

# **Work and Job Values in CEE and EU countries**

**Jiří Večerník**

**SP 03:3**

**2003**

Reviewers: Mgr. Alena Křížková  
Prof. PhDr. Petr Mareš, CSc.

This study was supported by the grant No. 403/03/0339 of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic „The Adjustment of Socio-economic Values in the Process of EU Accession“.

© Sociologický ústav Akademie věd České republiky, 2003.

ISBN 80-7330-036-2

## Obsah

Abstrakt	5
Abstract	6
Abstraktum	7
Introduction	9
1. Human values and work: the methodological approach	10
2. Data sources	13
3. A description of the main results	15
A. ISSP survey	15
B. EVS survey	25
C. The HWF survey	31
4. Conclusion and discussion	37
Data sources	41
A. International Social Survey Programme (ISSP)	41
B. European Values Study (EVS)	42
C. HWF Cross-Country Survey	43
References	43
Shrnutí	45
Summary	46
Zusammenfassung	47



# Hodnoty práce a zaměstnání v zemích ve středoevropských a západoevropských zemích

Jiří Večerník

## Abstrakt

Studie předkládá kritické čtení postojových výzkumů týkajících se hodnot práce a zaměstnání. Pro analýzy používáme tři mezinárodních výzkumů - modul ISSP o pracovních orientacích, European Values Study a výzkum provedený v rámci projektu Households-Work-Flexibility. V první části popisujeme některé metodologické problémy a ilustrujeme je na dříve provedených výzkumech. Ve druhé části stručně prezentujeme zdroje dat o hodnotách práce. Ve třetí a nejdelší části pak předkládáme některé výsledky. Se všemi možnými omezeními dospíváme k závěru, že existují značné odlišnosti mezi zeměmi střední a východní Evropy a sledovanými zeměmi EU v řadě indikátorů. Lidé z reformních zemí jsou mimo jiné méně spokojeni ve svém zaměstnání, především kvůli nízkým výdělkům. Pracovníci tu rovněž mají méně kontroly nad různými aspekty své práce než v zemích EU. V závěru pak otevíráme otázku týkající se „opravdové“ hodnotové změny během transformace. Tento proces byl pochopen jako poměrně snadná cesta a v mnoha aspektech omezen jen na přejmenování předchozích institucí a přeznačení předchozích pravidel a zvyklostí. Pokud jde o tradiční „pracovní ctnosti“, vlažný postoj do značné míry přetrval.

## Klíčová slova

hodnoty práce, ekonomická sociologie, výzkumy postojů, reformní země

# Work and Job Values in CEE and EU countries

Jiří Večerník

## Abstract

The study presents a critical reading of opinion data on work and job values. Three cross-national surveys are used – the ISSP module on Work Orientations, the European Values Study and the Households-Work-Flexibility survey. In the first part, some methodological problems are described and then illustrated through previous research. In the second part, a brief presentation is made of the sources of data on work values. In the third and longest part several results are displayed. One of the main conclusions of the analysis is that there are considerable differences between Central-Eastern Europe (CEE) and the EU countries under observation in a number of indicators. CEE people appear to be less satisfied with their jobs than EU people, first and foremost owing to their low salaries. People in CEE countries also have much less control over different aspects of their work than do people in the EU countries. In the conclusion, the question is raised of the „true“ value change during transition. Transition was presented as an easy journey and was often limited to merely the re-naming of former institutions and the re-labelling of previous rules and manners. The relaxed attitudes towards traditional work virtues were thus to a large extent maintained.

## Key words

work values, economic sociology, opinion surveys, transition countries

# **Die Werte der Arbeit und der Beschäftigung in den mittel- und westeuropäischen Ländern**

**Jiří Večerník**

## **Abstraktum**

Die Studie gewährt einen kritischen Einblick in die Meinungsumfragen zu den Werten der Arbeit und der Beschäftigung. Für die Analysen werden drei internationale Umfragen herangezogen – das ISSP-Modul „Work orientations“, die „European Values Study“ und eine Umfrage, die im Rahmen des Projektes „Households-Work-Flexibility“ durchgeführt wurde. Im ersten Teil werden methodologische Probleme beschrieben und anhand früherer Untersuchungen veranschaulicht. Im zweiten Teil werden die Datenquellen über die Werte der Arbeit in Kurzform präsentiert. Im dritten und ausführlichsten Teil legen wir dann eine Reihe von Ergebnissen vor. Mit diversen Einschränkungen, gelangen wir zu dem Schluss, dass es bei einer Reihe von Indikatoren zwischen den Ländern Mittel- und Osteuropas und den untersuchten EU-Ländern erhebliche Unterschiede gibt. Die Menschen aus den Reformländern sind unter anderem mit ihrer Arbeitssituation weniger zufrieden, vor allem wegen des geringen Verdienstes. Die Arbeitnehmer hier haben über verschiedene Aspekte ihrer Arbeit auch weniger Kontrolle, als in den EU-Ländern. Zum Abschluss wenden wir uns dann der Frage der „wahren“ Werteverstärkungen während der Transformation zu. Dieser Prozess wurde als relativ einfacher Weg betrachtet und beschränkte sich in vielen Aspekten lediglich auf die Umbenennung der früheren Institutionen sowie auf neue Bezeichnungen für Regeln und Gewohnheiten. Im Hinblick auf die traditionellen „Arbeitstugenden“ blieb die laxen Haltung in erheblichem Maße bestehen.

## **Schlüsselwörter**

Werte der Arbeit, ökonomische Soziologie, Meinungsumfragen, Reformländer



## Introduction

In recent decades, the developed world has seen important changes in the area of human labour. Economic activity, originally a matter of terrestrial pain and strain, turned into a positive behaviour, enriching human life on a mass scale. Post-modern society, according to Ronald Inglehart, replaces the values of starvation with the values of security, and unleashes the opportunity for the “cognitive mobilisation” of workers. The change in the nature of work itself, as well as related work values, is part of a comprehensive cultural change, linked to economic development and leading people toward post-materialist values, individual lifestyles and civic participation [Inglehart 1990].

At the same time, however, work has become scarcer and many people have become worse off as a result of unemployment. In the globalisation process, international capital moves much faster than the ability of national economies to adapt. Unskilled work moves away from the developed and into the poorer countries, where wage costs are negligible. The share of work that involves the high, intrinsic values of human development is still not a mass phenomenon. Over the past centuries, paid work has become a basic status-forming activity of Western civilisation. However, it brings not only satisfaction, but also risks, which have a stressful effect on people’s lives [Beck 1992; Beck 2000]. Increasingly, there are fewer and fewer jobs: “In fact, from being a burden, work has become a privilege” [Dahrendorf 1990: 144].

Both the positive and negative features of recent development in the world of work are present in contemporary societies. The modernisation process fuels economic growth and thus reduces the risk of starvation. However, the increasing returns of technological change and skilled labour later diminish. Education and the new challenges of the information society contribute to human development. Instead of strategies for mere survival and well-being, post-modern times bring about a richer life-style and improvements in the quality of life [Inglehart 2001]. But the price to be paid is by no means negligible – a polluted environment, mounting stress, and weakening family and social ties.

Within such a general framework, the transformation of political and economic systems in Central-Eastern Europe (CEE hereafter) opened up additional problems. After decades of the state administration of work under a command economy, the labour market returned to the economic stage and changed the supply and demand sides of the workforce. On the supply side, the skills acquired under the communist regime were reshaped and improved in the light of new requirements. On the demand side, the more stringent requirements put on the utilisation of human resources reflected the imperatives of the market economy. On both sides, more flexibility in jobs and work was required, but not easily accepted by workers.

In fact, the drive towards market behaviour has been burdened by many disturbing factors. The legacies of the communist regime lie deep, and the expectations of the population concerning social protection are high. Owing to such restraints, the use of the labour force remains sub-optimal in large areas of the economy. For instance, in the Czech Republic, labour hoarding has continued, long after formal (legal) privatisation has been carried out, owing to the generous conditions created for former state firms by semi-state banks responding to political requirements. While the pressures put on work performance and job mobility continue to be weak, deficiencies in work habits and a lack of flexibility remain evident in large sections of the labour force.

During the period of economic reform in the CEE countries, labour market problems were described exclusively in the vocabulary and methodology of mainstream economics.

Therefore, there was little or no place for inspecting the human values related to economic behaviour and work. There are several causes for this: (1) values (more specifically, the hierarchy of preferences) are taken for granted and have no standing in neoclassical economics; (2) the measurement of human values is rather problematic, since one has to rely on subjective data; (3) there are no time series, which would enable comparisons with the communist past; (4) there is no research tradition in the CEE countries that would facilitate this type of inquiry – e.g. economic sociology, social anthropology or cultural studies.

By contrast, no small amount of attention is paid to the institutional surroundings and the social dimension of work in the West. Scholars are trying to unveil the current qualitative changes in work and jobs relative to a general value change, whether from materialism to post-materialism, from national economies to globalisation, or from social networks to an atomised social web. There are indeed important branches of economic sociology and socio-economics which do deal with the social settings of human work [Yankelovich et al. 1985; Tilly and Tilly 1994; Sennett 1998].

The requirement of flexibility makes the value dimension of work even more important. In place of the former stability, there are instead high job and occupational mobility and a variability of work hours and locations. Instead of fixed skills, life-long education and permanent training are asserted. And instead of the distinct separation of work and family life, there appears an overlapping and mixture of the two, with some people working in part or entirely at home, and with the massive development of tele-working. While people face strict demands with regard to their adaptation, they are empowered by their increased competencies. They are also granted considerable decision-making freedom, which allows them to establish the balance between family and work life.

This study is neither theoretical nor historical. In a certain sense, it is only the beginning of a systematic analysis based on a critical reading of opinion data, which is backed by a historical-cultural study. I have made use of available data sources that reflect work and job values through people's opinions. In the first part of the study, I mention some methodological problems, also using examples drawn from previous research. In the second part, I introduce the relevant data sources, along with all their weaknesses. In the third and longest part, I display the main results of the analysis of the three cross-national surveys. In conclusion, I make a summary of the main findings and discuss the uneasy possibilities for drawing generalisations from them.

### ***1. Human values and work: the methodological approach***

An analysis of work values exposes many methodological problems. The main problem is that we cannot discover work or any other values directly, but only indirectly, through surveys of opinions or participated observation. There are though various concepts that describe human perceptions – thus we can at least distinguish between preferences and attitudes, and values and norms. Generally, the latter are considered more general and durable than the former.

For instance, Michael Hechter considers values to be relatively general and durable criteria of an evaluation. “As such, they differ from other concepts like preferences (and attitudes) and norms. Like values, preferences (and attitudes) are internal, but unlike values, preferences are liable rather than durable and particular rather than general. Whereas norms are also evaluative, general and durable, they are external to actors and – in contrast to values – require sanctions for their efficacy” [Hechter 1994: 321].

The circumstances of collecting data indeed matter, especially when making a comparison between culturally different countries. Even if the greatest care is invested in ensuring the comparability of questionnaires and methods, we can never avoid the different understandings of formally identical words and questions, as well as the variance in the psychology of interview situations. The cultural context, which largely determines the consistency of answers, and the population training in survey interviews are both important. As Max Haller stresses in his critique of Inglehart's findings, "given the complexities of comparative research, the chances are high that the differences found have more to do with the methods employed than with 'real' differences between the countries compared" [Haller 2002: 153].

Real behaviour tells most about values. Human values as such can be identified only by means of a complex comparative socio-historical analysis (such as Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*). The traditions and socio-economic climate of a country may seriously constrain the calibration of a given value scale. People responding to sociological questionnaires express their long-term value orientations along with their spontaneous opinions and immediate reactions in varying combinations, which differ according to the cultural and communication capacities of the respondent. For this reason, it is better to uncover the longer-term value shifts (as opposed to the shorter-term attitudes) through longitudinal surveys. However, there are almost no such surveys available for the CEE countries at present.

Even if declared values are taken for granted, there is still another important issue – that "subjective" human happiness does not depend very much on "objective" well-being [Diener et al. 1993].

The given general framework of values (economic, social and cultural) and the standard of value judgement in a country are more important for forging people's opinions than the aggregate indicators of economic performance. Not only the specificities of a regime, but also national mentalities matter, as do changing reference contexts – like in the case of the transition from a command to a market economy and from totalitarian to democratic rule.

In transition countries there are additional problems that evolved out of the communist legacy, the significance of which is threefold. First, the communist regime was a totalitarian paternalism that destroyed the human freedom of decision-making and, consequently, the values of self-reliance and responsibility. Second, it undermined the very foundation of the process of creating values by confining the public space and, consequently, by limiting, or even obliterating, the communication over general issues in society. Third, it also undermined trust among people, which is at a lower level than in Western societies, and which declined even further during the first period of transformation [Raiser et al. 2002]. While the first aspect is somewhat acknowledged in cross-national comparisons, the second and third are not. Yet all of them have an effect on an interview situation and on survey results.

Attitudinal data collected in the East and the West can never ever be considered to be homogeneous and strictly comparative. The articulation of values in the CEE countries was confined and biased in the past. Though people did not believe in the Marxist ideology, there was nothing else at hand to form a consistent framework of life and society. After 1989, people had to re-learn to formulate their opinions in consistent frameworks. Therefore, even if using verbally identical questions in a cross-national comparison, we have to be aware of their different meanings in various countries or cultural regions. Paradoxically, the situation is somewhat better in areas where people were indoctrinated by an ideology – such as inequality, the welfare state and social justice. However the ideology may have been biased, an understanding of problems was cultivated in a sense, and thus the differences between the East and

the West are salient. Nevertheless, even here, any effort to find “objective determinants” of some key attitudes towards work and employment could fail.

Let's look at several examples. With regard to *inequality*, in a study based on the 1999 ISSP survey, Marc Suhrcke concluded that “results do confirm the hypothesis of significant differences in attitudes. People living in transition countries tolerate existing income differences significantly less than people in the West, even after we control for the usual determinants of attitudes to inequality and for the actual level of income inequality” [Suhrcke 2001: 25]. As the issue of inequality was the main issue raised by the communist regime, systemic differences are quite understandable. Despite this, the comparison provides ambiguous results – as the most egalitarian country appears to be Portugal, while egalitarian attitudes in the Czech Republic are on the same level as those in France.

With regard to *social justice*, a very important variable is historical time. As Kluegel and Mason [2000: 172] found, “in the early years of the transition, many citizens of postcommunist states supported market justice norms in simple opposition to socialist justice norms of the communist era. As the years pass, however, the influence of such ‘revolutionary zeal’ has declined, opening these beliefs to scrutiny on the ground of opportunity and equity”. In this regard, the reversed tendency in the Czech Republic is quite telling: in comparison with 1995, “Czechs in 1999 were less likely to believe that their society provided equal opportunity, served people's needs, or rewarded their intelligence and skill” [Kluegel and Mason 2000: 249]. Most likely, previous attitudes had been based on the illusion that a miraculous switch of the economic regime could be performed.

If one focuses on similarly complex issues, such as the *welfare state*, it is even harder to find associations between the actual (objective) state of affairs and people's attitudes – or, from a different perspective, consistent and clear country or regional patterns. This was shown in an analysis of people's support for different welfare regimes among five Western countries, based on data from the 1996 ISSP survey. Giuliano Bonoli found “the way surveys questions are answered can be best understood with reference to norms and values that have traditionally dominated national practices and discourses” [Bonoli 2000: 449]. It is possible to assume that the same would be found when comparing countries within the CEE region, but the picture would probably be more blurred.

Unlike such “ideological” issues, the area of work and job values is burdened more by relativity and a lack of specificity. Under the communist regime, work itself was endowed with the dichotomous status of being simultaneously a right and an obligation. Through the promotion of work in the communist ideology, it eventually came to be devaluated in real human lives. People learned to prefer other components of work than its prestige and their own achievements through formal labour. More often, what became primary were such features as the absence of any supervisory control or less strict working conditions, which permitted less of a work burden and more hours of discretion, making it possible to perform informal jobs or bricolage at home. When the salaries were generally low, the informal characteristics of work, including the chances of obtaining extra income in cash and kind, became important.

Analyses of work values, strictly speaking, are rather rare, even within the same “family of nations”. Wolfgang Teckenberg and Michael Bayer [1999] compared the work values of (West) Germans and Italians (with the distinction of Northern-Middle and Southern regions) using the European Values Study of 1980 and 1990. They found that while for Italians work mainly represented a channel of social integration it possessed much more intrinsic values in West Germany, where work is subordinated more to the rational criteria

of an earning activity and economic efficiency. In West Germany, the economic area of life is more clearly distinguished from family life and leisure. In Italy, work and social life are more mixed – which is somewhat more similar to the case in East Germany, as the EVS 1990 showed.

S. D. Harding and F. J. Hikspoors [1995] used the same source for a comparison of thirteen Western countries. Following earlier analytical findings, they distinguished the factors of “personal development” and “comfort and material conditions”, noting the increasing importance of the former. While Northern European countries “form the most fertile ground for empowered employees”, Southern Europeans ascribe rather more importance to the “value of comfort”. At the same time, however, “employees are becoming more demanding of their employers”, not only in terms of the wage amount itself, but also in terms of the relationship between individual performance and reward [Harding and Hikspoors 1995: 445–448].

As a comparison between East and West Germany suggests, the value of work in the countries of really existing socialism was higher, but only due to the stronger importance of the workplace with regard to its socialisation function [Meulemann 1996]. In this sense, communist countries were similar to Southern European, less developed nations, where work also has more of a social than economic function. This aspect in particular was the one raised by women in opinion surveys in communist Czechoslovakia, whose labour force participation was extremely high and whose pay extremely low [Večerník 1986]. Unlike the Southern countries, however, there was little mix between the family and work life in pre-1989 Czechoslovakia.

In the transition, “hard” labour market conditions led to work performance being subjected to more demanding criteria, which ought to have attenuated the previously social character of work and produced a more critical stance toward workers’ capacities and abilities. However, the accustomed experience of the past often produced rather an exaggerated, subjective assessment of a person’s abilities and a tendency to blame instead the state for job insecurities and work inadequacies. It is also possible to assume that the legacy of communist attitudes is unevenly distributed among the population, most probably downwards along the educational hierarchy, and according to the distinction between dependent and independent work.

## 2. Data sources

As indicated above, human values can only be identified by means of a complex comparative socio-historical analysis. What we are doing here is much simpler – this study relies on individual opinions and attitudes regarding employment and work in general and some of their particular features. An analysis of this is then made in a cross-national perspective, which has both advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, a comparison based on cross-national surveys is the only possible way of defining “national”, “regional” or “transitional” opinion profiles. On the other hand, even taking precautions for the comparability of survey questions, the various cultural, regional and societal contexts do matter and they affect results in a way that is hard to estimate.

Taking into account the limitations of the method, I have made use here of three data sources that make it possible to apply an internationally comparative perspective:

1. the 1997 module of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) on “Work Orientations”, which is fully devoted to work and job issues;

2. the 1999 European Values Study (EVS), which contains several sets of questions concerning work and jobs;
3. the 2001 Households, Work and Flexibility (HWF) survey, which includes a set of questions relating to work values.

As the HWF project is taken here as a benchmark, for the sake of adequacy the focus has been put as much as possible on the “HWF countries” – in other words, preference is always given to those countries in the selection of the nations from the other two surveys, which are much larger in their range of countries. To be consistent with the HWF survey, I also selected sub-samples of respondents 18–65 years of age. In the first (ISSP) case, I selected nine countries out of all thirty-two countries under observation, seven of which are “HWF countries”; in the second (EVS) case, I again selected nine out of twenty-eight countries, six of which are “HWF countries”. Unfortunately, I did not have a full sample of “HWF countries” either, as the set of value questions was only facultative.

Ad 1. *The ISSP “Work Orientations” survey* makes it possible to analyse attitudes towards work using a comparative questionnaire, which reflects the debates and conclusions of sociologists worldwide. Furthermore, the survey contains data concerning not only opinions and beliefs about jobs and work, but also perceptions of working conditions and job stability. Similarly, it provides information about the workers’ sense of loyalty to employers, as well as their willingness to stay in their present job or their intention to seek another job. Data concerning the utilisation of formal education and prior work experience are located somewhere in between the objective situation and its subjective perception.

Ad 2. *The European Values Study* questionnaire has a broad scope, with particular attention being paid to religion and family values. At that margin, it also involves the evaluation of work in general and its various dimensions, partly in comparison with the other areas of human life. Here again, basic information about occupation and employment status was involved. A special merit of the EVS data is that work values can be linked to and compared with other human values, and thus it could cover a large area of human decision-making.

Ad 3. *Households, Work and Flexibility (HWF)* is a complex study that looks at the relationship between the home and work and the impact that flexibility has in various countries of Eastern and Western Europe. The empirical survey focuses mostly on the objective characteristics of employment, multiple jobs and their conditions with regard to hours, location and contract arrangements. The study also pays some attention to work values and the “potential for change”. Moreover, the value section was facultative for project participants, and, therefore, was not applied to all under observation. The same holds true for the set of question describing employment and job experience since 1989.

In all these cases, the information is mostly subjective, and it could hardly be otherwise. Most of the relevant data could never have been collected in a standard statistical survey and cannot be compared with “objective” data. This is at odds with the dominant economic ideology of early transformation, mostly governed by neoclassical mainstream economics. Neither institutions nor human values were discussed as important factors in economic transition and further development. However, having observed the failures and insufficiencies of this narrow view of things, the institutional, network and value dimensions have been invited back into economic analysis.

The comparability and reliability of subjective perceptions is probably lower than that of hard statistical data. However, the importance of such “soft” dimensions in economic life is probably as great as the weight of so-called “objective” dimensions. Looking behind the

scenes, where “hard” statistical data are actually forged, we might often be surprised by the relaxed approach in the collection of information from economic subjects, as well as by the great deal of estimation and rule of thumb applied, for example, in such crucial indicators as GDP. What is called “hard” might in the end often be quite “soft”.

### 3. A description of the main results

#### A. ISSP survey

In this section, I will describe the main results of the ISSP survey on work orientations, looking mostly at cross-national differences. At the same time, I will try to check the internal consistency/inconsistency of several sets of questions (see Table A1).

The instrumental/goal orientation of work is surveyed with three questions. When we produce a scale using all three variables, we discover that the highest degree of work instrumentality is declared by the Polish and Bulgarian respondents, followed by the Czechs and the Slovenes. The countries with the lowest degree of work instrumentality are the Netherlands and, especially, Sweden. No particular patterns for the “Easterners” can be found, except the high value that is ascribed to work as a “person’s most important activity”. However, here we could suspect the legacy of former ideological indoctrination is at play, which has little to do with true attitudes. Exceptionally striking is the case of Bulgaria, where most respondents declare both the instrumental and intrinsic value of work simultaneously (see Table A2).

It is difficult to evaluate the whole set of questions describing the various characteristics of jobs. Therefore, we must try to simplify the picture through factor analysis. Using this, three (in the case of desired values), or even only two (in the case of accomplished values) clusters of variables appear. When we rank individual dimensions according to their general importance in the eyes of respondents, the central issues are (1) an independent and interesting job, (2) the utility the work holds for society, and (3) a secure and well-paid job. If we refer to the perception of accomplishment of individual characteristics in the respondent’s current job, only (1) societal utility and (2) a promising career (promotion) appear as the key variables around which the other characteristics group. If we compare both views (e.g. how desired values are accomplished in the respondent’s own job), it is mainly satisfaction or dissatisfaction with reward and promotion that appears as a rather separate dimension.

When we select the key variables, we can more easily compare the individual countries grouping them. With regard to desired values, Western countries score higher in asking for an independent and interesting job, while Eastern countries score higher in seeking work

**Table A1. General value of work (percentage of answers „strongly agree“ and „agree“)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>A job is just a way of earning money - no more:</i>	38.2	31.5	47.6	37.1	63.2	29.4	33.1	20.5	16.9
<i>I would enjoy having a paid job even if I did not need the money:</i>	45.9	54.4	67.6	42.3	34.5	66.5	53.5	52.7	72.6
<i>Work is a person's most important activity:</i>	52.6	56.6	57.2	75.1	73.1	37.8	26.3	31.6	39.7

### 3. A description of the main results

**Table A2. Evaluation of various dimensions of work: how important they are and how they are accomplished in the person's present job (percentage of answers A. „very important“ and „important“, B. „definitively agree“ and „rather agree“)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West German	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>A. Desired characteristics of work:</i>									
Security	89.6	95.6	87.3	95.1	95.8	96.9	96.6	87.8	91.3
Reward	78.9	96.4	94.4	92.9	98.3	77.5	77.7	58.3	70.1
Promotion	48.0	72.5	69.1	81.0	75.0	74.0	78.3	77.7	49.5
Interesting	88.9	83.7	87.8	93.3	79.8	97.4	95.5	93.5	96.6
Independence	56.8	70.4	74.5	85.6	57.7	91.5	66.6	86.1	83.2
Help to people	68.7	73.0	76.7	87.0	62.5	60.9	70.2	76.8	69.7
Useful job	65.5	78.8	77.4	85.3	84.6	57.8	65.0	68.6	62.4
<i>B. Accomplished characteristics of work:</i>									
Security	36.4	24.2	29.9	40.3	20.8	46.6	35.8	41.0	55.7
Reward	7.4	5.0	4.8	19.8	4.9	18.5	11.1	15.3	17.0
Promotion	7.0	7.0	5.3	16.4	8.3	12.8	13.0	15.2	20.1
Interesting	42.6	32.7	32.3	45.8	30.1	56.9	48.0	48.2	74.8
Independence	48.1	37.6	26.5	46.5	26.6	59.3	55.0	53.7	83.0
Help to people	43.9	37.6	32.8	46.9	33.7	33.6	47.1	40.4	64.6
Useful job	50.9	40.0	44.5	46.8	45.6	42.4	38.7	38.9	65.6
<i>Difference B-A:</i>									
Security	-53.2	-71.4	-57.4	-54.8	-75.0	-50.3	-60.8	-46.8	-35.6
Reward	-71.5	-91.4	-89.6	-73.1	-93.4	-59.0	-66.6	-43.0	-53.1
Promotion	-41.0	-65.5	-63.8	-64.6	-66.7	-61.2	-65.3	-62.5	-29.4
Interesting	-46.3	-51.0	-55.5	-47.5	-49.7	-40.5	-47.5	-45.3	-21.8
Independence	-8.7	-32.8	-48.0	-39.1	-31.1	-32.2	-11.6	-32.4	-0.2
Help to people	-24.8	-35.4	-43.9	-40.1	-28.8	-27.3	-23.1	-36.4	-5.1
Useful job	-14.6	-38.8	-32.9	-38.5	-39.0	-15.4	-26.3	-29.7	3.2

rewards and job promotions. The Czech Republic and Slovenia are somewhat closer to the West in certain aspects. Regarding the values met in the respondent's current job, Western populations declare themselves to be more satisfied in all aspects of their work and job than Eastern ones. On average, the least satisfied populations are in Poland, Bulgaria and Hungary, while the Czech Republic is much closer to Western countries such as Germany. However, the absolute winner is Sweden, where in some aspects, the desired values are fully met, even, surprisingly, with regard to independent work (see Table A3).

The survey investigates four criteria for rewarding work. Each of them represents a different system of distribution: performance (meritocracy), family burden or need (socialist approach), formal qualification (credentials) and loyalty to the firm (traditional). While the first criterion is fairly distinct from the others, the last three are somewhat associated when calculating the international sample as a whole. Furthermore, while people of all nations mostly agree that "how well the person does the job" is essential or very important for rewarding work, the national samples do differ with respect to other criteria.

**Table A3. Criteria for rewarding work (percentage of answers „essential“ and „very important“)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>How well the person does the job:</i>	90.6	86.3	91.9	88.9	95.8	90.6	84.1	78.4	86.8
<i>Family responsibilities:</i>	21.9	39.8	33.7	27.7	30.8	27.1	25.6	47.6	16.9
<i>Education and formal qualifications:</i>	56.8	54.0	63.1	67.4	67.0	26.1	32.8	34.7	41.5
<i>How long the person has been with the firm:</i>	28.7	43.3	48.8	46.9	42.0	24.7	26.8	29.2	25.0

There is no clear East/West distinction in this regard. The highest evaluation of family responsibilities does not occur in the countries where state paternalism ruled, or in social-democratic Scandinavia, but rather in the mostly Protestant Netherlands. This contrasts with the (formerly communist) Czech Republic and (the truly socialist) Sweden. With regard to formal skills, some distinctions appear which put the CEE countries in contrast with Western Europe (West Germany and Great Britain and the Netherlands). Loyalty to the firm is appreciated in all CEE countries, with the exception of the Czech Republic, where it reaches the low level that is common to all the Western European countries under observation (see Table A4).

Respondents were confronted with three kinds of choices: employee vs. self-employed, small vs. big firm, and private vs. public organisation. There is only one axis for all three questions in the international sample as a whole: private and small firms against state and

**Table A4. Criteria for choosing a job (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Being an employee/self-employed:</i>									
employee	53.3	45.4	14.7	35.0	39.7	29.9	49.7	61.4	54.1
self-employed	36.7	51.1	62.8	48.5	53.4	53.3	41.3	32.9	36.4
can't decide	10.1	3.5	22.5	16.5	6.9	16.8	9.0	5.7	9.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Working in a small firm/large firm:</i>									
small firm	67.9	55.3	38.5	56.9	41.0	48.7	56.7	65.8	64.2
large firm	19.6	38.8	38.2	27.7	37.5	31.9	26.9	23.1	23.3
can't decide	12.5	6.0	23.3	15.3	21.4	19.4	16.4	11.1	12.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Working in a private firm/state firm:</i>									
private	41.3	50.1	31.7	25.3	33.2	48.8	62.4	58.8	64.7
state	42.8	43.2	52.1	63.8	56.5	35.9	17.3	23.0	18.2
can't decide	16.0	6.7	16.2	10.9	10.3	15.3	20.3	18.1	17.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table A5. Difficulty or ease of finding an acceptable job (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Very easy	5.9	2.1	4.8	4.1	2.6	2.1	3.0	6.7	4.6
Fairly easy	15.7	9.0	16.1	9.1	7.1	10.6	21.8	23.5	20.7
Neither nor	20.5	13.8	16.1	20.9	8.2	23.2	15.8	18.7	15.9
Fairly difficult	31.6	28.4	32.5	38.1	20.4	33.7	34.1	27.2	30.9
Very difficult	20.4	44.6	21.6	25.3	56.8	22.9	24.3	21.3	24.7
Cannot choose	5.9	2.1	8.9	2.5	4.8	7.6	0.9	2.6	3.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean*	3.5	4.1	3.6	3.7	4.3	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.5
Unemployment rate	5.2	11.6	13.9	7.1	13.7	9.9**	7.0	5.2	8.3

\* The mean is computed so that „very easy“=1 and „very difficult“=5, while „cannot choose“ is put as missing.

\*\* In Germany as a whole.

big ones. Again, it is not easy to find any specific East/West distinction. The Czechs (like all the “Westerners”) are inclined toward the status of employee, while all other “Easterners” prefer self-employment. The choice of a small firm is especially notable among the Czechs, the Slovenes, the Dutch and the Swedes, while large firms are preferred by all other “Easterners”. The preference for a state firm is the only characteristic where a distinction between Western and Eastern countries is quite regular, but again the exception is the Czech population, which balances between both (see Table A5).

The sense of it being relatively easy or difficult to find another acceptable job (were one to really put an effort into the search) is a reflection of two features of the labour market. On the one hand, it indicates the openness of a free market in contrast with the closed nature of job structures under the communist regime. On the other hand, in the former communist countries, it also indicates the lower level of appraisal given to one’s job, which could be a consequence of the guarantees produced by the former regime – work was employment rather than a job. The question may thus indicate both the difficulty in finding a new job as a reflection of the rigidity of the labour market and as a reflection of the level of appreciation a worker feels towards the job currently held.

The survey shows a high level of perceived ease when it comes to finding a new job in most Western countries – Great Britain, the Netherlands and Sweden – with the Czech Republic and Poland not far behind. In contrast, in the other Eastern countries (but also in West Germany), the job search is perceived as rather difficult. We could thus talk about a prevailing Eastern European pessimism, contrasting with the prevailing Western European optimism, but with a great many “exceptions”. How much this attitude correlates with the national unemployment rate is rather ambiguous: Western countries differ much more in their unemployment rates than in terms of the perception of how easy it is to find a job; among Eastern countries, the most striking exception is Poland, with both a high rate of unemployment and a high level of perceived ease in finding another job, which can hardly be objectively true.

If we compare the perceived ease or difficulty of finding another acceptable job with

**Table A6. Feelings about a person's job (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Works only as hard as he/she has to:</i>	13.1	10.8	24.5	11.1	57.0	7.5	11.0	6.6	6.0
<i>Works hard, but not so that it interferes with the rest of his/her life:</i>	33.7	53.6	37.6	33.5	23.3	37.2	43.5	63.2	26.4
<i>Makes a point of doing the best work:</i>	51.7	35.6	34.4	54.0	18.1	52.3	44.5	28.5	66.5
Can't choose	1.5		3.5	1.3	1.5	3.1	1.0	1.7	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

the multidimensional evaluation of one's current job, one clear regularity emerges in almost all countries: the more interesting the job, the higher the perceived difficulty in finding an appropriate alternative. This rule is most conspicuous in Hungary and Slovenia, and in Germany and the Netherlands. By contrast, any similar correlation with a well-paid job is much weaker, except in Slovenia. In neither case does any such connection appear in Sweden, where jobs on all levels seem to meet people's requirements. The absence of any East/West distinction indicates that the appeal of an interesting and well-paid job is certainly not regime-specific.

The answers regarding the intensity with which a respondent performs his or her job do not produce many surprising results. As we could expect, the Germans and the Swedes rank themselves as the most hard-working nations. Almost one-half of Britons also feel they work hard, which is less than the percentage of Czechs and Slovenes. The Bulgarians declare themselves to be the most relaxed nation, followed – at a substantial distance – by the Poles and the Hungarians. The strongest declaration of having a “balance” between work and life comes from the Dutch respondents. Here again, the attitude towards work performance transcends the East/West borderlines, as well as any other regional boundaries.

It might seem senseless to ask people whether they would want to earn less money. But in relation to fewer working hours, it makes sense at least in the most developed countries, where a higher standard of living has already been reached. Between 5 and 15 percent of respondents in the Western countries respond positively to the question, while only a maximum of 5 percent do so in the Eastern countries. By contrast, between one- and two-thirds of Easterners would accept working more hours for more money. The cleavage between

**Table A7. Work longer and earn more, or not (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Longer	34.9	35.2	49.0	34.4	63.9	19.7	21.4	17.8	16.2
Same	52.6	55.6	35.4	57.7	31.0	63.7	66.4	67.6	62.4
Fewer	5.0	4.9	2.2	3.0	0.9	9.8	4.9	11.3	16.0
Can't choose	7.6	4.2	13.5	4.9	4.1	6.8	7.3	3.2	5.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
GDP per capita in ,000\$*	8.9	6.1	5.5	6.2	4.4	19.5	18.0	18.8	17.1

\* GDP per capita in thousand USD adjusted to PPP in 1994 (World Development Report 1996).

### 3. A description of the main results

**Table A8. Working conditions (percentage of answers „always“ and „often“)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Comes home from work exhausted:</i>	22.8	27.2	29.3	28.5	35.3	29.0	29.2	10.3	27.9
<i>Has to do hard physical work:</i>	13.2	16.5	22.1	11.2	16.1	13.6	15.2	9.5	19.6
<i>Finds the work stressful:</i>	14.1	22.3	19.6	21.3	16.8	25.4	23.0	17.0	32.7
<i>Works in dangerous conditions:</i>	13.2	13.5	13.4	12.7	14.9	7.1	7.8	3.8	7.2

“transitional” and “rooted” capitalism seems quite striking here. The differences follow performance of the national economy (here indicated by GDP per capita adjusted to purchasing power parity).

A subjective evaluation of working conditions indicates a high percentage of people who complain of work-induced fatigue, both in the East and the West. The highest figure, which is found in Bulgaria, contrasts with the “relaxed” statement referred to above, that one works only as hard as s/he has to (and it contributes to some suspicion about the consistency of attitudes in that country). Apparently, there is more hard physical work in the East than in the West, with the somewhat surprising exception of Sweden. Conversely, work is found to be stressful more often in the West, but also in Slovenia and Hungary. The only clear distinction between the East and the West is in reference to the dangerous conditions of one’s work (see Tables A9–11).

With regard to working hours and the individual discretion a person has over when to start and finish work, there is a systemic difference between the East and the West. In the East, starting and finishing times are more often set by employers, while in the West a person can more often decide, within certain limits, their own starting and finishing times. An exceptionally high percentage of people declaring they are entirely free in this sense are found in Poland – which can be explained by it also having the highest percentage of farmers. Among the Eastern countries, the Czech Republic appears the most liberal in terms of working hours.

**Table A9. Working hours (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Starting and finishing times are decided by employee:</i>	56.6	63.9	60.8	61.5	75.3	45.7	51.7	49.3	32.4
<i>Person can decide the time within certain limits</i>	32.3	23.4	21.7	29.8	14.7	43.4	38.7	42.6	55.5
<i>Person is entirely free to decide when to start and finish work</i>	11.1	12.6	17.5	8.7	10.1	10.9	9.6	8.1	12.1
Total	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table A10. Usual location of work (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>In one place away from work</i>	77.0	76.4	68.7	79.7	89.4	73.2	74.3	70.5	77.4
<i>At home</i>	2.9	3.1	3.9	3.6	1.9	2.5	2.9	3.2	2.2
<i>Part of the week at home and part at one place away from home</i>	6.6	3.7	8.4	3.4	3.1	8.7	2.1	5.8	2.3
<i>In a variety of places</i>	13.4	16.8	18.9	13.4	5.6	15.5	20.7	20.5	18.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table A11. Work contract (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>No written contract</i>	5.2	13.4	11.3	5.1	13.6	10.3	20.6	8.5	14.7
<i>A fixed-term job lasting less than 12 months</i>	6.1	5.4	5.9	8.3	9.1	2.1	2.6	4.1	5.3
<i>Fixed-term job lasting for one year or more</i>	7.6	6.8	7.0	9.3	15.6	6.7	10.3	17.8	3.3
<i>A job with no set limit</i>	77.7	73.6	69.2	76.4	61.0	76.4	60.7	67.2	71.6
<i>Cannot choose</i>	3.3	0.8	6.5	0.9	0.7	4.5	5.8	2.5	5.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The usual location of work is still traditional for about 70–90 percent of both Eastern and Western Europeans. However, a greater flexibility in work location is already apparent among Western countries, whether this means being partly at home or in a variety of places. Also, the figures concerning work contracts indicate a somewhat higher degree of non-standard contracts (no written contract in Great Britain and Sweden) in the West, or the frequent use of fixed-term contracts (Netherlands). But any comparison between the East and the West must be biased, owing to the much higher share of farmers in the Eastern countries, especially in Hungary, Poland and Bulgaria (see Tables A12–13).

Stability in a job, and the ensuing cumulative experience, in some sense contrasts with functional flexibility. It expresses the “traditional” virtues of having a life-long job and occupation. Surprisingly, the utilisation of past work experience among Western countries is highest in Sweden, followed by Germany. The figures on Eastern countries reveal a high level of labour mobility during the transition period, which contrasts with the forced job stability that existed under the communist regime. A similar variation is to be found in the figures on the utilisation of formal education and training. In all regards, the Western labour force mani-

**Table A12. Utilisation of past work experience and job skills (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Almost none	12.2	12.1	18.6	9.4	15.8	7.1	11.8	16.6	3.6
A little	18.6	23.0	19.4	16.4	19.7	9.5	23.1	21.3	8.8
A lot	29.7	18.0	26.6	33.2	22.3	32.5	24.4	34.1	33.8
Almost all	36.7	46.4	18.0	37.7	40.0	46.0	37.3	24.3	52.5
Can't choose	2.8	0.5	17.3	3.2	1.8	4.9	3.5	3.8	1.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0

**Table A13. Utilisation of formal education and of training or experience (percentage of answers „very important“ and „important“)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Utilisation of formal education:</i>									
	46.9	28.7	33.7	36.0	29.7	45.2	34.9	36.3	60.5
<i>Utilisation of training or experience:</i>									
	48.0	35.0	39.2	54.2	42.6	56.1	56.3	50.9	90.9

festes more continuity in occupational careers, while the Eastern labour force more mobility, with a large degree of variability within both groups. While Sweden seems to be an extremely stable country, Poland shows itself to be the country that makes least use of experience, education and training. The use of formal education is also pronounced in the Czech Republic and Germany – both being typical “credential societies” (see Tables A14–15).

With regard to relations in the workplace, between management and employees, and among employees/colleagues themselves, the most relaxed country appears to be Sweden. However, all the other Western countries display better relations than the Eastern ones. Among the latter, the Czech Republic scores highest. Also, indicators of loyalty to the employer differ somewhat between the East and West, to the detriment of the Eastern countries. Moreover, while in the West, a person’s self-respect with regard to their job is high and the intention to change jobs is low, the opposite is true in Eastern countries, except Slovenia. The aversion to changing one’s current job for a bit more pay is highest in Germany and Sweden (where the standard of living is high) but is also high in the Czech Republic (where

**Table A14. Relations at the workplace (percentage of answers „very good“ and „quite good“)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Between management and employees:</i>									
	38.3	30.6	32.6	28.1	32.8	53.2	45.6	41.8	63.8
<i>Between employees/colleagues:</i>									
	50.8	40.2	43.9	44.9	37.2	60.9	60.0	52.6	86.5

**Table A15. Loyalty to the employer (percentage of answers „strongly agree“ and „agree“)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Willing to work harder in order to help the firm or organisation to succeed:</i>	38.7	30.6	24.7	35.8	30.8	39.9	41.0	40.3	50.0
<i>Proud to be working for the firm or organisation:</i>	29.0	26.6	28.6	39.9	20.2	34.1	36.2	37.0	56.8
<i>Given to chance, present type of work for something different:</i>	28.2	15.8	24.7	26.9	26.3	19.8	24.1	20.0	31.1
<i>Would turn down another job that offered a bit more pay in order to stay with the present:</i>	16.7	7.1	10.1	13.5	14.7	15.9	12.8	13.5	16.0
<i>Proud of the type of work he/she does:</i>	31.5	29.5	29.0	44.3	27.3	42.3	42.0	43.6	65.7

**Table A16. Worry about the possibility of losing the job (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Worry much	7.8	8.2	10.3	17.1	26.6	9.8	7.1	4.0	8.2
Worry some	24.6	9.4	18.7	33.0	29.9	21.5	21.0	8.6	13.3
Worry a little	46.7	46.7	29.3	24.3	29.1	30.6	31.3	23.5	30.0
Don't worry	20.9	35.6	41.7	25.6	14.5	38.1	40.6	63.9	48.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean*	2.2	1.9	2.0	2.4	2.7	2.0	1.9	1.5	1.8
Unemployment rate	5.2	11.6	13.9	7.1	13.7	9.9**	7.0	5.2	8.3

\* The mean is computed so that „don't worry“ = 1 and „worry much“ = 4.

\*\* In Germany as a whole.

**Table A17. Probability of trying to find another job (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Very likely	6.2	3.5	6.8	4.9	11.9	6.9	14.3	7.7	7.8
Likely	13.2	9.4	20.3	7.8	32.1	8.9	12.5	12.4	9.3
Unlikely	32.7	34.7	35.5	17.6	35.7	20.5	24.6	34.4	25.8
Very unlikely	48.0	52.5	37.4	69.7	20.2	63.7	48.5	45.5	57.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean*	1.8	1.6	2.0	1.5	2.4	1.6	1.9	1.8	1.7

\* The mean is computed so that „very unlikely“ = 1 and „very likely“ = 4.

**Table A18. Satisfaction in the job (percentages)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Very satisfied	28.3	22.2	26.0	27.0	26.7	38.6	35.0	48.0	40.1
Rather satisfied	50.7	38.5	55.5	39.7	48.8	42.4	44.5	42.2	42.1
Neither-nor satisfied	14.3	30.4	11.3	26.3	14.1	13.8	9.2	5.8	11.7
Fairly dissatisfied	4.6	5.7	6.1	5.3	6.7	4.0	7.9	2.8	4.4
Rather dissatisfied	2.0	3.3	1.1	1.7	3.7	1.3	3.3	1.2	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean*	3.99	3.71	3.99	3.85	3.88	4.12	4.00	4.32	4.14

\* The mean is computed so that „very satisfied“ = 5 and „very dissatisfied“ = 1.

the reason is rather an aversion to mobility). The Hungarians reveal themselves to be the most sensitive to a pay increase (see Tables A16-17).

There is only a small systemic difference between the East and the West with regard to concerns about losing one's job. While Hungary and Poland have about the same average level as Germany and Great Britain, the Czechs, the Slovenes and, in particular, the Bulgarians declare a higher degree of concern. By contrast, the least amount of worry is evident in the Netherlands and Sweden (of 1996). The correlation between such worries and the unemployment rate is evidently weak. Conversely, the probability that a respondent will be seeking another job within the next 12 months does to a good extent reflect the concern over losing one's job (correlation coefficient 0.21-0.25 in all countries except Slovenia).

Satisfaction in the job varies much less among countries than the conditions of work and jobs, including rewards. It might be influenced by various factors such as high security and considerable wage levels, as in the Netherlands, Germany and Sweden. In Eastern countries, there are definitively fewer people who are completely satisfied, but more people declare that they are rather satisfied. The percentage of dissatisfied people is thus highest in Great Britain and Bulgaria. A systemic difference between the Western and Eastern countries can be found only on the highest level of satisfaction. The most happy among the Eastern countries appears to be the Czech Republic, with 28 percent of people very satisfied,

**Table A19. Decisions relating to the current work situation**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Full-time job	60.0	69.6	76.0	73.7	68.6	55.3	51.8	47.8	54.8
Part-time job	30.0	26.7	15.4	20.6	25.7	35.4	38.1	35.8	41.0
Less than 10 hours	3.9	1.7	3.7	2.5	2.5	4.7	4.5	6.1	2.3
No paid job	6.0	1.5	4.9	3.2	3.1	4.6	5.6	5.7	1.9
Cannot choose	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table A20. Decisions on working hours and pay**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	West Germany	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
More hours, more pay	34.9	35.2	49.0	34.4	63.9	19.7	21.4	17.8	16.2
Same hours, same pay	52.6	55.6	35.4	57.7	31.0	63.7	66.4	67.6	62.4
Less hours, less pay	5.0	4.9	2.2	3.0	0.9	9.8	4.9	11.3	16.0
Can't choose	7.6	4.2	13.5	4.9	4.1	6.8	7.3	3.2	5.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

but followed closely by the other countries at 26–27 percent, with the exception of Hungary (see Table A19–20).

In a strict sense, there are only a few questions on work flexibility in the ISSP survey. The first raises a hypothetical choice between a full-time or a part-time job. Here, the systemic difference between the East and the West appears clearly. The Czech Republic is closest to the Western countries, as “only” 60 percent of workers would prefer a full-time job. The figure is much less in all Western countries and much more in all Eastern countries. A similar, if not even bigger, systemic difference becomes visible when comparing nations in a hypothetical choice between the willingness to work more hours for higher earnings or less hours for lower earnings. Most Western populations prefer the status quo, while a considerable portion of the Eastern populations would opt for more money for more work. In Poland and Bulgaria in particular, this refers to the majority of the population. The Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovenia are on about the same level.

### **B. EVS survey**

Unlike the 1997 ISSP module, which was devoted to work values entirely, work and job issues were only one of several areas of interest for the European Values Study. This means that our analysis is rather limited in this sense. However, as the value context is much broader in the EVS, it is possible to compare the importance of work values relative to other values. It is

**Table B1. Importance of various areas in a respondent's life (percentage of answers „very important“ and „important“)**

	Czech Republic	Slovakia	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Austria	Netherlands	Sweden
Work	94.1	95.7	98.1	96.3	93.7	94.8	94.2	90.3	97.8
Family	98.5	97.8	99.5	97.6	98.0	97.8	98.2	93.1	98.1
Friends	87.5	88.7	86.5	88.2	87.8	69.3	90.7	96.3	94.7
Leisure	81.4	83.8	83.9	80.9	74.1	64.6	87.8	95.5	93.3
Politics	29.2	29.9	29.6	13.1	31.8	28.4	41.4	55.5	55.4
Religion	15.9	54.6	82.7	33.2	43.4	83.1	49.5	32.7	31.6

**Table B2. Satisfaction and freedom in the job (points on 10-point scale)**

	Czech Republic	Slovakia	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Austria	Netherlands	Sweden
1. Satisfaction	7.28	6.68	6.61	7.20	7.15	6.59	7.72	7.52	7.29
2. Freedom	6.24	5.61	5.87	6.31	5.82	6.33	7.05	7.55	7.63

Answers are measured on a 10-point scale, where 10=„very satisfied/full freedom“ and 1 „not satisfied/no freedom“. Employed respondents only.

Question:

1. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your job? 2. How free are you to make decisions in your job?

even possible to assume also that the respondents in this survey were much more aware of a broader value context, and thus might respond with an awareness of work in relation to other dimensions of human life, such as family, religion, environment, etc. (see Table B1).

The major values stressed by respondents are the same in all countries: the family is first, work second, and friends third. The only exception is the Netherlands, where work and leisure are both put in first place. Considerable inter-country differences could be found in the ranking of politics and religion. With regard to the importance of political life, there is a clear cleavage between the East and the West. Generally, politics ranks much higher in the West than in the East. This is slightly surprising given the fact that democracy is in its incipient phase in the former communist countries and one might have thought that the suddenly unleashed possibilities for political participation would be more attractive in comparison with the rooted democracy in the West. Conversely, the importance of religion has varying

**Table B3. Opinions about work in general (percentage of answers „very important“ and „important“)**

	Czech Republic	Slovakia	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Austria	Netherlands	Sweden
1. Develop talents	78.0	67.3	91.1	69.5	86.0	80.9	87.8	36.0	44.7
2. One should deserve pay	43.8	52.3	62.1	50.6	68.8	69.5	48.5	22.8	37.9
3. Work for not turn lazy	77.6	77.4	76.9	84.4	62.9	83.1	73.3	30.2	35.9
4. Work is a duty	59.9	61.4	70.6	74.0	72.0	83.6	79.7	52.2	54.7
5. People should not work	34.7	22.8	68.5	17.2	36.5	54.9	13.5	21.5	12.3
6. Work comes always first	51.6	59.0	59.3	52.4	51.7	86.4	53.7	16.9	24.2

1. To fully develop your talents you need to have a job.
2. It is humiliating to receive money without having to work for it.
3. People who don't work turn lazy.
4. Work is a duty towards society.
5. People should not have to work if they don't want to.
6. Work should always come first, even if it means less spare time.

roots and traditions: it ranks very high in two post-communist countries – Poland and Romania – while it is the lowest in the traditionally atheist Czech lands (see Table B2).

The general level of satisfaction in a job is rather high and in most countries it passes seven on a ten-point scale. It is considerably higher in the Western than the Eastern countries, though it remains quite close in some cases (e.g. in Sweden and the Czech Republic). More systemic differences appear with regard to the appreciation of the freedom to make decisions. Here, Western countries score much higher and the respondents' feelings largely correlate with the economic level of the given country. This indicates that the discretion of individuals in the sphere of work is tied to the performance of the economy or – conversely – that the more advanced the economy, the freer the workers are in their decision-making. Here, it is hard to distinguish between the cause and the effect, because it is evidently a self-reinforcing circle (see Table B3).

There is one set of questions regarding various aspects of work. Although most aspects vary – e.g. between work as a duty and work as a way of developing talents – they are mostly inter-correlated, as factor analysis demonstrates. The only opinion that contrasts with all the others is that “people should not work if they do not want to”. Such an opinion is largely shared in Poland and Romania, while almost completely rejected in Sweden and Austria. However, countries located between those two extremes also differ in a considerable way.

**Table B4. Importance of various dimensions of the respondent's work and job**  
(all important items mentioned by respondents marked by 1, else = 0)

	Czech Republic	Slovakia	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Austria	Netherlands	Sweden
1. Good pay	0.77	0.92	0.93	0.87	0.92	0.90	0.68	0.75	0.61
2. Pleasant colleagues	0.66	0.53	0.75	0.91	0.68	0.74	0.71	0.91	0.85
3. Good job security	0.53	0.74	0.79	0.88	0.80	0.88	0.74	0.27	0.49
4. Interesting job	0.59	0.51	0.74	0.93	0.68	0.64	0.61	0.59	0.73
5. Meeting abilities	0.57	0.58	0.66	0.87	0.81	0.78	0.60	0.70	0.41
6. One can achieve something	0.39	0.38	0.67	0.92	0.67	0.72	0.58	0.39	0.73
7. Opportunity, initiative	0.31	0.33	0.56	0.81	0.54	0.56	0.51	0.64	0.54
8. Meeting people	0.36	0.24	0.52	0.71	0.60	0.54	0.47	0.63	0.48
9. Respected job	0.35	0.22	0.65	0.75	0.53	0.70	0.34	0.51	0.29
10. Good hours	0.32	0.46	0.50	0.38	0.65	0.58	0.44	0.39	0.45
11. Responsible job	0.30	0.22	0.52	0.72	0.44	0.57	0.50	0.39	0.56
12. Useful job for society	0.31	0.24	0.47	0.73	0.59	0.65	0.35	0.37	0.25
13. Chances to promote	0.25	0.26	0.50	0.74	0.48	0.59	0.36	0.29	0.32
14. Not much pressure	0.37	0.19	0.63	0.72	0.43	0.34	0.18	0.34	0.36
15. Generous holidays	0.18	0.19	0.30	0.47	0.37	0.39	0.22	0.28	0.20

**Table B4. Importance of various dimensions of the respondent's work and job (factor analysis, rotated factor matrix)**

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Initiative	0.71928	0.04403
Responsible	0.66231	0.11643
Achievement	0.63813	0.10188
Meeting people	0.59832	0.14664
Useful for society	0.58924	0.26885
Interesting	0.57506	0.13623
Abilities	0.57989	0.10860
Respected job	0.56074	0.26643
Promotion	0.54619	0.35568
Colleagues	0.47437	0.18287
Good hours	0.11088	0.68629
Holidays	0.21651	0.66955
Good pay	0.04887	0.56230
Secure job	0.14232	0.56464
No pressure	0.26425	0.54453

The correlation between agreement with such a statement and the economic level of the country is weak, but nonetheless evidently positive.

The opinion "people should not work" is in obvious contrast to the opinion "work always comes first". However, it is surprising that in many countries both opinions are shared by similar percentages of the population, whether this means low or high. The most perceptible countries from this point of view are Sweden and the Netherlands, where only small percentages of respondents agree with such extreme opinions. At the opposite end is Poland, where both opinions are supported by considerable parts of the population. In this single case, nearly 40 percent of respondents agree with both sharply contrasting opinions at the same time. This puts some doubts on the survey data (see Table B4).

In Table B4, the items were ordered according to their importance in the whole set of countries. Good pay, pleasant colleagues and job security rank among the highest values. Work achievements and opportunities for developing initiative and for promotion are mostly in the middle. The absence of pressure and generous holidays are among the last values that people prefer. Factor analysis clearly distinguishes between the cluster of intrinsic values of work (initiative, responsibility, interest, promotion) and the cluster of external conditions of the job (pay, hours, vacations, not too much pressure). This fits well with the result that S.D. Harding and F.J. Hikspoors [1995] found in their comparison of 13 Western countries. As we mentioned above, they distinguish between the factors of "personal development" and "comfort and material conditions".

Value structures differ among countries, however, and the distinction between those two clusters is, to a degree, associated with the distinction between Western and Eastern countries. The distinction is more apparent in the latter cluster than in the former. Job conditions are evaluated as highly important in Bulgaria, Romania, Poland and Slovenia, while as least important in countries such as Sweden and the Netherlands, followed by Austria and the Czech Republic. Achievement values are very high in Slovenia and quite high in Western countries, while they are extremely low in both succession countries of former Czechoslovakia (see Table 5).

**Table B5. Preferences for individual or state responsibility (points on 10-point scale)**

	Czech Republic	Slovakia	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Austria	Netherlands	Sweden
1. Responsibility	4.85	6.29	5.70	6.47	5.01	4.97	3.97	4.67	4.25
2. Unemployment	4.81	4.81	4.57	3.70	5.40	4.64	4.06	5.35	3.97
3. Competition	3.21	3.56	3.91	3.19	3.33	2.84	3.18	4.68	3.52
4. Firms	5.94	7.03	6.57	5.41	5.22	6.37	4.01	5.47	3.87
<i>Average 1-4</i>	<i>4.70</i>	<i>5.42</i>	<i>5.18</i>	<i>4.69</i>	<i>4.74</i>	<i>4.71</i>	<i>3.81</i>	<i>5.04</i>	<i>3.90</i>
5. Incomes	5.60	.	6.26	4.10	6.55	3.63	4.76	6.19	.
<i>Average 1-5</i>	<i>4.88</i>	.	<i>5.40</i>	<i>4.57</i>	<i>5.10</i>	<i>4.49</i>	<i>4.00</i>	<i>5.27</i>	.
6. Ownership	4.62	.	5.68	.	.	4.64	3.39	4.38	.
7. Pension	6.55	.	.	6.22	.	6.54	5.86	.	.
8. Housing	5.75	.	.	.	4.13	4.34	3.63	.	.

Question: How would you place your views on this scale?

1. Individuals should take more responsibility for providing for themselves/The state should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for.
2. People who are unemployed should have to take any job available or lose their unemployment benefits/People who are unemployed should have the right to refuse a job they do not want.
3. Competition is good. It stimulates people to work hard and develop new ideas/Competition is harmful. it brings out the worst in people.
4. The state should give more freedom to firms/The state should control firms more effectively .
5. Incomes should be made more equal/There should be greater incentives for individual effort
6. Private ownership of business and industry/Government ownership of business and industry should be increased
7. Each individual should be responsible for arranging his or her own pension/The state should be responsible for everyone's pension
8. Each individual should be responsible for arranging his or her own housing/The state should be responsible for everyone's housing

Overall, European populations think that competition is good but that firms should be controlled by the state more effectively. With regard to taking a strict stance on unemployed people and the responsibility of an individual to provide for himself/herself, both opinions are distributed around the average, with the former a bit lower (the unemployed should take any job) and the latter a bit higher (the state should provide jobs for everyone). National disparities are of course considerable here. The most “etatist” nations (regarding the distribution of responsibilities) are the Slovenes and the Slovaks, followed by the Poles; the least ones are markedly the Austrians. It is again the Austrians, along with the Swedes, who would give the greatest amount of freedom to the firms, in particularly sharp contrast to the Slovaks and the Romanians.

From the average of the four items included in this set, the preference for individual against state’s responsibility returns the following order, from highest to lowest: Austria, Sweden, Slovenia and the Czech Republic, Romania and Bulgaria, the Netherlands, Poland, and Slovakia. The Slovenes score high because of their severe attitude toward unemployed people, while the Romanians are very enthusiastic about competition. Surprisingly, there is a big distance between “socialist” Sweden and the “social-market” Netherlands (not to mention Austria). In the Netherlands, people opt for protectionist measures and income equali-

**Table B6. Expected changes (percentage of answers „it is good news“)**

	Czech Republic	Slovakia	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Austria	Netherlands	Sweden
1. Materialism	48.2	61.6	61.0	62.4	57.8	64.3	48.7	58.7	67.7
2. Work	11.3	8.4	17.2	19.9	39.3	16.1	31.0	39.5	53.5
3. Technology	75.4	79.9	79.9	79.9	84.3	83.8	58.9	47.9	33.5
4. Individual	88.1	87.5	87.2	92.8		90.4	88.6	86.0	90.3
5. Authority	49.5	67.7	53.0	40.3	66.6	86.8	34.8	64.5	22.3
6. Family life	92.2	94.6	93.9	95.4	95.1	96.6	91.2	64.5	75.8
7. Natural life-style	82.1	87.6	85.0	91.3	77.7	85.7	79.3	64.8	83.0
8. Local power	69.2	73.7	53.7	39.9	49.2	75.4	38.7	26.5	35.3

**Question:**

Here is a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or if you don't mind?

1. Less emphasis on money and material possessions.
2. Decrease in the importance of work in our lives.
3. More emphasis on the development of technology.
4. Greater emphasis on the development of the individual.
5. Greater respect for authority.
6. More emphasis on family life.
7. A simple and more natural lifestyle.
8. More power to local authorities.

ty not only more frequently than in the other Western countries, but also more frequently than in several Eastern countries. This is associated with a largely relaxed attitude toward work, which is doubly surprising in such a traditionally hard-working, Protestant country (see Table B6).

While most news regarding possible changes in lifestyle which might occur in the near future are considered to be good, only one such change is considered to be bad by two-thirds of all respondents: this is the decreasing importance work occupies in human life. This testifies to the deep roots of “homo faber” in our hearts and our lacking enthusiasm for the purely consumer lifestyle of post-modern times. However, the Swedes and the Dutch (again) are quite happy about this kind of development, as are the Bulgarians. Both the Czechs and the Slovaks claim to work with pleasure.

In contrast, people welcome more of an emphasis on individual and family life, the trend toward a more natural lifestyle, and less emphasis on money. Core issues are the work/money cluster and the individual/family cluster. While within the first, nations do not differ in terms of the “materialism” value, they do differ considerably in terms of work values. What is good news for the Swedes and the Dutch, who welcome less work in their lives, represents bad news for most Eastern nations. It might be the case that while the populations well accustomed to technology and welfare can quite well imagine a high standard of living without work, the poorer newcomers to the advanced world cannot.

### C. The HWF survey

Strictly speaking, there is only one question on work values in the HWF survey that covers the full range of “HWF countries”: satisfaction with one’s main job. After reporting about their overall satisfaction, respondents were asked about various components of their satisfaction. The contrast between the Eastern and the Western countries is striking – each of the two sets of countries exhibits a great deal of internal homogeneity and a distance toward one another. The most satisfied are the Dutch and the Swedes and the least satisfied are the Czechs, the Hungarians and the Romanians. In all countries, the area of highest satisfaction is with job stability and working hours, while the lowest refers to the item of work locality – which relates to frequent commuting (see Table C1 and C2).

An interesting enough fact is that the average of the individual components is in all cases lower than the level of overall satisfaction – this suggests a value-added of the composite effect of the job. However, while in the Czech Republic, Bulgaria and Romania, partial satisfactions predict the overall index quite well, in other countries the correlations are much lower. Surprisingly, in most cases it is not the item of earnings that contributes most to the overall satisfaction (only in Hungary and Slovenia), but rather stability in the job (in the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Bulgaria and Romania), working hours (in Great Britain) or the locality of work (in Sweden) (see Table C3).

Using regression analysis, it is easy to predict overall satisfaction in a job from partial satisfactions, but it is difficult to do the same from a person’s characteristics. Only the level

**Table C1. Satisfaction with one’s main job (index)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Overall	64.3	65.2	68.8	67.2	65.4	78.2	84.9	81.1
1. Stability	71.1		72.7	67.8	69.2	86.2	91.1	89.1
2. Duration	62.0	77.1	64.5	71.7	67.7	75.8	85.9	72.7
3. Hours	70.9	65.3	74.7	74.1	73.5	83.3	83.6	84.6
4. Locality	49.1	73.8	51.5	44.2	41.0	62.0	71.2	59.6
5. Earnings	60.8	43.3	62.0	61.5	60.7	72.7	79.4	74.0
Average 1–5	63.0		66.2	64.5	64.7	77.4	82.6	77.5

Index is computed so that „very satisfied“ = 100 and „very dissatisfied“ = 0.

**Table C2. Satisfaction with one’s main job (correlations of the overall satisfaction with partial satisfactions)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
1. Stability	0.552		0.320	0.575	0.582	0.397	0.461	0.354
2. Duration	0.511	0.339	0.304	0.452	0.557	0.264	0.311	0.235
3. Hours	0.511	0.464	0.418	0.490	0.537	0.410	0.338	0.267
4. Locality	0.518	0.429	0.301	0.577	0.515	0.347	0.361	0.415
5. Earnings	0.500	0.465	0.469	0.455	0.526	0.331	0.301	0.310

All correlations significant on the level  $P = .000$ .

**Table C3. Overall satisfaction with one's main job (correlation with the person's characteristics)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Sex	0.013 (0.668)	0.054 (0.158)	0.023 (0.586)	0.062 (0.053)	0.052 (0.123)	0.062 (0.113)	0.050 (0.166)	0.006 (0.830)
Age	0.002 (0.948)	0.017 (0.664)	-0.047 (0.264)	-0.016 (0.614)	-0.051 (0.132)	0.004 (0.917)	0.091 (0.011)	0.058 (0.038)
Education	0.112 (0.000)	0.220 (0.000)	0.169 (0.000)	0.112 (0.000)	0.284 (0.000)	-0.027 (0.483)	-0.013 (0.719)	0.016 (0.563)
Self-employed.	0.097 (0.002)	0.075 (0.050)	-0.003 (0.938)	-0.089 (0.005)	0.077 (0.023)	0.080 (0.040)	0.081 (0.023)	0.138 (0.000)
Type of locality	-0.042 (0.185)	-0.096 (0.012)	-0.094 (0.024)	-0.039 (0.226)	-0.165 (0.000)	0.004 (0.924)	-0.001 (0.975)	0.003 (0.928)
Household income	0.116 (0.000)	0.270 (0.000)	0.267 (0.000)	0.233 (0.000)	0.348 (0.000)	-0.050 (0.260)	0.020 (0.616)	0.142 (0.000)
Economic satisfaction	0.155 (0.000)	0.163 (0.002)	0.172 (0.000)	0.186 (0.000)	0.368 (0.000)	-0.024 (0.637)	-0.561 (0.205)	0.158 (0.000)

P level in parentheses.

**Table C4. Liberty in decision-making in the main job (index)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Number of hours	20.9	22.0	21.6	18.0	34.0	30.9	34.0	35.9
Working schedule	17.7	23.2	22.0	18.2	33.5	31.2	42.3	35.8
Overtime work	27.3	25.4	25.4	20.9	42.6	43.8	61.6	58.8
Place of work	19.3	21.4	20.5	18.2	37.2	21.2	25.7	27.7

Answers on decision-making were recoded so that 1 = 'I decide myself' and 0=all other variants.  
P level in parentheses.

of education returns significant results, and surprisingly only in the Eastern countries. This may be caused by the relative scarcity of higher education in these countries, which results in a more pronounced educational hierarchy. It testifies also to the rapid transition changes that opened the doors to educated workers. In some countries (the Czech Republic, Sweden), the status of self-employment contributes to job satisfaction, while in other countries (all the Eastern countries, and Romania in particular) the type of locality is important. This is not the case of the highly urbanised Western countries that have, in addition, a consolidated (and widely supported) agricultural sector (see Table C4).

One important fact is how much a worker feels free in his/her job with regard to decision-making about working hours, work schedules, overtime work and the location of work. One might suppose that the more developed the economy is and the more skilled the labour

**Table C5. Overall satisfaction with one's main job (correlation with liberty in decision-making)**

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Great Britain	Netherlands	Sweden
Number of hours	0.060 (0.054)	0.133 (0.000)	0.006 (0.883)	-0.100 (0.002)	-0.047 (0.164)	0.082 (0.035)	0.074 (0.041)	0.198 (0.000)
Working schedule	0.059 (0.059)	0.116 (0.002)	0.034 (0.417)	-0.095 (0.003)	-0.096 (0.005)	0.090 (0.022)	0.065 (0.072)	0.100 (0.001)
Overtime work	0.086 (0.006)	0.123 (0.002)	0.050 (0.257)	-0.076 (0.019)	0.027 (0.447)	0.042 (0.309)	0.093 (0.014)	0.130 (0.000)
Place of work	0.060 (0.058)	0.120 (0.002)	-0.039 (0.361)	-0.099 (0.002)	-0.077 (0.024)	0.099 (0.011)	0.067 (0.068)	0.117 (0.000)

**Table C6. Imagine that you had no job and could get a new one only under certain conditions.**

Would you be willing to ...

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Great Britain	Netherlands
1. Work more	39.5	.	53.2	57.5	53.6	27.4
2. Migrate	15.9	19.1	26.0	27.3	38.6	25.4
3. Worse work	16.6	25.0	23.7	33.0	27.2	20.3
4. Retrain	57.5	58.0	40.2	46.2	64.3	50.2
5. Language	39.7	44.6	48.6	36.9	57.4	63.2
<i>Count:</i>						
0	48.9	.	32.3	29.2	46.9	28.7
1-2	32.5	.	34.2	33.3	22.4	40.8
3-5	18.6	.	33.4	37.4	30.7	30.5
Mean	1.14	.	1.73	1.96	1.52	1.72

Only „yes“ answers were taken into account. The other two answers were „maybe“ and „no“.

force is, the greater the liberty a worker has in making decisions. To simplify the picture, in table C4 I chose only the answer “I decide” and collapsed all the others into one category (“the employer decides”, “the employer and I decide together”, “it is outside the control of both of us”). We can see a marked contrast between the Eastern and the Western countries, the percentage of “free” workers being roughly one-fifth in the former and one-third in the latter. With regard to overtime work, the figures are obviously much higher. The only exception to this rule is Romania. An attempt to explain this through the existence of a large agricultural population fails because farmers would hardly have much discretion concerning their place of work (see Table C5).

We can find only two countries among those observed in which the overall satisfaction has a significantly positive association with the amount of declared liberty in decision-making on the job: Hungary and Sweden. In most of the other countries, the relationship is positive but insignificant. In Bulgaria and Romania, the correlations are negative, which means, the more freedom, the less satisfaction. This is rather strange, but it could be explained by the fact that a considerable part of the “free” working population is farmers, who have many

**Table C7. Imagine that you were offered a new job position with twice the salary you have now.**

Would you be willing to ...

	Czech Republic	Hungary	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Great Britain	Netherlands
1. Work more	63.9		.	70.1	63.8	31.6
2. Migrate	26.4	26.8	.	36.2	50.3	28.9
3. Worse work	31.8	29.1	.	41.7	39.8	19.1
4. Retrain	67.6	60.9	.	54.1	70.2	46.4
5. Language	49.1	47.5	.	44.2	63.8	60.5
<i>Count:</i>						
0	42.2		.	25.5	46.2	34.7
1-2	25.3		.	25.5	14.2	33.2
3-5	32.5		.	49.1	39.6	32.1
Mean	1.61		.	2.36	1.82	1.70

Only „yes“ answers were taken into account. The other two answers were „maybe“ and „no“.

**Detailed answers:**

1. Work more than 40 hours per week
2. Move (migrate) to another settlement
3. Accept less attractive work conditions
4. Retrain for another occupation
5. Learn a new foreign language

other reasons for dissatisfaction in the transition processes. However, as mentioned above, such an explanation does not fit in the case of Romania.

There are two question sets which refer to something that could be described as skills- and labour-mobility potential, or a readiness to adapt to harder working conditions. The first item evokes the situation of joblessness and asks about the respondent's willingness to accept a new job under certain conditions. The second evokes the situation of an attractive offer for a job with twice the salary of the respondent's current earnings and asks again about the willingness to accept a new job under certain conditions (see Table C6).

It is hard to find a rationale behind the large inter-country diversity in the conditions considered acceptable for taking a new job if unemployed. Apparently, Eastern nations are ready to work more – but the Britons are, too. Western populations are ready to learn a new language – but so are the Slovenes. The choosiest seem to be Dutch workers, who would be reluctant to work more (probably the intensity of work is high enough there already), or accept less attractive work conditions, or – even – retrain. However, they compensate for this reluctance with a readiness to learn a new language. The very opposite case is represented by the Bulgarians, who most of all declare their readiness to work more and to accept worse conditions.

When all the strategies are counted together, we find that almost one-half of Czechs and Britons have zero interest in investing in their own skills or compensating with something else for the sake of obtaining new employment. However, almost one-third of Britons

are ready to accept one of 3-5 strategies or several of them together. The Czechs accept a much narrower scope of potential activities. The most ready to accept any or several strategies are the Bulgarians, in sharp contrast to the Czechs, where only less than one-fifth would be ready to follow any of the proposed strategies. The Czechs score well in retraining, but are laggards in other possible approaches (see Table C7).

In general, the incentive (pull) effect is much stronger than the enforcement (push) effect of unemployment. It is again the Czech Republic where the gap between both “potentials” is the highest (when comparing a mean count of strategies). Bulgaria is in second place, followed by Great Britain and the Netherlands, where both perspectives return the same averages. The Czechs in particular would be more willing to accept poorer working conditions (twice as bad), work more (1.6 times more) and even migrate (also 1.6 times more) to obtain a higher salary than they would for a new job if unemployed.

In any case, there still remain 42 percent of Czechs who would not be interested in any strategy leading to a doubled salary, which is somewhat less than Britons. By contrast, only one-quarter of Bulgarians and one-third of Dutch would not be interested. There are also more Bulgarians and Britons who are ready to accept 3-5 strategies. In this perspective, the structure of attitudes does not respect regime differences at all. The fact that we can compare only four countries makes it difficult to consider the possible reasons. Also surprising is the fact that, in comparison with the British, the Eastern populations – who speak “impractical” minority languages – are less ready to learn a new language (see Table C8).

Unlike the previous questions, the ones about changes in economic and occupational status appear to be purely “objective”. However, as our experience with the Czech data shows, there is a huge difference between labour mobility (usually measured by the Labour Force Surveys (LFS)) and the respondents’ retrospection. Certainly the main reason is that the LFS cannot cover such a long period of time, their analyses being limited to one year (five quarters exactly). The other reason is that the LFS do not indicate such a broad spectrum of changes. Last but not least, people often perceive as important changes even other events that cannot be measured by statistics, i.e. when comparing a reported status in two periods.

The objective of the question that prompted respondents to report on changes over a long period of time (which was used several times in the Czech surveys) was to demonstrate the huge changes that occurred during the first transition decade in the reforming countries in comparison with the advanced Western countries. Given the non-obligatory status of the question, there is only one “benchmark country” in the West – Great Britain. Against all expectations, the various mobility flows are much higher in the politically and economically “stable” Great Britain than in the post-communist, transforming Czech Republic and Slovenia.

The most mobile population appears to be the Bulgarians, as among them only one-fifth has not registered any change. This contrasts with the most immobile, the Czech population, where “only” 55 % of respondents have moved in some sense. A first glance at the survey data raises some doubts about their reliability: while the percentage of labour force entrants ranges between 15 and 25 percent, the percentages for those leaving the labour force (newly retired people) vary extremely. Unfortunately, no demographic statistics have been found that could yet confirm or revise our results.

In the second part of the table, only those respondents remaining in the labour force for the entire period under observation have been kept. The percentage ranges from two-thirds in Slovenia and the Balkan countries to nearly three-quarters in the Czech Republic and Great Britain. Here an extreme difference can be found between Bulgaria, which exhibits

**Table C8A. Have any of the following changes occurred in your occupational life since 1989?**

**A. All respondents**

	Czech Republic	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Great Britain
1. Entered employment	23.8	20.0	20.7	14.5	15.3
2. Retired	3.8	16.9	9.9	24.0	11.7
3. Changed job once	30.8	17.2	15.2	17.6	15.2
4. Changed job more times	25.7	12.2	20.8	10.1	27.5
5. Changed profession once	24.5	9.5	9.6	9.1	8.5
6. Changed profession more	13.3	4.7	10.5	4.7	8.1
7. Started private business.	24.2	6.5	7.0	5.7	6.7
8. Promoted	22.6	16.9	6.7	8.3	21.3
9. Demoted	9.6	3.4	1.8	1.2	2.0
10. Started second job	15.6	7.1	4.6	5.4	7.6
11. Lost employment once	18.8	13.1	19.5	14.9	10.1
12. Lost employment more times	8.3	3.6	16.7	3.3	4.6
<i>Count</i>					
0	45.2	40.4	19.5	38.7	26.0
1-2	26.1	43.6	61.5	48.1	55.6
3 and more	7.3	16.1	19.0	13.2	18.5

**Table C8B. Have any of the following changes occurred in your occupational life since 1989?**

**B. Respondents in the labour force over the entire period**

	Czech Republic	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Great Britain
<i>Percent of the sample</i>	<i>72.5</i>	<i>65.6</i>	<i>69.7</i>	<i>62.7</i>	<i>73.0</i>
3. Changed job once	31.3	14.7	16.9	19.1	18.6
4. Changed job more times	25.7	9.3	21.9	10.1	27.2
5. Changed profession once	24.9	7.2	10.3	10.5	9.4
6. Changed profession more	13.1	3.5	10.8	4.9	7.7
7. Started private business	26.4	5.7	8.2	6.8	7.8
8. Promoted	23.6	16.1	6.2	6.9	22.3
9. Demoted	10.0	3.5	1.9	1.2	2.2
10. Started second job	13.4	5.5	3.9	5.4	6.4
11. Lost employment once	16.8	12.2	23.0	17.4	11.3
12. Lost employment more times	7.6	3.1	18.5	3.9	4.2
<i>Count</i>					
0	50.0	57.7	36.2	60.4	39.7
1-2	24.8	30.2	48.9	29.6	45.4
3 and more	25.2	12.1	14.9	10.1	15.0

high mobility (64 %), and Romania, reporting only low mobility (40 %). In comparison with Romania, in Bulgaria there are twice as many people who report a change of job more than once, and almost five times as many people who report multiple spells of unemployment. In the Czech Republic, the most individual changes are observed, but they occur mostly in parallel – while one-half of respondents declare no change, one-quarter report more than three.

In many cases, various “typical” mobility shifts can be found in individual countries. In Bulgaria, there are repeated job losses followed by repeated spells of unemployment. In contrast, in Romania, there are many single instances of a job loss and ensuing single spells of unemployment. One might wonder whether the actual situation in the two Balkan countries is really as different as the survey data suggest.

In the Czech Republic, the typical biographical event is a job change paralleled by a change of occupation. The country is similar to Great Britain in terms of high job mobility, but dissimilar in the sense that this mobility involves a change of occupation at the same time. Moreover, a change of profession is also often linked to self-employment in the Czech Republic. We identified 11 percent of respondents (permanently in the labour force) for whom job mobility also involves a change of profession and the starting up of a private business, as opposed to about 2 percent in all other countries. There is also a considerable portion of respondents who declare three or more job changes.

#### 4. Conclusion and discussion

All the information presented here is subjective and could hardly be anything else. Most of the relevant data could never be collected in standard statistical surveys. The comparability and reliability of subjective perceptions are probably lower than that of hard statistical data. However, the importance of such “soft” dimensions in real economic life is probably as great as the weight of “objective” dimensions. Moreover, looking behind the scene, where “hard” statistical data are actually forged, we might often be surprised by the problematic ways in which information is collected from companies and households, as well as by the great deal of estimation and rule of thumb applied, for example, in the computation of such crucial indicators like the GDP.

The observations here at present are cross-national, and do not take any time dimension into account. Although the time span of the surveys used covers five years, they do not offer us any knowledge about how they may have changed over time. This is because the questions are different (any detail in formulation matters), as are the questioning frameworks, which are important, too. Thus it is difficult to respond to the otherwise interesting question about to what extent work values in the two halves of Europe are converging. Something like this has been done so far only for individual countries.

From this point of view, the most interesting case is the two parts of Germany, which is a living experiment, because the two regions of formerly a single country (albeit culturally diversified) were separated for decades by a political and economic regime. Therefore, it is surprising that the perception of a respondent’s job did not differ in the two parts of the unified Germany in 1998, and has not changed at all since 1993. While the objective situation certainly did change in the sense of there being a greater similarity of work-styles and job insecurities, its subjective perception did not change at all [Habich, Noll and Zapf 1999]. Job satisfaction was also constant during the 1990–2000 decade, remaining very close in both Germanies [Christoph 2002].

This observation again raises doubts about opinion surveys. It also suggests, however, that our results might not be so much transitory in nature, but rather testimony to a longer-held state of mind. Another experience – not stability in this case, but a comeback – is provided by the Czech surveys on Economic Expectations and Attitudes conducted in 1990–1998. According to these, “capitalist” attitudes of self-reliance and personal investment, paralleled by fears over skill insufficiency and job inaccessibility, expanded somewhat in the early 1990s, but were then replaced by “socialist” attitudes of reliance on the state, paralleled by an exaggerated confidence in one’s own skills and work performance, evident since the mid-1990s. Better put, the liberal attitudes of the first period were apparently only verbal.<sup>1</sup>

One of the main conclusions of our data comparison is that there are considerable differences between the CEE countries and the EU countries under observation with regard to a number of indicators. CEE people appear to be less satisfied with their jobs than EU people, first and foremost owing to unsatisfactory salaries; by contrast, the level of control does not seem to affect satisfaction with work and a job to any great extent. People in the CEE countries also have much less control over different aspects of their work than people in the EU countries; this might be because of the continued importance of big, old-style companies and the not too strong pressure of the modern job requirements.

Despite the differences, there is apparently no “value barrier” which could hinder the EU accession of the new candidates. However, looking at the weak association between the objective job situation and its subjective perception, it seems that the national value systems are rather closed. This corresponds to Pierre Bourdieu’s fundamental observation that “basic economic dispositions like needs, preferences and propensions – towards work, savings, investment, etc. – are not exogenous, i.e. dependent on universal human nature, but endogenous. i.e. dependent on history representing also an economic cosmos in which they are required and re-compensated” [Bourdieu 1997: 51]. Thus every society – as well as its various sections – is a specific economic “field” in which values are reproduced and perceived in its own way.

Regarding the weak association between “subjective” and “objective” indicators, we find, for example, that the perceived difficulty or ease of finding another acceptable job varies much less among countries than the rate of unemployment. Two countries with the same rate of unemployment – Poland and Bulgaria – exhibit in the ISSP survey very different levels of perception regarding the difficulties of finding another suitable job. High satisfaction in the job may be related to comfortable work conditions (Sweden) or to the relaxed attitudes of the workers (Czech Republic). The degree of job satisfaction in the Czech Republic, which in 1996 was among the highest, may be associated with the slow restructuring of the economy, which did not evoke as much anxiety among people about the personal consequences it held for them.

As multivariate analysis attests, while opinions and attitudes are internally quite consistent, they manifest only little association with the objective socio-economic characteristics of workers. Neither the demographic features of workers (sex and age), nor human capital indicators (education) and other labour market variables (union membership) exhibited a large effect on the degree of satisfaction in the present job, fears of losing a job or feelings about finding another acceptable job (Table D1). The effect of the position in the occupational hierarchy and earnings (not in the table) is mostly statistically significant, but also rather weak.

---

<sup>1</sup> The weakening self-assessment and relaxed attitudes of the Czech population are evidenced by the growing gap between them and the experts’ evaluations of various aspects of the Czech labour force (Večerník 2003).

Table D1. Regression analysis of various attitudes

*A. Worry about the possibility of losing the job*

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
SEX	-,110946	,042145	-,027060	-2,632	,0085
AGE	-,016845	,001724	-,101433	-9,770	,0000
W1	,688112	,059267	,145351	11,610	,0000
W3	1,044220	,053521	,250299	19,510	,0000
W4	1,384053	,079406	,199840	17,430	,0000
EDUCYRS	,091953	,006536	,145819	14,069	,0000
WRKHRS	,002362	1,0491E-04	,228752	22,510	,0000
UNION	-,864470	,042896	-,208432	-20,153	,0000
(Constant)	2,888643	,161637	17,871	,0000	
<b>1. Adj R Square</b>	<b>,19906</b>	<b>Increase by</b>			
<b>2. Adj R Square</b>	<b>,28869</b>	<b>,08963</b>			
<b>3. Adj R Square</b>	<b>,28131</b>	<b>,08225</b>			

*B. Difficulty or ease of finding an acceptable job*

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
SEX	,150269	,031747	,051703	4,733	,0000
AGE	,016770	,001299	,142452	12,912	,0000
W1	-,006178	,044644	-,001841	-,138	,8899
W3	-,341266	,040316	-,115398	-8,465	,0000
W4	-,304536	,059815	-,062031	-5,091	,0000
EDUCYRS	-,087750	,004923	-,196308	-17,823	,0000
WRKHRS	2,26540E-04	7,9025E-05	,030957	2,867	,0042
UNION	,146170	,032313	,049718	4,524	,0000
(Constant)	3,891675	,121756	31,963	,0000	
<b>1. Adj R Square</b>	<b>,09555</b>	<b>Increase by</b>			
<b>2. Adj R Square</b>	<b>,11576</b>	<b>,02021</b>			
<b>3. Adj R Square</b>	<b>,19370</b>	<b>,00815</b>			

*C Satisfaction with the job*

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
SEX	-,198372	,044420	-,046898	-4,466	,0000
AGE	-,021370	,001817	-,124732	-11,760	,0000
W1	,804829	,062466	,164789	12,884	,0000
W3	,977042	,056409	,227010	17,321	,0000
W4	,933884	,083692	,130704	11,159	,0000
EDUCYRS	,041375	,006889	,063599	6,006	,0000
WRKHRS	,002517	1,1057E-04	,236300	22,760	,0000
UNION	-,824490	,045211	-,192693	-18,236	,0000
(Constant)	3,672573	,170360	21,558	,0000	
<b>1. Adj R Square</b>	<b>,16404</b>	<b>Increase by</b>			
<b>2. Adj R Square</b>	<b>,19324</b>	<b>,02929</b>			
<b>3. Adj R Square</b>	<b>,21875</b>	<b>,05471</b>			

*Variables used in the regression analysis:*

SEX 1. man 2. woman

AGE in years

AGE2 age squared

W1 government organisation

W2 public-owned firm (omitted)

W3 private firm

W4 self-employed

EDUYRS years of education

WRKHRS hours worked weekly

ISCO88 International Code of Occupations 1988 (ranked downscale according to prestige)

UNION 1. member 2. non-member of trade unions

Nation 1-9 (West Germany omitted)

The first R square is for the enumerated variables.

The second R square is for the enumerated variables plus unemployment rate and GDP.

The third R square is for the enumerated variables plus nation added.

The addition of macroeconomic indicators (the unemployment rate and GDP) increases in some cases the variance explained in a considerable way. In particular, if we take into account attitudes directly concerning labour supply, they contribute by one-third to the variance explained, which increases to 30 percent. However, with regard to satisfaction on the job, the contribution of macroeconomic indicators is much smaller than the contribution of the variable nation, the variance explained reaching 22 percent. Thus we could guess that satisfaction on the job is a more “endogeneous” variable than are fears of unemployment and the perceived chances of finding a new job.

Looking behind the cross-national differences, there are certainly bigger disparities within the individual countries than between them. We had to leave aside such important factors as education, the ownership sector, and the branch and the level of urbanisation. First and foremost, however, differences in economic values and behaviour run across all those lines and distribute people mainly according to much more subtle criteria, such as work commitment or the capacity for invention. Also important are the various network memberships that had already been forged under the communist regime and which expanded immensely under “network capitalism” in the 1990s. Behind the stability and comebacks in value orientations in general, there is an uneven dynamism accompanying the differentiation and crystallisation of attitudes among the population.<sup>2</sup>

In any case, the main question remains open: has the break in regime brought about a true value change? Leaving aside all the methodological limitations of the surveys used here, we must raise some serious doubts about this. First, a deep ideological similarity appears between “communist” (pre-1989) and “neoclassical” behaviour (asserted after 1989), which hinders such a change [Večerník 1998]. Second, when referring to Czech society in particular, “it is not sure if the market and democracy were taken as real challenges, it means as objectives that are difficult to attain and necessitate full engagement and sacrifices of indi-

---

<sup>2</sup> The differentiation and crystallisation of attitudes were documented in Večerník 1996 on the Czech time series of Economic Expectations and Attitudes.

viduals in post-1989 development” [Večerník and Matějů 1999: 296]. Transition was presented as an easy journey and was often limited to the mere re-naming of former institutions and the re-labelling of previous rules, while old habits were maintained. In reality, however, there is no change in society without strain and effort.

Here, the considerations of Mariano Grondona are very inspirational: “The process of economic development reaches a crisis when a nation passes from one stage to the next. It is at that moment when temptations arise... When a nation is rich, something other than the pursuit of wealth must be present in its value system so that the wealth generated never suffices. This non-economic ‘something’ may be salvation, survival, excellence, prestige, or even empire: any value that always be wanting” [Grondona 2000: 44].

Indeed, many temptations appeared after 1989 and the main one lay in the immense wealth ready to be transferred into private hands. This was a unique historical opportunity for the selected ones to be promoted to the new ruling and/or wealthy class. For the rest of the population, this was also a signal that it is not exactly hard work and human capital but other personal characteristics and social capital that determine an individual’s position and wealth. The relaxed attitudes towards traditional work and capitalist virtues were thus to a large extent maintained. As the non-economic “something” that governs over the economic world was largely missing, declarations and behaviour could easily remain separated.

## Data sources

### **A. International Social Survey Programme (ISSP)**

The ISSP is a long-term international research project which originated in 1983 and is based on international and inter-project co-operation in the social sciences. It has four founding members – Social and Community Planning Research (SCPR) from the United Kingdom, the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) from the USA, Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen (ZUMA) from Germany and the Institute of Advanced Studies of the Australian National University. Since 1983, the number of participants has grown continually, reaching 29 in 1998.

Each year, a survey on one topic is conducted in all the participating countries. These topics are then developed by all the participants over several years, and are then discussed at team meetings. At each ISSP annual working conference, modules of survey questions are completed and accepted for the following year, proposals for questionnaires for the next year are presented to all participants for discussion, and a vote on the research topic for the third year is taken. Questionnaires are designed and prepared in British English and their final versions are then translated into the national languages.

The institutes of the participating countries are responsible for the collection, initial preparation and documentation of data for their country. Data files from all countries are brought together, polished, controlled and archived by the Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung at the University of Cologne. Data from the ISSP research project are freely available to the scientific community, including students. Files for all countries are accessible two years after their completion. See the ISSP home page <http://www.issp.org>.

Samples of the 1996 ISSP module “Work Orientations” in the countries under observation, after the above-mentioned selection, include the following numbers of respondents:

<i>Country</i>	<i>Total N of respondents</i>	<i>18-65 years of age</i>
1. Czech Republic	1080	816
2. Hungary	1496	1242
3. Poland	1200	1040
4. Slovenia	1005	875
5. Bulgaria	1004	800
6. Germany (West)	1215	1049
7. Great Britain	1087	891
8. The Netherlands	2267	1887
9. Sweden	1353	1189

### **B. European Values Study (EVS)**

The European Values Study was started in 1978 and the first large empirical survey was organised in 1981. The former Czechoslovakia and eight other post-communist countries joined the project in its second wave in 1991. The survey involved 28 countries altogether (East Germany as a separate country), with a total sample amounting to 36,711 respondents

Here, we are using the third and last wave conducted in 1999 in 27 countries: Austria, Belgium, Belorussia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Ukraine. The project was coordinated by L. Hallman of Tilburg University.

Samples in the countries under observation, after the above-mentioned selection, include the following numbers of respondents:

<i>Country</i>	<i>Total N of respondents</i>	<i>18-65 years of age</i>
1. Czech Republic	1908	1487
2. Slovakia	1331	1153
3. Poland	1095	892
4. Slovenia	1006	875
5. Bulgaria	1000	783
6. Romania	1146	791
7. Austria	1522	1306
8. The Netherlands	1004	847
9. Sweden	1015	892

### C. HWF Cross-Country Survey

A representative sample survey, with at least 1000 individuals in each country, 18–65 years of age. Respondents also reported on their household and other household members. The fieldwork was carried out in the Spring 2001. The HWF questionnaire includes five sections: 1. Detailed information on individual respondents, 2. Information on household members, 3. Work values, 4. Potential flexibility, economic resources of households.

Country	Total N of respondents 18-65 years of age	Type of interview
1. Czech Republic	1556	Face to face
2. Hungary	1166	Face to face
3. Slovenia	1008	Face to face
4. Bulgaria	1806	Face to face
5. Romania	1864	Face to face
6. Great Britain	945	Face to face
7. Netherlands	1007	Telephone
8. Sweden	2292	Telephone

### References

- Beck, U. 1992. *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Beck, U. 2000. *The New Brave World of Work*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bonoli, G. 2000. "Public Attitudes to Social Protection and Political Economy Traditions in Western Europe." *European Societies* 2 (4): 431–452.
- Bourdieu, P. 1997. Le champ économique. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*. Septembre, pp. 48–55.
- Christoph, B. 2002. Weiter deutliche Zufriedenheitsdifferenzen zwischen Ost und West trotz Annäherung in manchen Bereichen. *Informationsdienst Soziale Indikatoren* 28.
- Dahrendorf, R. 1990. *Modern Social Conflict. An Essay on Politics of Liberty*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Diener, E., E. Sandvik, L., Seidlitz, M. Diener 1993. The Relationship between Income and Subjective Well Being: Relative or Absolute? *Social Indicators Research* 28: 195–223.
- Etzioni, A. 1988. *The Moral Dimension. Toward A New Economics*. New York: The Free Press.
- Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic Action and Social Structure: the Problem of Embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology* 91 (3): 481–510.
- Grondona, M. 2000. A Cultural Typology of Economic Development. In: Harrison and Huntington, 2000.
- Habich, R., H.-H. Noll, W. Zapf 1999. Subjektives Wohlbefinden in Ostdeutschland nähert sich Westdeutschem Niveau. *Informationsdienst Soziale Indikatoren* 22.
- Haller, M. 2002. Theory and Method in the Comparative Study of Values. Critique and Alternative to Inglehart. *European Sociological Review* 18 (2): 139–158.
- Harding, S. D., F. J. Hikspoors 1995. New Work Values: in Theory and in Practice. *International Social Science Journal* 145: 441–456.

- Harrison, L. E., S. P. Huntington (eds.) 2000. *Culture Matters. How Values Shape Human Progress*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hechter, M. 1994. The Role of Values in Rational Choice Theory. *Rationality and Society* 6: 318–333.
- Inglehart, R. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mareš, P. 2001. The Czechs: Job and Work. *Czech Sociological Review* 9 (1): 69–84.
- Mason, D. S., J. R. Kluegel 2000. *Marketing Democracy. Changing Opinion about Inequality and Politics in East Central Europe*. Boston: Rowman and Littlefields.
- Meulemann, H. 1996. *Werte und Wertwandel. Zur Identität einer geteilten und wiedervereinigten Nation*. Weinheim/München: Juventa.
- Raiser, M., Ch. Haerpfer, T. Nowotny, C. Wallace 2002. Social Capital in Transition: A First Look at the Evidence. *Czech Sociological Review* 38 (6): 693–720.
- Řeháková, B. 2001. Who Are the Czech Materialists, Post-materialists, and Those Who Are 'Mixed'. *Czech Sociological Review* 9 (1): 35–52.
- Sennet, R. 1998. *The Corrosion of Character*. New York: Norton.
- Suhrcke, M. 2001. Preferences for Inequality: East vs. West. *Innocenti Working Papers* No. 89. UNICEF, Innocenti Research Centre, Florence.
- Teckenberg, W., M. Bayer 1999. Arbeit im Lebenskontext von Italiener und Deutschen. *Annali di Sociologia* 13 (1–2): 173–206. Università degli Studi di Trento.
- Tilly, Ch., Ch. Tilly 1994. Capitalist Work and Labor Markets. Pp. 283–312 in Smelser, N. J., R. Swedberg (eds.), *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*. Princeton University Press and Russell Sage Foundation.
- Toš, H., P. P. Mohler, B. Malnar (eds.) 1999. *Modern Society and Values*. FSS, University of Ljubljana and ZUMA Mannheim.
- Večerník, J. 1986. Wage and Income Disparities: Analysis of Some Problems. Study of the Institute for Philosophy and Sociology of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.
- Večerník, J. 1996. *Markets and People. The Czech Reform Experience in a Comparative Perspective*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Večerník, J. 1998. Transformation in a Socio-economic Perspective. *Prague Economic Papers* 7: 251–262.
- Večerník, J. 2003. Czech Capitalism, Institutional Environment, Work Values and Flexibility. In: Večerník, J., Matějů, P. and Schneider, O. eds. *Why So Difficult?* Praha: ISEA (in Czech).
- Večerník, J., P. Matějů (eds.) 1999. *Ten Years of Rebuilding Capitalism. Czech Society after 1989*. Praha: Academia.
- Yankelovich, D., H. Zetterberg, M. Shanks, B. Strümpel 1985. *The World at Work*. New York: Octagon.

## Shrnutí

Studie předkládá kritické čtení postojových výzkumů týkajících se hodnot práce a zaměstnání. Pro analýzy používáme tři mezinárodních výzkumů – modul ISSP o pracovních orientacích, European Values Study a výzkum provedený v rámci projektu Households-Work-Flexibility. V první části popisujeme některé metodologické problémy a ilustrujeme je na dříve provedených výzkumech. Ve druhé části stručně prezentujeme zdroje dat o hodnotách práce. Ve třetí a nejdelší části pak předkládáme některé výsledky.

Se všemi možnými omezeními dospíváme k závěru, že existují značné odlišnosti mezi zeměmi střední a východní Evropy a sledovanými zeměmi EU v řadě indikátorů. Lidé z reformních zemí jsou mimo jiné méně spokojeni ve svém zaměstnání, především kvůli nízkým výdělkům. Pracovníci tu rovněž mají méně kontroly nad různými aspekty své práce než v zemích EU. Avšak přes značné diference neexistuje nějaká zjevná „hodnotová bariéra“, jež by bránila postupnému přizpůsobení a integraci nových kandidátských zemí.

V závěru pak otevíráme otázku týkající se „opravdové“ hodnotové změny během transformace. Necháme-li stranou všechna metodologická omezení výzkumů, máme o tom určité pochybnosti. Za prvé se ukazuje hlubinná ideologická podobnost mezi „komunistickým“ (před rokem 1989) a „neoklasickým“ chováním (prosazovaným na počátku 90. let), která brání takové změně. Za druhé hovoříme-li zejména o české společnosti, není jisté, do jaké míry byly trh a demokracie v polistopadovém vývoji uchopeny jako skutečné výzvy, tj. cíle obtížné k dosažení a tedy vyžadující plné nasazení a oběti jednotlivců. Transformační proces byl pochopen jako poměrně snadná cesta a v mnoha aspektech omezen na přejmenování předchozích institucí a přeznačení předchozích pravidel a zvyklostí. Pokud jde o tradiční pracovní ctnosti, vlažný postoj do značné míry přetrval.

## **Summary**

The study presents a critical reading of opinion data on work and job values. Three cross-national surveys are used – the ISSP module on Work Orientations, European Values Study and Households-Work-Flexibility survey. In the first part, some methodological problems are described and illustrated using previous research. In the second part, a brief presentation is made of the sources of data on work values. In the third and longest part, several results are displayed.

Taking into account limitations of the method, one of the main conclusions of the data comparison is that there are considerable differences between the CEE countries and the EU countries under observation in a number of indicators. CEE people appear to be less satisfied with their jobs than EU people, first and foremost owing to their unsatisfactory salaries; by contrast, the level of control does not seem to affect satisfaction with work and job to any great extent. People in the CEE countries also have much less control over different aspects of their work than people in the EU countries. Despite the differences, there is no apparent “value barrier” which could hinder the EU accession of the new candidates.

In any case, the main question remains open: has the break in regime brought about a true value change? Leaving aside all the methodological limitations of the surveys, some doubts about this are raised. First, a deep ideological similarity appears between “communist” (pre-1989) and “neoclassic” behaviour (asserted after 1989), which hinders such a change. Second, when referring to Czech society in particular, it is not certain whether the market and democracy were taken as real challenges, this means as objectives that are difficult to attain and necessitate full engagement and sacrifices on the part of individuals in the post-1989 development. Transition was presented as an easy journey and was often limited to the mere re-naming of former institutions and the re-labelling of previous rules while old habits were maintained.

## Zusammenfassung

Die Studie gewährt einen kritischen Einblick in die Meinungsumfragen zu den Werten der Arbeit und der Beschäftigung. Für die Analysen werden drei internationale Umfragen herangezogen – das ISSP-Modul „Work orientations“, die „European Values Study“ und eine Umfrage, die im Rahmen des Projektes „Households-Work-Flexibility“ durchgeführt wurde. Im ersten Teil werden methodologische Probleme beschrieben und anhand früherer Untersuchungen anschaulich gemacht. Im zweiten Teil werden die Datenquellen über die Werte der Arbeit in Kurzform präsentiert. Im dritten und ausführlichsten Teil legen wir dann eine Reihe von Ergebnissen vor.

Mit verschiedenen Einschränkungen gelangen wir zu dem Schluss, dass es bei einer Reihe von Indikatoren zwischen den Ländern Mittel- und Osteuropas und den untersuchten EU-Ländern erhebliche Unterschiede gibt. Die Menschen aus den Reformländern sind unter anderem mit ihrer Arbeitssituation weniger zufrieden, vor allem wegen des geringen Verdienstes. Die Arbeitnehmer hier haben über verschiedene Aspekte ihrer Arbeit auch weniger Kontrolle, als in den EU-Ländern.. Trotz erheblicher Differenzen gibt es jedoch keine sichtbare „Wertebarrriere“, die eine schrittweise Anpassung und die Integration der Beitrittsländer verhindern würde.

Zum Abschluss wenden wir uns dann der Frage der „wahren“ Werteverstärkungen während der Transformation zu. Abgesehen von den methodologischen Grenzen der Umfragen hegen wir daran gewisse Zweifel. Erstens zeigt sich die tiefe ideologische Ähnlichkeit zwischen dem „kommunistischen“ Verhalten (vor 1989) und dem „neoklassischen“ (seit Anfang der 90er Jahre), die eine solche Veränderung verhindert. Zweitens ist, insbesondere im Bezug auf die tschechische Gesellschaft, nicht sicher, in welchem Maße Markt und Demokratie in der Entwicklung nach 1989 als wirkliche Herausforderungen angesehen wurden, d.h. als Ziele, die schwer zu erreichen sind und daher dem Einzelnen vollen Einsatz und auch Opfer abverlangen. Der Transformationsprozess wurde als relativ einfacher Weg betrachtet und beschränkte sich in vielen Aspekten lediglich auf die Umbenennung der früheren Institutionen sowie auf neue Bezeichnungen für Regeln und Gewohnheiten. Im Hinblick auf die traditionellen „Arbeitstugenden“ blieb die laxe Haltung in erheblichem Maße bestehen.

## **PUBLIKACE EDICE SOCIOLOGICKÉ TEXTY/SOCIOLOGICAL PAPERS:**

- SP 03:2 F.Zich, O. Roubal, B. Spalová: Mezigenerační biografická konfigurace obyvatel české části Euroregionu Nisa. 120 s.
- SP 03:1 P. Matějů, B. Řeháková, N. Simonová: Strukturální determinace růstu nerovností. 49 s.
- SP 02:13 E. Rendlová, T. Lebeda: Výzkumy veřejného mínění – teoretické souvislosti a praktická aplikace. 52 s., 100 Kč
- SP 02:12 M. Havelka, M. Tuček, J. Černý, J. Česal, M. Hudema: Skupinové mentality. 85 s., 154 Kč
- SP 02:11 M. Hájek, T. Holeček, J. Kabele, J. Kandert, P. Kohútek, Z. Vajdová: The World of Hierarchies and Real Socialism. 108 s., 190 Kč
- SP 02:10 A. Křížková, L. Václavíková-Helšusová: Sociální kontext života žen pracujících v řídicích pozicích. 48 s., 107 Kč
- SP 02:9 L. Linek, P. Rakušanová: Parties in the Parliament. Why, When and How do Parties Act in Unity?. 73 s., 81 Kč
- SP 02:8 A. Křížková: Životní strategie manažerek: případová studie. 67 s., 129 Kč
- SP 02:7 T. Kostelecký, J. Stachová, D. Čermák: Region a politika. 76 s., 116 Kč
- SP 02:6 M. Hájek, T. Holeček, J. Kabele, J. Kandert, P. Kohútek, Z. Vajdová: Svět hierarchií a reálný socialismus. 97 s., 169 Kč
- SP 02:5 P. Sunega, D. Čermák, Z. Vajdová: Dráhy bydlení v ČR 1960 – 2001. 97 s., 177 Kč
- SP 02:4 Z. R. Nešpor: Reemigranti a sociálně sdílené hodnoty. Prolegomena k sociologickému studiu českých emigračních procesů 20. století se zvláštním zřetelem k západní reemigraci 90. let. 85 s., 148 Kč
- SP 02:3 M. Lux: Spokojenost českých občanů s bydlením. 56 s., 93 Kč
- SP 02:2 N. Simonová: The Influence of Family Origin on the Evolution of Educational Inequalities in the Czech Republic after 1989, 36 s., 73 Kč
- SP 02:1 P. Machonin, M. Tuček: Zrod a další vývoj nových elit v České republice (od konce osmdesátých let 20. století do jara 2002; 64 s., 97 Kč
- SP 01:12 M. Hájek, T. Holeček, J. Kabele, P. Kohútek, Z. Vajdová: Kdo se bojí hierarchií? Dědictví komunistické vlády; 99 s., 133 Kč
- SP 01:11 H. Jeřábek a E. Veisová: 11 September. Mezinárodní internetový komunikační výzkum International On-line Communication Research; 60 s., 95 Kč
- SP 01:10 J. Rychtaříková, S. Pikálková, D. Hamplová: Diferenciace reprodukčního a rodinného chování v evropských populacích; 83 s., 117 Kč
- SP 01:9 T. Kostelecký: Vzestup nebo pád politického regionalismu? Změny na politické mapě v letech 1992 až 1998 – srovnání České a Slovenské republiky; 96 s., 133 Kč

- SP 01:8 M. Novák a K. Vlachová: Linie štěpení v České republice. Komparace národní úrovně s příkladem konkrétní lokality; 32 s., 68 Kč
- SP 01:7 D. Kozlíková: Romská otázka – překážka vstupu České republiky do Evropské unie?; 64 s., 100 Kč
- SP 01:6 P. Soukup: ISSP – Životní prostředí; 74 s., 105 Kč
- SP 01:5 J. Večerník: Mzdová a příjmová diferenciacie v České republice v transformačním období; 66 s., 111 Kč
- SP 01:4 F. Zich: The Bearers of Development of the Cross-Border Community on Czech-German Border; 54 s., 88 Kč
- SP 01:3 P. Sunega: Adresný příspěvek na nájemné v prostředí České republiky: komparace vybraných modelů; 96 s., 138 Kč
- SP 01:2 M. Kreidl: The Role of Political, Social and Cultural Capital in Secondary School Selection in Socialist Czechoslovakia, 1948–1989; 48 pp., 89 Kč
- SP 01:1 P. Štěpánková: Income Maintenance Policies, Household Characteristics and Work Incentives in the Czech Republic; 40 pp., 77 Kč
- SP 00:7 L. Simerská, I. Smetáčková: Pracovní a rodinná praxe mladých lékařek; 70 s., 95 Kč
- SP 00:6 P. Machonin, L. Gatnar, M. Tuček: Vývoj sociální struktury v české společnosti 1988–1999; 70 s., 101 Kč
- SP 00:5 K. Vlachová: Stranická identifikace v České republice; 38 s., 62 Kč
- SP 00:4 M. Kreidl: What makes inequalities legitimate? An international comparison; 54 pp., 80 Kč
- SP 00:3 D. Hamplová: Náboženství a nadpřirozeno ve společnosti (mezinárodní srovnání na základě jednoho empirického výzkumu); 64 s., 90 Kč
- SP 00:2 K. Müller, V. Štědranský: Transformace a modernizace společnosti na příkladech vybraných institucí. První část případových studií: střední průmyslový podnik, softwarová firma, banka, různá zdravotnická zařízení, vysokoškolský institut; 116 s., 109 Kč
- SP 00:1 M. Lux: The housing policy changes and housing expenditures in the Czech Republic; 64 pp., 82 Kč

## **PUBLIKACE EDICE “WORKING PAPERS“**

- WP 99:11 M. Jeřábek (ed.): Geografická analýza pohraničí České republiky; 184 s.
- WP 99:10 M. Kreidl, K. Vlachová: Rise and Decline of Right-Wing Extremism in the Czech Republic in the 1990s; 40 p.
- WP 99:9 B. Řeháková: Vnímané a spravedlivé nerovnosti: vývoj v devadesátých letech a další souvislosti; 46 s.

- WP 99:8 L. Brokl, A. Seidlová, J. Bečvář, P. Rakušanová: Postoje československých občanů k demokracii v roce 1968; 84 s.
- WP 99:7 H. Jeřábek, R. Gabriel, M. Kříž, H. Malečková, M. Novák, E. Pilíková, K. Plecítá, J. Remr, A. Vlachová: Utváření postojů obyvatel českého města I. Lidé s vlivem a osobní mezilidská komunikace při utváření politických postojů v lokální komunitě; 136 s.
- WP 99:6 H. Maříková: Muž v rodině: demokratizace sféry soukromé; 110 s.
- WP 99:5 M. Musilová: Vývoj politiky rovných příležitostí mužů a žen v České republice v kontextu evropské integrace; 60 s.
- WP 99:4 F. Zich: Nositelé přeshraniční spolupráce na česko-německé hranici; 108 s.
- WP 99:3 L. Bušíková: Známosti osobností lokální politiky; 68 s.
- WP 99:2 A. Nedomová (editor), L. Bušíková, E. Heřmanová, T. Kostelecký, Z. Vajdová, P. Vojtěchovská: Trh bydlení, jeho regionální diference a sociální souvislosti; 82 s.
- WP 99:1 M. Tuček, E. Rendlová, M. Rezková, A. Glasová, J. Černý: Odras společenských změn ve veřejném mínění 1990-1998 (analýza dat IVVM); 104 s.
- WP 98:6 K. Müller: Modernizační kontext transformace, strukturální a institucionální aspekty; 82 s.
- WP 98:5 L. Brokl, Z. Mansfeldová, A. Kroupa: Poslanci prvního českého parlamentu (1992-1996); 94 s.
- WP 98:4 M. Lux: Konzervatismus a liberalismus na pozadí percepce sociálního státu; 56 s.
- WP 98:3 M. Tuček a kol.: Česká rodina v transformaci - Stratifikace, dělba rolí a hodnotové orientace; 162 s.

# **Work and Job Values in CEE and EU countries**

**Jiří Večerník**

Edice Sociologické texty/Sociological Papers SP 03:3

Řídí: Marie Čermáková

Překlady: Robin Cassling, Daniel Meier

Redakce: Anna Čermáková

Sazba: Martin Pokorný

Vydal: Sociologický ústav AV ČR

Jilská 1, 110 00 Praha 1

Náklad 170 ks

1. vydání

Prodej zajišťuje Tiskové a ediční oddělení SoÚ

tel.: 222 221 761, fax: 221 183 250

e-mail: prodej@soc.cas.cz