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topics for discussion

I. leave take-up - poor statistics, the survey data
   • Who takes up parental leaves?
   • Why parents did not use the leave?

II. preferences for measures aimed at reconciling work and family
   • Which policy measures are considered as important?

III. duration of leaves, possible ways of its prolongation
   • Users’ and employers’ opinion

IV. Returns to job after parental leave

V. Shortages in care facilities
• *reconciliation of work and family*

• the Eurostat survey, a module of the LFS, 2nd quarter of 2005

• part-time work, work organisation, child care arrangements, parental leave, care patterns

• mothers in the labour market

• The survey of non-random sample of mothers, November 2006, n = 1000 of women, employed in non-agriculture sector, who gave a birth in the years 1995 - 2004; 71% aged 25-34 and 19% aged 35-39; 98% living in cities; 34% with university education and 45% with post-secondary and secondary education

• the survey of employers

• the random sample of n = 1000 firms, November - December 2006, representative by firm size
parental leave take-up (2005)

- during the last 12 month:
  - 2.5% of men / 49.9% of women took the leave
  - 97.1% only leave (no employment)
  - 92.9% without any breaks,
  - 80% full leave (three years)
- allowance received by 69.3% women, (more frequently mothers in rural than urban areas 81.9% and 64.3% respectively)
- the higher the education level the lower share of paid leavers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No allowance/ too low*</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No flexibility to choose the leave period</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative effects for social insurance</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative effect for career</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for work due to other reasons</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*400 PLN per month (around 110 EURO, up to two years)
### Policy measures selected as important (percentage of mothers)

<p>| Measure                                                        | Percentage |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental leave paid without income testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible working time for parents of small children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax relief for parents with dependent children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher family allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher family allowance for low income families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining costs of children's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time work for parents of small children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better housing conditions for families with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More places in kindergartens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of care facilities for school age children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More places in creches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean testead family allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The survey on mothers, 2006*
• mostly preferred policy measures, irrespectively of age and education of mothers (I)
  paid parental leaves without income testing
  flexible working time for parents and
  lower income tax for parents
• Higher family allowance (II)
• Part-time work for parents of small children (III)
• Measures aimed at lowering costs of education (III)

surprisingly low preference for institutional child care
Evaluation of the parental leave duration

**mothers**
- the length is accepted by **84%**, too short – nearly **15%**
- *how to prolong the leave?* **97%** opted for additional months for parents (3% for fathers only)
- *leave entitlement for grandparents*: **63%** „NO“; (41% of mothers aged 20-29 supported that solution vs. 34% of aged 30 and more)

**employers**
- the length is accepted by **92.3%**, too short – **3.4%**, too long – **4.3%**
- *how to prolong the leave?* A majority opted for additional months for parents.
Effects of parental leave prolongation according to employers’ opinions

- New employee should be hired
- Difficulties to keep work schedule
- Work organisation should be changed
- Additional costs
- Lower use of employee’s skills
- Loss of human capital investment

Bar chart showing opinions on prolongation of parental leave:
- Yes & rather yes
- No & rather no
evaluation of the maternity leave duration (16-18-26) (18-20-28)

mothers
- the length is accepted by 24%, too short - 75%
- how to prolong the maternity leave?
  additional obligatory weeks for parents 37%
  additional weeks voluntary used by parents 34%
  additional obligatory weeks for a mother only 27%
  additional obligatory weeks for a father only 1%

employers
- the length is accepted by 67%, too short - 31%
  (more often by public sector firms), too long - 2%
- how to prolong the maternity leave?
  additional weeks voluntary used by parents 41%
  additional obligatory weeks for a mother only 26%
  additional obligatory weeks for parents 23%
ER males – min: PL, SK, HU; max: DK, NL, MT, CY, UK
ER females – min: Southern Europe, PL (around 50%), SK, HU; max: DK, SE, (above 70%), FI, UK
Part-time employment in Poland.

LFS data

Part-timers as a percentage of total employment, 15-64

Part-time employment in Poland by age and sex (LFS data)

Part-timers as a percentage of total employment

Returns to work after parental leave

- After 71% job breaks mothers came back to job, others in half moved to unemployment and in half to inactivity.
- Permanent job contract - after 78% of breaks mothers returned to job (the same firm 71%, another firm - 7%).
- Temporary job contract, terminated during pregnancy - after 57% of breaks mothers moved to unemployment and inactivity (no obligation of employers to guarantee a job).
- Temporary job contract, not terminated during pregnancy - after 48% of breaks mothers moved to unemployment and inactivity and after 39% of breaks returned to the same employer.
- Education really matters - only after 13% of job breaks mothers with tertiary education moved to unemployment or inactivity, nearly 30% mothers with secondary education, 40% with lower education (returns to the same employer).
The use of different reconciliation measures by age of employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Flexible working time</th>
<th>Breaks during the working day</th>
<th>Work at home</th>
<th>A free day outside of the holiday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconciliation between work and family survey, 2005
Employed parents of children aged up to 14 by care arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Care arrangements</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Alone parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public care centers</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private care centers</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid carers</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives – members of the same households</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives, living in other households</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No use of any care</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconciliation between work and family survey, 2005
Persons caring for children up to 14 (not own children) and the elderly

Reconciliation between work and family survey, 2005
Conclusions:

- Preferences for paid parental leave without income testing, incentives for fathers, however concerns related to job prospects.

- Preferences for flexible working time.

  *In the context of the rigid labour market and under-developed care facilities and relatively traditional gender relations.*

- Changes in patterns of use existing regulations on parental leave - more flexible attitudes among parents and employers.

- Needed attitude change with respect to institutional care.

- More focus on work-family reconciliation issue in public discourse and the intended changes in family policy.