analysis by gender, Figures–15–16

- **Men’s working conditions are better than women’s in 9 of 15 aspects** As one can see, men’s working conditions surpass that of women in qualification possibilities, creativity, career chances, possibilities for influence, communication and transparency, industrial culture, collegiality, emotional strains, and income. Women gain in quality of management, meaningfulness of work, time arrangements, intensity/exhaustiveness, physical strains, and job stability. The attitude to the importance of working conditions is somewhat similar. Men, comparing to women, pay more attention to income and career chances, and women are more than men sensitive to meaningfulness of work and emotional strains.
- **Women: Bad transparency and strong emotional strains** The evaluation in absolute scales by the HBS method shows that women, unlike men, have a bad level of communication and transparency and of emotional strains.

Analysis by the type of contract, Figures 17–18

- **All atypical employees have working conditions below average** The only social group with working conditions above the European average is that of employees with permanent contracts. Employees with fix-term contract, temporary employment agency workers (TWA), and employees with no contract have working conditions below the European average. Those who have no contracts have a bad level of industrial culture, and the TWA workers are the ones who have a bad level for possibilities of influence.
- **Work with no contract is better than a TWA contract** TWA-workers have the worst working conditions. They undercut the employees with no contract even in job stability, although gaining a little in income. At the same time, TWA workers are concerned with job stability much less that other groups.

4 Reform proposal: Workplace tax

Our study reveals considerably disparities in working conditions among countries and different social groups which, according to the European policy, should be urgently reduced. Therefore, to stimulate employers to equalize working conditions, it is proposed to introduce a **workplace tax** for bad working conditions.


The workplace tax is supposed to be imposed on the employers who offer bad working conditions. Similarly to the green tax in the environment protection which stimulates enterprises to consider the natural environment, the workplace tax should stimulate enterprises to consider the working environment. Indexing working conditions developed in our study can be regarded as prototype measuring the 'social pollution' and used to determine the tax amount. A fraction of the tax can be paid directly to the employee as a bonus for bad working conditions. However, its significant fraction should be paid to the state to keep the situation under the statutory control. The workplace tax is particularly topical for atypical employees who, as has been shown, have worse working conditions. If 'more and better jobs' should be attained 'through flexibility' then their quality should be controlled and secured.

5 Conclusions

Composite indicators of *Decent Work* for 31 European countries are constructed with the data of the Fourth European Working Conditions Survey 2005 (EWCS 2005). Partial indices reflect 15 aspects of working conditions as in the recently published German DGB-index *Gute-Arbeit*. Two methodologies, of the OECD and of the Hans Böckler Foundation, differing in scaling, give very similar results. The indices reveal disparities among countries and social groups, main of which are summarized in the abstract.


Besides policy monitoring, the indices constructed can be used for measuring the quality of working conditions for imposing the **workplace tax** for bad working conditions which could stimulate employers to protect 'the working environment' in the same way as the green tax protects the natural environment.

Figure 7: Sheet A. Composition of aggregate indices 'Total quality of work (A+B+C)' by occupation (ISCO) computed with the HBS method: Senior officials—Legislators and senior officials and managers, Professionals—Professionals, Technicians—Technicians and associated professionals, Clerks—Clerks, Service—Service/sales workers, Agriculture—Agricultural and fishery skilled workers, Craft workers—Craft and related trades workers, Operators—Operators of machines and plants and assemblers, Elementary—Elementary occupations, Military—Military and armed forces




Indices scaled by the HBS method (0-abs.min, 100-abs.max)

Figure 7: Sheet B. Composition of aggregate indices 'Total quality of work (A+B+C)' by occupation (ISCO) computed with the OECD method: Senior officials—Legislators and senior officials and managers, Professionals—Professionals, Technicians—Technicians and associated professionals, Clerks—Clerks, Service—Service/sales workers, Agriculture—Agricultural and fishery skilled workers, Craft workers—Craft and related trades workers, Operators—Operators of machines and plants and assemblers, Elementary—Elementary occupations, Military—Military and armed forces




Indices scaled by the OECD method (0=mean, 100=std.deviation)

Figure 8: Sheet A. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for general satisfaction with working conditions by occupation (ISCO) computed with the HBS and OECD methods: Senior officials—Legislators and senior officials and managers, Professionals—Professionals, Technicians—Technicians and associated professionals, Clerks—Clerks, Service—Service/sales workers, Agriculture—Agricultural and fishery skilled workers, Craft workers—Craft and related trades workers, Operators—Operators of machines and plants and assemblers, Elementary—Elementary occupations, Military—Military and armed forces




Importance estimated with the HBS method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)

Figure 8: Sheet B. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for general satisfaction with working conditions by occupation (ISCO) computed with the HBS and OECD methods: Senior officials—Legislators and senior officials and managers, Professionals—Professionals, Technicians—Technicians and associated professionals, Clerks—Clerks, Service—Service/sales workers, Agriculture—Agricultural and fishery skilled workers, Craft workers—Craft and related trades workers, Operators—Operators of machines and plants and assemblers, Elementary—Elementary occupations, Military—Military and armed forces




Importance estimated with the OECD method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)

Figure 9: Sheet A. Composition of aggregate indices 'Total quality of work (A+B+C)' by industry branch (NACE) computed with the HBS method: A+B agriculture—Agriculture, hunting, forestry, and fishing, C+D manufacturing—Mining and manufacturing, E energy—Electricity, gas and water supply, F construction—Construction, G trade—Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and household goods, H hotels—Hotels and restaurants, I transport—Transport, storage and communication, J finances—Financial intermediation, K business—Real estate, renting and business activities, L administration—Public administration and defence; compulsory social security, M+N education—Education, health and social work




Indices scaled by the HBS method (0-abs.min, 100-abs.max)

Figure 9: Sheet B. Composition of aggregate indices 'Total quality of work (A+B+C)' by industry branch (NACE) computed with the OECD method: A+B agriculture—Agriculture, hunting, forestry, and fishing, C+D manufacturing—Mining and manufacturing, E energy—Electricity, gas and water supply, F construction—Construction, G trade—Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and household goods, H hotels—Hotels and restaurants, I transport—Transport, storage and communication, J finances—Financial intermediation, K business—Real estate, renting and business activities, L administration—Public administration and defence; compulsory social security, M+N education—Education, health and social work




Indices scaled by the OECD method (0=mean, 100=std.deviation)

Figure 10: Sheet A. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for general satisfaction with working conditions by industry branch (NACE) computed with the HBS and OECD methods: A+B agriculture—Agriculture, hunting, forestry, and fishing, C+D manufacturing—Mining and manufacturing, E energy—Electricity, gas and water supply, F construction—Construction, G trade—Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and household goods, H hotels—Hotels and restaurants, I transport—Transport, storage and communication, J finances—Financial intermediation, K business—Real estate, renting and business activities, L administration—Public administration and defence; compulsory social security, M+N education—Education, health and social work




Importance estimated with the HBS method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)

Figure 10: Sheet B. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for general satisfaction with working conditions by industry branch (NACE) computed with the HBS and OECD methods: A+B agriculture—Agriculture, hunting, forestry, and fishing, C+D manufacturing—Mining and manufacturing, E energy—Electricity, gas and water supply, F construction—Construction, G trade—Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and household goods, H hotels—Hotels and restaurants, I transport—Transport, storage and communication, J finances—Financial intermediation, K business—Real estate, renting and business activities, L administration—Public administration and defence; compulsory social security, M+N education—Education, health and social work




Importance estimated with the OECD method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)

Figure 11: Composition of aggregate indices 'Total quality of work (A+B+C)' by size of local unit computed with the HBS method (top) and OECD method (bottom)




Indices scaled by the HBS method (0–abs.min, 100–abs.max)




Indices scaled by the OECD method (0–mean, 100–std.deviation)

Figure 12: Importance of different aspects of working conditions for general satisfaction with working conditions by size of local unit computed with the HBS method (top) and OECD method (bottom)




Importance estimated with the HBS method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)




Importance estimated with the OECD method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)

Figure 13: Composition of aggregate indices 'Total quality of work (A+B+C)' by company status computed with the HBS method: Private sector—Private sector, Public sector—Public sector, Private-public—Joint private-public organisation or company, Non-profit—Non-profit and NGO, Other—Other




Indices scaled by the HBS method (0-abs.min, 100-abs.max)




Indices scaled by the OECD method (0-mean, 100-std.deviation)

Figure 14: Importance of different aspects of working conditions for general satisfaction with working conditions by company status computed with the HBS and OECD methods: Private sector—Private sector, Public sector—Public sector, Private-public—Joint private-public organisation or company, Non-profit—Non-profit and NGO, Other—Other




Importance estimated with the HBS method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)




Importance estimated with the OECD method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)

Figure 15: Composition of aggregate indices 'Total quality of work (A+B+C)' by gender computed with the HBS method (top) and OECD method (bottom)




Indices scaled by the HBS method (0-abs.min, 100-abs.max)




Indices scaled by the OECD method (0-mean, 100-std.deviation)

Figure 16: Importance of different aspects of working conditions for general satisfaction with working conditions by gender computed with the HBS method (top) and OECD method (bottom)



Importance estimated with the HBS method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)



Importance estimated with the OECD method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)

Figure 17: Sheet A. Composition of aggregate indices 'Total quality of work (A+B+C)' by type of contract computed with the HBS method (top) and OECD method (bottom): Permanent contract—Permanently employed, Fixed-term—Fixed-term employed, TWA—Temporary employment agency workers, No contract—Work with no contract







Figure 18: Importance of different aspects of working conditions for general satisfaction with working conditions by type of contract computed with the HBS method (top) and OECD method (bottom): Permanent contract—Permanently employed, Fixed-term—Fixed-term employed, TWA—Temporary employment agency workers, No contract—Work with no contract



Importance estimated with the HBS method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)



Importance estimated with the OECD method (1 – most important, 2 – next important, etc.)

6 Annex 1: 1st-, 2nd-, and 3rd-level indicators of working conditions by country

6.1 Evaluating countries with respect to survey questions

Table 3 illustrates three phases in constructing the national indicators. To be specific, consider Belgium with 798 employees interviewed (shown in parentheses in the left table column) and its table cell related to the first question

		q28a (increasing) Training provided by employer in the past 12 months
		1: Not mentioned 2: 1–3 days 3: 4–7 days 4: 8–15 days 5: 15–30 days 6: 31–60 days 7: 61–180 days 8: over 180 days
BE	(798)	1.84
Belgium		12/6 108 / 6

The top element of the cell shows the average national answer coded as shown in the second headline. The average Belgian answer 1.84 means that Belgians on the average belong rather to the second group specified (1–3 days training) than the first one (Not mentioned).

The middle element displays the average answer code by the HBS method, that is, normalized. The average code 1.84 is converted into 12%. Thus, this partial indicator of training provided by employer is only 12% of its absolute maximum which could be attained if all Belgian employees belonged to the 8th group (over 180 days). The number 6 after the slash / is the rank of the Belgium figure (computed with the HBS method) in the column. Since the table represents 31 countries, its 31 rows occupy two successive pages, so that every column should be regarded in two pages.

The bottom element of the cell is the national average of the individual codes standardized by the OECD method. Its value 108 says that the Belgian average above the European average is 105% of the standard deviation computed for all 23788 individuals interviewed (not for countries!). The 6 after the slash indicates the rank of Belgium in the row. Since standardization with *fixed* mean and standard deviation is a linear transformation (the mean and standard deviation are constant for each column), the rank is the same as for the normalized figure (the situation will be different for aggregated indices).

6.2 Evaluating countries with respect to partial indices (1st-level aggregate indices)

Beginning from Sheet Z19–Z20, the layout of table cells is somewhat different. They no longer display figures for single questions but show first-level aggregate indices — partial indices *1. Qualification and development possibilities*, *2. Creativity*, etc. For example, consider the Belgian cell for the *1. Qualification and development possibilities* in Sheet Z19:

		Partial indices
		1
		Qualification and development possibilities
		Mean score,%
BE	(798)	36/12
Belgium		53 / 10

The top left figure 36 means the 36%-valued *Qualification and development possibilities* computed by the HBS method. It is obtained by taking the mean of normalized 23788 answers to the eight questions from the section *1. Qualification and development possibilities* in Sheets A–D. The 100% would be attained if *all* Belgians declared the maximal possibilities with respect to *all* eight questions. The top right figure 12 after the slash is the Belgian rank in the column.

The bottom left element of the cell 53 is the *Qualification and development possibilities* in Belgium computed by the OECD method. For this purpose, the 23788-long *columns* of eight standardized individual indices from the section *1. Qualification and development possibilities* are summarized, and then the summary column is standardized again. Then the codes of Belgian respondents are selected, and their mean is computed. It gives the 53 displayed. Note that the ranks of partial indices obtained with both methods do not differ much in columns of Table 3.

6.3 Evaluating countries with respect to aggregate indices

The *Aggregate indices* A, B, and C in Sheets Z27–Z30 are obtained similarly from partial indices 1–10, 11–13, and 14–15, respectively. The third-level aggregate index *The quality of work* ($A + B + C$) is the derivative from the 2nd-level aggregate indices A, B, and C.

Due to three-step aggregation, of questions and of partial indices, the ranks of the aggregate indices obtained by HBS and OECD methods are not that similar as after the first aggregation. Still, they are not much contradictory.

Table 3: Sheet A. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		1. Qualification and development possibilities			
		q28a (increasing) Training provided by employer in the past 12 months	q28c (decreasing) On-the-job training in the past 12 months	q28d (decreasing) Other forms of on-site training in the past 12 months	q34ab (decreasing) Educational leave in the past 12 months
		1: Not mentioned 2: 1-3 days 3: 4-7 days 4: 8-15 days 5: 15-30 days 6: 31-60 days 7: 61-180 days 8: over 180 days	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
BE Belgium	(798)	1.84 12 / 6 108 / 6	1.58 42 / 7 81 / 7	1.74 26 / 8 60 / 8	1.97 3 / 20 -37 / 20
CZ Czech Republic	(749)	1.44 6 / 21 -53 / 21	1.64 36 / 12 28 / 12	1.79 21 / 17 1 / 17	1.97 3 / 23 -60 / 23
DK Denmark	(865)	1.96 14 / 2 159 / 2	1.66 34 / 15 13 / 15	1.76 24 / 13 37 / 13	1.98 2 / 26 -90 / 26
DE Germany	(877)	1.46 7 / 19 -44 / 19	1.72 28 / 19 -36 / 19	1.83 17 / 21 -52 / 21	1.94 6 / 7 35 / 7
EE Estonia	(555)	1.58 8 / 13 5 / 13	1.57 43 / 6 85 / 6	1.70 30 / 4 121 / 4	1.95 5 / 9 28 / 9
EL Greece	(629)	1.37 5 / 26 -85 / 26	1.78 22 / 26 -90 / 26	1.89 11 / 28 -135 / 28	1.96 4 / 13 -3 / 13
ES Spain	(786)	1.26 4 / 29 -128 / 29	1.87 13 / 31 -164 / 31	1.90 10 / 30 -147 / 30	1.98 2 / 27 -92 / 27
FR France	(878)	1.40 6 / 24 -72 / 24	1.76 24 / 23 -72 / 23	1.92 8 / 31 -170 / 31	1.99 1 / 31 -120 / 31
IE Ireland	(768)	1.87 12 / 4 121 / 4	1.65 35 / 13 17 / 13	1.76 24 / 14 36 / 14	1.92 8 / 4 123 / 4
IT Italy	(691)	1.33 5 / 28 -99 / 28	1.84 16 / 30 -144 / 30	1.88 12 / 27 -125 / 27	1.96 4 / 19 -25 / 19
CY Cyprus	(482)	1.38 5 / 25 -78 / 25	1.74 26 / 22 -53 / 22	1.87 13 / 26 -110 / 26	1.94 6 / 6 40 / 6
LV Latvia	(903)	1.50 7 / 18 -32 / 18	1.63 37 / 10 34 / 10	1.63 37 / 1 210 / 1	1.95 5 / 11 4 / 11
LT Lithuania	(873)	1.36 5 / 27 -89 / 27	1.72 28 / 20 -38 / 20	1.76 24 / 12 42 / 12	1.94 6 / 8 35 / 8
LU Luxemburg	(520)	1.58 8 / 14 4 / 14	1.68 32 / 16 -4 / 16	1.81 19 / 20 -33 / 20	1.95 5 / 10 22 / 10
HU Hungary	(810)	1.46 7 / 20 -47 / 20	1.78 22 / 25 -89 / 25	1.86 14 / 25 -93 / 25	1.96 4 / 17 -15 / 17
MT Malta	(507)	1.68 10 / 10 45 / 10	1.73 27 / 21 -48 / 21	1.79 21 / 16 3 / 16	1.89 11 / 2 202 / 2

Table 3: Sheet B. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		1. Qualification and development possibilities			
		q28a (increasing) Training provided by employer in the past 12 months	q28c (decreasing) On-the-job training in the past 12 months	q28d (decreasing) Other forms of on-site training in the past 12 months	q34ab (decreasing) Educational leave in the past 12 months
		1: Not mentioned			
		2: 1–3 days			
		3: 4–7 days			
		4: 8–15 days			
		5: 15–30 days			
		6: 31–60 days			
		7: 61–180 days			
		8: over 180 days			
NL	(877)	1.61 9 / 12	1.69 31 / 17	1.83 17 / 22	1.90 10 / 3
Netherlands		16 / 12	–17 / 17	–58 / 22	172 / 3
AT	(842)	1.76 11 / 9	1.63 37 / 11	1.80 20 / 18	1.99 1 / 28
Austria		75 / 9	33 / 11	–11 / 18	–103 / 28
PL	(793)	1.51 7 / 17	1.66 34 / 14	1.78 22 / 15	1.99 1 / 29
Poland		–26 / 17	14 / 14	13 / 15	–109 / 29
PT	(788)	1.42 6 / 23	1.84 16 / 29	1.90 10 / 29	1.98 2 / 25
Portugal		–63 / 23	–137 / 29	–143 / 29	–80 / 25
SI	(500)	1.78 11 / 8	1.60 40 / 8	1.73 27 / 6	1.94 6 / 5
Slovenia		84 / 8	63 / 8	82 / 6	41 / 5
SK	(860)	1.65 9 / 11	1.47 53 / 3	1.71 29 / 5	1.97 3 / 22
Slovakia		34 / 11	171 / 3	108 / 5	–52 / 22
FI	(911)	1.82 12 / 7	1.41 59 / 1	1.64 36 / 2	1.98 2 / 24
Finland		100 / 7	225 / 1	199 / 2	–67 / 24
SE	(951)	1.95 14 / 3	1.46 54 / 2	1.74 26 / 7	1.96 4 / 18
Sweden		153 / 3	177 / 2	61 / 7	–17 / 18
UK	(876)	1.53 8 / 15	1.54 46 / 5	1.69 31 / 3	1.95 5 / 12
United Kingdom		–19 / 15	113 / 5	130 / 3	4 / 12
BG	(954)	1.19 3 / 30	1.79 21 / 27	1.81 19 / 19	1.96 4 / 14
Bulgaria		–155 / 30	–100 / 27	–32 / 19	–4 / 14
HR	(816)	1.51 7 / 16	1.71 29 / 18	1.75 25 / 10	1.96 4 / 16
Croatia		–23 / 16	–30 / 18	55 / 10	–12 / 16
RO	(798)	1.42 6 / 22	1.83 17 / 28	1.84 16 / 23	1.99 1 / 30
Romania		–63 / 22	–133 / 28	–70 / 23	–117 / 30
TR	(454)	1.13 2 / 31	1.78 22 / 24	1.85 15 / 24	1.96 4 / 15
Turkey		–182 / 31	–86 / 24	–83 / 24	–4 / 15
NO	(846)	1.85 12 / 5	1.62 38 / 9	1.74 26 / 9	1.97 3 / 21
Norway		112 / 5	44 / 9	60 / 9	–43 / 21
CH	(831)	2.16 17 / 1	1.50 50 / 4	1.75 25 / 11	1.85 15 / 1
Switzerland		242 / 1	144 / 4	47 / 11	344 / 1

Table 3: Sheet C. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		1. Qualification and development possibilities			
		q23e (decreasing) Complex tasks	q23f (decreasing) Learning new things	q26a1R (decreasing) Necessity of different skills in rotating tasks	q27R (decreasing) Necessity of further training
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
BE	(798)	1.45 55 / 22 -56 / 22	1.23 77 / 8 46 / 8	1.13 87 / 9 75 / 9	1.88 12 / 18 -15 / 18
CZ	(749)	1.39 61 / 16 5 / 16	1.34 66 / 23 -62 / 23	1.15 85 / 12 60 / 12	1.89 11 / 22 -50 / 22
DK	(865)	1.23 77 / 2 158 / 2	1.11 89 / 3 173 / 3	1.07 93 / 4 126 / 4	1.86 14 / 10 30 / 10
DE	(877)	1.30 70 / 7 90 / 7	1.37 63 / 25 -87 / 25	1.28 72 / 22 -49 / 22	1.80 20 / 3 147 / 3
EE	(555)	1.44 56 / 19 -42 / 19	1.26 74 / 13 19 / 13	1.14 86 / 11 67 / 11	1.83 17 / 5 90 / 5
EL	(629)	1.46 54 / 24 -65 / 24	1.37 63 / 26 -87 / 26	1.34 66 / 25 -96 / 25	1.86 14 / 13 15 / 13
ES	(786)	1.62 38 / 31 -216 / 31	1.41 59 / 28 -123 / 28	1.23 77 / 18 -9 / 18	1.94 6 / 29 -141 / 29
FR	(878)	1.48 52 / 26 -85 / 26	1.32 68 / 18 -35 / 18	1.23 77 / 17 -7 / 17	1.91 9 / 26 -78 / 26
IE	(768)	1.45 55 / 23 -57 / 23	1.24 76 / 9 45 / 9	1.31 69 / 23 -69 / 23	1.90 10 / 23 -57 / 23
IT	(691)	1.53 47 / 29 -134 / 29	1.31 69 / 17 -32 / 17	1.25 75 / 19 -18 / 19	1.86 14 / 12 19 / 12
CY	(482)	1.52 48 / 28 -121 / 28	1.37 63 / 27 -91 / 27	1.31 69 / 24 -70 / 24	1.93 7 / 27 -122 / 27
LV	(903)	1.43 57 / 18 -33 / 18	1.32 68 / 19 -39 / 19	1.25 75 / 20 -23 / 20	1.87 13 / 15 3 / 15
LT	(873)	1.44 56 / 21 -46 / 21	1.46 54 / 31 -179 / 31	1.12 88 / 8 86 / 8	1.79 21 / 2 172 / 2
LU	(520)	1.37 63 / 12 25 / 12	1.25 75 / 10 33 / 10	1.26 74 / 21 -33 / 21	1.86 14 / 11 27 / 11
HU	(810)	1.24 76 / 4 149 / 4	1.43 57 / 30 -146 / 30	1.43 57 / 30 -171 / 30	1.87 13 / 16 -7 / 16
MT	(507)	1.56 44 / 30 -158 / 30	1.25 75 / 11 32 / 11	1.42 58 / 29 -161 / 29	1.89 11 / 21 -33 / 21

Table 3: Sheet D. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		1. Qualification and development possibilities			
		q23e (decreasing) Complex tasks	q23f (decreasing) Learning new things	q26a1R (decreasing) Necessity of different skills in rotating tasks	q27R (decreasing) Necessity of further training
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
NL	(877)	1.37 63 / 13	1.17 83 / 6	1.06 94 / 1	1.90 10 / 25
Netherlands		21 / 13	111 / 6	138 / 1	-65 / 25
AT	(842)	1.22 78 / 1	1.28 72 / 14	1.13 87 / 10	1.72 28 / 1
Austria		171 / 1	2 / 14	74 / 10	307 / 1
PL	(793)	1.44 56 / 20	1.33 67 / 22	1.41 59 / 28	1.85 15 / 9
Poland		-44 / 20	-48 / 22	-152 / 28	37 / 9
PT	(788)	1.47 53 / 25	1.32 68 / 20	1.34 66 / 26	1.90 10 / 24
Portugal		-70 / 25	-41 / 20	-100 / 26	-59 / 24
SI	(500)	1.36 64 / 10	1.17 83 / 7	1.49 51 / 31	1.88 12 / 19
Slovenia		31 / 10	108 / 7	-225 / 31	-16 / 19
SK	(860)	1.38 62 / 14	1.32 68 / 21	1.18 82 / 15	1.88 12 / 20
Slovakia		17 / 14	-42 / 21	32 / 15	-30 / 20
FI	(911)	1.27 73 / 6	1.10 90 / 1	1.07 93 / 3	1.86 14 / 14
Finland		119 / 6	178 / 1	128 / 3	12 / 14
SE	(951)	1.31 69 / 8	1.10 90 / 2	1.17 83 / 13	1.94 6 / 30
Sweden		76 / 8	177 / 2	43 / 13	-149 / 30
UK	(876)	1.42 58 / 17	1.29 71 / 15	1.20 80 / 16	1.93 7 / 28
United Kingdom		-30 / 17	-13 / 15	20 / 16	-124 / 28
BG	(954)	1.32 68 / 9	1.42 58 / 29	1.18 82 / 14	1.95 5 / 31
Bulgaria		70 / 9	-137 / 29	36 / 14	-160 / 31
HR	(816)	1.26 74 / 5	1.26 74 / 12	1.11 89 / 5	1.87 13 / 17
Croatia		130 / 5	22 / 12	94 / 5	-9 / 17
RO	(798)	1.37 63 / 11	1.31 69 / 16	1.11 89 / 7	1.85 15 / 6
Romania		27 / 11	-25 / 16	92 / 7	48 / 6
TR	(454)	1.50 50 / 27	1.35 65 / 24	1.36 64 / 27	1.85 15 / 7
Turkey		-105 / 27	-65 / 24	-110 / 27	40 / 7
NO	(846)	1.38 62 / 15	1.13 87 / 5	1.11 89 / 6	1.85 15 / 8
Norway		16 / 15	147 / 5	93 / 6	37 / 8
CH	(831)	1.23 77 / 3	1.12 88 / 4	1.07 93 / 2	1.81 19 / 4
Switzerland		157 / 3	160 / 4	131 / 2	132 / 4

Table 3: Sheet E. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		2.Creativity			
		q20aR (increasing) Repetitive tasks	q23c (decreasing) Solving unforeseen problems by oneself	q23d (increasing) Monotonuous tasks	q25j (decreasing) Ability to apply own ideas
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never
BE Belgium	(798)	1.72 72 / 1 171 / 1	1.12 88 / 6 101 / 6	1.69 69 / 8 91 / 8	2.23 69 / 8 77 / 8
CZ Czech Republic	(749)	1.57 57 / 13 12 / 13	1.24 76 / 24 -51 / 24	1.42 42 / 26 -108 / 26	2.65 59 / 21 -60 / 21
DK Denmark	(865)	1.48 48 / 26 -87 / 26	1.05 95 / 2 180 / 2	1.58 58 / 13 14 / 13	1.95 76 / 2 169 / 2
DE Germany	(877)	1.52 52 / 22 -43 / 22	1.24 76 / 23 -48 / 23	1.71 71 / 5 109 / 5	2.82 54 / 27 -116 / 27
EE Estonia	(555)	1.57 57 / 15 9 / 15	1.17 83 / 9 39 / 9	1.40 40 / 28 -123 / 28	2.77 56 / 25 -98 / 25
EL Greece	(629)	1.54 54 / 19 -17 / 19	1.31 69 / 28 -131 / 28	1.42 42 / 27 -108 / 27	2.92 52 / 30 -146 / 30
ES Spain	(786)	1.46 46 / 27 -111 / 27	1.23 77 / 20 -32 / 20	1.36 36 / 31 -159 / 31	2.49 63 / 18 -8 / 18
FR France	(878)	1.55 55 / 18 -10 / 18	1.17 83 / 10 36 / 10	1.56 56 / 17 -6 / 17	2.43 64 / 14 12 / 14
IE Ireland	(768)	1.67 67 / 5 118 / 5	1.24 76 / 21 -42 / 21	1.55 55 / 18 -14 / 18	2.16 71 / 6 99 / 6
IT Italy	(691)	1.52 52 / 21 -39 / 21	1.27 73 / 26 -78 / 26	1.57 57 / 16 0 / 16	2.90 52 / 29 -141 / 29
CY Cyprus	(482)	1.41 41 / 30 -167 / 30	1.32 68 / 30 -141 / 30	1.54 54 / 19 -18 / 19	2.47 63 / 16 -1 / 16
LV Latvia	(903)	1.65 65 / 8 92 / 8	1.30 70 / 27 -123 / 27	1.59 59 / 12 20 / 12	2.23 69 / 9 75 / 9
LT Lithuania	(873)	1.49 49 / 25 -70 / 25	1.37 63 / 31 -197 / 31	1.45 45 / 23 -87 / 23	3.03 49 / 31 -182 / 31
LU Luxemburg	(520)	1.58 58 / 12 26 / 12	1.15 85 / 8 59 / 8	1.63 63 / 10 52 / 10	2.37 66 / 13 30 / 13
HU Hungary	(810)	1.69 69 / 2 141 / 2	1.21 79 / 15 -11 / 15	1.62 62 / 11 43 / 11	2.68 58 / 24 -68 / 24
MT Malta	(507)	1.56 56 / 17 3 / 17	1.14 86 / 7 74 / 7	1.70 70 / 7 100 / 7	2.00 75 / 3 150 / 3

Table 3: Sheet F. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		2.Creativity			
		q20aR (increasing) Repetitive tasks	q23c (decreasing) Solving unforeseen problems by oneself	q23d (increasing) Monotonuous tasks	q25j (decreasing) Ability to apply own ideas
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never
NL (877) Netherlands		1.51 51 / 24 -58 / 24	1.06 94 / 3 172 / 3	1.77 77 / 3 156 / 3	2.07 73 / 4 129 / 4
AT (842) Austria		1.56 56 / 16 5 / 16	1.23 77 / 19 -30 / 19	1.70 70 / 6 104 / 6	2.66 59 / 22 -62 / 22
PL (793) Poland		1.69 69 / 4 136 / 4	1.21 79 / 13 -8 / 13	1.49 49 / 21 -55 / 21	2.87 53 / 28 -131 / 28
PT (788) Portugal		1.43 43 / 29 -137 / 29	1.21 79 / 14 -11 / 14	1.48 48 / 22 -65 / 22	2.34 67 / 12 41 / 12
SI (500) Slovenia		1.51 51 / 23 -55 / 23	1.18 82 / 11 32 / 11	1.58 58 / 14 12 / 14	2.28 68 / 11 61 / 11
SK (860) Slovakia		1.65 65 / 6 102 / 6	1.26 74 / 25 -71 / 25	1.58 58 / 15 7 / 15	2.64 59 / 20 -57 / 20
FI (911) Finland		1.33 33 / 31 -247 / 31	1.21 79 / 16 -13 / 16	1.52 52 / 20 -33 / 20	2.26 69 / 10 68 / 10
SE (951) Sweden		1.63 63 / 9 75 / 9	1.04 96 / 1 201 / 1	1.82 82 / 1 191 / 1	1.92 77 / 1 178 / 1
UK (876) United Kingdom		1.57 57 / 14 10 / 14	1.22 78 / 17 -19 / 17	1.43 43 / 25 -104 / 25	2.48 63 / 17 -5 / 17
BG (954) Bulgaria		1.59 59 / 11 29 / 11	1.31 69 / 29 -135 / 29	1.44 44 / 24 -98 / 24	2.66 58 / 23 -64 / 23
HR (816) Croatia		1.65 65 / 7 93 / 7	1.18 82 / 12 27 / 12	1.38 38 / 29 -145 / 29	2.61 60 / 19 -46 / 19
RO (798) Romania		1.53 53 / 20 -36 / 20	1.24 76 / 22 -45 / 22	1.68 68 / 9 85 / 9	2.46 63 / 15 2 / 15
TR (454) Turkey		1.44 44 / 28 -133 / 28	1.22 78 / 18 -22 / 18	1.37 37 / 30 -148 / 30	2.80 55 / 26 -107 / 26
NO (846) Norway		1.60 60 / 10 49 / 10	1.07 93 / 4 159 / 4	1.74 74 / 4 129 / 4	2.19 70 / 7 91 / 7
CH (831) Switzerland		1.69 69 / 3 138 / 3	1.10 90 / 5 128 / 5	1.78 78 / 2 160 / 2	2.12 72 / 5 111 / 5

Table 3: Sheet G. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	2.Creativity		3.Career chances		4.Possibilities for influence
	q25l (decreasing) Intellectually demanding work	q37c (increasing) Career prospects	q37e (increasing) Opportunities to learn and grow at work	q24a (decreasing) Choosing the order of tasks	
	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Bad 2: Rather bad 3: Modest 4: Rather good 5: Good	1: Bad 2: Rather bad 3: Modest 4: Rather good 5: Good	1: Yes 2: No	
BE (798) Belgium	2.68 58 / 22 -38 / 22	2.62 41 / 15 -1 / 15	3.48 62 / 8 60 / 8	1.26 74 / 8 97 / 8	
CZ (749) Czech Republic	2.93 52 / 27 -100 / 27	2.50 38 / 23 -62 / 23	2.76 44 / 30 -152 / 30	1.47 53 / 24 -76 / 24	
DK (865) Denmark	2.41 65 / 12 31 / 12	2.95 49 / 3 165 / 3	3.90 73 / 2 183 / 2	1.14 86 / 2 192 / 2	
DE (877) Germany	2.43 64 / 13 27 / 13	2.72 43 / 9 48 / 9	3.09 52 / 22 -55 / 22	1.49 51 / 26 -90 / 26	
EE (555) Estonia	2.48 63 / 16 13 / 16	2.33 33 / 30 -150 / 30	2.92 48 / 26 -104 / 26	1.38 62 / 13 -3 / 13	
EL (629) Greece	2.66 59 / 21 -31 / 21	2.47 37 / 26 -76 / 26	3.21 55 / 19 -21 / 19	1.54 46 / 30 -128 / 30	
ES (786) Spain	3.02 50 / 28 -121 / 28	2.60 40 / 16 -11 / 16	3.21 55 / 18 -19 / 18	1.42 58 / 17 -34 / 17	
FR (878) France	3.20 45 / 29 -167 / 29	2.68 42 / 10 26 / 10	3.26 56 / 16 -6 / 16	1.33 67 / 11 41 / 11	
IE (768) Ireland	2.66 59 / 20 -30 / 20	2.99 50 / 2 186 / 2	3.55 64 / 6 79 / 6	1.32 68 / 10 45 / 10	
IT (691) Italy	3.39 40 / 30 -215 / 30	2.36 34 / 28 -134 / 28	3.23 56 / 17 -14 / 17	1.55 45 / 31 -138 / 31	
CY (482) Cyprus	2.51 62 / 17 7 / 17	2.79 45 / 8 82 / 8	3.47 62 / 9 55 / 9	1.53 47 / 29 -122 / 29	
LV (903) Latvia	2.21 70 / 6 80 / 6	2.49 37 / 25 -65 / 25	2.96 49 / 24 -92 / 24	1.40 60 / 15 -12 / 15	
LT (873) Lithuania	2.54 61 / 18 -2 / 18	2.46 37 / 27 -82 / 27	2.99 50 / 23 -84 / 23	1.49 51 / 25 -90 / 25	
LU (520) Luxemburg	2.34 67 / 10 49 / 10	2.88 47 / 4 127 / 4	3.43 61 / 12 45 / 12	1.31 69 / 9 56 / 9	
HU (810) Hungary	3.46 39 / 31 -232 / 31	2.20 30 / 31 -212 / 31	2.96 49 / 25 -93 / 25	1.44 56 / 18 -45 / 18	
MT (507) Malta	1.68 83 / 1 215 / 1	2.84 46 / 6 107 / 6	3.45 61 / 10 51 / 10	1.16 84 / 3 172 / 3	

Table 3: Sheet H. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	2.Creativity	3.Career chances		4.Possibilities for influence
	q25l (decreasing) Intellectually demanding work	q37c (increasing) Career prospects	q37e (increasing) Opportunities to learn and grow at work	q24a (decreasing) Choosing the order of tasks
	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Bad 2: Rather bad 3: Modest 4: Rather good 5: Good	1: Bad 2: Rather bad 3: Modest 4: Rather good 5: Good	1: Yes 2: No
NL (877) Netherlands	2.72 57 / 25 -47 / 25	2.63 41 / 14 2 / 14	3.37 59 / 13 26 / 13	1.22 78 / 5 128 / 5
AT (842) Austria	2.27 68 / 8 66 / 8	2.66 42 / 11 19 / 11	3.26 57 / 15 -5 / 15	1.42 58 / 16 -33 / 16
PL (793) Poland	2.43 64 / 14 26 / 14	2.55 39 / 21 -35 / 21	2.86 46 / 28 -123 / 28	1.44 56 / 19 -52 / 19
PT (788) Portugal	2.69 58 / 23 -40 / 23	2.85 46 / 5 114 / 5	3.45 61 / 11 49 / 11	1.47 53 / 23 -75 / 23
SI (500) Slovenia	2.27 68 / 7 67 / 7	2.58 40 / 18 -21 / 18	2.89 47 / 27 -113 / 27	1.39 61 / 14 -7 / 14
SK (860) Slovakia	2.70 57 / 24 -42 / 24	2.33 33 / 29 -148 / 29	3.16 54 / 21 -36 / 21	1.45 55 / 21 -59 / 21
FI (911) Finland	2.21 70 / 5 82 / 5	2.81 45 / 7 94 / 7	3.94 73 / 1 193 / 1	1.19 81 / 4 153 / 4
SE (951) Sweden	2.32 67 / 9 55 / 9	2.58 39 / 19 -24 / 19	3.77 69 / 4 144 / 4	1.13 87 / 1 197 / 1
UK (876) United Kingdom	2.91 52 / 26 -93 / 26	3.02 51 / 1 200 / 1	3.51 63 / 7 68 / 7	1.37 63 / 12 5 / 12
BG (954) Bulgaria	2.46 63 / 15 18 / 15	2.50 38 / 24 -62 / 24	2.83 46 / 29 -132 / 29	1.47 53 / 22 -73 / 22
HR (816) Croatia	2.36 66 / 11 44 / 11	2.63 41 / 13 5 / 13	3.27 57 / 14 -4 / 14	1.45 55 / 20 -54 / 20
RO (798) Romania	2.18 71 / 4 89 / 4	2.51 38 / 22 -55 / 22	3.20 55 / 20 -23 / 20	1.50 50 / 27 -94 / 27
TR (454) Turkey	1.98 75 / 3 139 / 3	2.56 39 / 20 -34 / 20	2.69 42 / 31 -172 / 31	1.51 49 / 28 -107 / 28
NO (846) Norway	2.55 61 / 19 -3 / 19	2.59 40 / 17 -16 / 17	3.86 71 / 3 170 / 3	1.24 76 / 6 110 / 6
CH (831) Switzerland	1.92 77 / 2 154 / 2	2.65 41 / 12 14 / 12	3.70 68 / 5 124 / 5	1.26 74 / 7 97 / 7

Table 3: Sheet I. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		4.Possibilities for influence			
		q24b (decreasing) Choosing the method of work	q25d (decreasing) Choosing working partners	q25h (decreasing) Opportunity to do what you do best	q26a2R (decreasing) Influence on the division of rotating tasks
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Yes 2: No
BE	(798)	1.24 76 / 6	3.87 28 / 11	2.49 63 / 26	1.46 54 / 12
Belgium		99 / 6	28 / 11	-57 / 26	41 / 12
CZ	(749)	1.49 51 / 28	4.22 19 / 28	2.19 70 / 15	1.53 47 / 16
Czech Republic		-126 / 28	-112 / 28	20 / 15	-13 / 16
DK	(865)	1.16 84 / 2	3.37 41 / 1	1.87 78 / 4	1.30 70 / 3
Denmark		166 / 2	226 / 1	105 / 4	158 / 3
DE	(877)	1.32 68 / 11	4.19 20 / 27	2.71 57 / 28	1.42 58 / 9
Germany		30 / 11	-102 / 27	-116 / 28	69 / 9
EE	(555)	1.33 67 / 12	4.02 25 / 18	2.66 59 / 27	1.51 49 / 15
Estonia		19 / 12	-32 / 18	-101 / 27	3 / 15
EL	(629)	1.52 48 / 31	4.13 22 / 25	2.03 74 / 9	1.64 36 / 25
Greece		-152 / 31	-75 / 25	64 / 9	-93 / 25
ES	(786)	1.48 52 / 27	4.06 24 / 20	2.42 65 / 24	1.63 37 / 23
Spain		-119 / 27	-49 / 20	-38 / 24	-85 / 23
FR	(878)	1.36 64 / 15	4.11 22 / 23	2.36 66 / 20	1.42 58 / 8
France		-12 / 15	-67 / 23	-23 / 20	69 / 8
IE	(768)	1.34 66 / 13	3.90 27 / 14	1.82 79 / 2	1.48 52 / 13
Ireland		6 / 13	13 / 14	118 / 2	29 / 13
IT	(691)	1.36 64 / 14	4.18 21 / 26	2.39 65 / 23	1.57 43 / 19
Italy		-11 / 14	-96 / 26	-31 / 23	-39 / 19
CY	(482)	1.51 49 / 30	3.83 29 / 9	1.68 83 / 1	1.77 23 / 31
Cyprus		-145 / 30	44 / 9	156 / 1	-189 / 31
LV	(903)	1.29 71 / 10	3.74 32 / 5	2.29 68 / 18	1.56 44 / 18
Latvia		48 / 10	78 / 5	-6 / 18	-36 / 18
LT	(873)	1.39 61 / 19	4.04 24 / 19	2.17 71 / 13	1.48 52 / 14
Lithuania		-34 / 19	-42 / 19	26 / 13	28 / 14
LU	(520)	1.28 72 / 8	3.89 28 / 13	2.43 64 / 25	1.44 56 / 11
Luxemburg		59 / 8	20 / 13	-42 / 25	56 / 11
HU	(810)	1.40 60 / 23	4.25 19 / 29	2.39 65 / 22	1.62 38 / 21
Hungary		-42 / 23	-124 / 29	-30 / 22	-81 / 21
MT	(507)	1.17 83 / 3	3.88 28 / 12	2.14 71 / 12	1.63 37 / 22
Malta		163 / 3	22 / 12	34 / 12	-83 / 22

Table 3: Sheet J. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		4.Possibilities for influence			
		q24b (decreasing) Choosing the method of work	q25d (decreasing) Choosing working partners	q25h (decreasing) Opportunity to do what you do best	q26a2R (decreasing) Influence on the division of rotating tasks
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Yes 2: No
NL	(877)	1.28 72 / 7	3.45 39 / 3	2.24 69 / 17	1.36 64 / 5
Netherlands		64 / 7	191 / 3	8 / 17	116 / 5
AT	(842)	1.44 56 / 24	4.08 23 / 21	2.38 66 / 21	1.42 58 / 7
Austria		-85 / 24	-56 / 21	-27 / 21	70 / 7
PL	(793)	1.45 55 / 25	4.11 22 / 24	1.99 75 / 8	1.67 33 / 30
Poland		-93 / 25	-71 / 24	75 / 8	-117 / 30
PT	(788)	1.38 62 / 17	4.31 17 / 30	2.03 74 / 10	1.65 35 / 27
Portugal		-26 / 17	-146 / 30	63 / 10	-105 / 27
SI	(500)	1.39 61 / 20	3.98 26 / 15	3.47 38 / 31	1.58 42 / 20
Slovenia		-36 / 20	-16 / 15	-316 / 31	-52 / 20
SK	(860)	1.38 62 / 18	4.31 17 / 31	2.96 51 / 30	1.65 35 / 26
Slovakia		-28 / 18	-146 / 31	-181 / 30	-102 / 26
FI	(911)	1.28 72 / 9	3.75 31 / 7	1.91 77 / 5	1.27 73 / 2
Finland		58 / 9	73 / 7	95 / 5	180 / 2
SE	(951)	1.09 91 / 1	3.39 40 / 2	1.93 77 / 6	1.26 74 / 1
Sweden		232 / 1	218 / 2	90 / 6	189 / 1
UK	(876)	1.39 61 / 21	4.00 25 / 17	1.98 75 / 7	1.43 57 / 10
United Kingdom		-39 / 21	-23 / 17	76 / 7	64 / 10
BG	(954)	1.50 50 / 29	4.09 23 / 22	2.19 70 / 14	1.67 33 / 29
Bulgaria		-134 / 29	-62 / 22	23 / 14	-113 / 29
HR	(816)	1.39 61 / 22	3.98 25 / 16	2.23 69 / 16	1.54 46 / 17
Croatia		-40 / 22	-18 / 16	12 / 16	-18 / 17
RO	(798)	1.45 55 / 26	3.75 31 / 8	1.83 79 / 3	1.66 34 / 28
Romania		-94 / 26	72 / 8	117 / 3	-107 / 28
TR	(454)	1.37 63 / 16	3.84 29 / 10	2.91 52 / 29	1.63 37 / 24
Turkey		-16 / 16	40 / 10	-168 / 29	-86 / 24
NO	(846)	1.20 80 / 5	3.60 35 / 4	2.05 74 / 11	1.34 66 / 4
Norway		132 / 5	134 / 4	60 / 11	134 / 4
CH	(831)	1.17 83 / 4	3.74 31 / 6	2.30 67 / 19	1.36 64 / 6
Switzerland		156 / 4	77 / 6	-8 / 19	112 / 6

Table 3: Sheet K. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		4.Possibilities for influence			
		q26b1aR (decreasing) Influence on the division of tasks in a team	q26b1bR (decreasing) Selection of the head of the team by the team	q23b (decreasing) Assessing the quality of own work	q24c (decreasing) Ability to change the speed or rate of work
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
BE	(798)	1.49 51 / 13	1.78 22 / 21	1.28 72 / 18	1.29 71 / 15
Belgium		-4 / 13	-71 / 21	-3 / 18	14 / 15
CZ	(749)	1.54 46 / 20	1.85 15 / 31	1.30 70 / 22	1.45 55 / 31
Czech Republic		-41 / 20	-155 / 31	-21 / 22	-193 / 31
DK	(865)	1.19 81 / 1	1.55 45 / 2	1.11 89 / 1	1.19 81 / 2
Denmark		235 / 1	180 / 2	150 / 1	158 / 2
DE	(877)	1.38 62 / 5	1.70 30 / 12	1.36 64 / 26	1.40 60 / 29
Germany		83 / 5	14 / 12	-79 / 26	-134 / 29
EE	(555)	1.53 47 / 18	1.71 29 / 14	1.14 86 / 4	1.20 80 / 4
Estonia		-31 / 18	3 / 14	121 / 4	141 / 4
EL	(629)	1.68 32 / 30	1.78 22 / 23	1.37 63 / 27	1.36 64 / 24
Greece		-156 / 30	-74 / 23	-85 / 27	-74 / 24
ES	(786)	1.54 46 / 21	1.62 38 / 7	1.36 64 / 25	1.38 62 / 28
Spain		-47 / 21	107 / 7	-75 / 25	-110 / 28
FR	(878)	1.53 47 / 19	1.76 24 / 20	1.19 81 / 7	1.34 66 / 20
France		-34 / 19	-49 / 20	74 / 7	-53 / 20
IE	(768)	1.45 55 / 10	1.66 34 / 8	1.29 71 / 20	1.28 72 / 12
Ireland		25 / 10	66 / 8	-10 / 20	30 / 12
IT	(691)	1.51 49 / 15	1.70 30 / 10	1.31 69 / 24	1.30 70 / 16
Italy		-15 / 15	20 / 10	-30 / 24	7 / 16
CY	(482)	1.72 28 / 31	1.78 22 / 22	1.38 62 / 28	1.33 67 / 18
Cyprus		-188 / 31	-72 / 22	-94 / 28	-41 / 18
LV	(903)	1.41 59 / 8	1.69 31 / 9	1.16 84 / 5	1.21 79 / 5
Latvia		63 / 8	28 / 9	108 / 5	135 / 5
LT	(873)	1.62 38 / 28	1.73 27 / 18	1.29 71 / 21	1.20 80 / 3
Lithuania		-106 / 28	-21 / 18	-17 / 21	142 / 3
LU	(520)	1.50 50 / 14	1.75 25 / 19	1.22 78 / 10	1.26 74 / 9
Luxemburg		-8 / 14	-41 / 19	53 / 10	61 / 9
HU	(810)	1.51 49 / 17	1.80 20 / 26	1.59 41 / 31	1.29 71 / 14
Hungary		-23 / 17	-93 / 26	-284 / 31	25 / 14
MT	(507)	1.56 44 / 25	1.53 47 / 1	1.20 80 / 8	1.14 86 / 1
Malta		-63 / 25	202 / 1	65 / 8	229 / 1

Table 3: Sheet L. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		4.Possibilities for influence			
		q26b1aR (decreasing) Influence on the division of tasks in a team	q26b1bR (decreasing) Selection of the head of the team by the team	q23b (decreasing) Assessing the quality of own work	q24c (decreasing) Ability to change the speed or rate of work
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
NL	(877)	1.39 61 / 6	1.80 20 / 27	1.25 75 / 14	1.28 72 / 13
Netherlands		78 / 6	-101 / 27	25 / 14	27 / 13
AT	(842)	1.41 59 / 9	1.61 39 / 6	1.25 75 / 15	1.34 66 / 21
Austria		60 / 9	114 / 6	21 / 15	-56 / 21
PL	(793)	1.55 45 / 22	1.79 21 / 25	1.26 74 / 16	1.35 65 / 22
Poland		-54 / 22	-80 / 25	12 / 16	-58 / 22
PT	(788)	1.56 44 / 24	1.79 21 / 24	1.24 76 / 13	1.37 63 / 27
Portugal		-59 / 24	-80 / 24	31 / 13	-88 / 27
SI	(500)	1.51 49 / 16	1.70 30 / 11	1.28 72 / 19	1.27 73 / 10
Slovenia		-23 / 16	17 / 11	-5 / 19	44 / 10
SK	(860)	1.59 41 / 27	1.82 18 / 29	1.51 49 / 30	1.36 64 / 25
Slovakia		-87 / 27	-118 / 29	-214 / 30	-75 / 25
FI	(911)	1.25 75 / 3	1.57 43 / 4	1.23 77 / 12	1.28 72 / 11
Finland		189 / 3	158 / 4	43 / 12	33 / 11
SE	(951)	1.23 77 / 2	1.58 42 / 5	1.22 78 / 9	1.36 64 / 26
Sweden		206 / 2	150 / 5	54 / 9	-76 / 26
UK	(876)	1.49 51 / 12	1.71 29 / 13	1.27 73 / 17	1.34 66 / 19
United Kingdom		0 / 12	4 / 13	1 / 17	-50 / 19
BG	(954)	1.57 43 / 26	1.84 16 / 30	1.48 52 / 29	1.42 58 / 30
Bulgaria		-66 / 26	-144 / 30	-186 / 29	-160 / 30
HR	(816)	1.46 54 / 11	1.71 29 / 15	1.23 77 / 11	1.36 64 / 23
Croatia		20 / 11	3 / 15	44 / 11	-72 / 23
RO	(798)	1.55 45 / 23	1.73 27 / 17	1.31 69 / 23	1.33 67 / 17
Romania		-54 / 23	-21 / 17	-30 / 23	-36 / 17
TR	(454)	1.63 37 / 29	1.71 29 / 16	1.18 82 / 6	1.25 75 / 6
Turkey		-119 / 29	0 / 16	83 / 6	80 / 6
NO	(846)	1.30 70 / 4	1.57 43 / 3	1.14 86 / 3	1.25 75 / 8
Norway		148 / 4	162 / 3	124 / 3	73 / 8
CH	(831)	1.40 60 / 7	1.81 19 / 28	1.14 86 / 2	1.25 75 / 7
Switzerland		73 / 7	-108 / 28	125 / 2	76 / 7

Table 3: Sheet M. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		4.Possibilities for influence			
		q15a15bR (decreasing) Number of working hours	q17a (increasing) Working time arrangements	q25e (decreasing) Breaks on own choice	q25g (decreasing) Holidays on own choice
		1: As one will 2: Not as one will	1: Set by the company 2: Several options 3: Partial adaptability 4: Full adaptability	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never
BE	(798)	1.08 92 / 23 -70 / 23	1.79 26 / 8 57 / 8	2.97 51 / 13 25 / 13	2.70 58 / 9 57 / 9
CZ	(749)	1.02 98 / 4 117 / 4	1.40 13 / 19 -59 / 19	3.41 40 / 28 -100 / 28	2.75 56 / 11 45 / 11
DK	(865)	1.07 93 / 21 -35 / 21	2.14 38 / 4 165 / 4	2.71 57 / 5 98 / 5	2.30 67 / 2 154 / 2
DE	(877)	1.06 94 / 19 -4 / 19	1.69 23 / 13 28 / 13	3.60 35 / 30 -153 / 30	3.26 44 / 25 -80 / 25
EE	(555)	1.03 97 / 7 82 / 7	1.61 20 / 14 4 / 14	2.82 54 / 9 66 / 9	3.22 44 / 24 -72 / 24
EL	(629)	1.07 93 / 20 -33 / 20	1.31 10 / 25 -89 / 25	3.35 41 / 25 -81 / 25	3.46 39 / 27 -130 / 27
ES	(786)	1.09 91 / 26 -94 / 26	1.33 11 / 23 -81 / 23	3.03 49 / 17 8 / 17	3.09 48 / 23 -38 / 23
FR	(878)	1.07 93 / 22 -47 / 22	1.71 24 / 11 35 / 11	2.81 55 / 8 71 / 8	2.82 54 / 12 26 / 12
IE	(768)	1.06 94 / 17 10 / 17	1.72 24 / 10 36 / 10	2.88 53 / 11 50 / 11	2.41 65 / 4 126 / 4
IT	(691)	1.09 91 / 27 -105 / 27	1.58 19 / 16 -5 / 16	2.91 52 / 12 42 / 12	2.98 51 / 20 -12 / 20
CY	(482)	1.02 98 / 6 106 / 6	1.27 9 / 30 -101 / 30	3.27 43 / 22 -60 / 22	3.01 50 / 21 -20 / 21
LV	(903)	1.02 98 / 3 118 / 3	1.41 14 / 18 -58 / 18	2.75 56 / 7 87 / 7	2.92 52 / 17 2 / 17
LT	(873)	1.06 94 / 18 6 / 18	1.31 10 / 24 -87 / 24	3.58 35 / 29 -148 / 29	3.65 34 / 30 -177 / 30
LU	(520)	1.05 95 / 16 20 / 16	1.76 25 / 9 48 / 9	2.67 58 / 4 109 / 4	2.71 57 / 10 55 / 10
HU	(810)	1.05 95 / 12 42 / 12	1.27 9 / 29 -101 / 29	3.22 45 / 21 -44 / 21	2.98 51 / 19 -12 / 19
MT	(507)	1.05 95 / 15 25 / 15	1.29 10 / 26 -92 / 26	3.36 41 / 26 -85 / 26	2.92 52 / 16 3 / 16

Table 3: Sheet N. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		4.Possibilities for influence			
		q15a15bR (decreasing) Number of working hours	q17a (increasing) Working time arrangements	q25e (decreasing) Breaks on own choice	q25g (decreasing) Holidays on own choice
		1: As one will 2: Not as one will	1: Set by the company 2: Several options 3: Partial adaptability 4: Full adaptability	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never
NL (877) Netherlands		1.14 86 / 31 -253 / 31	2.18 39 / 3 177 / 3	2.84 54 / 10 63 / 10	2.26 69 / 1 165 / 1
AT (842) Austria		1.04 96 / 10 63 / 10	1.80 27 / 6 60 / 6	3.04 49 / 18 5 / 18	2.61 60 / 7 78 / 7
PL (793) Poland		1.11 89 / 30 -171 / 30	1.37 12 / 20 -69 / 20	3.16 46 / 19 -29 / 19	2.94 52 / 18 -2 / 18
PT (788) Portugal		1.05 95 / 13 34 / 13	1.27 9 / 27 -98 / 27	3.00 50 / 16 16 / 16	3.56 36 / 29 -154 / 29
SI (500) Slovenia		1.01 99 / 1 153 / 1	1.58 19 / 15 -4 / 15	3.28 43 / 23 -64 / 23	2.64 59 / 8 70 / 8
SK (860) Slovakia		1.02 98 / 5 115 / 5	1.34 11 / 22 -78 / 22	3.31 42 / 24 -70 / 24	2.89 53 / 14 11 / 14
FI (911) Finland		1.04 96 / 11 54 / 11	1.91 30 / 5 96 / 5	2.48 63 / 2 164 / 2	2.90 52 / 15 6 / 15
SE (951) Sweden		1.09 91 / 24 -80 / 24	2.42 47 / 1 251 / 1	2.38 66 / 1 191 / 1	2.42 65 / 5 126 / 5
UK (876) United Kingdom		1.09 91 / 25 -93 / 25	1.70 23 / 12 30 / 12	2.99 50 / 15 19 / 15	2.48 63 / 6 110 / 6
BG (954) Bulgaria		1.05 95 / 14 27 / 14	1.16 5 / 31 -133 / 31	4.02 25 / 31 -269 / 31	3.51 37 / 28 -143 / 28
HR (816) Croatia		1.01 99 / 2 138 / 2	1.36 12 / 21 -73 / 21	3.21 45 / 20 -42 / 20	3.39 40 / 26 -113 / 26
RO (798) Romania		1.03 97 / 8 77 / 8	1.27 9 / 28 -99 / 28	2.97 51 / 14 24 / 14	3.06 49 / 22 -32 / 22
TR (454) Turkey		1.04 96 / 9 74 / 9	1.53 18 / 17 -21 / 17	3.39 40 / 27 -94 / 27	3.78 30 / 31 -209 / 31
NO (846) Norway		1.10 90 / 28 -135 / 28	1.79 26 / 7 57 / 7	2.73 57 / 6 91 / 6	2.86 53 / 13 16 / 13
CH (831) Switzerland		1.10 90 / 29 -140 / 29	2.27 42 / 2 203 / 2	2.66 58 / 3 112 / 3	2.33 67 / 3 147 / 3

Table 3: Sheet O. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		5.Communication and transparency			
		q12 (decreasing) Information about healthy and safety risks	q30b (decreasing) Consultations about changes in the work organi- sation/working conditions	q30e (decreasing) Discussions about work-related problems with an employee representative	q21c (decreasing) Numerical production or performance targets
		1: Very well informed 2: Well informed 3: Not well informed 4: Not informed	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
BE (798) Belgium		1.85 72 / 22 -26 / 22	1.42 58 / 9 54 / 9	1.83 17 / 25 -81 / 25	1.42 58 / 1 189 / 1
CZ (749) Czech Republic		1.67 78 / 11 54 / 11	1.56 44 / 23 -57 / 23	1.76 24 / 18 -22 / 18	1.66 34 / 21 -55 / 21
DK (865) Denmark		1.62 79 / 6 77 / 6	1.42 58 / 7 57 / 7	1.57 43 / 4 160 / 4	1.69 31 / 25 -80 / 25
DE (877) Germany		1.73 76 / 15 27 / 15	1.60 40 / 28 -97 / 28	1.89 11 / 29 -139 / 29	1.57 43 / 10 37 / 10
EE (555) Estonia		1.71 76 / 14 35 / 14	1.39 61 / 5 84 / 5	1.71 29 / 10 29 / 10	1.63 37 / 19 -21 / 19
EL (629) Greece		1.86 71 / 23 -28 / 23	1.51 49 / 17 -17 / 17	1.75 25 / 17 -10 / 17	1.58 42 / 11 29 / 11
ES (786) Spain		2.05 65 / 29 -116 / 29	1.59 41 / 26 -86 / 26	1.86 14 / 28 -110 / 28	1.76 24 / 30 -146 / 30
FR (878) France		2.04 65 / 27 -112 / 27	1.59 41 / 27 -89 / 27	1.82 18 / 23 -72 / 23	1.48 52 / 4 125 / 4
IE (768) Ireland		1.56 81 / 3 103 / 3	1.43 57 / 10 52 / 10	1.66 34 / 6 75 / 6	1.72 28 / 27 -115 / 27
IT (691) Italy		2.05 65 / 28 -112 / 28	1.65 35 / 30 -135 / 30	1.80 20 / 22 -56 / 22	1.60 40 / 13 5 / 13
CY (482) Cyprus		1.66 78 / 9 60 / 9	1.46 54 / 12 24 / 12	1.70 30 / 9 37 / 9	1.60 40 / 12 9 / 12
LV (903) Latvia		1.76 75 / 20 14 / 20	1.45 55 / 11 33 / 11	1.62 38 / 5 119 / 5	1.63 37 / 17 -16 / 17
LT (873) Lithuania		1.77 74 / 21 10 / 21	1.21 79 / 2 230 / 2	1.68 32 / 7 60 / 7	1.71 29 / 26 -97 / 26
LU (520) Luxemburg		2.04 65 / 26 -110 / 26	1.52 48 / 18 -30 / 18	1.83 17 / 27 -88 / 27	1.49 51 / 6 121 / 6
HU (810) Hungary		1.75 75 / 16 19 / 16	1.49 51 / 14 -4 / 14	1.76 24 / 19 -22 / 19	1.67 33 / 22 -60 / 22
MT (507) Malta		2.13 62 / 30 -149 / 30	1.56 44 / 22 -57 / 22	1.77 23 / 20 -28 / 20	1.74 26 / 28 -126 / 28

Table 3: Sheet P. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		5.Communication and transparency			
		q12 (decreasing) Information about healthy and safety risks	q30b (decreasing) Consultations about changes in the work organi- sation/working conditions	q30e (decreasing) Discussions about work-related problems with an employee representative	q21c (decreasing) Numerical production or performance targets
		1: Very well informed 2: Well informed 3: Not well informed 4: Not informed	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
NL (877) Netherlands		1.98 67 / 25 -85 / 25	1.20 80 / 1 245 / 1	1.95 5 / 31 -199 / 31	1.53 47 / 9 82 / 9
AT (842) Austria		1.75 75 / 18 18 / 18	1.55 45 / 20 -49 / 20	1.82 18 / 24 -76 / 24	1.50 50 / 7 111 / 7
PL (793) Poland		1.63 79 / 8 71 / 8	1.57 43 / 25 -73 / 25	1.72 28 / 11 15 / 11	1.65 35 / 20 -36 / 20
PT (788) Portugal		1.89 70 / 24 -43 / 24	1.73 27 / 31 -204 / 31	1.90 10 / 30 -149 / 30	1.51 49 / 8 97 / 8
SI (500) Slovenia		1.75 75 / 19 17 / 19	1.50 50 / 16 -8 / 16	1.73 27 / 12 15 / 12	1.78 22 / 31 -171 / 31
SK (860) Slovakia		1.62 79 / 7 74 / 7	1.50 50 / 15 -8 / 15	1.74 26 / 15 2 / 15	1.68 32 / 23 -73 / 23
FI (911) Finland		1.54 82 / 2 110 / 2	1.28 72 / 3 177 / 3	1.52 48 / 1 208 / 1	1.46 54 / 3 149 / 3
SE (951) Sweden		1.75 75 / 17 18 / 17	1.38 62 / 4 91 / 4	1.54 46 / 3 189 / 3	1.62 38 / 16 -13 / 16
UK (876) United Kingdom		1.51 83 / 1 126 / 1	1.49 51 / 13 -2 / 13	1.73 27 / 14 9 / 14	1.61 39 / 14 -4 / 14
BG (954) Bulgaria		1.57 81 / 4 97 / 4	1.40 60 / 6 76 / 6	1.73 27 / 13 11 / 13	1.69 31 / 24 -77 / 24
HR (816) Croatia		1.61 80 / 5 81 / 5	1.62 38 / 29 -108 / 29	1.74 26 / 16 0 / 16	1.75 25 / 29 -139 / 29
RO (798) Romania		1.71 76 / 13 35 / 13	1.55 45 / 21 -51 / 21	1.69 31 / 8 48 / 8	1.48 52 / 5 125 / 5
TR (454) Turkey		2.61 46 / 31 -360 / 31	1.57 43 / 24 -71 / 24	1.77 23 / 21 -31 / 21	1.62 38 / 15 -9 / 15
NO (846) Norway		1.71 76 / 12 37 / 12	1.53 47 / 19 -33 / 19	1.54 46 / 2 189 / 2	1.63 37 / 18 -18 / 18
CH (831) Switzerland		1.66 78 / 10 58 / 10	1.42 58 / 8 55 / 8	1.83 17 / 26 -85 / 26	1.43 57 / 2 175 / 2

Table 3: Sheet Q. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		5.Communication and transparency			
		q23a (decreasing) Meeting precise quality standards	q30c (decreasing) Regular formal assessment of work performance	ef6g1R (decreasing) Payments based on the overall performance of the company based on a predefined formula	ef6h1R (decreasing) Payments based on the overall performance of the group/team based on a predefined formula
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
BE Belgium	(798)	1.28 72 / 16 -4 / 16	1.58 42 / 15 -7 / 15	1.24 76 / 21 -22 / 20	1.33 67 / 25 -84 / 25
CZ Czech Republic	(749)	1.33 67 / 23 -54 / 23	1.47 53 / 5 103 / 5	1.14 86 / 8 74 / 7	1.13 87 / 7 69 / 5
DK Denmark	(865)	1.19 81 / 3 95 / 3	1.67 33 / 27 -101 / 27	1.15 85 / 9 71 / 8	1.32 68 / 24 -75 / 23
DE Germany	(877)	1.31 69 / 21 -33 / 21	1.64 36 / 24 -67 / 24	1.19 81 / 14 27 / 13	1.18 82 / 12 35 / 11
EE Estonia	(555)	1.34 66 / 24 -69 / 24	1.51 49 / 8 58 / 8	1.26 74 / 25 -43 / 24	1.17 83 / 11 40 / 10
EL Greece	(629)	1.43 57 / 30 -169 / 30	1.61 39 / 21 -43 / 21	1.24 76 / 20 -19 / 19	1.50 50 / 28 -211 / 28
ES Spain	(786)	1.30 70 / 18 -21 / 18	1.65 35 / 25 -80 / 25	1.18 82 / 13 37 / 12	1.29 71 / 22 -48 / 21
FR France	(878)	1.25 75 / 12 36 / 12	1.75 25 / 31 -180 / 31	1.10 90 / 6 119 / 5	1.10 90 / 5 95 / 3
IE Ireland	(768)	1.30 70 / 20 -24 / 20	1.58 42 / 16 -11 / 16	1.07 93 / 3 144 / 2	1.09 91 / 4 102 / 2
IT Italy	(691)	1.26 74 / 14 21 / 14	1.74 26 / 30 -170 / 30	1.22 78 / 17 -1 / 16	1.17 83 / 10 43 / 8
CY Cyprus	(482)	1.34 66 / 25 -70 / 25	1.56 44 / 13 5 / 13	1.09 91 / 5 126 / 4	1.00 100 / 3 169 / 1
LV Latvia	(903)	1.30 70 / 19 -24 / 19	1.51 49 / 9 55 / 9	1.32 68 / 29 -106 / 28	1.26 74 / 19 -32 / 18
LT Lithuania	(873)	1.41 59 / 28 -150 / 28	1.35 65 / 1 221 / 1	1.32 68 / 29 -106 / 29	1.37 63 / 26 -111 / 26
LU Luxemburg	(520)	1.26 74 / 13 23 / 13	1.59 41 / 19 -23 / 19	1.25 75 / 23 -38 / 22	1.21 79 / 16 9 / 15
HU Hungary	(810)	1.15 85 / 2 143 / 2	1.63 37 / 22 -59 / 22	1.25 75 / 22 -34 / 21	1.33 67 / 25 -84 / 24
MT Malta	(507)	1.30 70 / 17 -19 / 17	1.57 43 / 14 -4 / 14	1.17 83 / 11 50 / 10	1.00 100 / 3 169 / 1

Table 3: Sheet R. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		5.Communication and transparency			
		q23a (decreasing) Meeting precise quality standards	q30c (decreasing) Regular formal assessment of work performance	ef6g1R (decreasing) Payments based on the overall performance of the company based on a predefined formula	ef6h1R (decreasing) Payments based on the overall performance of the group/team based on a predefined formula
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
NL	(877)	1.20 80 / 4 93 / 4	1.50 50 / 7 72 / 7	1.22 78 / 16 0 / 15	1.20 80 / 14 17 / 13
AT	(842)	1.20 80 / 6 89 / 6	1.59 41 / 18 -18 / 18	1.13 87 / 7 89 / 6	1.38 63 / 27 -116 / 27
PL	(793)	1.28 72 / 15 2 / 15	1.60 40 / 20 -30 / 20	1.28 72 / 27 -62 / 26	1.22 78 / 17 0 / 16
PT	(788)	1.20 80 / 5 91 / 5	1.67 33 / 26 -97 / 26	1.20 80 / 15 16 / 14	1.27 73 / 21 -38 / 20
SI	(500)	1.31 69 / 22 -40 / 22	1.58 42 / 17 -16 / 17	1.41 59 / 30 -200 / 30	1.25 75 / 18 -18 / 17
SK	(860)	1.34 66 / 26 -72 / 26	1.67 33 / 28 -102 / 28	1.52 48 / 31 -308 / 31	1.57 43 / 29 -264 / 29
FI	(911)	1.23 77 / 11 58 / 11	1.38 62 / 2 190 / 2	1.06 94 / 2 153 / 1	1.14 86 / 8 59 / 6
SE	(951)	1.47 53 / 31 -211 / 31	1.54 46 / 10 28 / 10	1.09 91 / 4 131 / 3	1.13 87 / 6 70 / 4
UK	(876)	1.21 79 / 7 79 / 7	1.47 53 / 6 103 / 6	1.17 83 / 12 46 / 11	1.15 85 / 9 52 / 7
BG	(954)	1.42 58 / 29 -164 / 29	1.55 45 / 12 17 / 12	1.28 72 / 26 -61 / 25	1.21 79 / 15 13 / 14
HR	(816)	1.35 65 / 27 -76 / 27	1.64 36 / 23 -66 / 23	1.15 85 / 10 70 / 9	1.17 83 / 10 43 / 9
RO	(798)	1.21 79 / 8 77 / 8	1.55 45 / 11 21 / 11	1.23 77 / 18 -15 / 17	1.18 82 / 13 31 / 12
TR	(454)	1.23 77 / 10 59 / 10	1.69 31 / 29 -122 / 29	1.30 70 / 28 -84 / 27	1.00 100 / 3 169 / 1
NO	(846)	1.05 95 / 1 261 / 1	1.41 59 / 4 155 / 4	1.25 75 / 24 -38 / 23	1.27 73 / 20 -33 / 19
CH	(831)	1.21 79 / 9 75 / 9	1.40 60 / 3 167 / 3	1.23 77 / 19 -16 / 18	1.32 68 / 23 -72 / 22

Table 3: Sheet S. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		6.Quality of management/leadership			
		q30a (decreasing) Frank discussion with boss about work performance	q30d (decreasing) Discussions about work-related problems with the boss	q17bR (increasing) Working time planning	q19 (increasing) Contacts related to the main job outside normal working hours, like telephone, email, etc.
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: On the same day 2: The day before 3: Several days before 4: Several weeks before 5: No schedule changes	1: Every day 2: At least once a week 3: A few times a month 4: Less often 5: Never
BE	(798)	1.41 59 / 12 38 / 12	1.34 66 / 18 -2 / 18	4.30 83 / 13 27 / 13	4.00 75 / 25 -77 / 25
CZ	(749)	1.59 41 / 27 -91 / 27	1.35 65 / 19 -6 / 19	4.16 79 / 22 -37 / 22	4.16 79 / 21 -27 / 21
DK	(865)	1.39 61 / 10 52 / 10	1.24 76 / 7 78 / 7	3.81 70 / 30 -192 / 30	3.93 73 / 27 -100 / 27
DE	(877)	1.59 41 / 28 -92 / 28	1.53 47 / 29 -151 / 29	3.92 73 / 29 -143 / 29	4.21 80 / 20 -11 / 20
EE	(555)	1.39 61 / 11 51 / 11	1.20 80 / 3 112 / 3	4.20 80 / 20 -19 / 20	3.97 74 / 26 -87 / 26
EL	(629)	1.46 54 / 16 -0 / 16	1.28 72 / 14 49 / 14	4.24 81 / 19 -1 / 19	4.63 91 / 4 128 / 4
ES	(786)	1.49 51 / 18 -23 / 18	1.51 49 / 28 -132 / 28	4.41 85 / 7 74 / 7	4.24 81 / 19 1 / 19
FR	(878)	1.55 45 / 25 -63 / 25	1.46 54 / 26 -98 / 26	4.07 77 / 26 -78 / 26	4.71 93 / 2 151 / 2
IE	(768)	1.45 55 / 13 11 / 13	1.29 71 / 16 41 / 16	4.18 79 / 21 -28 / 21	4.07 77 / 23 -56 / 23
IT	(691)	1.79 21 / 31 -226 / 31	1.45 55 / 24 -88 / 24	4.53 88 / 3 131 / 3	4.65 91 / 3 132 / 3
CY	(482)	1.48 52 / 17 -13 / 17	1.35 65 / 20 -6 / 20	4.46 87 / 4 98 / 4	4.71 93 / 1 152 / 1
LV	(903)	1.35 65 / 9 78 / 9	1.24 76 / 6 81 / 6	4.26 82 / 18 9 / 18	4.11 78 / 22 -42 / 22
LT	(873)	1.26 74 / 3 142 / 3	1.18 82 / 1 126 / 1	4.34 84 / 11 46 / 11	4.62 91 / 5 124 / 5
LU	(520)	1.53 47 / 23 -50 / 23	1.38 62 / 22 -33 / 22	4.03 76 / 27 -95 / 27	4.44 86 / 9 63 / 9
HU	(810)	1.31 69 / 6 103 / 6	1.26 74 / 9 66 / 9	4.26 82 / 17 11 / 17	4.28 82 / 14 12 / 14
MT	(507)	1.33 67 / 7 88 / 7	1.24 76 / 8 78 / 8	4.66 91 / 1 188 / 1	4.30 82 / 13 19 / 13

Table 3: Sheet T. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		6. Quality of management/leadership			
		q30a (decreasing) Frank discussion with boss about work performance	q30d (decreasing) Discussions about work-related problems with the boss	q17bR (increasing) Working time planning	q19 (increasing) Contacts related to the main job outside normal working hours, like telephone, email, etc.
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: On the same day 2: The day before 3: Several days before 4: Several weeks before 5: No schedule changes	1: Every day 2: At least once a week 3: A few times a month 4: Less often 5: Never
NL	(877)	1.25 75 / 2	1.28 72 / 15	4.43 86 / 5	3.82 71 / 28
Netherlands		147 / 2	47 / 15	84 / 5	-135 / 28
AT	(842)	1.50 50 / 20	1.49 51 / 27	4.35 84 / 10	4.27 82 / 15
Austria		-27 / 20	-120 / 27	47 / 10	11 / 15
PL	(793)	1.51 49 / 21	1.46 54 / 25	4.27 82 / 15	4.31 83 / 12
Poland		-37 / 21	-92 / 25	15 / 15	22 / 12
PT	(788)	1.77 23 / 30	1.64 36 / 31	4.31 83 / 12	4.47 87 / 8
Portugal		-215 / 30	-235 / 31	30 / 12	75 / 8
SI	(500)	1.45 55 / 14	1.27 73 / 13	4.27 82 / 16	4.34 84 / 11
Slovenia		5 / 14	53 / 13	14 / 16	33 / 11
SK	(860)	1.53 47 / 22	1.29 71 / 17	4.11 78 / 25	4.26 82 / 16
Slovakia		-49 / 22	41 / 17	-58 / 25	8 / 16
FI	(911)	1.21 79 / 1	1.19 81 / 2	3.59 65 / 31	3.74 68 / 29
Finland		173 / 1	119 / 2	-294 / 31	-165 / 29
SE	(951)	1.34 66 / 8	1.26 74 / 10	4.15 79 / 23	3.54 63 / 31
Sweden		85 / 8	63 / 10	-41 / 23	-229 / 31
UK	(876)	1.46 54 / 15	1.41 59 / 23	4.29 82 / 14	4.26 82 / 17
United Kingdom		0 / 15	-59 / 23	20 / 14	7 / 17
BG	(954)	1.30 70 / 5	1.20 80 / 4	4.58 89 / 2	4.60 90 / 6
Bulgaria		113 / 5	110 / 4	151 / 2	117 / 6
HR	(816)	1.58 42 / 26	1.37 63 / 21	4.38 84 / 8	4.50 88 / 7
Croatia		-81 / 26	-20 / 21	62 / 8	85 / 7
RO	(798)	1.50 50 / 19	1.26 74 / 11	3.98 75 / 28	4.25 81 / 18
Romania		-26 / 19	63 / 11	-117 / 28	4 / 18
TR	(454)	1.69 31 / 29	1.63 37 / 30	4.42 86 / 6	4.38 85 / 10
Turkey		-157 / 29	-229 / 30	81 / 6	46 / 10
NO	(846)	1.54 46 / 24	1.26 74 / 12	4.37 84 / 9	3.64 66 / 30
Norway		-58 / 24	61 / 12	59 / 9	-197 / 30
CH	(831)	1.28 72 / 4	1.24 76 / 5	4.15 79 / 24	4.04 76 / 24
Switzerland		124 / 4	81 / 5	-42 / 24	-64 / 24

Table 3: Sheet U. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		7.Industrial culture			
		q26a (decreasing) Rotating tasks between colleagues	q26b (decreasing) Team work	q21e (decreasing) Direct control of the work by boss	q25b (decreasing) Possible assistance from the superiors
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never
BE	(798)	1.49 51 / 12	1.34 66 / 14	1.65 35 / 22	2.47 63 / 26
Belgium		20 / 12	21 / 14	-50 / 22	-70 / 26
CZ	(749)	1.57 43 / 25	1.39 61 / 20	1.49 51 / 11	2.18 70 / 19
Czech Republic		-55 / 25	-25 / 20	53 / 11	0 / 19
DK	(865)	1.27 73 / 2	1.37 63 / 19	1.81 19 / 28	1.70 82 / 1
Denmark		224 / 2	-4 / 19	-157 / 28	118 / 1
DE	(877)	1.46 54 / 10	1.40 60 / 22	1.67 33 / 25	2.37 66 / 25
Germany		43 / 10	-43 / 22	-63 / 25	-44 / 25
EE	(555)	1.54 46 / 22	1.26 74 / 3	1.65 35 / 23	1.95 76 / 11
Estonia		-28 / 22	106 / 3	-52 / 23	57 / 11
EL	(629)	1.40 60 / 4	1.42 58 / 25	1.40 60 / 5	2.50 63 / 27
Greece		96 / 4	-64 / 25	117 / 5	-76 / 27
ES	(786)	1.71 29 / 30	1.57 43 / 30	1.56 44 / 16	2.19 70 / 20
Spain		-188 / 30	-213 / 30	10 / 16	-1 / 20
FR	(878)	1.64 36 / 27	1.52 48 / 29	1.59 41 / 17	3.02 50 / 30
France		-122 / 27	-159 / 29	-12 / 17	-204 / 30
IE	(768)	1.52 48 / 20	1.31 69 / 11	1.62 38 / 19	1.71 82 / 2
Ireland		-10 / 20	48 / 11	-30 / 19	117 / 2
IT	(691)	1.62 38 / 26	1.57 43 / 31	1.66 34 / 24	2.99 50 / 29
Italy		-105 / 26	-216 / 31	-61 / 24	-196 / 29
CY	(482)	1.47 53 / 11	1.41 59 / 23	1.35 65 / 2	2.22 70 / 22
Cyprus		34 / 11	-55 / 23	145 / 2	-8 / 22
LV	(903)	1.46 54 / 8	1.30 70 / 9	1.49 51 / 10	1.77 81 / 3
Latvia		47 / 8	60 / 9	56 / 10	102 / 3
LT	(873)	1.65 35 / 28	1.35 65 / 15	1.50 50 / 12	2.19 70 / 21
Lithuania		-129 / 28	10 / 15	47 / 12	-2 / 21
LU	(520)	1.56 44 / 24	1.31 69 / 10	1.63 37 / 20	2.36 66 / 24
Luxemburg		-47 / 24	55 / 10	-39 / 20	-43 / 24
HU	(810)	1.71 29 / 31	1.46 54 / 27	1.29 71 / 1	1.87 78 / 8
Hungary		-191 / 31	-100 / 27	190 / 1	77 / 8
MT	(507)	1.51 49 / 17	1.27 73 / 7	1.38 62 / 4	1.85 79 / 5
Malta		-4 / 17	91 / 7	129 / 4	83 / 5

Table 3: Sheet V. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		7.Industrial culture			
		q26a (decreasing) Rotating tasks between colleagues	q26b (decreasing) Team work	q21e (decreasing) Direct control of the work by boss	q25b (decreasing) Possible assistance from the superiors
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never
NL Netherlands	(877)	1.37 63 / 3 133 / 3	1.26 74 / 5 103 / 5	1.82 18 / 29 -162 / 29	1.94 77 / 9 61 / 9
AT Austria	(842)	1.50 50 / 16 9 / 16	1.40 60 / 21 -39 / 21	1.63 37 / 21 -39 / 21	2.02 74 / 13 40 / 13
PL Poland	(793)	1.50 50 / 14 12 / 14	1.42 58 / 24 -59 / 24	1.54 46 / 15 22 / 15	2.10 73 / 16 21 / 16
PT Portugal	(788)	1.68 32 / 29 -162 / 29	1.51 49 / 28 -148 / 28	1.44 56 / 7 85 / 7	2.83 54 / 28 -157 / 28
SI Slovenia	(500)	1.26 74 / 1 234 / 1	1.15 85 / 1 218 / 1	1.61 39 / 18 -25 / 18	1.85 79 / 6 81 / 6
SK Slovakia	(860)	1.49 51 / 13 20 / 13	1.36 64 / 18 -0 / 18	1.51 49 / 13 40 / 13	1.94 77 / 10 60 / 10
FI Finland	(911)	1.52 48 / 19 -7 / 19	1.25 75 / 2 112 / 2	1.82 18 / 30 -168 / 30	1.81 80 / 4 93 / 4
SE Sweden	(951)	1.46 54 / 9 45 / 9	1.28 72 / 8 88 / 8	1.84 16 / 31 -177 / 31	2.05 74 / 15 34 / 15
UK United Kingdom	(876)	1.50 50 / 15 11 / 15	1.27 73 / 6 98 / 6	1.47 53 / 9 68 / 9	2.04 74 / 14 36 / 14
BG Bulgaria	(954)	1.43 57 / 5 72 / 5	1.32 68 / 12 47 / 12	1.37 63 / 3 135 / 3	2.29 68 / 23 -27 / 23
HR Croatia	(816)	1.45 55 / 6 55 / 6	1.35 65 / 16 7 / 16	1.53 47 / 14 29 / 14	1.98 76 / 12 50 / 12
RO Romania	(798)	1.51 49 / 18 -5 / 18	1.34 66 / 13 26 / 13	1.47 53 / 8 70 / 8	2.17 71 / 18 3 / 18
TR Turkey	(454)	1.55 45 / 23 -42 / 23	1.43 57 / 26 -72 / 26	1.44 56 / 6 88 / 6	3.41 40 / 31 -300 / 31
NO Norway	(846)	1.45 55 / 7 54 / 7	1.26 74 / 4 103 / 4	1.77 23 / 27 -130 / 27	2.13 72 / 17 14 / 17
CH Switzerland	(831)	1.52 48 / 21 -13 / 21	1.36 64 / 17 5 / 17	1.75 25 / 26 -118 / 26	1.86 79 / 7 80 / 7

Table 3: Sheet W. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	7.Industrial culture	8.Collegiality		
	q25c (decreasing) Possible external assistance	q25a (decreasing) Possible assistance from colleagues	q37d (increasing) Feeling at home at the enterprise	q37f (increasing) Good friends at work
	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Definitive no 2: No 3: Neither yes nor no 4: Yes 5: Definitive yes	1: Definitive no 2: No 3: Neither yes nor no 4: Yes 5: Definitive yes
BE (798) Belgium	3.42 39 / 22 -25 / 22	1.99 75 / 23 -35 / 23	3.79 70 / 12 51 / 12	3.89 72 / 18 -28 / 18
CZ (749) Czech Republic	2.79 55 / 4 101 / 4	1.89 78 / 19 -5 / 19	3.24 56 / 26 -100 / 26	3.62 66 / 30 -153 / 30
DK (865) Denmark	2.54 61 / 1 150 / 1	1.41 90 / 1 137 / 1	4.27 82 / 1 182 / 1	4.17 79 / 7 101 / 7
DE (877) Germany	3.42 40 / 21 -24 / 21	2.18 71 / 27 -90 / 27	3.54 63 / 17 -19 / 17	3.73 68 / 27 -101 / 27
EE (555) Estonia	3.40 40 / 20 -22 / 20	1.69 83 / 11 54 / 11	3.59 65 / 15 -4 / 15	3.81 70 / 26 -67 / 26
EL (629) Greece	3.99 25 / 26 -138 / 26	2.13 72 / 26 -76 / 26	3.23 56 / 27 -103 / 27	3.94 74 / 14 -5 / 14
ES (786) Spain	3.40 40 / 19 -21 / 19	2.01 75 / 24 -40 / 24	3.47 62 / 21 -37 / 21	3.89 72 / 20 -30 / 20
FR (878) France	4.01 25 / 28 -143 / 28	2.54 61 / 30 -198 / 30	3.03 51 / 29 -157 / 29	3.85 71 / 23 -45 / 23
IE (768) Ireland	2.85 54 / 6 89 / 6	1.49 88 / 2 115 / 2	3.85 71 / 11 67 / 11	4.22 80 / 6 124 / 6
IT (691) Italy	4.23 19 / 30 -186 / 30	2.51 62 / 29 -188 / 29	3.28 57 / 25 -88 / 25	3.63 66 / 29 -150 / 29
CY (482) Cyprus	4.07 23 / 29 -154 / 29	1.90 78 / 20 -6 / 20	3.90 72 / 9 81 / 9	4.24 81 / 4 136 / 4
LV (903) Latvia	3.06 49 / 14 48 / 14	1.61 85 / 6 78 / 6	3.53 63 / 18 -19 / 18	3.84 71 / 24 -52 / 24
LT (873) Lithuania	2.83 54 / 5 94 / 5	1.96 76 / 22 -26 / 22	2.97 49 / 30 -175 / 30	3.70 68 / 28 -117 / 28
LU (520) Luxemburg	3.60 35 / 24 -60 / 24	1.90 78 / 21 -7 / 21	3.36 59 / 24 -66 / 24	3.87 72 / 22 -39 / 22
HU (810) Hungary	3.30 43 / 17 0 / 17	1.68 83 / 10 58 / 10	3.92 73 / 7 88 / 7	4.03 76 / 10 37 / 10
MT (507) Malta	2.98 51 / 12 64 / 12	1.65 84 / 8 66 / 8	3.91 73 / 8 83 / 8	4.32 83 / 1 174 / 1

Table 3: Sheet X. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	7.Industrial culture	8.Collegiality		
	q25c (decreasing) Possible external assistance	q25a (decreasing) Possible assistance from colleagues	q37d (increasing) Feeling at home at the enterprise	q37f (increasing) Good friends at work
	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Definitive no 2: No 3: Neither yes nor no 4: Yes 5: Definitive yes	1: Definitive no 2: No 3: Neither yes nor no 4: Yes 5: Definitive yes
NL (877) Netherlands	2.75 56 / 3 110 / 3	1.58 85 / 5 87 / 5	3.99 75 / 5 106 / 5	3.47 62 / 31 -225 / 31
AT (842) Austria	2.95 51 / 10 70 / 10	1.79 80 / 18 24 / 18	3.68 67 / 13 21 / 13	3.94 73 / 15 -6 / 15
PL (793) Poland	3.24 44 / 15 10 / 15	1.77 81 / 17 31 / 17	3.21 55 / 28 -110 / 28	3.82 70 / 25 -62 / 25
PT (788) Portugal	3.99 25 / 27 -138 / 27	2.48 63 / 28 -178 / 28	3.66 67 / 14 16 / 14	3.95 74 / 13 -0 / 13
SI (500) Slovenia	3.34 41 / 18 -9 / 18	1.72 82 / 13 45 / 13	3.46 62 / 22 -39 / 22	3.89 72 / 19 -30 / 19
SK (860) Slovakia	2.59 60 / 2 140 / 2	1.70 82 / 12 52 / 12	3.39 60 / 23 -58 / 23	3.95 74 / 12 1 / 12
FI (911) Finland	2.94 51 / 9 71 / 9	1.57 86 / 4 89 / 4	4.01 75 / 4 112 / 4	4.06 77 / 9 51 / 9
SE (951) Sweden	2.87 53 / 7 85 / 7	1.52 87 / 3 104 / 3	4.11 78 / 3 138 / 3	4.30 83 / 3 164 / 3
UK (876) United Kingdom	2.95 51 / 11 69 / 11	1.75 81 / 15 37 / 15	3.96 74 / 6 98 / 6	4.23 81 / 5 132 / 5
BG (954) Bulgaria	3.68 33 / 25 -76 / 25	2.04 74 / 25 -49 / 25	3.48 62 / 20 -35 / 20	3.96 74 / 11 4 / 11
HR (816) Croatia	3.01 50 / 13 58 / 13	1.67 83 / 9 61 / 9	3.56 64 / 16 -14 / 16	4.17 79 / 8 101 / 8
RO (798) Romania	3.44 39 / 23 -28 / 23	1.77 81 / 16 32 / 16	3.48 62 / 19 -34 / 19	3.87 72 / 21 -36 / 21
TR (454) Turkey	4.42 14 / 31 -226 / 31	2.83 54 / 31 -283 / 31	2.83 46 / 31 -214 / 31	3.90 73 / 17 -23 / 17
NO (846) Norway	2.88 53 / 8 83 / 8	1.65 84 / 7 68 / 7	4.17 79 / 2 155 / 2	4.30 83 / 2 165 / 2
CH (831) Switzerland	3.25 44 / 16 9 / 16	1.74 82 / 14 41 / 14	3.89 72 / 10 78 / 10	3.90 73 / 16 -22 / 16

Table 3: Sheet Y. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	9. Meaningfulness of work		10. Time arrangements	
	q25i (decreasing) Feeling of doing a good work	q25k (decreasing) Feeling of doing useful work	q17bR (increasing) Working time planning	q18 (decreasing) Compatibility of working hours with family or social commitments
	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: On the same day 2: The day before 3: Several days before 4: Several weeks before 5: No schedule changes	1: Very well 2: Well 3: Not very well 4: Not at all well
BE (798) Belgium	1.71 82 / 15 41 / 15	1.68 83 / 16 4 / 16	4.30 83 / 13 27 / 13	1.80 73 / 8 70 / 8
CZ (749) Czech Republic	2.06 73 / 27 -115 / 27	2.04 74 / 31 -200 / 31	4.16 79 / 22 -37 / 22	1.94 69 / 17 -5 / 17
DK (865) Denmark	1.50 87 / 2 129 / 2	1.39 90 / 1 161 / 1	3.81 70 / 30 -192 / 30	1.53 82 / 1 208 / 1
DE (877) Germany	1.91 77 / 21 -49 / 21	1.86 78 / 26 -99 / 26	3.92 73 / 29 -143 / 29	1.88 71 / 14 28 / 14
EE (555) Estonia	1.97 76 / 25 -74 / 25	1.87 78 / 27 -102 / 27	4.20 80 / 20 -19 / 20	2.02 66 / 21 -48 / 21
EL (629) Greece	2.14 71 / 29 -150 / 29	1.84 79 / 23 -85 / 23	4.24 81 / 19 -1 / 19	2.19 60 / 29 -134 / 29
ES (786) Spain	1.92 77 / 22 -51 / 22	1.86 79 / 25 -95 / 25	4.41 85 / 7 74 / 7	2.03 66 / 23 -54 / 23
FR (878) France	1.67 83 / 9 56 / 9	1.69 83 / 17 -6 / 17	4.07 77 / 26 -78 / 26	1.83 72 / 9 52 / 9
IE (768) Ireland	1.70 82 / 14 41 / 14	1.70 82 / 18 -11 / 18	4.18 79 / 21 -28 / 21	1.78 74 / 7 80 / 7
IT (691) Italy	1.81 80 / 18 -6 / 18	1.84 79 / 24 -89 / 24	4.53 88 / 3 131 / 3	2.19 60 / 30 -136 / 30
CY (482) Cyprus	1.53 87 / 4 117 / 4	1.43 89 / 2 140 / 2	4.46 87 / 4 98 / 4	1.83 72 / 10 52 / 10
LV (903) Latvia	1.84 79 / 20 -18 / 20	1.61 85 / 13 41 / 13	4.26 82 / 18 9 / 18	2.17 61 / 28 -123 / 28
LT (873) Lithuania	2.26 69 / 30 -200 / 30	1.97 76 / 29 -158 / 29	4.34 84 / 11 46 / 11	2.05 65 / 24 -63 / 24
LU (520) Luxemburg	1.56 86 / 6 104 / 6	1.56 86 / 10 67 / 10	4.03 76 / 27 -95 / 27	1.85 72 / 11 44 / 11
HU (810) Hungary	2.05 74 / 26 -108 / 26	1.61 85 / 12 41 / 12	4.26 82 / 17 11 / 17	2.14 62 / 26 -111 / 26
MT (507) Malta	1.46 89 / 1 150 / 1	1.46 88 / 4 122 / 4	4.66 91 / 1 188 / 1	1.90 70 / 15 15 / 15

Table 3: Sheet Z. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	9.Meaningfulness of work		10.Time arrangements	
	q25i (decreasing) Feeling of doing a good work	q25k (decreasing) Feeling of doing useful work	q17bR (increasing) Working time planning	q18 (decreasing) Compatibility of working hours with family or social commitments
	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: On the same day 2: The day before 3: Several days before 4: Several weeks before 5: No schedule changes	1: Very well 2: Well 3: Not very well 4: Not at all well
NL (877) Netherlands	1.54 86 / 5 112 / 5	1.46 88 / 5 121 / 5	4.43 86 / 5 84 / 5	1.85 72 / 12 41 / 12
AT (842) Austria	1.65 84 / 8 64 / 8	1.77 81 / 22 -45 / 22	4.35 84 / 10 47 / 10	1.68 77 / 4 132 / 4
PL (793) Poland	1.67 83 / 11 56 / 11	1.63 84 / 14 31 / 14	4.27 82 / 15 15 / 15	2.09 64 / 25 -83 / 25
PT (788) Portugal	1.70 82 / 13 42 / 13	1.63 84 / 15 30 / 15	4.31 83 / 12 30 / 12	1.95 68 / 18 -12 / 18
SI (500) Slovenia	1.67 83 / 10 56 / 10	1.49 88 / 6 106 / 6	4.27 82 / 16 14 / 16	2.15 62 / 27 -114 / 27
SK (860) Slovakia	1.97 76 / 24 -73 / 24	1.76 81 / 21 -42 / 21	4.11 78 / 25 -58 / 25	2.00 67 / 19 -35 / 19
FI (911) Finland	2.07 73 / 28 -117 / 28	1.71 82 / 19 -15 / 19	3.59 65 / 31 -294 / 31	1.73 76 / 5 104 / 5
SE (951) Sweden	1.77 81 / 17 14 / 17	1.56 86 / 9 69 / 9	4.15 79 / 23 -41 / 23	1.86 71 / 13 38 / 13
UK (876) United Kingdom	1.96 76 / 23 -70 / 23	1.94 76 / 28 -145 / 28	4.29 82 / 14 20 / 14	1.67 78 / 3 134 / 3
BG (954) Bulgaria	1.68 83 / 12 52 / 12	1.57 86 / 11 61 / 11	4.58 89 / 2 151 / 2	2.03 66 / 22 -51 / 22
HR (816) Croatia	1.84 79 / 19 -17 / 19	1.75 81 / 20 -35 / 20	4.38 84 / 8 62 / 8	1.93 69 / 16 -2 / 16
RO (798) Romania	1.59 85 / 7 90 / 7	1.56 86 / 8 70 / 8	3.98 75 / 28 -117 / 28	2.01 66 / 20 -42 / 20
TR (454) Turkey	2.33 67 / 31 -234 / 31	1.98 75 / 30 -166 / 30	4.42 86 / 6 81 / 6	2.38 54 / 31 -236 / 31
NO (846) Norway	1.71 82 / 16 37 / 16	1.51 87 / 7 97 / 7	4.37 84 / 9 59 / 9	1.62 79 / 2 158 / 2
CH (831) Switzerland	1.52 87 / 3 124 / 3	1.44 89 / 3 132 / 3	4.15 79 / 24 -42 / 24	1.75 75 / 6 91 / 6

Table 3: Sheet Z1. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		10. Time arrangements			
		q34aa (decreasing) Maternit/paternity leave in the past 12 months	q34ac (decreasing) Family-related leave in the past 12 months	q34ad (decreasing) Leave from work due to 'other reasons' in the past 12 months	q8a (increasing) Work over 42 hours a week
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
BE	(798)	1.95 5 / 5	1.88 12 / 17	1.66 34 / 5	1.09 9 / 26
Belgium		108 / 5	-19 / 17	93 / 5	-102 / 26
CZ	(749)	1.97 3 / 16	1.84 16 / 11	1.66 34 / 6	1.33 33 / 3
Czech Republic		-20 / 16	34 / 11	92 / 6	103 / 3
DK	(865)	1.95 5 / 6	1.99 1 / 31	1.65 35 / 4	1.14 14 / 23
Denmark		83 / 6	-150 / 31	106 / 4	-58 / 23
DE	(877)	1.99 1 / 31	1.81 19 / 4	1.71 29 / 11	1.13 13 / 24
Germany		-140 / 31	73 / 4	38 / 11	-68 / 24
EE	(555)	1.96 4 / 12	1.81 19 / 5	1.71 29 / 12	1.15 15 / 22
Estonia		4 / 12	71 / 5	33 / 12	-50 / 22
EL	(629)	1.96 4 / 13	1.83 17 / 8	1.83 17 / 28	1.30 30 / 5
Greece		-2 / 13	42 / 8	-113 / 28	79 / 5
ES	(786)	1.98 2 / 28	1.95 5 / 28	1.85 15 / 30	1.19 19 / 16
Spain		-88 / 28	-104 / 28	-138 / 30	-14 / 16
FR	(878)	1.97 3 / 15	1.90 10 / 20	1.79 21 / 24	1.06 6 / 31
France		-13 / 15	-45 / 20	-67 / 24	-124 / 31
IE	(768)	1.98 2 / 25	1.88 12 / 16	1.77 23 / 20	1.17 17 / 19
Ireland		-69 / 25	-16 / 16	-43 / 20	-36 / 19
IT	(691)	1.98 2 / 23	1.85 15 / 12	1.70 30 / 10	1.15 15 / 20
Italy		-63 / 23	25 / 12	41 / 10	-47 / 20
CY	(482)	1.98 2 / 27	1.88 12 / 18	1.81 19 / 27	1.20 20 / 15
Cyprus		-86 / 27	-20 / 18	-92 / 27	-11 / 15
LV	(903)	1.98 2 / 29	1.94 6 / 26	1.75 25 / 15	1.25 25 / 11
Latvia		-115 / 29	-94 / 26	-13 / 15	32 / 11
LT	(873)	1.98 2 / 22	1.95 5 / 29	1.77 23 / 18	1.22 22 / 13
Lithuania		-63 / 22	-105 / 29	-34 / 18	10 / 13
LU	(520)	1.96 4 / 8	1.88 12 / 15	1.67 33 / 7	1.12 12 / 25
Luxemburg		54 / 8	-12 / 15	79 / 7	-77 / 25
HU	(810)	1.97 3 / 14	1.62 38 / 1	1.74 26 / 14	1.23 23 / 12
Hungary		-5 / 14	302 / 1	2 / 14	21 / 12
MT	(507)	1.98 2 / 24	1.64 36 / 2	1.56 44 / 2	1.18 18 / 17
Malta		-69 / 24	279 / 2	214 / 2	-21 / 17

Table 3: Sheet Z2. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		10. Time arrangements			
		q34aa (decreasing) Maternit/paternity leave in the past 12 months	q34ac (decreasing) Family-related leave in the past 12 months	q34ad (decreasing) Leave from work due to 'other reasons' in the past 12 months	q8a (increasing) Work over 42 hours a week
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
NL	(877)	1.96 4 / 11	1.85 15 / 13	1.63 37 / 3	1.08 8 / 30
Netherlands		6 / 11	21 / 13	124 / 3	-105 / 30
AT	(842)	1.97 3 / 19	1.91 9 / 21	1.79 21 / 23	1.09 9 / 27
Austria		-53 / 19	-49 / 21	-63 / 23	-102 / 27
PL	(793)	1.97 3 / 17	1.91 9 / 23	1.79 21 / 22	1.27 27 / 7
Poland		-30 / 17	-51 / 23	-59 / 22	54 / 7
PT	(788)	1.98 2 / 26	1.95 5 / 27	1.87 13 / 31	1.21 21 / 14
Portugal		-81 / 26	-101 / 27	-162 / 31	-2 / 14
SI	(500)	1.95 5 / 4	1.84 16 / 10	1.67 33 / 8	1.25 25 / 10
Slovenia		110 / 4	38 / 10	75 / 8	34 / 10
SK	(860)	1.97 3 / 21	1.84 16 / 9	1.77 23 / 19	1.31 31 / 4
Slovakia		-58 / 21	38 / 9	-35 / 19	86 / 4
FI	(911)	1.95 5 / 3	1.82 18 / 6	1.51 49 / 1	1.08 8 / 29
Finland		110 / 3	53 / 6	272 / 1	-104 / 29
SE	(951)	1.91 9 / 1	1.83 17 / 7	1.70 30 / 9	1.17 17 / 18
Sweden		334 / 1	44 / 7	44 / 9	-36 / 18
UK	(876)	1.95 5 / 7	1.90 10 / 19	1.76 24 / 17	1.15 15 / 21
United Kingdom		60 / 7	-39 / 19	-31 / 17	-49 / 21
BG	(954)	1.97 3 / 20	1.91 9 / 24	1.76 24 / 16	1.27 27 / 8
Bulgaria		-53 / 20	-57 / 24	-30 / 16	47 / 8
HR	(816)	1.96 4 / 10	1.91 9 / 22	1.80 20 / 26	1.26 26 / 9
Croatia		38 / 10	-51 / 22	-81 / 26	42 / 9
RO	(798)	1.98 2 / 30	1.92 8 / 25	1.85 15 / 29	1.38 38 / 2
Romania		-118 / 30	-71 / 25	-132 / 29	138 / 2
TR	(454)	1.96 4 / 9	1.79 21 / 3	1.78 22 / 21	1.68 68 / 1
Turkey		53 / 9	94 / 3	-58 / 21	386 / 1
NO	(846)	1.93 7 / 2	1.97 3 / 30	1.72 28 / 13	1.09 9 / 28
Norway		194 / 2	-126 / 30	17 / 13	-102 / 28
CH	(831)	1.97 3 / 18	1.87 13 / 14	1.80 20 / 25	1.30 30 / 6
Switzerland		-31 / 18	-4 / 14	-77 / 25	75 / 6

Table 3: Sheet Z3. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		10. Time arrangements			
		q13 (decreasing) Time to get to the workplace and back	q14a (decreasing) Nightwork for at least 2 hours between 22:00–5:00	q14e (decreasing) Overwork (more than 10 hours a day)	q16ad (increasing) Shift work
		1: 0min 2: 1–30min 3: 31–60min 4: 61–90min 5: 91–120min 6: 121–180min 7: 181–240min 8: 241–300min 9: >300min	1: No 2: 1–3 per month 3: 4–8 per month 4: 9–12 per month 5: 13–20 per month 6: > 20 p.month	1: No 2: 1–3 per month 3: 4–8 per month 4: 9–12 per month 5: 13–20 per month 6: > 20 p.month	1: Yes 2: No
BE	(798)	2.78 89 / 20 –39 / 20	1.39 92 / 10 46 / 10	1.60 88 / 8 64 / 8	1.85 85 / 8 89 / 8
CZ	(749)	2.72 90 / 15 1 / 15	1.46 91 / 22 –48 / 22	1.85 83 / 25 –59 / 25	1.73 73 / 25 –90 / 25
DK	(865)	2.74 89 / 17 –16 / 17	1.34 93 / 6 109 / 6	1.74 85 / 17 –2 / 17	1.90 90 / 1 159 / 1
DE	(877)	2.84 88 / 23 –85 / 23	1.31 94 / 2 149 / 2	1.58 88 / 6 73 / 6	1.82 82 / 15 33 / 15
EE	(555)	2.90 87 / 29 –127 / 29	1.44 91 / 20 –23 / 20	1.84 83 / 24 –54 / 24	1.76 76 / 18 –43 / 18
EL	(629)	2.77 89 / 19 –33 / 19	1.50 90 / 26 –102 / 26	1.76 85 / 19 –11 / 19	1.83 83 / 13 52 / 13
ES	(786)	2.56 92 / 7 112 / 7	1.40 92 / 13 24 / 13	1.43 91 / 1 146 / 1	1.76 76 / 21 –52 / 21
FR	(878)	2.56 92 / 6 112 / 6	1.37 93 / 7 69 / 7	1.44 91 / 2 143 / 2	1.83 83 / 12 62 / 12
IE	(768)	2.85 88 / 25 –89 / 25	1.43 91 / 17 –6 / 17	1.79 84 / 23 –27 / 23	1.85 85 / 7 92 / 7
IT	(691)	2.60 91 / 8 84 / 8	1.31 94 / 3 143 / 3	1.51 90 / 3 111 / 3	1.76 76 / 20 –46 / 20
CY	(482)	2.49 93 / 2 162 / 2	1.40 92 / 11 36 / 11	1.64 87 / 9 46 / 9	1.87 87 / 4 113 / 4
LV	(903)	2.87 88 / 27 –104 / 27	1.44 91 / 19 –20 / 19	2.01 80 / 29 –137 / 29	1.76 76 / 24 –57 / 24
LT	(873)	2.68 90 / 13 27 / 13	1.38 92 / 9 61 / 9	1.76 85 / 20 –11 / 20	1.76 76 / 19 –44 / 19
LU	(520)	2.72 90 / 16 –1 / 16	1.32 94 / 4 133 / 4	1.52 90 / 5 105 / 5	1.84 84 / 11 65 / 11
HU	(810)	2.88 87 / 28 –111 / 28	1.51 90 / 28 –114 / 28	1.76 85 / 21 –12 / 21	1.78 78 / 17 –24 / 17
MT	(507)	2.52 93 / 4 141 / 4	1.44 91 / 18 –16 / 18	1.67 87 / 15 32 / 15	1.78 78 / 16 –13 / 16

Table 3: Sheet Z4. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		10. Time arrangements			
		q13 (decreasing) Time to get to the workplace and back	q14a (decreasing) Nightwork for at least 2 hours between 22:00–5:00	q14e (decreasing) Overwork (more than 10 hours a day)	q16ad (increasing) Shift work
		1: 0min 2: 1–30min 3: 31–60min 4: 61–90min 5: 91–120min 6: 121–180min 7: 181–240min 8: 241–300min 9: >300min	1: No 2: 1–3 per month 3: 4–8 per month 4: 9–12 per month 5: 13–20 per month 6: > 20 p.month	1: No 2: 1–3 per month 3: 4–8 per month 4: 9–12 per month 5: 13–20 per month 6: > 20 p.month	1: Yes 2: No
NL (877) Netherlands		3.00 86 / 31 –194 / 31	1.26 95 / 1 203 / 1	1.65 87 / 10 42 / 10	1.87 87 / 3 118 / 3
AT (842) Austria		2.51 93 / 3 145 / 3	1.40 92 / 12 34 / 12	1.59 88 / 7 69 / 7	1.84 84 / 10 75 / 10
PL (793) Poland		2.85 88 / 24 –88 / 24	1.51 90 / 27 –113 / 27	1.66 87 / 11 38 / 11	1.70 70 / 29 –137 / 29
PT (788) Portugal		2.53 92 / 5 136 / 5	1.49 90 / 25 –84 / 25	1.51 90 / 4 108 / 4	1.88 88 / 2 126 / 2
SI (500) Slovenia		2.66 91 / 11 44 / 11	1.48 90 / 23 –73 / 23	1.92 82 / 28 –93 / 28	1.70 70 / 30 –141 / 30
SK (860) Slovakia		2.81 88 / 22 –64 / 22	1.51 90 / 29 –115 / 29	1.91 82 / 27 –85 / 27	1.72 72 / 27 –108 / 27
FI (911) Finland		2.65 91 / 10 52 / 10	1.48 90 / 24 –75 / 24	1.76 85 / 18 –11 / 18	1.73 73 / 26 –99 / 26
SE (951) Sweden		2.77 89 / 18 –33 / 18	1.32 94 / 5 127 / 5	1.88 82 / 26 –70 / 26	1.86 86 / 6 106 / 6
UK (876) United Kingdom		2.79 89 / 21 –49 / 21	1.45 91 / 21 –36 / 21	1.69 86 / 16 19 / 16	1.82 82 / 14 44 / 14
BG (954) Bulgaria		2.71 90 / 14 9 / 14	1.41 92 / 15 12 / 15	1.76 85 / 22 –12 / 22	1.76 76 / 22 –54 / 22
HR (816) Croatia		2.62 91 / 9 70 / 9	1.41 92 / 14 19 / 14	1.66 87 / 12 37 / 12	1.62 62 / 31 –258 / 31
RO (798) Romania		2.95 86 / 30 –157 / 30	1.58 88 / 31 –206 / 31	2.08 78 / 30 –169 / 30	1.72 72 / 28 –111 / 28
TR (454) Turkey		2.87 88 / 26 –100 / 26	1.57 89 / 30 –194 / 30	2.45 71 / 31 –350 / 31	1.87 87 / 5 109 / 5
NO (846) Norway		2.49 93 / 1 162 / 1	1.43 91 / 16 –5 / 16	1.66 87 / 14 35 / 14	1.76 76 / 23 –55 / 23
CH (831) Switzerland		2.67 90 / 12 35 / 12	1.37 93 / 8 63 / 8	1.66 87 / 13 36 / 13	1.85 85 / 9 88 / 9

Table 3: Sheet Z5. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		11.Intensity/ exhaustiveness			
		q22R (increasing) Unpleasant interruptions for unforeseen tasks	q20ba (increasing) Work at a high speed	q20bb (increasing) Working to tight deadlines	q21d (increasing) Dependence on the speed of machines
		1: Very often 2: Fairly often 3: Occasionally 4: Never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Yes 2: No
BE	(798)	3.37 79 / 22 -49 / 22	4.71 62 / 10 49 / 10	4.48 58 / 11 42 / 11	1.85 85 / 9 51 / 9
CZ	(749)	3.67 89 / 7 96 / 7	4.46 58 / 16 11 / 16	3.74 46 / 29 -123 / 29	1.78 78 / 27 -73 / 27
DK	(865)	3.22 74 / 28 -117 / 28	3.69 45 / 25 -103 / 25	3.93 49 / 25 -81 / 25	1.88 88 / 3 112 / 3
DE	(877)	3.53 84 / 15 31 / 15	3.91 49 / 21 -70 / 21	4.10 52 / 19 -43 / 19	1.82 82 / 15 7 / 15
EE	(555)	3.56 85 / 13 42 / 13	4.49 58 / 15 16 / 15	4.57 59 / 10 62 / 10	1.77 77 / 28 -98 / 28
EL	(629)	3.37 79 / 21 -48 / 21	3.61 44 / 29 -114 / 29	3.82 47 / 27 -106 / 27	1.81 81 / 18 -16 / 18
ES	(786)	3.69 90 / 4 103 / 4	4.51 58 / 14 18 / 14	4.66 61 / 8 83 / 8	1.82 82 / 16 6 / 16
FR	(878)	3.45 82 / 17 -8 / 17	4.81 64 / 9 63 / 9	4.48 58 / 12 41 / 12	1.81 81 / 19 -16 / 19
IE	(768)	3.29 76 / 26 -85 / 26	5.09 68 / 4 105 / 4	4.38 56 / 15 19 / 15	1.87 87 / 6 105 / 6
IT	(691)	3.68 89 / 5 100 / 5	4.18 53 / 17 -30 / 17	4.47 58 / 13 39 / 13	1.82 82 / 13 10 / 13
CY	(482)	3.44 81 / 18 -14 / 18	3.63 44 / 28 -111 / 28	3.87 48 / 26 -94 / 26	1.84 84 / 11 42 / 11
LV	(903)	3.58 86 / 11 54 / 11	5.39 73 / 3 150 / 3	5.13 69 / 2 188 / 2	1.82 82 / 17 -8 / 17
LT	(873)	3.58 86 / 12 52 / 12	4.96 66 / 8 85 / 8	4.85 64 / 3 126 / 3	1.80 80 / 20 -30 / 20
LU	(520)	3.43 81 / 19 -20 / 19	4.60 60 / 12 33 / 12	4.59 60 / 9 66 / 9	1.85 85 / 8 58 / 8
HU	(810)	3.62 87 / 9 70 / 9	4.08 51 / 19 -45 / 19	4.15 53 / 16 -31 / 16	1.79 79 / 26 -61 / 26
MT	(507)	3.26 75 / 27 -100 / 27	4.09 52 / 18 -43 / 18	3.62 44 / 30 -151 / 30	1.83 83 / 12 30 / 12

Table 3: Sheet Z6. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		11.Intensity/ exhaustiveness			
		q22R (increasing) Unpleasant interruptions for unforeseen tasks	q20ba (increasing) Work at a high speed	q20bb (increasing) Working to tight deadlines	q21d (increasing) Dependence on the speed of machines
		1: Very often 2: Fairly often 3: Occasionally 4: Never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Yes 2: No
NL (877) Netherlands		3.36 79 / 23 -50 / 23	4.60 60 / 13 32 / 13	4.42 57 / 14 28 / 14	1.88 88 / 4 111 / 4
AT (842) Austria		3.51 84 / 16 18 / 16	3.75 46 / 23 -93 / 23	4.02 50 / 21 -61 / 21	1.79 79 / 25 -56 / 25
PL (793) Poland		3.68 89 / 6 100 / 6	5.05 68 / 5 100 / 5	4.78 63 / 6 109 / 6	1.87 87 / 7 98 / 7
PT (788) Portugal		3.55 85 / 14 38 / 14	5.00 67 / 6 91 / 6	4.84 64 / 4 122 / 4	1.74 74 / 29 -149 / 29
SI (500) Slovenia		3.32 77 / 25 -69 / 25	3.58 43 / 30 -119 / 30	4.02 50 / 20 -60 / 20	1.80 80 / 21 -34 / 21
SK (860) Slovakia		3.59 86 / 10 56 / 10	4.70 62 / 11 47 / 11	4.83 64 / 5 121 / 5	1.80 80 / 22 -39 / 22
FI (911) Finland		3.10 70 / 30 -173 / 30	3.76 46 / 22 -92 / 22	3.76 46 / 28 -119 / 28	1.79 79 / 24 -51 / 24
SE (951) Sweden		2.90 63 / 31 -269 / 31	3.65 44 / 27 -108 / 27	4.02 50 / 22 -61 / 22	1.93 93 / 1 225 / 1
UK (876) United Kingdom		3.38 79 / 20 -41 / 20	4.98 66 / 7 89 / 7	4.00 50 / 23 -65 / 23	1.80 80 / 23 -48 / 23
BG (954) Bulgaria		3.85 95 / 1 183 / 1	5.69 78 / 2 194 / 2	4.74 62 / 7 99 / 7	1.82 82 / 14 10 / 14
HR (816) Croatia		3.72 91 / 2 120 / 2	5.95 82 / 1 232 / 1	5.15 69 / 1 191 / 1	1.84 84 / 10 42 / 10
RO (798) Romania		3.64 88 / 8 84 / 8	3.72 45 / 24 -99 / 24	3.93 49 / 24 -80 / 24	1.74 74 / 30 -156 / 30
TR (454) Turkey		3.71 90 / 3 113 / 3	3.47 41 / 31 -135 / 31	3.46 41 / 31 -185 / 31	1.67 67 / 31 -299 / 31
NO (846) Norway		3.15 72 / 29 -152 / 29	3.66 44 / 26 -107 / 26	4.11 52 / 18 -40 / 18	1.88 88 / 2 123 / 2
CH (831) Switzerland		3.33 78 / 24 -65 / 24	4.08 51 / 20 -45 / 20	4.13 52 / 17 -36 / 17	1.87 87 / 5 107 / 5

Table 3: Sheet Z7. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	11.Intensity/ exhaustiveness	12.Physical strains		
	q25f (decreasing) Sufficiency of time to make the work	q11b (increasing) Lifting or moving people	q11c (increasing) Carrying or moving heavy loads	q11a (increasing) Tiring or painful positions
	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never
BE (798) Belgium	2.25 69 / 27 -90 / 27	6.40 90 / 31 -166 / 31	5.91 82 / 4 95 / 4	5.46 74 / 9 68 / 9
CZ (749) Czech Republic	2.35 66 / 28 -138 / 28	6.60 93 / 18 4 / 18	5.78 80 / 16 33 / 16	5.70 78 / 6 114 / 6
DK (865) Denmark	2.23 69 / 26 -82 / 26	6.51 92 / 24 -73 / 24	5.88 81 / 6 79 / 6	5.63 77 / 8 101 / 8
DE (877) Germany	2.35 66 / 29 -139 / 29	6.66 94 / 12 53 / 12	5.82 80 / 12 48 / 12	5.18 70 / 12 15 / 12
EE (555) Estonia	1.74 82 / 3 149 / 3	6.71 95 / 6 93 / 6	5.49 75 / 26 -106 / 26	5.04 67 / 19 -10 / 19
EL (629) Greece	2.20 70 / 24 -68 / 24	6.61 93 / 17 10 / 17	5.30 72 / 31 -193 / 31	3.91 49 / 31 -223 / 31
ES (786) Spain	1.88 78 / 7 84 / 7	6.42 90 / 28 -153 / 28	5.56 76 / 24 -73 / 24	5.15 69 / 13 10 / 13
FR (878) France	2.01 75 / 12 22 / 12	6.44 91 / 25 -133 / 25	5.32 72 / 29 -186 / 29	4.58 60 / 27 -97 / 27
IE (768) Ireland	2.02 75 / 13 18 / 13	6.51 92 / 23 -71 / 23	5.90 82 / 5 85 / 5	5.91 82 / 2 153 / 2
IT (691) Italy	2.05 74 / 15 4 / 15	6.71 95 / 4 95 / 4	6.03 84 / 3 150 / 3	5.06 68 / 17 -8 / 17
CY (482) Cyprus	2.20 70 / 23 -67 / 23	6.68 95 / 9 70 / 9	5.83 80 / 10 55 / 10	4.31 55 / 29 -148 / 29
LV (903) Latvia	1.69 83 / 2 173 / 2	6.74 96 / 3 122 / 3	5.58 76 / 22 -61 / 22	5.05 67 / 18 -9 / 18
LT (873) Lithuania	1.90 77 / 10 71 / 10	6.66 94 / 11 58 / 11	5.63 77 / 21 -38 / 21	5.10 68 / 16 1 / 16
LU (520) Luxemburg	2.04 74 / 14 7 / 14	6.68 95 / 8 73 / 8	5.88 81 / 7 78 / 7	4.98 66 / 20 -22 / 20
HU (810) Hungary	1.85 79 / 5 97 / 5	6.64 94 / 15 40 / 15	5.57 76 / 23 -68 / 23	4.60 60 / 26 -94 / 26
MT (507) Malta	2.15 71 / 20 -46 / 20	6.70 95 / 7 93 / 7	5.45 74 / 27 -121 / 27	4.87 64 / 23 -44 / 23

Table 3: Sheet Z8. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	11.Intensity/ exhaustiveness	12.Physical strains		
	q25f (decreasing) Sufficiency of time to make the work	q11b (increasing) Lifting or moving people	q11c (increasing) Carrying or moving heavy loads	q11a (increasing) Tiring or painful positions
	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never
NL (877) Netherlands	2.23 69 / 25 -79 / 25	6.59 93 / 20 -5 / 20	6.08 85 / 1 174 / 1	5.92 82 / 1 155 / 1
AT (842) Austria	2.36 66 / 30 -143 / 30	6.65 94 / 14 46 / 14	5.52 75 / 25 -92 / 25	4.92 65 / 22 -33 / 22
PL (793) Poland	1.90 78 / 8 75 / 8	6.80 97 / 1 171 / 1	5.78 80 / 15 33 / 15	4.97 66 / 21 -24 / 21
PT (788) Portugal	1.94 77 / 11 54 / 11	6.60 93 / 19 0 / 19	5.75 79 / 18 17 / 18	4.61 60 / 25 -92 / 25
SI (500) Slovenia	1.87 78 / 6 87 / 6	6.65 94 / 13 48 / 13	5.81 80 / 13 46 / 13	4.73 62 / 24 -69 / 24
SK (860) Slovakia	2.18 70 / 21 -60 / 21	6.71 95 / 5 94 / 5	5.83 81 / 9 57 / 9	5.72 79 / 5 118 / 5
FI (911) Finland	2.15 71 / 19 -44 / 19	6.42 90 / 27 -153 / 27	5.45 74 / 28 -123 / 28	5.18 70 / 11 15 / 11
SE (951) Sweden	2.20 70 / 22 -66 / 22	6.41 90 / 30 -164 / 30	5.71 78 / 19 -2 / 19	5.29 72 / 10 37 / 10
UK (876) United Kingdom	2.09 73 / 17 -17 / 17	6.41 90 / 29 -161 / 29	5.83 80 / 11 54 / 11	5.79 80 / 4 131 / 4
BG (954) Bulgaria	1.56 86 / 1 229 / 1	6.75 96 / 2 134 / 2	5.79 80 / 14 38 / 14	5.14 69 / 14 8 / 14
HR (816) Croatia	1.82 79 / 4 109 / 4	6.62 94 / 16 22 / 16	5.66 78 / 20 -26 / 20	4.39 57 / 28 -132 / 28
RO (798) Romania	1.90 78 / 9 73 / 9	6.54 92 / 22 -50 / 22	5.84 81 / 8 61 / 8	5.11 68 / 15 2 / 15
TR (454) Turkey	2.47 63 / 31 -193 / 31	6.57 93 / 21 -20 / 21	5.30 72 / 30 -191 / 30	4.14 52 / 30 -180 / 30
NO (846) Norway	2.11 72 / 18 -23 / 18	6.44 91 / 26 -135 / 26	5.76 79 / 17 21 / 17	5.88 81 / 3 147 / 3
CH (831) Switzerland	2.05 74 / 16 3 / 16	6.67 94 / 10 59 / 10	6.04 84 / 2 153 / 2	5.69 78 / 7 111 / 7

Table 3: Sheet Z9. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		12.Physical strains			
		q11d (increasing) Repetitive hand or arm movements	q10R (increasing) Noise and other disturbing / unhealthy factors	q32 (increasing) Feeling of risks to health and safety	q33 (increasing) Bad influence of work on health
		1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
BE (798)	Belgium	4.00 50 / 3 122 / 3	4.86 64 / 4 116 / 4	1.77 77 / 6 90 / 6	1.70 70 / 6 105 / 6
CZ (749)	Czech Republic	4.06 51 / 2 141 / 2	4.40 57 / 14 16 / 14	1.77 77 / 5 92 / 5	1.65 65 / 10 65 / 10
DK (865)	Denmark	3.50 42 / 20 -45 / 20	4.39 56 / 15 13 / 15	1.76 76 / 12 75 / 12	1.54 54 / 20 -25 / 20
DE (877)	Germany	3.72 45 / 12 30 / 12	4.63 61 / 9 67 / 9	1.82 82 / 2 140 / 2	1.77 77 / 2 159 / 2
EE (555)	Estonia	3.52 42 / 19 -40 / 19	4.09 52 / 23 -52 / 23	1.61 61 / 22 -82 / 22	1.40 40 / 27 -137 / 27
EL (629)	Greece	3.15 36 / 30 -161 / 30	3.26 38 / 31 -234 / 31	1.51 51 / 31 -194 / 31	1.32 32 / 31 -197 / 31
ES (786)	Spain	3.34 39 / 28 -100 / 28	4.48 58 / 13 33 / 13	1.69 69 / 16 1 / 16	1.67 67 / 9 74 / 9
FR (878)	France	3.37 40 / 27 -87 / 27	4.30 55 / 18 -6 / 18	1.76 76 / 8 84 / 8	1.73 73 / 4 123 / 4
IE (768)	Ireland	3.78 46 / 10 47 / 10	5.07 68 / 2 161 / 2	1.78 78 / 4 98 / 4	1.73 73 / 3 126 / 3
IT (691)	Italy	3.87 48 / 5 79 / 5	5.08 68 / 1 165 / 1	1.72 72 / 14 34 / 14	1.61 61 / 13 32 / 13
CY (482)	Cyprus	3.93 49 / 4 98 / 4	4.33 55 / 17 0 / 17	1.67 67 / 20 -17 / 20	1.59 59 / 14 11 / 14
LV (903)	Latvia	3.73 45 / 11 30 / 11	4.37 56 / 16 10 / 16	1.52 52 / 30 -175 / 30	1.36 36 / 30 -168 / 30
LT (873)	Lithuania	3.26 38 / 29 -125 / 29	4.04 51 / 25 -63 / 25	1.61 61 / 23 -84 / 23	1.50 50 / 24 -55 / 24
LU (520)	Luxemburg	3.86 48 / 6 76 / 6	4.51 59 / 11 40 / 11	1.69 69 / 15 4 / 15	1.62 62 / 12 41 / 12
HU (810)	Hungary	3.42 40 / 23 -71 / 23	3.69 45 / 29 -139 / 29	1.68 68 / 18 -6 / 18	1.55 55 / 17 -21 / 17
MT (507)	Malta	3.41 40 / 25 -74 / 25	3.76 46 / 28 -125 / 28	1.68 68 / 17 -5 / 17	1.51 51 / 23 -51 / 23

Table 3: Sheet Z10. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		12.Physical strains			
		q11d (increasing) Repetitive hand or arm movements	q10R (increasing) Noise and other disturbing / unhealthy factors	q32 (increasing) Feeling of risks to health and safety	q33 (increasing) Bad influence of work on health
		1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
NL Netherlands	(877)	4.57 60 / 1 312 / 1	4.77 63 / 7 97 / 7	1.76 76 / 10 80 / 10	1.72 72 / 5 120 / 5
AT Austria	(842)	3.43 40 / 22 -69 / 22	4.56 59 / 10 50 / 10	1.76 76 / 9 80 / 9	1.68 68 / 7 88 / 7
PL Poland	(793)	3.42 40 / 24 -71 / 24	4.12 52 / 21 -46 / 21	1.60 60 / 25 -89 / 25	1.39 39 / 28 -140 / 28
PT Portugal	(788)	3.11 35 / 31 -173 / 31	4.18 53 / 20 -32 / 20	1.74 74 / 13 55 / 13	1.63 63 / 11 48 / 11
SI Slovenia	(500)	3.72 45 / 13 30 / 13	3.89 48 / 27 -96 / 27	1.58 58 / 27 -114 / 27	1.37 37 / 29 -161 / 29
SK Slovakia	(860)	3.70 45 / 15 21 / 15	4.49 58 / 12 35 / 12	1.67 67 / 19 -13 / 19	1.50 50 / 25 -61 / 25
FI Finland	(911)	3.39 40 / 26 -81 / 26	4.19 53 / 19 -30 / 19	1.76 76 / 11 78 / 11	1.57 57 / 15 1 / 15
SE Sweden	(951)	3.72 45 / 14 27 / 14	4.65 61 / 8 70 / 8	1.54 54 / 29 -160 / 29	1.44 44 / 26 -105 / 26
UK United Kingdom	(876)	3.82 47 / 9 63 / 9	4.84 64 / 5 112 / 5	1.81 81 / 3 133 / 3	1.80 80 / 1 178 / 1
BG Bulgaria	(954)	3.59 43 / 17 -15 / 17	4.10 52 / 22 -49 / 22	1.61 61 / 24 -86 / 24	1.54 54 / 21 -27 / 21
HR Croatia	(816)	3.54 42 / 18 -32 / 18	4.05 51 / 24 -62 / 24	1.64 64 / 21 -46 / 21	1.52 52 / 22 -43 / 22
RO Romania	(798)	3.85 47 / 8 71 / 8	3.94 49 / 26 -85 / 26	1.60 60 / 26 -92 / 26	1.55 55 / 16 -18 / 16
TR Turkey	(454)	3.43 41 / 21 -68 / 21	3.38 40 / 30 -208 / 30	1.56 56 / 28 -136 / 28	1.54 54 / 18 -22 / 18
NO Norway	(846)	3.61 43 / 16 -9 / 16	4.94 66 / 3 135 / 3	1.84 84 / 1 168 / 1	1.54 54 / 19 -24 / 19
CH Switzerland	(831)	3.85 48 / 7 73 / 7	4.81 63 / 6 105 / 6	1.77 77 / 7 87 / 7	1.68 68 / 8 85 / 8

Table 3: Sheet Z11. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		12.Physical strains			
		q33aR (increasing) Health problems due to work	q34ad (increasing) Absence from work due to health problems over the past 12 months	q34b (decreasing) Absense from work due to health problems over the past 12 months	q34c1 (decreasing) Absense from work due to accident at work over the past 12 months
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Not mentioned 2: 1-3 days 3: 4-7 days 4: 8-15 days 5: 15-30 days 6: 31-60 days 7: 61-180 days 8: over 180 days	1: Not mentioned 2: 1-3 days 3: 4-7 days 4: 8-15 days 5: 15-30 days 6: 31-60 days 7: 61-180 days 8: over 180 days
BE	(798)	1.02 2 / 15 -38 / 15	1.66 66 / 27 -93 / 27	3.92 68 / 15 19 / 15	1.40 94 / 26 -81 / 26
CZ	(749)	1.00 0 / 31 -87 / 31	1.66 66 / 26 -92 / 26	4.33 61 / 28 -106 / 28	1.14 98 / 5 100 / 5
DK	(865)	1.09 9 / 4 158 / 3	1.65 65 / 28 -106 / 28	3.59 74 / 2 119 / 2	1.24 97 / 15 33 / 15
DE	(877)	1.01 1 / 28 -84 / 28	1.71 71 / 21 -38 / 21	3.65 72 / 7 98 / 7	1.28 96 / 18 5 / 18
EE	(555)	1.02 2 / 22 -55 / 22	1.71 71 / 20 -33 / 20	4.01 66 / 17 -10 / 17	1.19 97 / 10 64 / 10
EL	(629)	1.04 4 / 11 14 / 10	1.83 83 / 4 113 / 4	3.61 73 / 4 111 / 4	1.27 96 / 16 12 / 16
ES	(786)	1.03 3 / 13 -23 / 13	1.85 85 / 2 138 / 2	3.88 69 / 13 30 / 13	1.34 95 / 21 -37 / 21
FR	(878)	1.02 2 / 20 -51 / 20	1.79 79 / 8 67 / 8	4.13 65 / 20 -44 / 20	1.42 94 / 27 -92 / 27
IE	(768)	1.07 7 / 7 93 / 6	1.77 77 / 12 43 / 12	3.76 71 / 10 66 / 10	1.35 95 / 23 -47 / 23
IT	(691)	1.05 5 / 8 29 / 7	1.70 70 / 22 -41 / 22	3.79 70 / 11 59 / 11	1.11 98 / 1 118 / 1
CY	(482)	1.02 2 / 17 -42 / 17	1.81 81 / 5 92 / 5	4.01 66 / 16 -9 / 16	1.50 93 / 30 -147 / 30
LV	(903)	1.01 1 / 26 -69 / 26	1.75 75 / 17 13 / 17	4.06 66 / 18 -23 / 18	1.23 97 / 14 34 / 14
LT	(873)	1.00 0 / 29 -85 / 29	1.77 77 / 14 34 / 14	4.28 62 / 26 -92 / 26	1.20 97 / 11 57 / 11
LU	(520)	1.02 2 / 23 -55 / 23	1.67 67 / 25 -79 / 25	3.75 71 / 9 71 / 9	1.20 97 / 12 56 / 12
HU	(810)	1.02 2 / 19 -45 / 19	1.74 74 / 18 -2 / 18	4.13 64 / 21 -45 / 21	1.16 98 / 7 83 / 7
MT	(507)	1.03 3 / 12 -8 / 11	1.56 56 / 30 -214 / 30	3.25 79 / 1 221 / 1	1.17 98 / 8 77 / 8

Table 3: Sheet Z12. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		12.Physical strains			
		q33aR (increasing) Health problems due to work	q34ad (increasing) Absence from work due to health problems over the past 12 months	q34b (decreasing) Absense from work due to health problems over the past 12 months	q34c1 (decreasing) Absense from work due to accident at work over the past 12 months
		1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Not mentioned 2: 1-3 days 3: 4-7 days 4: 8-15 days 5: 15-30 days 6: 31-60 days 7: 61-180 days 8: over 180 days	1: Not mentioned 2: 1-3 days 3: 4-7 days 4: 8-15 days 5: 15-30 days 6: 31-60 days 7: 61-180 days 8: over 180 days
NL (877) Netherlands		1.04 4 / 10 17 / 9	1.63 63 / 29 -124 / 29	3.90 68 / 14 24 / 14	1.12 98 / 2 109 / 2
AT (842) Austria		1.03 3 / 12 -8 / 12	1.79 79 / 9 63 / 9	4.14 64 / 22 -47 / 22	1.43 94 / 28 -98 / 28
PL (793) Poland		1.03 3 / 14 -27 / 14	1.79 79 / 10 59 / 10	4.45 59 / 29 -141 / 29	1.28 96 / 19 4 / 19
PT (788) Portugal		1.02 2 / 16 -40 / 16	1.87 87 / 1 162 / 1	4.47 59 / 30 -149 / 30	1.48 93 / 29 -133 / 29
SI (500) Slovenia		1.02 2 / 21 -53 / 21	1.67 67 / 24 -75 / 24	4.30 62 / 27 -95 / 27	1.37 95 / 25 -58 / 25
SK (860) Slovakia		1.00 0 / 30 -85 / 30	1.77 77 / 13 35 / 13	4.27 62 / 25 -86 / 25	1.23 97 / 13 36 / 13
FI (911) Finland		1.01 1 / 24 -62 / 24	1.51 51 / 31 -272 / 31	3.61 73 / 3 112 / 3	1.28 96 / 17 6 / 17
SE (951) Sweden		1.08 8 / 5 121 / 4	1.70 70 / 23 -44 / 23	3.85 69 / 12 39 / 12	1.13 98 / 3 108 / 3
UK (876) United Kingdom		1.17 17 / 3 376 / 1	1.76 76 / 15 31 / 15	3.64 73 / 6 102 / 6	1.16 98 / 6 85 / 6
BG (954) Bulgaria		1.01 1 / 27 -79 / 27	1.76 76 / 16 30 / 16	4.12 65 / 19 -41 / 19	1.19 97 / 9 67 / 9
HR (816) Croatia		1.04 4 / 9 23 / 8	1.80 80 / 6 81 / 6	4.81 53 / 31 -249 / 31	1.36 95 / 24 -52 / 24
RO (798) Romania		1.01 1 / 25 -66 / 25	1.85 85 / 3 132 / 3	4.18 64 / 23 -60 / 23	1.13 98 / 4 107 / 4
TR (454) Turkey		1.02 2 / 18 -43 / 18	1.78 78 / 11 58 / 11	3.64 73 / 5 104 / 5	1.81 88 / 31 -355 / 31
NO (846) Norway		1.08 8 / 6 117 / 5	1.72 72 / 19 -17 / 19	4.20 63 / 24 -67 / 24	1.30 96 / 20 -14 / 20
CH (831) Switzerland		1.09 9 / 4 158 / 2	1.80 80 / 7 77 / 7	3.68 72 / 8 91 / 8	1.35 95 / 22 -46 / 22

Table 3: Sheet Z13. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		12.Physical strains	13.Emotional strains		
		q34c2 (decreasing) Absence from work due to health problems caused by work over the past 12 months	q11j (increasing) Dealing directly with customers, passengers, pupils, patients	q21a (increasing) Dependence on the work by colleagues	q21b (increasing) Dependence on non-colleagues
		1: Not mentioned 2: 1–3 days 3: 4–7 days 4: 8–15 days 5: 15–30 days 6: 31–60 days 7: 61–180 days 8: over 180 days	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
BE (798)	Belgium	1.80 89 / 7 79 / 7	3.93 49 / 18 –24 / 18	1.56 56 / 11 54 / 11	1.28 28 / 23 –62 / 23
CZ (749)	Czech Republic	1.51 93 / 2 150 / 2	4.68 61 / 5 118 / 5	1.56 56 / 9 63 / 9	1.33 33 / 13 1 / 13
DK (865)	Denmark	1.78 89 / 6 84 / 6	3.27 38 / 31 –148 / 31	1.50 50 / 21 –34 / 21	1.23 23 / 31 –136 / 31
DE (877)	Germany	1.95 86 / 14 41 / 14	4.08 51 / 13 5 / 13	1.60 60 / 4 121 / 4	1.29 29 / 20 –56 / 20
EE (555)	Estonia	2.03 85 / 15 20 / 15	4.47 58 / 8 78 / 8	1.47 47 / 24 –72 / 24	1.41 41 / 6 105 / 6
EL (629)	Greece	2.05 85 / 16 16 / 16	3.98 50 / 16 –15 / 16	1.46 46 / 25 –90 / 25	1.29 29 / 18 –47 / 18
ES (786)	Spain	2.23 82 / 20 –29 / 20	3.67 44 / 24 –73 / 24	1.62 62 / 3 138 / 3	1.29 29 / 21 –57 / 21
FR (878)	France	2.36 81 / 21 –62 / 21	3.52 42 / 26 –101 / 26	1.59 59 / 5 97 / 5	1.29 29 / 19 –48 / 19
IE (768)	Ireland	1.57 92 / 3 135 / 3	3.36 39 / 29 –130 / 29	1.56 56 / 12 53 / 12	1.30 30 / 17 –41 / 17
IT (691)	Italy	1.59 92 / 4 131 / 4	3.78 46 / 21 –51 / 21	1.57 57 / 8 69 / 8	1.34 34 / 12 7 / 12
CY (482)	Cyprus	2.47 79 / 24 –89 / 24	4.33 56 / 10 52 / 10	1.53 53 / 16 19 / 16	1.30 30 / 16 –35 / 16
LV (903)	Latvia	2.38 80 / 23 –66 / 23	4.50 58 / 7 83 / 7	1.48 48 / 22 –52 / 22	1.44 44 / 4 145 / 4
LT (873)	Lithuania	2.80 74 / 30 –171 / 30	3.81 47 / 20 –46 / 20	1.50 50 / 19 –22 / 19	1.40 40 / 7 90 / 7
LU (520)	Luxemburg	1.90 87 / 12 54 / 12	3.88 48 / 19 –33 / 19	1.57 57 / 7 78 / 7	1.37 37 / 10 48 / 10
HU (810)	Hungary	1.75 89 / 5 91 / 5	4.77 63 / 4 135 / 4	1.48 48 / 23 –64 / 23	1.46 46 / 3 164 / 3
MT (507)	Malta	1.42 94 / 1 172 / 1	4.34 56 / 9 53 / 9	1.38 38 / 31 –199 / 31	1.27 27 / 24 –76 / 24

Table 3: Sheet Z14. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	12.Physical strains	13.Emotional strains		
	q34c2 (decreasing) Absense from work due to health problems caused by work over the past 12 months	q11j (increasing) Dealing directly with customers, passengers, pupils, patients	q21a (increasing) Dependence on the work by colleagues	q21b (increasing) Dependence on non-colleagues
	1: Not mentioned 2: 1–3 days 3: 4–7 days 4: 8–15 days 5: 15–30 days 6: 31–60 days 7: 61–180 days 8: over 180 days	1: Always 2: Almost always 3: 3/4 of the time 4: Half of the time 5: 1/4 of the time 6: Almost never 7: Never	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No
NL (877) Netherlands	1.95 86 / 13 41 / 13	3.93 49 / 17 –24 / 17	1.56 56 / 10 54 / 10	1.25 25 / 28 –106 / 28
AT (842) Austria	2.13 84 / 18 –3 / 18	3.72 45 / 23 –63 / 23	1.58 58 / 6 93 / 6	1.28 28 / 22 –60 / 22
PL (793) Poland	2.69 76 / 28 –144 / 28	4.23 54 / 11 32 / 11	1.63 63 / 2 158 / 2	1.43 43 / 5 124 / 5
PT (788) Portugal	2.54 78 / 27 –106 / 27	4.00 50 / 15 –11 / 15	1.52 52 / 17 5 / 17	1.38 38 / 9 66 / 9
SI (500) Slovenia	2.47 79 / 25 –89 / 25	4.01 50 / 14 –10 / 14	1.40 40 / 30 –169 / 30	1.33 33 / 14 –7 / 14
SK (860) Slovakia	1.86 88 / 10 63 / 10	4.55 59 / 6 93 / 6	1.54 54 / 14 32 / 14	1.39 39 / 8 78 / 8
FI (911) Finland	1.83 88 / 9 72 / 9	3.67 44 / 25 –74 / 25	1.55 55 / 13 50 / 13	1.26 26 / 27 –97 / 27
SE (951) Sweden	2.08 85 / 17 8 / 17	3.42 40 / 28 –119 / 28	1.54 54 / 15 25 / 15	1.23 23 / 30 –134 / 30
UK (876) United Kingdom	1.81 88 / 8 77 / 8	3.45 41 / 27 –114 / 27	1.43 43 / 27 –133 / 27	1.27 27 / 25 –77 / 25
BG (954) Bulgaria	2.21 83 / 19 –24 / 19	4.86 64 / 3 151 / 3	1.41 41 / 29 –159 / 29	1.48 48 / 2 195 / 2
HR (816) Croatia	2.89 73 / 31 –194 / 31	3.78 46 / 22 –53 / 22	1.44 44 / 26 –108 / 26	1.32 32 / 15 –19 / 15
RO (798) Romania	2.48 79 / 26 –90 / 26	5.00 67 / 2 176 / 2	1.51 51 / 18 –9 / 18	1.35 35 / 11 26 / 11
TR (454) Turkey	2.78 75 / 29 –166 / 29	5.40 73 / 1 252 / 1	1.42 42 / 28 –141 / 28	1.51 51 / 1 227 / 1
NO (846) Norway	2.38 80 / 22 –66 / 22	3.28 38 / 30 –146 / 30	1.50 50 / 20 –32 / 20	1.23 23 / 29 –126 / 29
CH (831) Switzerland	1.86 88 / 11 62 / 11	4.11 52 / 12 9 / 12	1.64 64 / 1 173 / 1	1.26 26 / 26 –92 / 26

Table 3: Sheet Z15. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	13.Emotional strains			14.Job stability and job security
	q25m (increasing) Emotionally demanding work	q33a1R (increasing) Nervous provlblems due to work	q29R (increasing) Inappropriate attendance	q35R (decreasing) Ability to do the work after 60
	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No will 3: No
BE (798) Belgium	3.02 51 / 12 24 / 12	1.21 21 / 22 -63 / 22	1.81 81 / 19 -49 / 19	1.87 56 / 22 -31 / 22
CZ (749) Czech Republic	3.32 58 / 4 111 / 4	1.45 45 / 1 245 / 1	1.81 81 / 20 -50 / 20	1.80 60 / 16 2 / 16
DK (865) Denmark	2.76 44 / 24 -53 / 24	1.30 30 / 12 47 / 12	1.80 80 / 23 -68 / 23	1.59 71 / 7 94 / 7
DE (877) Germany	2.79 45 / 23 -45 / 23	1.31 31 / 10 62 / 10	1.87 87 / 11 46 / 11	1.43 79 / 1 166 / 1
EE (555) Estonia	2.63 41 / 27 -92 / 27	1.25 25 / 17 -18 / 17	1.85 85 / 16 10 / 16	1.69 65 / 10 49 / 10
EL (629) Greece	2.92 48 / 15 -6 / 15	1.15 15 / 29 -139 / 29	1.80 80 / 28 -77 / 28	2.13 44 / 29 -145 / 29
ES (786) Spain	2.88 47 / 17 -20 / 17	1.36 36 / 2 128 / 2	1.94 94 / 1 176 / 1	1.77 61 / 15 13 / 15
FR (878) France	3.18 54 / 7 70 / 7	1.20 20 / 25 -75 / 25	1.81 81 / 21 -51 / 21	2.02 49 / 25 -98 / 25
IE (768) Ireland	3.17 54 / 8 68 / 8	1.24 24 / 18 -31 / 18	1.80 80 / 27 -76 / 27	1.64 68 / 9 71 / 9
IT (691) Italy	3.55 64 / 2 181 / 2	1.20 20 / 23 -71 / 23	1.91 91 / 4 121 / 4	1.71 65 / 12 43 / 12
CY (482) Cyprus	2.79 45 / 22 -44 / 22	1.17 17 / 27 -121 / 27	1.92 92 / 3 144 / 3	1.75 63 / 14 24 / 14
LV (903) Latvia	2.17 29 / 31 -228 / 31	1.23 23 / 19 -37 / 19	1.89 89 / 6 95 / 6	1.74 63 / 13 26 / 13
LT (873) Lithuania	2.52 38 / 28 -126 / 28	1.22 22 / 21 -51 / 21	1.81 81 / 22 -64 / 22	1.80 60 / 17 1 / 17
LU (520) Luxemburg	2.81 45 / 21 -39 / 21	1.14 14 / 30 -150 / 30	1.79 79 / 29 -95 / 29	1.86 57 / 21 -27 / 21
HU (810) Hungary	3.84 71 / 1 264 / 1	1.35 35 / 3 121 / 3	1.91 91 / 5 119 / 5	1.86 57 / 20 -26 / 20
MT (507) Malta	3.24 56 / 5 88 / 5	1.31 31 / 9 67 / 9	1.85 85 / 14 19 / 14	1.81 59 / 18 -6 / 18

Table 3: Sheet Z16. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	13.Emotional strains			14.Job stability and job security
	q25m (increasing) Emotionally demanding work	q33a1R (increasing) Nervous provbblems due to work	q29R (increasing) Inappropriate attendance	q35R (decreasing) Ability to do the work after 60
	1: Almost always 2: Often 3: Sometimes 4: Rarely 5: Almost never	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No will 3: No
NL (877) Netherlands	3.15 54 / 9 62 / 9	1.23 23 / 20 -41 / 20	1.75 75 / 30 -170 / 30	1.48 76 / 3 140 / 3
AT (842) Austria	2.49 37 / 29 -134 / 29	1.25 25 / 16 -16 / 16	1.86 86 / 13 32 / 13	1.70 65 / 11 43 / 11
PL (793) Poland	2.69 42 / 26 -73 / 26	1.35 35 / 4 118 / 4	1.88 88 / 9 77 / 9	2.10 45 / 28 -132 / 28
PT (788) Portugal	2.81 45 / 20 -38 / 20	1.27 27 / 15 12 / 15	1.89 89 / 7 84 / 7	2.02 49 / 26 -98 / 26
SI (500) Slovenia	2.94 49 / 14 0 / 14	1.28 28 / 14 29 / 14	1.85 85 / 15 19 / 15	2.23 39 / 30 -188 / 30
SK (860) Slovakia	3.37 59 / 3 127 / 3	1.29 29 / 13 45 / 13	1.89 89 / 8 82 / 8	1.98 51 / 23 -78 / 23
FI (911) Finland	3.10 53 / 10 47 / 10	1.34 34 / 6 100 / 6	1.69 69 / 31 -272 / 31	1.64 68 / 8 71 / 8
SE (951) Sweden	2.85 46 / 18 -28 / 18	1.20 20 / 26 -82 / 26	1.80 80 / 26 -73 / 26	1.52 74 / 4 125 / 4
UK (876) United Kingdom	3.23 56 / 6 85 / 6	1.31 31 / 8 67 / 8	1.80 80 / 24 -71 / 24	1.55 73 / 6 113 / 6
BG (954) Bulgaria	3.10 52 / 11 46 / 11	1.35 35 / 5 115 / 5	1.92 92 / 2 149 / 2	2.02 49 / 27 -99 / 27
HR (816) Croatia	2.73 43 / 25 -62 / 25	1.20 20 / 24 -73 / 24	1.81 81 / 18 -47 / 18	1.98 51 / 24 -80 / 24
RO (798) Romania	2.95 49 / 13 1 / 13	1.16 16 / 28 -124 / 28	1.88 88 / 10 64 / 10	1.85 57 / 19 -23 / 19
TR (454) Turkey	2.91 48 / 16 -9 / 16	1.11 11 / 31 -197 / 31	1.82 82 / 17 -37 / 17	2.28 36 / 31 -212 / 31
NO (846) Norway	2.81 45 / 19 -38 / 19	1.30 30 / 11 56 / 11	1.86 86 / 12 36 / 12	1.53 73 / 5 120 / 5
CH (831) Switzerland	2.47 37 / 30 -140 / 30	1.32 32 / 7 80 / 7	1.80 80 / 25 -72 / 25	1.48 76 / 2 144 / 2

Table 3: Sheet Z17. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	14.Job stability and job security		15.Income	
	q37a (decreasing) Risk of unemployment in 6 months	q37d (increasing) Comfort feeling at work	q37b (increasing) Fair pay	ef6a (decreasing) Basic salary
	1: Very low 2: Rather low 3: Moderate 4: Rather high 5: Very high	1: Very low 2: Rather low 3: Moderate 4: Rather high 5: Very high	1: Unfair 2: Rather unfair 3: Moderate 4: Rather fair 5: Fair	1: Yes 2: No
BE (798) Belgium	1.76 81 / 6 101 / 6	3.79 70 / 12 51 / 12	3.39 60 / 5 114 / 5	1.04 96 / 18 29 / 18
CZ (749) Czech Republic	2.93 52 / 31 -222 / 31	3.24 56 / 26 -100 / 26	2.84 46 / 16 -45 / 16	1.02 98 / 12 60 / 12
DK (865) Denmark	1.55 86 / 2 161 / 2	4.27 82 / 1 182 / 1	3.32 58 / 8 93 / 8	1.01 99 / 1 93 / 1
DE (877) Germany	2.24 69 / 19 -31 / 19	3.54 63 / 17 -19 / 17	3.40 60 / 4 116 / 4	1.02 98 / 9 65 / 9
EE (555) Estonia	2.44 64 / 25 -86 / 25	3.59 65 / 15 -4 / 15	2.73 43 / 22 -76 / 22	1.20 80 / 31 -275 / 31
EL (629) Greece	2.42 64 / 24 -82 / 24	3.23 56 / 27 -103 / 27	2.82 45 / 18 -51 / 18	1.06 94 / 23 -1 / 23
ES (786) Spain	1.98 76 / 14 42 / 14	3.47 62 / 21 -37 / 21	3.28 57 / 11 81 / 11	1.02 98 / 6 71 / 6
FR (878) France	1.68 83 / 4 125 / 4	3.03 51 / 29 -157 / 29	2.80 45 / 19 -55 / 19	1.03 97 / 15 44 / 15
IE (768) Ireland	1.90 77 / 9 62 / 9	3.85 71 / 11 67 / 11	3.36 59 / 7 106 / 7	1.05 95 / 21 10 / 21
IT (691) Italy	1.93 77 / 11 55 / 11	3.28 57 / 25 -88 / 25	2.80 45 / 20 -57 / 20	1.12 88 / 27 -119 / 27
CY (482) Cyprus	1.97 76 / 13 44 / 13	3.90 72 / 9 81 / 9	3.64 66 / 1 187 / 1	1.02 98 / 3 76 / 3
LV (903) Latvia	2.32 67 / 20 -52 / 20	3.53 63 / 18 -19 / 18	2.69 42 / 26 -88 / 26	1.11 89 / 26 -115 / 26
LT (873) Lithuania	2.68 58 / 30 -152 / 30	2.97 49 / 30 -175 / 30	2.71 43 / 25 -83 / 25	1.17 83 / 30 -228 / 30
LU (520) Luxemburg	1.65 84 / 3 133 / 3	3.36 59 / 24 -66 / 24	3.51 63 / 3 150 / 3	1.03 97 / 14 54 / 14
HU (810) Hungary	2.49 63 / 26 -101 / 26	3.92 73 / 7 88 / 7	2.39 35 / 31 -176 / 31	1.06 94 / 24 -6 / 24
MT (507) Malta	1.97 76 / 12 45 / 12	3.91 73 / 8 83 / 8	3.11 53 / 13 33 / 13	1.04 96 / 16 35 / 16

Table 3: Sheet Z18. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	14.Job stability and job security		15.Income	
	q37a (decreasing) Risk of unemployment in 6 months	q37d (increasing) Comfort feeling at work	q37b (increasing) Fair pay	ef6a (decreasing) Basic salary
	1: Very low 2: Rather low 3: Moderate 4: Rather high 5: Very high	1: Very low 2: Rather low 3: Moderate 4: Rather high 5: Very high	1: Unfair 2: Rather unfair 3: Moderate 4: Rather fair 5: Fair	1: Yes 2: No
NL (877) Netherlands	2.01 75 / 16 32 / 16	3.99 75 / 5 106 / 5	3.28 57 / 10 81 / 10	1.01 99 / 2 90 / 2
AT (842) Austria	1.92 77 / 10 56 / 10	3.68 67 / 13 21 / 13	3.36 59 / 6 106 / 6	1.02 98 / 4 75 / 4
PL (793) Poland	2.59 60 / 28 -128 / 28	3.21 55 / 28 -110 / 28	2.73 43 / 23 -77 / 23	1.04 96 / 19 21 / 19
PT (788) Portugal	2.37 66 / 23 -66 / 23	3.66 67 / 14 16 / 14	2.77 44 / 21 -64 / 21	1.02 98 / 7 71 / 7
SI (500) Slovenia	2.36 66 / 22 -66 / 22	3.46 62 / 22 -39 / 22	2.82 46 / 17 -50 / 17	1.04 96 / 17 34 / 17
SK (860) Slovakia	2.35 66 / 21 -62 / 21	3.39 60 / 23 -58 / 23	2.63 41 / 28 -105 / 28	1.02 98 / 11 60 / 11
FI (911) Finland	1.88 78 / 7 68 / 7	4.01 75 / 4 112 / 4	2.72 43 / 24 -80 / 24	1.06 94 / 22 -0 / 22
SE (951) Sweden	1.98 76 / 15 41 / 15	4.11 78 / 3 138 / 3	2.91 48 / 15 -26 / 15	1.03 97 / 13 59 / 13
UK (876) United Kingdom	1.76 81 / 5 102 / 5	3.96 74 / 6 98 / 6	3.24 56 / 12 70 / 12	1.05 95 / 20 12 / 20
BG (954) Bulgaria	2.63 59 / 29 -139 / 29	3.48 62 / 20 -35 / 20	2.61 40 / 29 -112 / 29	1.12 88 / 28 -125 / 28
HR (816) Croatia	2.18 70 / 18 -15 / 18	3.56 64 / 16 -14 / 16	2.96 49 / 14 -11 / 14	1.02 98 / 5 74 / 5
RO (798) Romania	2.13 72 / 17 -1 / 17	3.48 62 / 19 -34 / 19	2.65 41 / 27 -100 / 27	1.09 91 / 25 -71 / 25
TR (454) Turkey	2.52 62 / 27 -109 / 27	2.83 46 / 31 -214 / 31	2.54 39 / 30 -130 / 30	1.17 83 / 29 -220 / 29
NO (846) Norway	1.48 88 / 1 179 / 1	4.17 79 / 2 155 / 2	3.30 58 / 9 89 / 9	1.02 98 / 10 61 / 10
CH (831) Switzerland	1.89 78 / 8 66 / 8	3.89 72 / 10 78 / 10	3.55 64 / 2 161 / 2	1.02 98 / 8 68 / 8

Table 3: Sheet Z19. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	15.Income		16.Satisfaction	Partial indices
	ef5 (increasing) Net monthly income harmonized	ef5R (increasing) Net monthly income	q36 (decreasing) General satisfaction with working conditions	1 Qualification and development possibilities
	1: National 1st decile 10: National 10th decile	EUR (derivative from national deciles)	1: Very satisfied 2: Satisfied 3: Not very satisfied 4: Not at all satisfied	Mean score, %
BE (798) Belgium	7.63 74 / 1 226 / 1	1406.56 22 / 11 30 / 11	1.81 73 / 7 100 / 7	36 / 12 53 / 10
CZ (749) Czech Republic	4.67 41 / 24 -83 / 24	411.15 6 / 22 -81 / 22	2.10 63 / 20 -39 / 20	31 / 18 -26 / 19
DK (865) Denmark	6.00 56 / 9 56 / 9	1968.96 31 / 5 93 / 5	1.63 79 / 1 189 / 1	41 / 3 123 / 4
DE (877) Germany	6.06 56 / 7 62 / 7	1416.53 22 / 10 31 / 10	1.89 70 / 9 64 / 9	33 / 17 -8 / 17
EE (555) Estonia	5.70 52 / 11 25 / 11	317.91 5 / 25 -91 / 25	2.21 60 / 22 -92 / 22	36 / 11 61 / 7
EL (629) Greece	6.44 60 / 4 102 / 4	940.97 15 / 17 -22 / 17	2.26 58 / 30 -116 / 30	28 / 25 -108 / 25
ES (786) Spain	5.69 52 / 12 23 / 12	1006.87 16 / 16 -14 / 16	2.09 64 / 19 -33 / 19	21 / 31 -200 / 31
FR (878) France	5.67 52 / 15 21 / 15	1356.11 21 / 12 25 / 12	2.02 66 / 16 1 / 16	26 / 28 -117 / 29
IE (768) Ireland	5.68 52 / 14 22 / 14	2021.12 32 / 4 99 / 4	1.87 71 / 8 71 / 8	33 / 15 32 / 13
IT (691) Italy	5.69 52 / 13 23 / 13	1062.02 16 / 15 -8 / 15	2.22 59 / 24 -95 / 24	26 / 29 -115 / 28
CY (482) Cyprus	4.49 39 / 26 -102 / 26	1291.18 20 / 13 17 / 13	1.75 75 / 4 131 / 4	27 / 27 -111 / 26
LV (903) Latvia	4.54 39 / 25 -97 / 25	241.47 3 / 28 -100 / 28	2.23 59 / 27 -100 / 27	34 / 14 22 / 15
LT (873) Lithuania	5.04 45 / 22 -45 / 22	234.99 3 / 29 -100 / 29	2.25 58 / 28 -109 / 28	29 / 22 -33 / 20
LU (520) Luxemburg	6.29 59 / 6 86 / 6	2469.67 39 / 3 149 / 3	1.96 68 / 12 32 / 12	33 / 16 9 / 16
HU (810) Hungary	4.24 36 / 27 -128 / 27	340.65 5 / 24 -89 / 24	2.22 59 / 23 -95 / 23	29 / 24 -61 / 23
MT (507) Malta	3.92 32 / 30 -162 / 30	850.16 13 / 18 -32 / 18	1.98 67 / 14 19 / 14	30 / 20 -20 / 18

Table 3: Sheet Z20. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	15.Income		16.Satisfaction	Partial indices
	ef5 (increasing) Net monthly income harmonized	ef5R (increasing) Net monthly income	q36 (decreasing) General satisfaction with working conditions	1 Qualification and development possibilities
	1: National 1st decile 10: National 10th decile	EUR (derivative from national deciles)	1: Very satisfied 2: Satisfied 3: Not very satisfied 4: Not at all satisfied	Mean score, %
NL (877) Netherlands	5.28 48 / 19 -20 / 19	1552.09 24 / 8 47 / 8	1.95 68 / 11 32 / 11	36 / 7 57 / 8
AT (842) Austria	6.37 60 / 5 95 / 5	1265.71 20 / 14 15 / 14	1.80 73 / 6 108 / 6	38 / 6 88 / 6
PL (793) Poland	3.80 31 / 31 -174 / 31	311.70 4 / 26 -92 / 26	2.05 65 / 17 -13 / 17	30 / 19 -51 / 21
PT (788) Portugal	5.65 52 / 16 19 / 16	628.62 10 / 20 -57 / 20	2.00 67 / 15 8 / 15	25 / 30 -125 / 30
SI (500) Slovenia	6.04 56 / 8 60 / 8	694.96 11 / 19 -49 / 19	2.23 59 / 26 -100 / 26	36 / 10 34 / 12
SK (860) Slovakia	5.22 47 / 20 -26 / 20	296.61 4 / 27 -94 / 27	2.13 62 / 21 -52 / 21	36 / 8 53 / 9
FI (911) Finland	7.41 71 / 2 203 / 2	1482.33 23 / 9 39 / 9	1.97 68 / 13 22 / 13	44 / 2 186 / 2
SE (951) Sweden	5.57 51 / 17 11 / 17	1712.17 27 / 7 64 / 7	1.92 69 / 10 51 / 10	40 / 4 126 / 3
UK (876) United Kingdom	4.21 36 / 28 -131 / 28	1736.91 27 / 6 67 / 6	1.68 77 / 2 165 / 2	35 / 13 22 / 14
BG (954) Bulgaria	6.79 64 / 3 139 / 3	131.15 2 / 31 -112 / 31	2.25 58 / 29 -113 / 29	29 / 23 -97 / 24
HR (816) Croatia	5.54 50 / 18 8 / 18	541.86 8 / 21 -66 / 21	2.07 64 / 18 -23 / 18	36 / 9 41 / 11
RO (798) Romania	5.07 45 / 21 -41 / 21	163.36 2 / 30 -108 / 30	2.22 59 / 25 -96 / 25	30 / 21 -56 / 22
TR (454) Turkey	4.10 34 / 29 -143 / 29	343.56 5 / 23 -88 / 23	2.44 52 / 31 -204 / 31	27 / 26 -114 / 27
NO (846) Norway	4.81 42 / 23 -69 / 23	3744.92 59 / 1 291 / 1	1.68 77 / 3 163 / 3	38 / 5 92 / 5
CH (831) Switzerland	5.81 53 / 10 36 / 10	3246.85 51 / 2 236 / 2	1.76 75 / 5 124 / 5	44 / 1 245 / 1

Table 3: Sheet Z21. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		Partial indices			
		2 Creativity	3 Career chances	4 Possibilities for influence	5 Communication and transparency
		Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %
BE	(798)	71 / 5	51 / 12	58 / 11	53 / 12
Belgium		109 / 5	42 / 12	32 / 11	30 / 14
CZ	(749)	57 / 27	41 / 28	50 / 26	50 / 18
Czech Republic		-103 / 27	-130 / 28	-79 / 26	-6 / 18
DK	(865)	68 / 7	61 / 1	70 / 1	54 / 8
Denmark		92 / 7	197 / 1	223 / 1	79 / 6
DE	(877)	63 / 14	48 / 18	51 / 25	46 / 25
Germany		-10 / 14	-18 / 18	-74 / 23	-81 / 25
EE	(555)	60 / 21	41 / 29	56 / 14	53 / 11
Estonia		-56 / 21	-131 / 29	15 / 15	38 / 12
EL	(629)	55 / 28	46 / 20	47 / 30	47 / 22
Greece		-129 / 28	-46 / 20	-127 / 30	-67 / 22
ES	(786)	54 / 30	48 / 17	51 / 23	42 / 31
Spain		-132 / 29	-17 / 17	-80 / 27	-170 / 30
FR	(878)	61 / 19	49 / 14	57 / 12	46 / 23
France		-48 / 19	6 / 14	18 / 13	-89 / 26
IE	(768)	65 / 13	57 / 4	59 / 8	53 / 13
Ireland		30 / 13	130 / 4	65 / 7	42 / 11
IT	(691)	55 / 29	45 / 21	53 / 16	43 / 30
Italy		-143 / 30	-64 / 21	-49 / 19	-141 / 29
CY	(482)	58 / 26	53 / 11	50 / 27	52 / 15
Cyprus		-83 / 26	73 / 11	-76 / 25	30 / 13
LV	(903)	66 / 9	43 / 25	59 / 10	54 / 10
Latvia		43 / 9	-93 / 24	54 / 10	57 / 8
LT	(873)	54 / 31	43 / 24	51 / 24	56 / 4
Lithuania		-152 / 31	-94 / 25	-76 / 24	82 / 5
LU	(520)	68 / 8	54 / 8	59 / 9	49 / 20
Luxemburg		68 / 8	85 / 8	56 / 8	-49 / 20
HU	(810)	61 / 18	40 / 31	50 / 28	51 / 16
Hungary		-54 / 20	-153 / 31	-95 / 28	8 / 16
MT	(507)	74 / 3	54 / 10	60 / 7	45 / 27
Malta		168 / 3	79 / 10	55 / 9	-117 / 28

Table 3: Sheet Z22. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		Partial indices			
		2	3	4	5
		Creativity	Career chances	Possibilities for influence	Communication and transparency
		Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %
NL	(877)	70 / 6	50 / 13	62 / 6	55 / 6
Netherlands		108 / 6	17 / 13	103 / 6	49 / 10
AT	(842)	66 / 10	49 / 15	56 / 15	52 / 14
Austria		34 / 12	4 / 15	15 / 14	18 / 15
PL	(793)	63 / 15	43 / 26	52 / 22	49 / 19
Poland		-18 / 15	-101 / 26	-67 / 20	-7 / 19
PT	(788)	59 / 22	54 / 9	52 / 20	45 / 28
Portugal		-60 / 22	83 / 9	-70 / 21	-102 / 27
SI	(500)	66 / 12	43 / 23	52 / 19	48 / 21
Slovenia		42 / 10	-90 / 23	-46 / 18	-58 / 21
SK	(860)	63 / 16	44 / 22	47 / 29	46 / 24
Slovakia		-24 / 17	-84 / 22	-124 / 29	-80 / 24
FI	(911)	61 / 20	59 / 2	65 / 3	66 / 1
Finland		-24 / 18	173 / 2	141 / 3	270 / 1
SE	(951)	77 / 2	54 / 7	70 / 2	54 / 9
Sweden		208 / 2	89 / 7	221 / 2	52 / 9
UK	(876)	59 / 23	57 / 3	57 / 13	55 / 5
United Kingdom		-72 / 24	130 / 3	21 / 12	98 / 4
BG	(954)	58 / 24	42 / 27	44 / 31	50 / 17
Bulgaria		-79 / 25	-118 / 27	-171 / 31	4 / 17
HR	(816)	62 / 17	49 / 16	53 / 17	45 / 26
Croatia		-20 / 16	-1 / 16	-37 / 16	-75 / 23
RO	(798)	66 / 11	47 / 19	53 / 18	55 / 7
Romania		39 / 11	-37 / 19	-39 / 17	74 / 7
TR	(454)	58 / 25	40 / 30	52 / 21	44 / 29
Turkey		-69 / 23	-135 / 30	-71 / 22	-181 / 31
NO	(846)	72 / 4	56 / 5	64 / 5	60 / 2
Norway		127 / 4	112 / 5	126 / 5	166 / 2
CH	(831)	77 / 1	54 / 6	65 / 4	58 / 3
Switzerland		208 / 1	92 / 6	136 / 4	125 / 3

Table 3: Sheet Z23. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		Partial indices			
		6 Quality of management/leadership	7 Industrial culture	8 Collegiality	9 Meaningfulness of work
		Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %
BE	(798)	69 / 16	51 / 24	72 / 15	83 / 15
Belgium		-19 / 17	-45 / 24	0 / 15	26 / 15
CZ	(749)	65 / 27	56 / 11	66 / 27	73 / 29
Czech Republic		-84 / 27	38 / 11	-95 / 27	-164 / 29
DK	(865)	70 / 13	60 / 5	84 / 1	89 / 1
Denmark		-18 / 16	105 / 4	173 / 1	149 / 1
DE	(877)	59 / 29	50 / 25	67 / 25	78 / 25
Germany		-180 / 30	-52 / 25	-79 / 26	-76 / 25
EE	(555)	73 / 11	55 / 15	72 / 16	77 / 26
Estonia		34 / 11	12 / 18	-6 / 16	-91 / 26
EL	(629)	74 / 9	53 / 22	67 / 26	75 / 28
Greece		88 / 6	-29 / 23	-79 / 25	-126 / 28
ES	(786)	66 / 25	45 / 27	69 / 22	78 / 23
Spain		-64 / 25	-111 / 27	-42 / 21	-73 / 24
FR	(878)	66 / 22	40 / 30	61 / 30	83 / 14
France		-23 / 20	-214 / 30	-168 / 30	30 / 14
IE	(768)	70 / 14	58 / 9	80 / 5	82 / 16
Ireland		-9 / 14	80 / 7	118 / 5	19 / 16
IT	(691)	62 / 28	37 / 31	62 / 29	79 / 21
Italy		-74 / 26	-258 / 31	-164 / 29	-45 / 21
CY	(482)	74 / 10	54 / 20	77 / 9	88 / 3
Cyprus		93 / 5	-10 / 21	78 / 8	134 / 3
LV	(903)	75 / 6	61 / 3	73 / 14	82 / 18
Latvia		61 / 8	111 / 3	8 / 14	10 / 18
LT	(873)	82 / 1	54 / 18	64 / 28	72 / 30
Lithuania		222 / 2	11 / 19	-130 / 28	-193 / 30
LU	(520)	67 / 21	50 / 26	70 / 21	86 / 6
Luxemburg		-26 / 21	-56 / 26	-43 / 22	93 / 6
HU	(810)	76 / 4	55 / 14	77 / 8	79 / 20
Hungary		99 / 4	27 / 14	74 / 9	-43 / 20
MT	(507)	79 / 3	63 / 2	80 / 4	88 / 2
Malta		149 / 3	132 / 2	122 / 4	141 / 2

Table 3: Sheet Z24. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		Partial indices			
		6 Quality of manage- ment/leadership	7 Industrial culture	8 Collegiality	9 Meaningfulness of work
		Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %
NL	(877)	74 / 8	58 / 10	74 / 12	87 / 5
Netherlands		51 / 10	66 / 9	15 / 13	122 / 5
AT	(842)	66 / 23	55 / 16	73 / 13	82 / 17
Austria		-56 / 23	18 / 16	16 / 12	11 / 17
PL	(793)	66 / 24	54 / 19	69 / 23	84 / 11
Poland		-56 / 24	7 / 20	-56 / 23	43 / 11
PT	(788)	57 / 31	43 / 28	68 / 24	83 / 13
Portugal		-194 / 31	-165 / 28	-67 / 24	39 / 13
SI	(500)	73 / 12	64 / 1	72 / 17	85 / 8
Slovenia		52 / 9	140 / 1	-7 / 18	83 / 8
SK	(860)	69 / 19	60 / 6	72 / 18	78 / 22
Slovakia		-23 / 19	92 / 6	-6 / 17	-61 / 22
FI	(911)	74 / 7	54 / 17	79 / 6	78 / 24
Finland		22 / 12	28 / 13	105 / 6	-72 / 23
SE	(951)	69 / 17	54 / 21	82 / 2	83 / 12
Sweden		-52 / 22	16 / 17	158 / 2	42 / 12
UK	(876)	68 / 20	60 / 4	79 / 7	76 / 27
United Kingdom		-21 / 18	94 / 5	102 / 7	-106 / 27
BG	(954)	82 / 2	58 / 8	70 / 20	84 / 10
Bulgaria		223 / 1	48 / 10	-36 / 20	59 / 10
HR	(816)	69 / 18	59 / 7	75 / 11	80 / 19
Croatia		6 / 13	70 / 8	49 / 10	-25 / 19
RO	(798)	70 / 15	56 / 12	71 / 19	86 / 7
Romania		-18 / 15	22 / 15	-15 / 19	84 / 7
TR	(454)	59 / 30	43 / 29	57 / 31	71 / 31
Turkey		-162 / 29	-196 / 29	-220 / 31	-213 / 31
NO	(846)	66 / 26	55 / 13	82 / 3	85 / 9
Norway		-102 / 28	29 / 12	152 / 3	67 / 9
CH	(831)	75 / 5	52 / 23	75 / 10	88 / 4
Switzerland		81 / 7	-13 / 22	46 / 11	134 / 4

Table 3: Sheet Z25. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		Partial indices			
		10 Time arrangements	11 Intensity/ exhaustiveness	12 Physical strains	13 Emotional strains
		Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %
BE	(798)	56 / 6	70 / 15	73 / 6	52 / 14
Belgium		70 / 6	6 / 15	86 / 7	-21 / 16
CZ	(749)	56 / 11	67 / 19	71 / 7	57 / 4
Czech Republic		36 / 13	-49 / 19	74 / 9	126 / 4
DK	(865)	56 / 10	65 / 27	69 / 13	46 / 31
Denmark		81 / 5	-98 / 27	46 / 10	-154 / 31
DE	(877)	55 / 18	67 / 21	73 / 5	54 / 10
Germany		-6 / 17	-64 / 21	101 / 5	14 / 12
EE	(555)	54 / 24	72 / 10	63 / 26	52 / 15
Estonia		-82 / 26	51 / 9	-82 / 27	6 / 13
EL	(629)	55 / 16	64 / 29	55 / 31	47 / 29
Greece		-57 / 23	-111 / 28	-235 / 31	-103 / 28
ES	(786)	54 / 26	74 / 6	69 / 12	54 / 9
Spain		-63 / 25	80 / 6	13 / 14	46 / 9
FR	(878)	54 / 28	72 / 12	68 / 14	52 / 13
France		-15 / 18	38 / 11	-26 / 19	-22 / 17
IE	(768)	55 / 20	73 / 8	75 / 3	51 / 19
Ireland		-32 / 21	57 / 8	160 / 3	-47 / 20
IT	(691)	55 / 14	71 / 13	71 / 8	56 / 5
Italy		20 / 15	29 / 13	96 / 6	110 / 6
CY	(482)	56 / 4	65 / 24	67 / 17	53 / 12
Cyprus		82 / 4	-85 / 24	-11 / 15	27 / 11
LV	(903)	53 / 30	78 / 3	61 / 28	51 / 17
Latvia		-205 / 30	169 / 3	-84 / 28	-10 / 15
LT	(873)	54 / 27	75 / 5	64 / 25	49 / 23
Lithuania		-94 / 28	97 / 5	-78 / 24	-78 / 24
LU	(520)	56 / 9	72 / 11	69 / 11	51 / 16
Luxemburg		64 / 7	38 / 12	38 / 12	-40 / 18
HU	(810)	57 / 3	70 / 16	64 / 22	62 / 1
Hungary		45 / 10	4 / 16	-78 / 25	263 / 1
MT	(507)	61 / 1	65 / 25	64 / 23	51 / 20
Malta		284 / 1	-94 / 26	-69 / 23	-5 / 14

Table 3: Sheet Z26. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	Partial indices			
	10	11	12	13
	Time arrangements	Intensity/exhaustiveness	Physical strains	Emotional strains
	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %
NL (877) Netherlands	56 / 8 57 / 8	71 / 14 9 / 14	75 / 2 164 / 2	51 / 21 -55 / 22
AT (842) Austria	55 / 21 44 / 12	65 / 26 -93 / 25	70 / 10 30 / 13	50 / 22 -73 / 23
PL (793) Poland	53 / 29 -130 / 29	77 / 4 131 / 4	63 / 27 -67 / 22	56 / 6 110 / 5
PT (788) Portugal	55 / 19 -25 / 20	73 / 7 70 / 7	67 / 16 -20 / 17	53 / 11 30 / 10
SI (500) Slovenia	55 / 17 -38 / 22	66 / 23 -75 / 22	61 / 29 -121 / 29	49 / 25 -42 / 19
SK (860) Slovakia	55 / 22 -87 / 27	72 / 9 48 / 10	68 / 15 39 / 11	58 / 3 158 / 3
FI (911) Finland	56 / 12 51 / 9	63 / 30 -135 / 30	66 / 18 -64 / 21	49 / 26 -98 / 26
SE (951) Sweden	56 / 7 120 / 2	64 / 28 -114 / 29	64 / 21 -37 / 20	46 / 30 -134 / 30
UK (876) United Kingdom	55 / 15 19 / 16	69 / 17 -2 / 17	76 / 1 169 / 1	49 / 24 -90 / 25
BG (954) Bulgaria	55 / 13 -19 / 19	81 / 2 214 / 1	66 / 20 -21 / 18	58 / 2 168 / 2
HR (816) Croatia	54 / 25 -60 / 24	81 / 1 214 / 2	64 / 24 -79 / 26	47 / 28 -110 / 29
RO (798) Romania	52 / 31 -243 / 31	67 / 20 -53 / 20	66 / 19 -17 / 16	55 / 8 84 / 8
TR (454) Turkey	58 / 2 27 / 14	60 / 31 -172 / 31	61 / 30 -171 / 30	56 / 7 99 / 7
NO (846) Norway	54 / 23 45 / 11	66 / 22 -81 / 23	71 / 9 84 / 8	48 / 27 -103 / 27
CH (831) Switzerland	56 / 5 111 / 3	68 / 18 -28 / 18	74 / 4 160 / 4	51 / 18 -55 / 21

Table 3: Sheet Z27. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	Partial indices			Aggregate indices
	14 Job stability and job security	15 Income	16 Satisfaction	A. Professional aspects (1+...+10)
	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %
BE (798) Belgium	69 / 13 53 / 11	65 / 4 99 / 5	73 / 7 100 / 7	60 / 9 39 / 10
CZ (749) Czech Republic	56 / 26 -135 / 28	52 / 21 -61 / 22	63 / 20 -39 / 20	55 / 26 -91 / 25
DK (865) Denmark	80 / 2 179 / 2	61 / 6 110 / 4	79 / 1 189 / 1	65 / 1 181 / 1
DE (877) Germany	70 / 10 28 / 13	60 / 10 73 / 7	70 / 9 64 / 9	55 / 24 -88 / 24
EE (555) Estonia	65 / 17 -24 / 19	48 / 25 -124 / 27	60 / 22 -92 / 22	58 / 18 -21 / 18
EL (629) Greece	55 / 29 -124 / 27	55 / 17 -3 / 16	58 / 30 -116 / 30	55 / 25 -101 / 27
ES (786) Spain	66 / 15 2 / 15	60 / 9 34 / 14	64 / 19 -33 / 19	53 / 29 -139 / 29
FR (878) France	61 / 22 -51 / 23	57 / 14 10 / 15	66 / 16 1 / 16	54 / 27 -100 / 26
IE (768) Ireland	72 / 8 78 / 8	61 / 7 92 / 6	71 / 8 71 / 8	61 / 8 77 / 8
IT (691) Italy	66 / 16 -4 / 16	52 / 20 -42 / 20	59 / 24 -95 / 24	52 / 30 -162 / 30
CY (482) Cyprus	71 / 9 63 / 9	57 / 13 44 / 12	75 / 4 131 / 4	59 / 15 20 / 14
LV (903) Latvia	64 / 19 -26 / 20	45 / 28 -128 / 29	59 / 27 -100 / 27	60 / 11 28 / 11
LT (873) Lithuania	55 / 28 -147 / 30	44 / 29 -137 / 30	58 / 28 -109 / 28	56 / 23 -65 / 23
LU (520) Luxemburg	66 / 14 13 / 14	66 / 2 159 / 3	68 / 12 32 / 12	59 / 13 22 / 13
HU (810) Hungary	64 / 18 -9 / 17	44 / 30 -127 / 28	59 / 23 -95 / 23	57 / 19 -22 / 19
MT (507) Malta	70 / 11 55 / 10	50 / 23 -46 / 21	67 / 14 19 / 14	63 / 5 132 / 5

Table 3: Sheet Z28. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

	Partial indices			Aggregate indices
	14 Job stability and job security	15 Income	16 Satisfaction	A. Professional aspects (1+...+10)
	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %
NL (877) Netherlands	75 / 6 105 / 6	58 / 11 59 / 9	68 / 11 32 / 11	62 / 7 94 / 7
AT (842) Austria	70 / 12 44 / 12	63 / 5 73 / 8	73 / 6 108 / 6	59 / 14 27 / 12
PL (793) Poland	54 / 30 -141 / 29	47 / 26 -107 / 25	65 / 17 -13 / 17	56 / 22 -59 / 22
PT (788) Portugal	61 / 23 -49 / 22	54 / 18 -28 / 19	67 / 15 8 / 15	54 / 28 -108 / 28
SI (500) Slovenia	56 / 27 -104 / 26	55 / 16 -18 / 17	59 / 26 -100 / 26	59 / 12 19 / 15
SK (860) Slovakia	59 / 24 -75 / 24	50 / 22 -73 / 23	62 / 21 -52 / 21	57 / 21 -45 / 21
FI (911) Finland	74 / 7 102 / 7	58 / 12 56 / 10	68 / 13 22 / 13	64 / 4 132 / 4
SE (951) Sweden	76 / 3 122 / 4	56 / 15 48 / 11	69 / 10 51 / 10	64 / 3 149 / 3
UK (876) United Kingdom	76 / 4 122 / 3	60 / 8 34 / 13	77 / 2 165 / 2	60 / 10 46 / 9
BG (954) Bulgaria	57 / 25 -101 / 25	50 / 24 -85 / 24	58 / 29 -113 / 29	57 / 20 -34 / 20
HR (816) Croatia	62 / 21 -37 / 21	54 / 19 -24 / 18	64 / 18 -23 / 18	58 / 17 -2 / 16
RO (798) Romania	64 / 20 -22 / 18	46 / 27 -120 / 26	59 / 25 -96 / 25	58 / 16 -16 / 17
TR (454) Turkey	48 / 31 -208 / 31	40 / 31 -165 / 31	52 / 31 -204 / 31	51 / 31 -202 / 31
NO (846) Norway	80 / 1 181 / 1	65 / 3 195 / 2	77 / 3 163 / 3	63 / 6 124 / 6
CH (831) Switzerland	75 / 5 109 / 5	67 / 1 202 / 1	75 / 5 124 / 5	65 / 2 166 / 2

Table 3: Sheet Z29. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		Aggregate indices			
		B. Strains (11+12+13)	C. Income and security (14+15)	D. Satisfaction with working conditions (16)	Total quality of work (A+B+C)
		Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %
BE	(798)	65 / 10	66.99 / 5	72.85 / 7	64.00 / 7
Belgium		38 / 15	85.25 / 6	99.56 / 7	26.49 / 7
CZ	(749)	65 / 7	53.87 / 27	63.29 / 20	57.93 / 26
Czech Republic		63 / 9	-97.16 / 27	-38.70 / 20	-32.72 / 28
DK	(865)	60 / 26	70.53 / 3	79.00 / 1	65.21 / 3
Denmark		-107 / 26	147.96 / 3	188.58 / 1	49.79 / 3
DE	(877)	64 / 13	64.85 / 12	70.39 / 9	61.45 / 12
Germany		17 / 17	58.27 / 12	64.01 / 9	-1.06 / 14
EE	(555)	62 / 21	56.09 / 20	59.63 / 22	58.64 / 24
Estonia		-7 / 20	-88.62 / 25	-91.65 / 22	-26.11 / 26
EL	(629)	55 / 31	54.78 / 23	57.96 / 30	54.94 / 30
Greece		-237 / 31	-56.73 / 20	-115.82 / 30	-51.60 / 30
ES	(786)	66 / 5	63.17 / 14	63.71 / 19	60.49 / 15
Spain		78 / 7	21.86 / 14	-32.60 / 19	-11.82 / 16
FR	(878)	64 / 15	58.95 / 17	66.05 / 16	59.14 / 20
France		1 / 18	-16.34 / 16	1.26 / 16	-21.15 / 21
IE	(768)	66 / 3	66.32 / 8	70.86 / 8	64.56 / 5
Ireland		97 / 5	91.43 / 5	70.79 / 8	39.03 / 4
IT	(691)	66 / 2	59.37 / 16	59.37 / 24	59.07 / 21
Italy		117 / 3	-27.39 / 17	-95.49 / 24	-23.08 / 22
CY	(482)	62 / 22	63.76 / 13	75.03 / 4	61.42 / 13
Cyprus		-48 / 22	55.57 / 13	131.18 / 4	9.32 / 12
LV	(903)	64 / 18	54.48 / 25	59.04 / 27	59.37 / 18
Latvia		60 / 10	-91.20 / 26	-100.26 / 27	-13.29 / 18
LT	(873)	63 / 20	49.73 / 30	58.41 / 28	56.10 / 29
Lithuania		-12 / 21	-150.55 / 30	-109.33 / 28	-47.57 / 29
LU	(520)	64 / 16	66.23 / 9	68.15 / 12	63.17 / 8
Luxemburg		26 / 16	104.89 / 4	31.61 / 12	27.27 / 6
HU	(810)	65 / 8	54.33 / 26	59.41 / 23	59.00 / 22
Hungary		81 / 6	-83.52 / 23	-94.93 / 23	-17.41 / 20
MT	(507)	60 / 25	59.89 / 15	67.26 / 14	61.02 / 14
Malta		-97 / 25	-4.62 / 15	18.71 / 14	8.52 / 13

Table 3: Sheet Z30. Decentness of work for European countries, their normalized scores (HBS methodology), and standardized scores (OECD methodology) with their ranks

		Aggregate indices			
		B. Strains (11+12+13)	C. Income and security (14+15)	D. Satisfaction with working conditions (16)	Total quality of work (A+B+C)
		Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %	Mean score, %
NL	(877)	65 / 6	66.66 / 6	68.19 / 11	64.83 / 4
Netherlands		65 / 8	83.59 / 8	32.11 / 11	36.94 / 5
AT	(842)	62 / 23	66.40 / 7	73.46 / 6	62.39 / 11
Austria		-77 / 24	64.12 / 11	108.45 / 6	9.69 / 11
PL	(793)	65 / 9	50.40 / 29	65.05 / 17	57.24 / 28
Poland		99 / 4	-129.26 / 29	-13.32 / 17	-31.89 / 27
PT	(788)	65 / 12	57.58 / 19	66.54 / 15	58.72 / 23
Portugal		47 / 11	-38.94 / 19	8.27 / 15	-23.44 / 23
SI	(500)	59 / 29	55.29 / 21	59.07 / 26	57.73 / 27
Slovenia		-129 / 27	-57.74 / 21	-99.84 / 26	-23.72 / 24
SK	(860)	66 / 4	54.63 / 24	62.37 / 21	59.18 / 19
Slovakia		121 / 2	-78.65 / 22	-52.00 / 21	-16.26 / 19
FI	(911)	59 / 27	66.04 / 10	67.51 / 13	62.88 / 9
Finland		-162 / 30	80.08 / 9	22.30 / 13	22.06 / 10
SE	(951)	58 / 30	65.88 / 11	69.48 / 10	62.75 / 10
Sweden		-151 / 28	84.07 / 7	50.77 / 10	26.48 / 8
UK	(876)	65 / 11	68.25 / 4	77.37 / 2	64.36 / 6
United Kingdom		44 / 13	75.55 / 10	164.97 / 2	26.01 / 9
BG	(954)	68 / 1	53.52 / 28	58.18 / 29	59.68 / 17
Bulgaria		201 / 1	-97.58 / 28	-112.62 / 29	-11.90 / 17
HR	(816)	64 / 17	58.10 / 18	64.40 / 18	60.07 / 16
Croatia		47 / 12	-31.13 / 18	-22.63 / 18	-5.40 / 15
RO	(798)	63 / 19	54.79 / 22	59.31 / 25	58.62 / 25
Romania		-4 / 19	-84.58 / 24	-96.31 / 25	-24.34 / 25
TR	(454)	59 / 28	44.08 / 31	51.84 / 31	51.27 / 31
Turkey		-152 / 29	-195.11 / 31	-204.46 / 31	-91.17 / 31
NO	(846)	61 / 24	72.79 / 1	77.26 / 3	65.77 / 2
Norway		-55 / 23	202.23 / 1	163.40 / 3	57.97 / 2
CH	(831)	64 / 14	71.44 / 2	74.54 / 5	66.80 / 1
Switzerland		39 / 14	174.26 / 2	124.00 / 5	66.38 / 1

7 Annex 2: Importance of aspects of working conditions by country

The layout of the following graphs is the same as of the graph in Figure 5; see Section 3.3 for explanations. The difference is that they are computed for each country (indicated at the top of each graph) instead of the whole of Europe. Note that since the number of observations in a country is much smaller than for the whole of Europe, the non-significance of regression coefficients (shown by grey font color) occurs more frequent.

Figure 5: Sheet B. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet C. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet D. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet E. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet F. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet G. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet H. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet I. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet J. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet K. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet L. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet M. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet N. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet O. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet P. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet Q. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet R. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet S. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet T. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet U. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet V. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet W. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet X. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet Y. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet Z. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet Z1. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet Z2. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet Z3. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet Z4. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)




Figure 5: Sheet Z5. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)





Figure 5: Sheet Z6. Importance of different aspects of working conditions for satisfaction with working conditions computed by the HBS method (red bars: stepwise regression coefficients and correlation coefficients) and OECD method (blue bars: stepwise regression coefficients=correlation coefficients); the statistically non-significant values (5%) are distinguished by grey font)



8 References

- ANKER, R., CHERNYSHEV, I., EGGER, PH., MEHRAN, F., AND RITTER, J. (2003) Measuring decent work with statistical indicators. *International Labour Review*, 142 (2), 147–177.
- BREMER, W., AND SEIFERT, H. (2007) *Wie prekär sind atypische Beschäftigungsverhältnisse? Eine empirisch Analyse*. WSI Diskussionspapier 156, Hans Böckler Stiftung, Düsseldorf. http://www.boeckler.de/pdf/p_wsi_diskp_156.pdf
- CHERCHYE, L. (2001) Using data envelopment analysis to assess macroeconomic policy performance. *Applied Economics*, 33, 407–416.
- COX, D., FITZPATRICK, R., FLETCHER, A., GORE, S., SPIEGELHALTER, D., AND JONES, D. (1992) Quality-of-life assessment: can we keep it simple? *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 155 (3), 353–393.
- DGB INDEX GUTE ARBEIT (2007) *Der Report*, DGB, Berlin.
<http://www.dgb-index-gute-arbeit.de>
- EDITORIAL(2004), *Arbeit*, 13 (3), 191–192.
- ETUC (2007) *Decent Work*. <http://www.etuc.org/a/4311>
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2001A) *Employment and Social Policies: a Framework for Investing in Quality*. Brussels, 26.6.2001 COM(2001) 313.
http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2001/com2001_0313en01.pdf
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2001B) *Structural Indicators*. Brussels 30.10.2001, COM(2001) 619 http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2001/com2001_0619en.html
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2002) *Towards a European Research Area "Science, Technology and Innovation": Key Figures 2002*.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/era/pdf/benchmarking2002_en.pdf
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2003) *Improving Quality in Work: a Review of Recent Progress*. Brussels 26.11.2003, COM(2003) 728. http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/employment_strategy/pdf/comm_en.pdf
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2007) *European Employment Strategy. Homepage. Today and Tomorrow*. http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/employment_strategy/eestm_en.htm
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2006) *Promoting decent work for all, Communication from the European Commission on May 24, 2006*
http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/news/2006/may/com_2006_249_en.pdf
- EUROPEAN FOUNDATION (1997) *3rd Indicators of Working Conditions in the European Union*, by S. Dhondt, I. Houtman and N. Tno. Dublin, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

- EUROPEAN FOUNDATION (2002) *Working Time Preferences in Sixteen European Countries*, by H. Bielski, G. Bosch and A. Wagner. Dublin, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
<http://www.eurofound.eu.int/publications/EF0207.htm>
- EUROPEAN FOUNDATION (2007A) *4th European Working Conditions Survey*. Dublin, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
- EUROPEAN FOUNDATION (2007B) *Industrial Relations in EU Member States 2000-2004*. Dublin, European Foundation
<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2007/15/en/1/ef0715en.pdf>
- GRICHILLES, Z. (1990) Patent statistics in economic indicators. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 28 1661–1707.
- GUERARD, J.B. (2001) A note on the forecasting effectiveness of the US leading economic indicators. *Indian Economic Review*, 36 (1), 251–268.
- HUGGINS, R. (2003) Creating a UK competitive index: regional and local benchmarking. *Regional Studies*, 37, 89–96.
- IG METALL PROJEKT GUTE ARBEIT (2007) *Handbuch "Gute Arbeit"*. Hamburg, VSA-Verlag.
- ILO (1999) *Report of the Director-General: Decent Work*. Geneva, ILO.
<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/relm/ilc/ilc87/rep-i.htm>
- INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT (2000–) *The World Competitiveness Yearbook*. Lausanne, International Institute for Management Development.
- JACKSON, J.E. (1988) *A User's Guide to Principal Components*. New York, Wiley.
- KENDALL, M. G., AND MORAN, P. A. P. (1963) *Geometric Probability*. New York: Hafner, 1963.
- KLEINKNECHT, A., VAN MONTFORT, K., AND BROUWER, E. (2002) The non trivial choice between innovation indicators. *Economic Innovation and New Technologies*, 11 (2), 109–121.
- KORN, G.A., AND KORN, TH.M. (1968) *Mathematical handbook for Scientists and Engineers*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- KRZANOWSKI, W.J. (1988) *Principles of Multivariate Analysis*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- LOVELL, C.A.K., PASTOR, J.T., AND TURNER, J.A. (1995) Measuring macroeconomic performance in the OECD: a comparison of European and non-European countries. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 87, 507–518.
- MUNDA, G., AND NARDO, M. (2003) *On the Methodological Foundations of Composite Indicators Used for Ranking Countries*. Ispra (IT), Joint Research Center.
http://webfarm.jrc.cec.eu.int/uasa/events/oecd_12may03/Background

- OECD (2002) *Aggregated Environmental Indices: Review of Aggregation Methodologies in Use*. ENV/EPOC/SE(2001)1/Final. Paris, OECD.
[http://www.oalis.oecd.org/oalis/2001doc.nsf/LinkTo/env-epoc-se\(2001\)2-final](http://www.oalis.oecd.org/oalis/2001doc.nsf/LinkTo/env-epoc-se(2001)2-final)
- OECD (2003) *Composite Indicators of Country Performance: A Critical Assessment*. DSTI/DOC (2003)16. Paris, OECD.
[http://www.oalis.oecd.org/oalis/2003doc.nsf/43bb6130e5e86e5fc12569fa005d004c/8bb0f462911c2cc6c1256ddc00436279/\\$FILE/JT00153477.PDF](http://www.oalis.oecd.org/oalis/2003doc.nsf/43bb6130e5e86e5fc12569fa005d004c/8bb0f462911c2cc6c1256ddc00436279/$FILE/JT00153477.PDF)
- OECD (2004A) *OECD Composite Leading indicators: a tool for short-term analysis*.
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/4/33/15994428.pdf>
- OECD (2004B) *Employment Outlook*. Paris, OECD.
- OECD (2007) *Program for International Student Assessment. PISA 2006 Results*.
http://www.pisa.oecd.org/document/2/0,3343,en_32252351_32236191_39718850_1_1_1_1,00.html
- OECD-JRC (2005) *Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide*
[http://www.oalis.oecd.org/oalis/2005doc.nsf/LinkTo/std-doc\(2005\)3](http://www.oalis.oecd.org/oalis/2005doc.nsf/LinkTo/std-doc(2005)3)
- PROHOROV, A.V. (1984) Regression analysis. *Mathematical Encyclopedia, Vol. 4*. Moscow, Soviet Encyclopedia, 926–934.
- SAISANA, M., AND TARANTOLA, S. (2002) *State-of-the-art Report on Current Methodologies and Practices for Composite Indicator Development*, EUR 20408 EN Report, European Commission, Joint Research Center, Ispra, Italy, see Saltelli (2003).
- SAISANA M., SALTELLI A., TARANTOLA S. (2005) Uncertainty and Sensitivity analysis techniques as tools for the quality assessment of composite indicators. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society - A*, 168(2), 307-323.
- SEBER, G.A.F. (1984) *Multivariate Observations*. New York, Wiley.
- SEIFERT, H., AND TANGIAN, A. (2007) *Flexicurity: Reconciling Social Security with Flexibility — Empirical findings for Europe*. WSI Diskussionspapier 154, Hans Böckler Stiftung, Düsseldorf.
http://www.boeckler.de/pdf/p_wsi_diskp_154_e.pdf
- TANGIAN A.S. (2004) *Constructing the composite indicator “Quality of work” from the third European survey on working conditions*. WSI Diskussionspapier 132, Hans Böckler Stiftung, Düsseldorf. http://www.boeckler.de/pdf/p_wsi_diskp_132.pdf
- TANGIAN A.S. (2005A) *A composite indicator of working conditions in the EU-15 for policy monitoring and analytical purposes..* WSI Diskussionspapier 135, Hans Böckler Stiftung, Düsseldorf.
http://www.boeckler.de/pdf/p_wsi_diskp_135_e.pdf

- TANGIAN A.S. (2005B) *Ein zusammengesetzter Indikator der Arbeitsbedingungen in der EU-15 für Politik-Monitoring und analytische Zwecke*. WSI Diskussionspapier 135D, Hans Böckler Stiftung, Düsseldorf.
http://www.boeckler.de/pdf/p_wsi_diskp_135_d.pdf
- TANGIAN A.(2007A) Analysis of the third European survey on working conditions with composite indicators. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 181, 468–499.
- TANGIAN A.S. (2007B) *Is flexible work precarious? A study based on the 4th European survey of working conditions 2005*. WSI Diskussionspapier 153, Hans Böckler Stiftung, Düsseldorf. http://www.boeckler.de/pdf/p_wsi_diskp_153_e.pdf
- UNITED NATIONS (2001–) Human Development Index and Technology Achievement Index. In: *Human Development Report 2001–*. New York, United Nations.
- WILSON, J.W., AND JONES, C.P. (2002) An analysis of the S&P-500 index and Cowle’s extensions: price indexes and stock returns, 1870–1999. *Journal of Business*, 75, 505–533.
- WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM (2002–) *Pilot Environmental Performance Index*. Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy.