Part-time work as a transitional phase? The role of preferences and institutions in Germany, Great Britain and The Netherlands.

Dekker, Ronald

Delft University of Technology, Tilburg University

1 April 2008

Part-time work as a transitional phase? The role of preferences and institutions in Germany, Great Britain and The Netherlands.

Ronald Dekker
Delft University of Technology

Abstract:

This paper uses 11 years of data from household panel data sets for the Netherlands, Germany and Great-Britain to investigate part-time employment and the role of institutions and preferences on transitions from part-time into full-time employment or into other employment statuses. The behavioural choice model distinguishes four labour market states: short hours part-time employment, long hours part-time employment, full-time employment and nonparticipation. This dynamic model is estimated with a multinomial logit model. Results from the estimates are interpreted against the background of the institutional differences between the three countries. In particular we look at the role of stated preferences on the number of working hours on the transition patterns of individual workers. Results indicate that both the Netherlands and Great-Britain as welfare states are more capable of facilitating workers to end up in their preferred hours bracket than Germany is.

Keywords: part-time employment • labour supply • stated preferences

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: THIS ARTICLE HAS BENEFITED FROM COMMENTS ON EARLIER DRAFTS PRESENTED AT SEMINARS AT TILBURG UNIVERSITY. WE ALSO THANK RUUD MUFFELS, DIDIER FOUARGE, MARCO FRANCESCONI, REGINA RIPHAHN, AND KEA TIJDENS FOR THEIR COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS. THIS ARTICLE IS PRODUCED AS PART OF MY DISSERTATION RESEARCH AT TILBURG UNIVERSITY.

Introduction

Part-time work is a widespread phenomenon in labour markets world-wide. The Netherlands stands out as being the world's first 'part-time economy' (Freeman ,1998; Visser ,2002) , but other European countries also have substantial and increasing numbers of workers working less hours than full-time. In this paper we are interested in the individual transition patterns between different labour market states defined by the number of hours per week. This interest stems from both the policy and the academic labour economics debate. From a policy perspective it is interesting to look whether part-time work is a stepping stone towards full-time work (or a transitional phase from full-time work to retirement). In that case, part-time work is either partial unemployment if you look at it negatively or a substantial labour reserve in a more positive approach. From a theoretical labour economics perspective it is interesting to look at the role of preferences and constraint in an individual's labour supply decision. Part-time work could be a rational choice to align leisure preferences, home production and paid work (O'Reilly & Bothfeld, 2002). But it could also be the case that workers want to supply a full-time equivalent of hours, but that these jobs are rationed and that they are in fact partially unemployed in their part-time job. (Shapiro & Stiglitz, 1984; Visser, 2002)

The different labour market states in this paper states are defined on the basis of the number of working hours per week. In accordance with the convention in most of the empirical literature (OECD, 1997; ECHP 1995-2001; O'Reilly & Fagan, 1998) we distinguish short hours part-time jobs (less than 15 hours per week), part-time jobs (15-29 hours per week) and full-time jobs (over 30 hours per week).

This paper focuses on the determinants of transition patterns in three different labour markets in general and on indicators of preferences in particular. The question is whether these determinants (e.g. worker characteristics) have different impacts in different types of labour markets.

Differences in type of labour market can be addressed in terms of welfare state typology or in terms of the percentage share of part-time employment in total employment[1]. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom are examples of countries where part-time work is widespread also among men, with the Netherlands as the prime example, whereas Germany has only very few men and less women in part-time employment. (see Table 1) Furthermore the United Kingdom, Germany and the Netherlands can be considered as typical examples of Liberal, Corporatist and Social democratic welfare states, according to the typology devised by Esping-Andersen (1990), respectively. For the purpose of this paper we adopt a more labour market oriented 'employment regime' typology that is based on the aforementioned welfare state typology by Esping-Andersen (1990). Following Gallie & Paugam (2000), we use an unemployment welfare regime typology in this paper based on three dimensions: the degree of coverage of the benefit system, the level of financial compensation and the extent of development of active employment policies. Gallie & Paugam distinguish four 'unemployment welfare regimes': Sub-Protective (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece), Liberal/Minimal (UK and Ireland), Employment centred (France, Belgium, Netherlands, Germany) and Universalistic (Denmark, Sweden). In this paper we analyse the Liberal/Minimal regime of Great Britain and the Employment centred regimes of the Netherlands and Germany that are quite different in terms of the extent of part-time employment.

<insert Table 1 here>

The macro statistics in Table 1, based on the self-reported status of working part-time (without specific information about the actual number of hours) show a marked increase in the relative size of part-time employment as a percentage of total employment. For men in Germany the percentage has doubled from 1991 to 2001 and the percentage for German women increased

[1] This is not as tautological as it may seam. The level of part-time employment in a country does not necessarily tell us very much about an individual's transition rates into and out of part-time employment

with 10 per cent points. The same is true for Dutch women, but in the Netherlands the percentage of women in part-time employment is consistently 30 per cent points higher than in Germany. Between 15 per cent (1991) and 20 per cent (2001) of Dutch men work part-time. In Great-Britain the percentages of part-timers are in between the Dutch and the German situation. The percentage of men working part-time increases from 6 per cent in 1991 to 9 per cent in 2001, and the percentage of women in part-time employment increases from 28 per cent in 1991 to 33 per cent in 2001. These numbers show that Germany part-time employment is at the average level for the EU-15 and Great-Britain is somewhat higher. The Netherlands stand out as a country where part-time employment is the norm for women and widespread phenomenon for men, both percentages well above the EU-15 average.

A theoretical framework for employment transitions between part-time and full-time jobs

Now we focus on developing a theoretical framework to describe and eventually explain labour market transitions between nonparticipation, short hours, part-time and full-time jobs. We can identify two different hypotheses to these labour market transitions: Some argue that part-time jobs function as 'stepping-stones' to full-time employment, whereas others would argue that part-time jobs (either short hours or long hours) are second rate jobs without to much prospect for improvement in terms of making transitions into fulltime work. Both hypotheses incorporate the notion that the job that you are in, is a result of individual preferences and constraints. The individual or household decision making process based on individual preferences (and individual constraints) may result in either part-time or fulltime labour supply, but in the latter case, only part-time jobs might be available due to labour market constraints.

Earlier research on part-time employment transitions

There is a vast literature on the role of part-time work as a possible 'stepping-stone' to full-time work. Blank (1989, 1994) suggested that part-time work may indeed function as a stepping stone into full-time work for (black) women in the US. Gianelli (1996) found similar results for foreign women in West Germany. In his transitional labour market approach, Schmid (1998) identifies part-time work as one of the means for integration into work for people currently unemployed or inactive. However, this approach has its limitations. Firstly in the sense that recent empirical work for Germany and Great Britain (O'Reilly and Bothfeld, 2002) and other EU countries (Buddelmeyer, Mourre and Ward (2005), shows that there is little evidence that part-time work leads to full-time work. Secondly, it implicitly assumes that full-time employment is the only labour market state to strive for, which from an individual or household labour supply perspective is not necessarily true, as stated in the preceding paragraph.

The contribution of this paper is, among other things, to recognize that part-time work is not necessarily just a transitional phase, but could also be the result of an optimal labour supply decision for individuals with a certain leisure (or homework) preference. Time-use studies have shown (e.g. Freeman & Schettkatt, 2005) that the number of working hours per year has been consistently decreasing for most European countries for the 1970-2002 period.

An important contribution of this research is that we introduce two subsets of part-time work: short hours part-time jobs and long hours part-time jobs. Short-hours part-time jobs are often not considered to be part of the labour market. Their number is substantial nevertheless (Dekker & Kaizer, 2000; O'Reilly & Bothfeld, 2002). With the resulting 4 labour market states: inactivity (including unemployment), short hours part-time employment, long hours part-time employment and full time employment we can analyze a number of interesting labour market transition patterns for both men and women. When looking at the determinants of these transitions, we explicitly incorporate subjective preferences and the institutional context.

Definitions

For the purpose of international comparison we use a definition of short and long part-time employment suggested by van Bastelaer et al, 1997. This means that the threshold between part-time and full-time employment is drawn at <30 hours. Furthermore the threshold between short part-time and long part-time is drawn at <15 hours, in contrast with our earlier work on part-time transitions for the Netherlands (Dekker et al, 1999) but in line with earlier work for other countries and for work with an international comparative focus (Dekker & Kaizer, 2000; Dingeldey, 2001; O'Reilly & Bothfeld, 2002, Bardasi & Francesconi, 2003). By using these hours thresholds, we can distinguish four labour market states:

- Nonemployment (non-participation and unemployment)
- Small part-time employment (<15 hours per week)
- Part-time employment (>=15 and <30 hours per week)
- Full-time employment (>=30 hours per week

Focus

In this paper we are primarily interested in the dynamics of part-time employment and the role of preferences in labour market transitions. That is, our main interest is in the determinants of labour market transitions, rather than in the determinants of labour market states. Furthermore, the international comparison enables us to make meaningful inferences about the role that labour market and social security institutions in the different countries play in individual part-time employment transition patterns.

Theoretical framework and behavioural choice model

A fairly standard, yet eclectical theoretical framework (compare O'Reilly & Bothfeld, 2002) is adopted that includes determinants from Human capital theory (Age, schooling, experience) and Segmented labour market theory (Segmented labour market, Industry sector, firm size).

Furthermore we include determinants that characterize household structures of the individual workers (Pre-school children, Other sources of income in the household) and leisure preferences (Preference for working more or less hours, occupational status (student, household work).

Finally we include into the analytical framework a typology approach that will enable a meaningful comparison between the three countries in the sense that we can make inferences and formulate hypotheses concerning labour market transition patterns based upon fairly general characteristics of welfare states and their labour market institutions. The aforementioned employment regime typology from Gallie and Paugam is used for that purpose. Since it is essentially impossible to integrate these macro institutional differences in a micro data analysis, we will use the identified differences in institutional settings to explain differences in the outcomes of the micro econometric analyses.

The behavioural choice model is the Roy model (Roy, 1951; Heckman & Honore, 1990; Magnac, 1991), which is basically a modified labour supply model in which different wages are offered in various sectors on the labour market. For the purpose of this paper we make a disctinction based on the value of a job offer, rather than the wage.

Now we have a four sector model that can be characterized as follows: a worker will choose any of the following categories:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{Full-time employment if:} && V_{ft} > V_{pt}, \quad V_{ft} > V_{shpt}, \quad V_{ft} > V^{*} \\
&\text{Part-time employment if:} && V_{pt} > V_{ft}, \quad V_{pt} > V_{shpt}, \quad V_{pt} > V^{*} \\
&\text{Short hours pt. empl. if:} && V_{shpt} > V_{ft}, \quad V_{shpt} > V_{pt}, \quad V_{shpt} > V^{*} \qquad (1) \\
&\text{Non-employment if:} && V^{*} > V_{shpt}, \quad V^{*} > V_{pt}, \quad V^{*} > V_{ft}
\end{aligned}
$$

where V_{ft} is the value of a full-time job offer, V_{pt} the value of a part-time job offer, V_{shpt} the value of a short hours part-time job offer and V^* the reservation value of the worker derived from the individual optimization of the search process.

A first examination of the micro data

We will use data from three household panel surveys: The British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), the German SOcio-Economic Panel (GSOEP) and the Dutch Socio-Economic Panel (SEP). We use the information from the years 1991-2001, which is available for all three data-sources.

Descriptive statistics

First of all, we take a look at the percentages of people of working age that are in either one of the four labour market states: nonparticipation (including unemployment), short hours part-time, part-time and full time employment. Numbers are presented for men and women separately for all three countries in Table 2.

The data from the household panel data sets more or less confirm the picture from the macro data. For the purpose of the analyses in the rest of the paper we look at the percentages of the working age population for the four labour market statuses defined earlier: Because of the inclusion of people in nonparticipation and the overall rise in the number of employed workers the trends in part-time are less pronounced here. First of all, we can establish, that on average over 70 per cent of German men is employed, most of them in full-time jobs. For German women this percentage is about 55 per cent. In the Netherlands a similar percentage of men are employed and 58 per cent of women are employed on average. Dutch women are much more likely to be employed part-time though. Surprisingly, only 65 per cent British men (lower than in Germany and the Netherlands) is employed. The percentage of British women in employment is higher than in the two other countries with about 60 per cent on average.

As a percentage of people in employment the average percentage of part-time workers according to the definition of this paper is substantially lower than in the macro statistics, except for women in Great-Britain. This could possibly explained by the fact that the status(es) of part-time employment in this paper are constructed from the micro data on contractual working hours per week whereas the status of part-time employment in the "Employment in Europe" data is self-reported without information on the number of contractual hours.

<insert Table 2.1 here>

<insert Table 2.2 here>

<insert Table 2.3 here>

<insert Table 3 here>

Our primary interest is in transition patterns between the different states on the labour market. When we look at Table 3, we can observe that labour market states 'Nonparticipation' and 'Full-time employment are the most 'absorbing' states. A vast majority of the people in those states are in that same state the next year. Being in either short hours part-time or part-time employment tends to be more volatile, especially for men. Much of the dynamics is to be found for workers in either short hours or 'normal' part-time jobs and the question is whether the dynamics lead to upward mobility, that is, stronger labour market attachment in the form of a job with more hours per week or to downward mobility where people end up in nonparticipation or smaller jobs.

<insert Table 4.1 here>

<insert Table 4.2 here>

<insert Table 4.3 here>

The empirical model: logit models

From the behavioural choice model it is straightforward to understand that for our empirical analysis we could use 'dynamic' ordered and multinomial logit models.[2] They are dynamic in the sense that we model transition rates between labour market states, rather than probabilities of occupying a certain labour market state. Formally, we estimate the relative probability of entering a certain labour market state in year t+1, given the labour market state in year t.

If we (implicitly) assume that the determinants have similar effects on all of the transitions, either upward or downward, we can use an ordered logit model. To allow for a more flexible specification in which parameters have different values for different destination states, both 'upward' and 'downward' we use a multinomial logit model. Furthermore in the multinomial specification we don't have to restrict ourselves to upward or downward mobility. For reasons of conciseness we not document the results from the ordinal logit model for transitions from nonparticipation for women and from full-time work for men here.

In this paper we concentrate on the multinomial logit analyses for men and women in part-time jobs to see whether they are 'upwardly or downwardly mobile' and to what extent this is dependent on their preferences. The empirical results are interpreted against the background of the institutional differences between the three countries.

As in the previous papers, we have implicitly formulated hypotheses with regard to the effects on 'upward'[3] mobility to of the following variables. The effects for 'downward' mobility are expected to be the reverse.

- Human capital variables (Age (+, quadratic), schooling (+), experience(+))
- Household structure variables (Presence of pre-school children (-), Other sources of income in the household (-))

[2] For an elaborate mathematical description and interpretation of ordered and multinomial logit models, we refer to Maddala (1983) and Liao (1994)

[3] That is: mobility to a labour market state that involves more hours of work per week.

- Leisure preferences variables (Preference for working more (+) or less (-) hours,
- Occupational status variables (student (-), household work(-)).

Results of estimation

Netherlands

(see Table 1 in the Appendix I)

There is a significant U-shaped (quadratic) effect of age on transitions out of part-time employment for both men and women in the Netherlands. The older a person gets, less likely it is to make a transition into either nonparticipation, short hours part-time employment and into full-time employment (not significantly for men). The quadratic effect is positive, meaning that the negative linear effect reduces with age. Eventually the positive quadratic effect will dominate the linear effect. The 'turning point' is at the age of about 37 for women, about 40 for men for the transitions into nonparticipation and short hours part-time. The turning point for Dutch women making transitions into full-time is largely irrelevant since it is around the age of 60, when most women do not work anymore.

A lower than average educational level has a significantly positive effect on transitions into nonparticipation and short hours part-time work for women. Furthermore it has a negative effect on the transition rate into fulltime employment for men. A higher than average education only has a significantly positive effect for the transition rate into fulltime employment for women.

A higher number of children reduces the probability of going into fulltime employment for women and increases their probability of working fewer hours (short hours part-time). The presence of a child with an age lower than six has an additional negative effect on the relative transition probability into fulltime employment for women.

Nonlabour household income does not have a significant effect on transition rates out of part-time employment, neither for men nor for women. The labour income of other household members does increase the probability for men to make a transition into both short-hours part-

time work and into fulltime work. This seems to be counterintuitive but is in line with the theoretical ambiguity of this effect. The extra income could have a bigger wealth effect and then labour supply is lower or a larger substitution effect and then labour supply will be bigger. Both cases seem to be present here.

Students in substantial part-time jobs are more likely to make a transition to short hours part-time when they are female and less likely to make transition to fulltime when they are male. Men that want to work more hours are less likely to move to short hours part-time jobs as one would expect and women that want to work more hours are indeed more likely to move to fulltime jobs, which is encouraging from both an emancipation and labour market point of view. Women that want to work less are using both options (nonparticipation and short hours part-time work) significantly. For men the wish to reduce their number of hours does not result in a significant change in the transition probabilities.

Employment history variables do play a significant role in the transition patterns for those currently in part-time employment in the Netherlands. Previous experience in a standard (over 12 hours per week and permanent) reduces the probability of making a transition to either state for women, indicating that they are relatively stable in part-time employment. Previous experience in a non-standard job (less than 12 hours per week or temporary/on-call/etc.) reduces the transition probability to nonparticipation and increases the transition probability to short-hours part-time for women. The only effect found for men is the almost significantly (5%) positive effect on the transition into short hours part-time employment of previous experience in unemployment.

The effects of the year dummies are predominantly positive for the transition into nonparticipation. This is an indication that favourable economic and labour market conditions lead some part-time workers to drop out from the part-time labour, especially women. For men, some positive effects are found for the transition to full-time employment.

Great Britain

(see Table 2 in the Appendix I-7)

The U-shaped (quadratic) effect of age on transitions out of part-time employment is, in Great Britain, very similar to that in the Netherlands, at least for women. The linear effect of age is negative and the quadratic effect is positive for transitions into nonparticipation and short hours part-time work. For men, the effect is similar to the Dutch finding (and similar to the effect for British women) only for transitions into short hours part-time work. For transitions into full-time work there is a purely linear negative effect of age for women and an inverse U shaped effect for men, compared to their Dutch counterparts. The older a British part-time worker gets, the more likely he is to get a full-time job. This effect is reduced by the quadratic term and eventually (at about 27 years of age) is reversed. So the positive effect of age dominates the quadratic effect for young male workers only.

The 'turning point' is at the age of about 50 for women for the transitions into nonparticipation and short hours part-time. The turning point for British men making transitions into short hours part-time is at around age 37.

A lower than average educational level has a less significant effect on transitions out of part-time employment compared to the Netherlands. It is only significant and positive for women making a transition into nonparticipation. As in the Netherlands, a higher than average education only has a significantly positive effect on the transition rate into fulltime employment for women, but also a small and almost significant effect on the transition rate into nonparticipation for women.

A higher number of children reduces the probability of going into fulltime employment for British women and increases their probability of working less hours (short hours part-time). The presence of a child with an age lower than six has an additional negative effect on the relative transition probability into fulltime employment for women and also increases the probability of transiting into nonparticipation for women.

Nonlabour household income does have a significant effect on transition rates out of part-time employment in Britain. It reduces the transition probability into fulltime employment for men and increases the transition probability into nonparticipation for women. The labour income of other household members does reduce the probability for women to make a transition into both short-hours part-time work and into nonparticipation.

As in the Netherlands, students in substantial part-time jobs are more likely to make a transition to short hours part-time when they are female.

British men and women that want to work more hours are indeed more likely to move to fulltime jobs. Women that want to work less are using both options (nonparticipation and short hours part-time work) significantly. For British men the wish to reduce their number of hours does not play a significant role which is similar to the finding for the Netherlands.

Employment history variables do play a significant role in the transition patterns for those currently in part-time employment, also in Great-Britain. Previous experience in a non-standard (less than 12 hrs per week or temporary/on-call/etc.) reduces the probability of making a transition to nonparticipation and increases the probability of making a transition into short hours part-time for British women. Previous experience in a standard job (over 12hrs per week and permanent) reduces the transition probability to nonparticipation and short hours part-time for both British men and women. No significant effect, neither for men nor for women, is found for transitions into either state from part-time employment of previous experience in unemployment.

In contract to the Netherlands, the effects of the year dummies on the transition rate into nonparticipation in Great-Britain are predominantly negative. This is an indication that favourable economic and labour market conditions are actually reducing the probability that part-time workers drop out of the labour force.

Germany

(see Table 3 in the Appendix I-7)

In Germany also there is a significant U-shaped (quadratic) effect of age on transitions out of part-time employment for both men and women. The older a women gets, less likely she is to make a transition into either nonparticipation, short hours part-time employment and into full-time employment. The same is true for German men, though only for the downward (to nonparticipation and short hours part-time) transitions. As in the Netherlands, the quadratic effect is positive, meaning that the negative linear effect reduces with age. Eventually the positive quadratic effect will dominate the linear effect. The 'turning point' is at the age of about 37 to 40 for women, about 40 for men for the transitions into nonparticipation and short hours part-time, very similar to the finding in the Netherlands. For transitions into full-time employment the effect of age is not very significant in Germany.

A lower than average educational level does not have a significant effect on transitions into nonparticipation and short hours part-time work for both men and women. As in both the Netherlands and Great Britain, a higher than average education only has a significantly positive effect for the transition rate into fulltime employment for women.

A higher number of children reduces the probability of going into fulltime employment for women. The presence of a child with an age lower than six has an additional negative effect on the relative transition probability into fulltime employment for women. No significant effects of these variables are found for German men in part-time employment.

Nonlabour household income does not have a significantly positive effect on all transition rates out of part-time employment for German men, so it effectively reduces the probability of staying in part-time employment. A higher labour income of other household members does reduce the probability for women to make a transition into fulltime work.

German students, both male and female in substantial part-time jobs are likely to stay, given the negative effects on the transition rates into short hours part-time and full-time employment.

Furthermore, female students have an increased probability to drop out of employment and go into nonparticipation.

German women and men in part-time employment that want to work more hours are indeed more likely to move to fulltime jobs. Women and men that want to work less are not very successful given the significantly negative effects found for transitions into short-hours part-time for both and the significantly negative effect for transitions into nonparticipation for men. As in the Netherlands, employment history variables do play a significant role in the transition patterns for those currently in part-time employment in Germany. Previous experience in a standard (over 12 hrs per week and permanent) reduces the probability of making a transition to nonparticipation and short hours part-time for women, indicating that they are relatively stable in part-time employment. Previous experience in a non-standard job (less than 12 hrs per week or temporary/on-call/etc.) increases the transition probability to short hours part-time for women. The only effect found for previous spells of unemployment is the significantly positive effect on the transition into nonparticipation for German women.

Foreign born part-timers in Germany are not significantly more or less likely to move to another labour market state, whereas female part-timers in the former GDR are more likely to move into nonparticipation and full-time employment and less likely to move into short hours part-time employment.

As in Great-Britain, the effects of the year dummies on the transition rate into nonparticipation in Germany are predominantly negative. This is an indication that favourable economic and labour market conditions are actually reducing the probability that part-time workers drop out of the labour force.

Robustness checks

To check the robustness of our results for some of the assumptions made, we also tried specifications in which the dependent variable is the two-year relative transition probability and the three-year relative transition probability respectively. The results are more or less comparable with the results presented in this paper. In particular, the 'stated preference' variables showed very similar results. The tentative conclusion might be that the mechanisms at work for year-to-year transitions simply translate to longer time-periods.

Furthermore we experimented with specifications in which the preference variables (dummies for 'wants more hours' and wants less hours') were interacted with the household income variables, nonlabour household income and labour income of other household members, respectively. This did not lead to significant improvements of the specification. Finally, we did rerun the analyses excluding the 'students' (workers that indicated to be in full-time education), this did not significantly change the estimation results.

Comparison of the results and discussion

When comparing the results for the three different countries, the main focus is on the 'preference variables'; that is, whether the worker that is currently in a part-time job wants to work more or less hours per week. Given the number of other controls, the estimates found with these preference variables give an indication of the possibilities that a labour market and its institutions provide for an individual to align his/her labour supply with his/her preferences. Furthermore the functioning of these labour markets can also be compared with respect to the effects of labour market history variables. This can be interpreted as an indication of the presence of 'scarring' effects, in particular for previous unemployment and flexible employment in labour markets.

As could already be seen from the descriptive statistics, part-time work is much more widespread in the Netherlands and to a lesser extent in Great Britain than in Germany. But does that also

mean that German part-time workers have more trouble aligning labour supply with their preferences?

The results in this paper suggest that female part-time workers in the Netherlands are indeed more likely to end up in their preferred hours bracket. That is, when they want to work less hours they are more likely to go to nonparticipation and short hours part-time and when they want to work more hours they are more likely to go into full time employment. For male Dutch workers in part-time jobs, their preferences do not play a significant role, which could either mean that they are somehow restricted to part-time employment, even when they want to leave this labour market state or that they have realized their preferences in their current part-time job. In Great-Britain we see the same situation for women when it comes to their preferences for either less work or more work. Just as in the Netherlands, female British workers are likely to realize their preferences and are more likely to make transitions to nonparticipation and short hours part-time work and to full-time work, respectively. Contrary to Dutch men, British men however do succeed in realizing their preference for working more hours.

German men and women in part-time employment both are less likely to realize their preference for working less hours. This could be an indication of the lack of suitable (short hours) part-time jobs in Germany. On the other hand, both men and women do manage to find full-time employment when they want to work more hours. In turn, this is in line with the Corporatist nature of the German labour market that favours fulltime employment, especially for breadwinners. We can conclude that, in contrast to the Netherlands, augmenting the terminology of Gallie and Paugam, Germany is a 'Full employment centred' unemployment welfare regime. At the same time we can conclude that the 'Liberal/minimal' unemployment welfare regime in Great Britain has very similar outcomes as the 'Part-time Employment centred' regime in the Netherlands, the main difference being that men in the Netherlands are much more likely to work part-time and not make a transition into full-time work, even when they want to.

For the employment history variables, we can observe marked differences in the outcomes in the three regimes. Earlier spells of unemployment increase the probability of going from long hours part-time to short hours part-time for men in the Netherlands. No effects are found in Great-Britain neither for male nor female workers in long hours part-time jobs. In Germany however, women with part-time jobs that were in unemployment in the three years before, are more likely to end up in unemployment/nonparticipation again. Other analyses (not documented here), suggest that scarring effects of previous unemployment exist for male full-time workers in Great Britain and the Netherlands and for both male and female full-timers in Germany. This is an indication that the scarring effect of previous unemployment for part-time workers is the biggest in Germany and the smallest in Great Britain.

Similar effects could be expected for previous experience in standard employment and non-standard, flexible employment, respectively. Workers with previous experience in standard employment are expected to benefit from that experience and maintain or increase their attachment to the labour market when in part-time employment. Experience in non-standard employment could have a negative scarring effect on continued labour market attachment when the perception is that these are second rate jobs or a similar effect as for previous standard employment when non-standard work is perceived as being not very different from standard work.

Previous experience in standard employment does perpetuate the state of part-time employment in Germany, especially for women. Previous experience in non-standard employment does lead to a higher probability of working less for German women. So, in Germany non-standard employment has a scarring effect similar too, but smaller than the effect of unemployment. In Great Britain, the same positive effect as in Germany is found for standard employment experience, and again, especially for women. The effect of non-standard employment experience is that women are likely to reduce their number of working hours but are less likely to stop

working. In this respect, the scarring effect of non-standard employment is less prevalent in Great Britain, compared to Germany.

In the Netherlands with its high level of non-standard employment, we find a similar effect for previous experience in non-standard employment as in Great Britain. As in the two other countries, the effect of previous experience in standard employment is to perpetuate part-time employment, especially for women.

The effect of the business cycle on the transition patterns in this paper are coarsely measured with year dummies. The striking result is that favourable economic and labour market conditions over the course of the 1990s have quite a different effect for part-time workers in the Netherlands than for part-time workers in Great-Britain and Germany. In the Netherlands, part-time workers seem to drop out more often whereas in the other two countries part-time workers are less likely to drop out of the labour force. This is consistent with the impression that in the Netherlands workers have a higher leisure preference but could also indicate that intra household decision making yields different results for labour supply compared to these results in Great-Britain and Germany.

Labour market history variables have fairly consistent and similar effects in all three countries. Having said that, in Germany previous unemployment and/or non-standard employment have more detrimental effects than in the two other countries. Again, this could be attributed to the focus on full time employment that is so prevalent in the German unemployment welfare regime. From the results for Great Britain and the Netherlands we can learn that even though they have quite different unemployment welfare regimes, the labour market transitions patterns in these countries are fairly similar with respect to employment history variables and scarring effects of unemployment.

Combined with the results we found for the preference variables it can be concluded that Great Britain and the Netherlands are more successful in facilitating individual labour market transitions than Germany. The 'Employment centred' orientation of the German unemployment

welfare regime is too much 'Full employment centred'. The 'Employment centred' orientation in the Dutch unemployment welfare regime is more geared towards part-time and non-standard forms of employment and this could be an alternative way to reach a fairly flexible labour market that can compete with the even more flexible labour markets in a 'Liberal/minimal' unemployment welfare regimes that is exemplified by Great Britain. This could also be a possible explanation for the relative success of the Dutch and British labour markets in terms of macroeconomic outcomes.

References

Bardasi, Elena and Marco Francesconi, (2003), 'The impact of atypical employment on individual wellbeing: evidence from a panel of British workers', ISER Working Paper 2003-2, University of Essex

Becker, Uwe, (2000), 'Welfare State Development and Employment in the Netherlands in Comparative Perspective', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 10(3), pp. 219-39.

Buddelmeyer, Hielke, Gilles Mourre and Melanie Ward-Warmedinger, (2005), 'Part-Time Work in EU Countries: Labour Market Mobility, Entry and Exit', ECB working paper series.

Debels, Annelies (2004), 'Temporary jobs: Segmented security through the labour and welfare system', Paper for TLM.Net Conference: Quality in Labour Market Transitions: A European Challenge

Dekker, Ronald & Lutz Kaizer (2000), 'Atypical or Flexible? How to define Non-Standard Employment Patterns - The cases of Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom', EPAG Working Paper 14, Colchester: University of Essex

Dekker, Ronald, Elena Stancanelli and Ruud Muffels, (2000), 'A Longitudinal Analysis of Part-Time Work by Women and Men in the Netherlands' in: Gustaffson & Meulders (eds.), Gender and the Labour Market, Palgrave

Del Boca, Daniela, (2002), 'The Effect of Child Care and Part Time Opportunities on Participation and Fertility Decisions in Italy', *Journal of Population Economics*, 15(3), pp. 549-73.

Dingeldey, Irene (2001), 'European Tax Systems and their Impact on Family Employment Patterns', *Journal of Social Policy* 30: 653-672

Fagan, Colette, and Jacqueline O'Reilly, (1998), 'Conceptualising Part-Time Work: The Value of an Integrated Comparative Perspective', in: C. Fagan, and Jacqueline O'Reilly, Part-Time Prospects: International Comparisons of Part-Time Work in Europe, North America and the Pacific Rim,. London & New York: Routledge

Farber, H.S., (1999), 'Alternative and Part-Time Employment Arrangements as a Response to Job Loss', *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17, pp. 142-69.

Freeman, R. (1998), 'War of the models: Which labour market institutions for the 21st century?', *Labour Economics*, 5 (1), 1-24.

Freeman, R. & R. Schettkat, (2005), 'Marketization of household production and the EU–US gap in work', *Economic Policy*, January 2005 pp. 5–50

Gallie, D. & S. Paugam, (2000), Welfare regimes and the experience of unemployment in Europe, Oxford University Press, New York

Garibaldi, P., (1998), 'Job Flow Dynamics and Firing Restrictions', *European Economic Review*, 42, pp. 245-75.

Heckman, James J. & Bo E. Honoré (1990), The Empirical Content of the Roy Model, *Econometrica*, Vol. 58, No. 5., pp. 1121-1149.

Kalleberg, Arne L., (2000), 'Non-standard Employment Relations: Part-Time, Temporary and Contract Work', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), pp. 341-65.

Liao, Tim Futing, (1994), 'Interpreting Probability Models: Logit, Probit, and Other Generalized Linear Models', Sage University Paper 101

Maddala, G.S. (1983), Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics, Cambridge University Press

Magnac, Th. (1991), Segmented or Competitive Labor Markets? *Econometrica : journal of the Econometric Society*, vol.59 nr.1, p.165

OECD, (2002) 'Employment Outlook,' OECD

O'Reilly, Jacqueline and Bothfeld, Silke, (2002), 'What Happens after Working Part Time? Integration, Maintenance or Exclusionary Transitions in Britain and Western Germany', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 26(4), pp. 409-39.

O'Reilly, J. & C.Fagan (eds.), (1998), Part-time prospects: International comparisons of part-time work in Europe, North-America and the Pacific Rim, London, Routledge

Plantenga, Janneke, (2002), 'Combining Work and Care in the Polder Model: An Assessment of the Dutch Part-Time Strategy', *Critical Social Policy*, 22(1), pp. 53-71.

Plantenga, Janneke; Schippers, Joop J and Siegers, Jacques J., (1999), 'Towards an Equal Division of Paid and Unpaid Work: The Case of the Netherlands', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 9(2), pp. 99-110.

Powell, Lisa M., (1998), 'Part-Time Versus Full-Time Work and Child Care Costs: Evidence for Married Mothers', *Applied economics,* 30(4), pp. 503 - 11.

Visser, Jelle, (2002), 'The First Part-Time Economy in the World: A Model to Be Followed?', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12(1), pp. 23-42.

Román, Amelia; Didier Fouarge & Ruud Luijkx, (2004), 'Career consequences of part-time work: results from Dutch Panel data 1990-2001', OSA-publication A206

Roy, A. D., (1951) Some Thoughts on the Distribution of Earnings, *Oxford Economic Papers*, New Series, Vol. 3, No. 2., pp. 135-146.

Smith M., C. Fagan and J. Rubery, (1998). 'Where and why is part-time work growing in Europe?', in O'Reilly J. and C. Fagan (eds.), Part-time prospects, London: Routledge.

Warren, Tracey, (2000) 'Diverse Breadwinner Models: A Couple-Based Analysis of Gendered Working Time in Britain and Denmark', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 10(4), pp. 349-71.

Table 1 Part-time employment (self-reported as % of total employment) for All, Men & Women, 1991-2001

Netherlands	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
All	33.1	34.6	35.3	36.6	37.5	38.1	38.2	39.0	39.8	41.5	42.2
Men	15.6	15.4	15.5	16.2	16.8	17.0	17.3	18.0	18.2	19.3	20.0
Women	60.9	64.0	64.9	66.3	67.6	68.3	67.9	68.1	69.1	71.0	71.3
Great-Britain	1991[a]	1992[a]	1993[c]	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
All	22.6	23.3	23.7	24.2	24.3	24.8	24.8	24.7	24.8	25.0	24.9
Men	6.2	6.9	7.0	7.7	8.0	8.6	8.8	8.7	9.1	9.1	9.1
Women	43.5	43.7	44.1	44.6	44.5	44.7	44.7	44.5	44.2	44.6	44.1
Germany	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
All	14.1	14.5	15.2	15.8	16.3	16.7	17.6	18.4	19.0	19.6	20.3
Men	2.5	2.7	3.0	3.3	3.6	3.8	4.3	4.7	4.9	5.1	5.3
Women	30.2	30.9	32.1	33.2	33.7	33.9	35.3	36.4	37.3	38.2	39.2
EU-15	1991[a,b]	1992[a,b]	1993[c]	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
All	13.9	14.5	14.8	15.5	16.0	16.4	16.9	17.3	17.6	17.8	17.9
Men	4.1	4.4	4.9	5.0	5.2	5.5	5.8	6.0	6.1	6.2	6.2
Women	28.3	29.1	30.5	30.6	31.3	31.6	32.3	32.9	33.2	33.4	33.4

Source: Employment in Europe, European Commission, 2002, 2001[a], 2003[c]
[b]Involves some estimation by Eurostat

Table 2.1 Employment status (% of working age population) for Men & Women, 1991-2001

Nether lands								
	Men				Women			
	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
1991	27.63	3.86	3.31	65.2	52.41	11.39	14.21	21.99
1992	27.87	4.59	3.09	64.44	49.01	12.5	16.31	22.18
1993	28.17	4.73	3.00	64.12	47.00	14.00	16.00	23.00
1994	28.91	5.14	2.70	63.25	46.41	14.1	16.08	23.41
1995	28.34	4.01	2.75	64.89	43.05	13.02	19.06	24.87
1996	27.91	4.4	3.11	65	42.37	15.02	19.02	23.58
1997	26.00	4.46	3.34	66	40.37	14.06	20.26	25.3
1998	26.69	3.92	2.95	66.43	39.01	13.21	22.01	25.77
1999	27.00	4.00	3.00	66	38.52	13.10	22.18	26.20
2000	25.00	4.05	3.78	67	35.77	13.82	22.61	27.80
2001	24.88	4.17	4.15	66.8	34.47	12.95	24.51	28.07
Average 1991-2001	27.22	4.00	3.18	65.00	42.68	13.37	19.25	24.70
Part vs. full-time		9.95		90.05		56.91		43.09

Source: SEP, 1991-2001, Own calculations

Table 2.2 Employment status (% of working age population) for Men & Women, 1991-2001

Great-Britain								
	Men				Women			
	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
1991	36.13	2.14	1.33	60.39	40.59	8.77	15.09	35.55
1992	38.14	1.91	1.63	58.32	41.07	9.24	14.89	34.79
1993	38.02	2.43	1.90	57.66	40.38	9.42	14.84	35.36
1994	36.54	2.08	2.03	59.35	39.26	9.02	16.08	35.64
1995	35.94	1.90	2.23	59.94	38.68	8.88	16.47	35.97
1996	35.65	1.92	2.42	60.02	38.50	8.54	16.97	35.99
1997	32.76	2.15	2.34	62.75	37.87	8.06	16.82	37.25
1998	32.69	1.86	2.52	62.93	37.27	8.20	17.22	37.31
1999	35.16	1.88	2.33	60.63	38.98	7.24	17.58	36.2
2000	33.90	1.47	2.63	62.00	39.78	6.64	17.26	36.32
2001	34.56	1.67	2.85	60.92	39.45	6.96	17.11	36.48
Average 1991-2001	35.27	1.90	2.27	60.57	39.28	8.05	16.54	36.13
Part vs. full-time		6.44		93.56		40.50		59.50

Source: BHPS,1991-2001, Own calculations

Table 2.3 Employment status (% of working age population) for Men & Women, 1991-2001

Germany								
	Men				Women			
	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
1991	23.78	1.05	1.56	73.61	43.40	3.75	10.40	42.45
1992	25.07	1.14	0.99	72.80	45.48	3.49	8.84	42.19
1993	26.75	0.72	0.92	71.61	45.46	3.93	9.21	41.40
1994	27.50	0.91	0.87	70.72	47.17	3.78	9.49	39.56
1995	26.24	1.49	1.26	71.01	45.57	4.66	9.88	39.90
1996	27.38	1.07	1.07	70.48	45.93	4.31	10.40	39.36
1997	27.42	0.93	1.21	70.45	45.96	4.47	10.19	39.38
1998	27.59	1.37	1.51	69.52	46.97	4.51	10.30	38.21
1999	24.26	2.10	1.58	72.06	41.92	5.97	11.49	40.62
2000	25.17	1.43	1.42	71.97	42.48	6.51	12.54	38.47
2001	24.14	1.73	1.67	72.45	40.12	6.91	12.99	39.98
Average 1991-2001	25.81	1.30	1.31	71.58	44.26	4.96	10.76	40.02
Part vs. full-time		3.52		96.48		28.20		71.80

Source: GSOEP,1991-2001, Own calculations

Table 3 Yearly transition probabilities (Average %/year t to t+1) for Men & Women of Working age, 1991-2001

Netherlands	*Men*				*Women*			
To:	Nonp.	Sh.part	L.part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L.part	Full
From:								
Nonparticipation	83.88	3.69	1.49	10.95	85.79	6.53	3.89	3.78
Short part-time	26.41	49.24	9.51	14.84	18.68	62.84	13.13	5.36
Long part-time	13.96	7.28	45.46	33.30	8.48	6.56	74.21	10.75
Full-time	6.63	0.50	1.30	91.58	8.69	1.53	8.90	80.88
Great-Britain	*Men*				*Women*			
To:	Nonp.	Sh.part	L.part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
From:								
Nonparticipation	83.76	1.56	1.70	12.98	84.70	4.86	4.87	5.57
Short part-time	35.03	32.36	11.68	20.94	24.11	52.37	16.45	7.07
Long part-time	25.57	5.28	36.47	32.68	14.30	5.37	67.35	12.98
Full-time	12.66	0.17	0.82	86.35	11.90	0.70	5.04	82.36
Germany	*Men*				*Women*			
To:	Nonp.	Sh.part	L.part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
From:								
Nonparticipation	70.78	2.07	1.29	25.86	80.98	4.06	3.99	10.97
Short part-time	31.95	24.70	7.10	36.24	26.84	48.32	16.41	8.43
Long part-time	22.65	6.32	36.76	34.26	14.73	5.41	64.32	15.54
Full-time	9.85	0.57	0.55	89.03	13.39	0.82	3.30	82.49

Source: GSOEP, SEP, BHPS,1991-2001, Own calculations

Table 4.1 Yearly transition probabilities (Average %/year t to t+1) for Men & Women of Working age, divided by working hours preference 1991-2001

Netherlands								
	Men (want more hours)				Women (want more hours)			
To:	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
From:								
Short part-time	22.04	42.76	13.82	21.38	16.59	52.38	22.65	8.39
Long part-time	12.00	2.40	44.40	41.20	7.24	6.05	64.09	22.62
Full-time	7.62	0.78	1.81	89.79	10.26	1.83	10.62	77.29
	Men (want less hours)				Women (want less hours)			
To:	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
From:								
Short part-time	0.00	62.50	12.50	25.00	18.60	58.14	12.79	10.47
Long part-time	16.90	12.68	40.85	29.58	8.38	8.02	74.01	9.58
Full-time	4.43	0.46	1.24	93.87	6.89	1.79	11.39	79.94

Source: SEP,1991-2001, Own calculations

Table 4.2 Yearly transition probabilities (Average %/year t to t+1) for Men & Women of Working age, divided by working hours preference 1991-2001

Great-Britain								
	Men (want more hours)				Women (want more hours)			
To:	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
From:								
Short part-time	32.45	29.43	13.58	24.53	22.44	46.43	22.13	9.00
Long part-time	24.24	4.76	27.27	43.72	12.37	5.03	56.29	26.31
Full-time	12.72	0.19	1.27	85.81	10.57	1.25	4.30	83.87
	Men (want less hours)				Women (want less hours)			
To:	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
From:								
Short part-time	34.48	34.48	8.62	22.41	28.37	50.23	12.56	8.84
Long part-time	21.00	6.00	38.00	35.00	16.73	5.80	65.67	11.80
Full-time	10.90	0.18	0.69	88.23	10.99	0.68	5.84	82.49

Source: BHPS,1991-2001, Own calculations

Table 4.3 Yearly transition probabilities (Average %/year t to t+1) for Men & Women of Working age, divided by working hours preference 1991-2001

Germany								
	Men (want more hours)				Women (want more hours)			
To:	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
From:								
Short part-time	29.27	22.25	7.49	40.98	25.56	45.77	17.75	10.91
Long part-time	22.53	6.84	30.63	40.00	14.58	5.53	60.70	19.20
Full-time	9.71	0.36	0.67	89.25	14.23	0.63	3.05	82.09
	Men (want less hours)				Women (want less hours)			
To:	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full	Nonp.	Sh.part	L. part	Full
From:								
Short part-time	24.24	24.24	3.03	48.48	31.03	46.80	14.78	7.39
Long part-time	13.68	4.21	55.79	26.32	13.75	4.27	69.03	12.95
Full-time	8.80	0.65	0.51	90.04	12.19	0.91	3.24	83.66

Source: GSOEP, 1991-2001, Own calculations

Appendix I-7: Tables with Results of estimation

Table 1: Netherlands *(coefficients of multinomial logit estimation; dependent variable: relative transition probability from part-time work), Robust z statistics in parentheses*

** significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%*

To:	Nonparticipation		Short hours Part-time		Full- time	
From: Part-time						
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Age	-0.289	-0.237	-0.225	-0.249	-0.120	-0.094
	(6.18) ***	(3.33) ***	(4.43) ***	(2.45) **	(2.96) ***	(1.55)
Age squared	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.001	0.001
	(6.01)***	(3.48)***	(4.40)***	(2.43)**	(2.02)**	(0.89)
Dummy: Education low	0.423	-0.270	0.429	-0.199	-0.218	-0.647
	(2.99)***	(0.77)	(2.71)***	(0.42)	(1.67)*	(2.29)**
Dummy: Education	0.003	-0.349	-0.116	0.384	0.418	0.173
high	(0.02)	(1.07)	(0.65)	(0.96)	(3.66)***	(0.68)
Number of children	-0.032	-0.113	0.300	-0.114	-0.321	0.133
	(0.44)	(0.69)	(3.95)***	(0.51)	(4.69)***	(1.25)
Child younger than 6 yrs	-0.035	0.098	0.217	0.070	-0.603	0.187
	(0.23)	(0.27)	(1.31)	(0.13)	(4.63)***	(0.73)
Nonlabour household	0.003	-0.004	-0.000	0.015	0.006	0.004
income /1000	(0.66)	(0.36)	(0.01)	(1.43)	(1.74)*	(0.55)
Other household labour	-0.001	0.001	0.003	0.010	-0.001	0.007
income / 1000	(0.79)	(0.25)	(1.32)	(2.11)**	(0.88)	(2.16)**
Dummy: Student	0.239	-0.219	1.179	-0.091	0.135	-1.224
	(0.74)	(0.44)	(3.93)***	(0.14)	(0.46)	(3.38)***
Dummy: Wants more	-0.221	0.233	-0.203	-1.473	0.885	0.169
hours						
	(1.39)	(0.72)	(1.14)	(2.64)***	(7.89)***	(0.74)
Dummy: Wants less	0.412	0.595	0.398	0.179	0.143	-0.032
hours	(2.68)***	(1.35)	(2.45)**	(0.37)	(1.02)	(0.08)
Non-standard	-0.203	0.269	0.248	-0.312	0.018	-0.048
employment in last 3	(2.27)**	(1.35)	(3.25)***	(1.31)	(0.26)	(0.32)
years						

Unemployment in last 3	0.026	0.395	-0.229	1.069	0.013	-0.325
years	(0.15)	(0.83)	(1.03)	(1.99)**	(0.10)	(0.81)
Standard employment in	-0.442	-0.067	-0.602	-0.308	-0.232	-0.235
last 3 years	(8.25)***	(0.54)	(9.20)***	(1.71)*	(5.26)***	(2.29)**
Dummy: Year 1995	0.977	0.924	0.835	0.374	-0.132	-0.008
	(4.23)***	(1.98)**	(3.76)***	(0.62)	(0.74)	(0.02)
Dummy: Year 1996	1.331	0.798	0.481	1.074	-0.023	0.861
	(5.99)***	(1.71)*	(2.01)**	(1.87)*	(0.13)	(2.70)***
Dummy: Year 1997	0.657	0.833	0.269	0.796	0.000	0.873
	(2.84)***	(1.94)*	(1.17)	(1.41)	(0.00)	(2.88)***
Dummy: Year 1998	0.284	0.787	0.211	0.468	-0.125	0.240
	(1.15)	(1.73)*	(0.93)	(0.85)	(0.74)	(0.72)
Dummy: Year 1999	0.416		0.437		0.167	
	(1.74)*		(2.03)**		(1.04)	
Dummy: Year 2000		0.798		0.145		0.306
		(1.81)*		(0.26)		(0.97)
Constant	3.236	2.260	1.154	2.663	1.921	1.759
	(3.55)***	(1.42)	(1.16)	(1.12)	(2.45)**	(1.40)
Number of observations	4691	691	4691	691	4691	691

Table 2: Great-Britain *(coefficients of multinomial logit estimation; dependent variable: relative transition probability from part-time work), Robust z statistics in parentheses*

** significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%*

To:	Nonparticipation		Short hours Part-time		Full- time	
From: Part-time						
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Age	-0.202	-0.050	-0.195	-0.148	-0.066	0.107
	(9.35)***	(1.30)	(6.54)***	(2.49)**	(2.30)**	(2.61)***
Age squared	0.002	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.000	-0.002
	(9.19)***	(0.87)	(6.52)***	(2.32)**	(0.57)	(4.17)***
Dummy: Education low	0.369	0.098	-0.077	0.085	-0.056	0.466
	(3.16)***	(0.35)	(0.47)	(0.18)	(0.43)	(1.55)
Dummy: Education	0.200	0.140	-0.272	0.045	0.348	0.310
high	(1.86)*	(0.51)	(1.78)*	(0.10)	(3.39)***	(1.09)
Number of children	0.040	0.031	0.138	-0.084	-0.303	-0.058
	(0.81)	(0.23)	(2.04)**	(0.33)	(4.97)***	(0.48)
Child younger than 6 yrs	0.207	0.568	0.012	0.019	-0.490	0.098
	(1.73)*	(1.57)	(0.07)	(0.03)	(4.48)***	(0.31)
Nonlabour household	0.005	-0.002	0.000	-0.003	-0.002	-0.018
income /1000	(2.15)**	(0.25)	(0.05)	(0.27)	(0.60)	(2.16)**
Other household labour	-0.017	-0.016	-0.025	-0.006	-0.007	0.008
income / 1000	(3.30)***	(1.12)	(3.19)***	(0.28)	(1.60)	(0.74)
Dummy: Student	-0.006	-0.429	0.995	-0.336	-0.020	-0.586
	(0.02)	(1.06)	(2.50)**	(0.56)	(0.05)	(1.45)
Dummy: Wants more hours	0.006	0.337	-0.119	0.212	0.858	0.677
	(0.04)	(1.22)	(0.58)	(0.49)	(7.82)***	(2.51)**
Dummy: Wants less	0.436	0.290	0.443	0.266	0.031	0.321
hours	(3.88)***	(0.97)	(2.69)***	(0.49)	(0.24)	(1.04)
Non-standard	-0.223	0.031	0.341	0.067	-0.048	0.016
employment in last 3	(3.04)***	(0.20)	(4.18)***	(0.32)	(0.68)	(0.10)
years						
Unemployment in last 3	-0.007	-0.318	-0.056	-0.459	-0.002	-0.035

years	(0.04)	(1.41)	(0.23)	(1.07)	(0.01)	(0.16)
Standard employment in	-0.420	-0.290	-0.274	-0.517	-0.071	0.103
last 3 years	(9.98)***	(2.85)***	(4.35)***	(2.71)***	(1.78)*	(0.95)
Ethnic	-0.226	0.964	0.962	-31.120	-0.587	0.332
	(0.24)	(0.77)	(1.00)	(25.26)***	(0.46)	(0.24)
Dummy: Year 1995	-0.272	-0.359	-0.051	0.468	0.020	0.144
	(1.69)*	(1.00)	(0.21)	(0.73)	(0.11)	(0.40)
Dummy: Year 1996	-0.334	-0.349	-0.123	0.425	0.081	-0.184
	(2.12)**	(1.02)	(0.52)	(0.66)	(0.49)	(0.47)
Dummy: Year 1997	-0.634	-0.742	-0.172	-0.307	0.261	-0.181
	(3.76)***	(1.99)**	(0.68)	(0.44)	(1.50)	(0.46)
Dummy: Year 1998	-0.622	-0.417	-0.096	-0.708	0.128	0.074
	(3.74)***	(1.16)	(0.39)	(0.91)	(0.76)	(0.20)
Dummy: Year 1999	-0.772	-0.790	-0.069	-1.374	0.148	-0.431
	(4.97)***	(2.21)**	(0.31)	(1.78)*	(0.94)	(1.18)
Dummy: Year 2000	-0.898	-1.302	-0.155	-0.123	-0.059	-0.267
	(5.85)***	(3.61)***	(0.68)	(0.20)	(0.36)	(0.77)
Constant	2.961	1.089	1.605	1.433	1.045	-1.006
	(6.63)***	(1.44)	(2.64)***	(1.19)	(2.00)**	(1.26)
Number of observations	5602	802	5602	802	5602	802

Table 3: Germany *(coefficients of multinomial logit estimation; dependent variable: relative transition probability from part-time work), Robust z statistics in parentheses*

** significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%*

To:	Nonparticipation		Short hours Part-time		Full- time	
From: Part-time						
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Age	-0,247***	-0,161**	-0,136**	-0,243**	-0,074*	0,088
	(6,770)	(2,230)	(2,540)	(2,510)	(1,930)	(1,260)
Age squared	0,003***	0,002**	0,002**	0,003**	0,000	-0,001
	(6,700)	(2,470)	(2,920)	(2,790)	(0,930)	(1,500)
Dummy: Education low	0,169	0,663	0,016	-0,156	0,192	0,704
	(1,300)	(1,490)	(0,080)	(0,210)	(1,420)	(1,570)
Dummy: Education high	0,162	-0,384	-0,074	0,021	0,543***	-0,349
	(1,290)	(1,140)	(0,390)	(0,050)	(4,610)	(1,180)
Number of children	-0,083	0,196	0,115	-0,172	-0,273***	0,106
	(1,210)	(0,890)	(1,380)	(0,360)	(4,190)	(0,670)
Child younger than 6 yrs	0,080	-0,274	0,244	0,662	-0,431**	0,394
	(0,530)	(0,380)	(1,240)	(0,730)	(2,820)	(0,890)
Nonlabour household income /1000	0,098	0,283**	0,077	0,378**	-0,009	0,375**
	(1,560)	(2,020)	(1,190)	(2,710)	(0,130)	(2,870)
Other household labour income / 1000	-0,001	0,004	0,001	0,003	-0,006**	0,005
	(0,490)	(0,820)	(0,300)	(0,370)	(2,840)	(1,200)
Dummy: Student	30,888***	-0,967	-1,030**	-32,334***	-1,247***	-32,940***
	(29,770)	(1,000)	(2,630)	(34,790)	(4,580)	(40,270)
Dummy: Wants more hours	-0,053	-0,099	0,005	0,287	0,375***	0,675**
	(0,410)	(0,330)	(0,030)	(0,630)	(3,080)	(2,430)
Dummy: Wants less hours	-0,041	-0,938**	-0,373*	-1,719**	0,009	-0,411
	(0,320)	(2,210)	(1,910)	(2,240)	(0,070)	(0,990)
Non-standard employment in last 3 years	-0,065	-0,275	0,228**	0,244	-0,139*	-0,093
	(0,860)	(1,450)	(2,810)	(1,300)	(1,860)	(0,560)
Unemployment in last 3 years	0,302**	0,166	-0,181	-0,432	-0,092	-0,319
	(2,530)	(0,620)	(0,760)	(0,930)	(0,690)	(1,210)
Standard employment in last 3 years	-0,312***	-0,367**	-0,638***	-0,175	-0,169***	-0,146
	(6,690)	(2,480)	(8,740)	(0,860)	(3,970)	(1,230)
Dummy: Ethnic origin	0,263	0,326	0,044	-1,055	0,300	-0,184
	(1,570)	(0,840)	(0,180)	(1,520)	(1,770)	(0,490)

Dummy: Former GDR	0,304*	0,223	-0,811**	0,138	0,443**	0,243
	(1,990)	(0,610)	(2,380)	(0,260)	(2,940)	(0,690)
Dummy: Year 1995	0,184	0,527	-0,398	0,612	-0,224	0,954*
	(1,000)	(0,980)	(1,290)	(0,860)	(1,220)	(1,840)
Dummy: Year 1996	0,061	0,495	-0,122	-0,323	-0,356*	-0,298
	(0,310)	(0,910)	(0,430)	(0,380)	(1,950)	(0,510)
Dummy: Year 1997	0,033	-0,231	-0,088	-0,848	-0,171	-0,298
	(0,170)	(0,440)	(0,320)	(1,070)	(0,960)	(0,570)
Dummy: Year 1998	-0,500**	-0,032	-0,012	-0,171	-0,060	0,859
	(2,440)	(0,070)	(0,040)	(0,240)	(0,340)	(1,720)
Dummy: Year 1999	-0,119	-0,485	-0,293	0,127	0,097	0,543
	(0,660)	(0,950)	(1,060)	(0,190)	(0,580)	(1,030)
Dummy: Year 2000	-0,361**	-0,411	-0,272	-0,059	0,017	0,457
	(2,010)	(0,840)	(1,090)	(0,090)	(0,110)	(0,920)
Constant	3,873***	2,518*	0,592	2,886	1,254*	-2,284*
	(5,330)	(1,700)	(0,550)	(1,310)	(1,650)	(1,610)
Number of observations	4272	529	4272	529	4272	529