1. Background

As the title implies, this project focuses on the consequences of the parallel reshaping of gender relations, and employment, as women enter the world of paid work in ever-greater numbers. A number of other more general sociological concerns also contributed to the formulation of the original research proposal. First, it had increasingly been argued that ‘work’ as employment was no longer a significant sociological category, and/or source of social identity (Offe 1985). This criticism was frequently associated with claims that ‘consumption’ or ‘lifestyle’ had become more significant in structuring individual lives. ‘Work’ as employment had by convention been a male domain, did these kinds of arguments also apply to the women who were entering the labour force? Social theorists such as Giddens (1992) and Beck (1992) had suggested that struggles over relationships between men and women were in effect taking the place of employment (or ‘class’) related conflicts in ‘reflexive modernity’. Are such relationships in fact in a process of fundamental transformation? Finally, research and theorising within feminism seemed to have reached a point where the ‘deconstructionist turn’ ran some danger of removing attention from the institutions and practices which shaped women’s (and men’s) experiences. These general issues were incorporated into a series of empirical topics relating to gender relations and employment (see below).

The project (R00023561701) grew out of two previous ESRC-funded projects: R00023160401 (1988); and R000234841 (1993). R00023160401 was carried out together with Prof. L Hantrais (Loughborough) and Ms P Waters (Salford), and had included a series of unstructured biographical interviews with professional women in Britain and France. R000234841 had facilitated travel to the five countries eventually studied in R00023561701, during which essential contacts were made and research possibilities explored. Specific topics identified in the original proposal included:

- The ‘Women and Welfare’ Debate
- The Social Construction of Occupations, Equality and the Gender Order
- Towards an Androgynous Employment Model
- Work, Gender, and Identity
- Desegregation and the ‘Queuing’ Hypothesis

The grant awarded was less than applied for. This meant that the last topic above, which was planned as an in-depth investigation of the erosion of vertical segregation in the UK, was not pursued further.

2. Objectives

The topics described above relate to the structuring of gender inequalities and gender difference. The origins of both have been endlessly debated. An influential set of arguments identifies the division of labour between the sexes as being a crucial factor (Hartmann 1892, Walby 1990). Men, it is argued, have confined women to the domestic sphere in order to ensure their continuing subordination. When women have
taken up market work, they have been confined to poorly-paid jobs, thus limiting their material independence. A set of counter arguments, deriving from Human Capital theory (Becker 1985), argues that women have a preference for domestic work rather than market work and will therefore choose to make greater investments in the former (a modified version of these arguments has been recently re-stated by Hakim 1996). One research objective, therefore, was to examine the outcomes of the continuing increase in the extent and level of women’s employment against the background of these debates. As noted above, the research design also incorporated a focus on arguments developed by contemporary social theorists such as Giddens and Beck, who have argued that the transformation of gender relations is a major feature of ‘reflexive modernity’.

Gender relations are produced and reproduced via already-existing institutions, norms and practices, as well as through the relationships between individual women and men. The project, therefore, was designed to investigate gender relations at all societal levels: macro, meso, and micro, and aspired to investigate gendered structures as well as individuals and interpersonal relationships (Connell’s (1987) concepts of ‘gender order’ and ‘gender regime’ influenced this formulation). Institutional structures reproducing the gender order include educational systems, welfare states, systems of occupational regulation, etc., as well as legislation etc. pertaining directly to women - often linked to an ‘equality agenda’ which has been formally adopted, at a national and trans-national level, since the Second World War. Esping-Andersen’s (1990, 1993) influential argument has linked the development of welfare state regimes directly to the structuring of women’s employment. The countries chosen for comparative analysis reflected these variations: Britain (‘Liberal’); France (‘Corporatist’); Norway (‘Social Democratic’) and Russia and the Czech Republic (‘State Socialist self-welfare’).  

As noted above, ‘human capital’ theories explain women’s relatively disadvantaged labour market position with reference to their lack of qualifications and employment experience. The research design did not, therefore, focus on such ‘disadvantaged workers’, but on women in professional and managerial occupations. This strategy also facilitated a systematic contrast between these two occupational types. To summarise: the research framework, and associated research methods, was as follows:

- **Macro level**: Focused on the nation state. It included (i) Nationally available descriptive statistics including census data, government and other reports, for all five countries. These national ‘case studies’ included, (amongst other topics) information relating to education systems, family policies, ‘welfare states’, occupational and labour market structures as well as the ‘equality agenda’. (ii) Data collected by the International Social Survey Programme (Family and Gender Roles Module) for Britain, Norway and the Czech Republic.
- **Meso level**: Focused on the occupational structure. It included case studies, for each country, of the development of medicine and retail banking.
- **Micro level**: Focused on individuals and their relationships. It included biographical work-life interviews with fifteen women, in each occupation, in each country (154 interviews in all).

The outline research objectives, and their relationship to the topics specified in the original research proposal, may be summarised as follows:
1. To investigate the impact of different state policies on gender relations and
employment (The women and welfare debate; Equality and the Gender Order).

2. To investigate the consequences of the entry of women into higher-level occupations for (a) occupational structuring within management and the professions, and (b) the ‘equality agenda’. To establish the impact of national policies on gendered occupational structuring (The social construction of occupations; Towards an androgynous employment model).

3. To investigate the consequences of women’s entry into higher-level occupations for individual identities, domestic and personal relationships (Work, Gender and Identity).

4. To contribute to theoretical debates relating to these issues.

All of the objectives described above have been met, as will become apparent in the description of methods and results to follow. The only problematic area of the project relates to the quality of the Russian data. It had been intended to use the ISSP Family and Gender Roles module for Russia, and arrangements had been made to obtain an advance copy of the data set. However, during a research trip to Moscow it emerged that the data had been assembled from two separate surveys and the demographic details were not reliable. There were also difficulties with the researchers commissioned to gather Russian data, and carry out interviews (i.e. they left Russia whenever possible). The Russian ISSP data, therefore, has not been used. Russian interviews were eventually carried out, transcribed, and translated, and have been included in publications relating to the interview material.

3. Methods

As described above, this project utilised a mix of methods, quantitative and qualitative, including the analysis of secondary sources, the manipulation of survey data, case studies, and biographical interviews. The range and complexity of methods employed reflected the complexity of the structuring of both gender relations and occupations. Three seminars relating to the project were organised in September 1994, February 1996, and April 1997, in Canterbury, Leicester and Bergen.

Survey Analysis. This relates to the ISSP data. We were fortunate in obtaining advance copies of the Family and Gender Roles data sets from SCPR (Social and Community Planning Research), London; The Gender Studies Centre, Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences, Prague; and Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Bergen. These data sets have been cleaned, spliced and a range of new variables constructed. Data analysis has been carried out by Dr Fiona Harris, who joined the project as a Research Officer in October 1995. We have been able to proceed much further in our comparative analyses than if we had only had access to the consolidated data set available from the ESRC archive in 1997 (we have also obtained a copy of this data set). This is because the data set available for general use lacks many demographic details (including region and whether or not there was a child under 16 in the household).

Case Studies. Case studies of medicine and retail banking have been carried out for each country. In the case of medicine, a major source of secondary information and statistics has been the professional organisations, and Ministries of Health (or their equivalent), as well as secondary sources. Details have been gathered of the extent
and rate of the feminisation of the medical profession, and the distribution (by specialty) of women within the profession, for each country. The case studies have also included descriptive accounts of the funding, organisation and delivery of medical care. In the case of retail banking, we have been fortunate in gaining co-operation from retail banks in Norway, Britain, France and the Czech Republic (however, they prefer to remain anonymous). Details have been gathered of the entry of women into the banking industry, and their distribution within the occupational hierarchy of banking. A summary account of the recent history of retail banking (i.e. over the last 15-20 years) has also been constructed. As far as these case studies are concerned, information of high quality has been obtained for Britain, France and Norway, which is not surprising given the long standing contacts with academic collaborators in these countries (Dr G E Birkelund and Dr N Le Feuvre). Reasonable quality information has also been obtained for the Czech Republic, but as explained above, the Russian information is less satisfactory.

Biographical Interviews. These were discussed, and strategies developed, during the first project seminar, which was attended by (most of) the interviewers (most interviewers were experienced academics, some were postgraduate students). Our discussions addressed a number of problems relating to cross-national research. First, there was the problem of incommensurability of both concepts and measurement. How can we be certain that comparable phenomena are in fact being investigated? The comparative study of employment and occupations is especially problematic. Definitions of crucial occupational groupings often vary between nation states. The particularities of national education and welfare systems can give rise to occupational categories in particular countries that are not to be found in other societies (Maurice et al 1986). These problems exist over and above the more practical difficulties relating to translation and meaning (e.g. if it is intended to ask the same question in a number of different societies), and the standardisation of research instruments. The methodological solutions adopted in this project were as follows. Problems of occupational comparability were addressed by concentrating upon two specific occupations: medicine and retail banking. Further standardisation was achieved via a number of simple rules to be followed by all interviewers. All doctors had to have completed their post-registration qualification, and all bankers had to hold managerial positions. All had to be currently employed. The women had to be aged between 30 and 55.

The project director (R Crompton) developed an Interview Guide, together with a Recording Document. Interviews were semi-structured and tape-recorded, and the common Recording Document was used to transcribe (translated) interviews. The Recording Document identified topic headings, and translated text relating to these headings was entered under the relevant topic (full interview transcripts, in translation, would simply have been too expensive). R Crompton paid a research visit to each country in order to provide further briefing, deliver tape recorders (where necessary), Recording Documents and Interview Guides. The interviews took place from late 1995 through to January 1997. The plan was for R Crompton to return to each country when the interviews had been completed, in order to de-brief, raise any questions relating to translation, etc. This objective was achieved in all countries, with the exception of Russia (although some de-briefing relating to the Russian interviews took place in Paris in 1996). Interviews have been carried out by Dr Elena Mezentseva, Irina Aristakheva, Prof. Marie Cermakova, Dr Irena Hradecka, Dr
The interviews were checked, filed, then coded from the Recording Document. Coding took place in two stages. First, demographic details, together with answers to questions specified in the Recording Document, were coded in a straightforward fashion. This information generated a number of interesting findings, particularly relating to the contrast between ‘professional’ and ‘managerial’ occupations, but we felt we had not properly tapped into the richness of our material. We had considered the possibility of using a qualitative data analysis package such as NUD*IST (Richards and Richards 1994) but faced a number of difficulties. As we were dealing with translated text, a word-linked package would problematic to employ. Another problem we faced was that the interviews varied considerably in respect of both length and detail of transcription (this was not necessarily a reflection of the length of the interview itself). We therefore developed a procedure we describe as ‘holistic’ coding. The researchers (myself and Dr Harris) read every interview and wrote a paragraph giving biographical details, together with the ‘presentations of self’ emerging from the Recording Documents. These focused upon both the interviewees’ accounts of their management of their employment and family careers, together with any turning points (‘epiphanies’: Denzin 1989) in either. Sixty pages of text resulted. We then developed a coding frame relating to these foci, and each researcher recoded independently, cross-checking the categories. The categories identified in the second round of coding were then analysed in relation to the first round of coding. These comparisons confirmed the reliability of our ‘holistic’ coding.

The analysis of the qualitative material is an ongoing process, that is, it has not yet been completed. Besides the several coding exercises described above, we have also made extensive use of biographical examples, as well as direct quotations from the Recording Documents, in a number of publications.

4. Results

The project design was complex, and has generated a wide range of results. The discussion of the results will cross-reference with the numbering of the published outputs, details of which are given in Section 6 below.

In outline, our approach was first, to systematically examine the impact of the structures, institutional and normative, shaping gender relations and employment. Subsequently, through the analysis of the biographical interviews, we have examined the way in which individuals have acted out their interpersonal and employment careers.

The initial results, therefore, were focused at the national (macro) level of analysis. As described above, the cross-national comparisons had been selected with regard to Esping-Andersen’s classification of welfare states. In brief, Esping-Andersen has argued that different welfare state ‘regimes’ have had different impacts on women’s employment possibilities and thus on their material situation in relation to men. ‘Social democratic’ welfare regimes (Norway) are associated with the expansion of relatively high quality employment for women, but this employment is likely to be concentrated within the state welfare sector, thus generating high levels of
occupational segregation. ‘Liberal’ regimes (Britain) are also associated with the expansion of women’s employment, but as such expansion is market led jobs may not be of high quality. ‘Corporatist’ regimes, he suggests, do not generate employment expansion for women to the same extent as social democratic or liberal. Thus varying welfare state regimes have had different ‘equality outcomes’ in respect of women’s employment, although they were not specifically designed to achieve this.

Esping-Andersen’s model has been extensively debated and criticised. In particular, feminists have criticised him for focusing only upon ‘work’ in the public sphere, that is, employment (Lewis 1992, 1993), and failing to take into account necessary but unpaid ‘work’ in the domestic sphere. Thus Lewis has suggested an alternative categorisation of welfare states along the ‘male breadwinner’ continuum (strong, modified, weak). In a similar fashion, state socialist gender equality policies have been criticised for the lack of attention given to women’s unpaid caring work - even though a ‘dual breadwinner’ model of employment and family life officially prevailed in these societies, and women’s employment has been seen as a central to women’s equality. However, the collapse of state socialism has been accompanied by a widespread rejection of this ‘dual breadwinner’ model of women’s ‘liberation’, as well as a lack of sympathy to western feminist ideology (in which women’s employment opportunities were seen as occupying too central a role).

The project findings contributed directly to this last debate (see 2 Section 6 below). Czech feminists had argued that the country’s state socialist past, rather than ‘patriarchy’ per se was the key to the understanding of the contemporary situation of women. Our analysis of the ISSP data demonstrated that gender role attitudes in the Czech Republic were extremely conservative as compared to the West. The occupational case studies revealed that intra-occupational segregation by sex within medicine and banking paralleled that to be found in Western Europe, and indeed, new patterns of segregation were emerging within banking which resembled those characteristic of the West in the 1980s. Moreover, the biographical interviews revealed that women in the Czech Republic considered that it was ‘masculine’, rather than ‘state’ patriarchal structures which contributed to their experiences of sexual inequality within both the home and the workplace.

Research relating to gender, employment and the welfare state contributed further to two other strands of publication, one theoretical, one policy-oriented. Whilst recognising the persistence of structures and practices which might be described as ‘patriarchal’, the theoretical approach developed during the course of the project has not used ‘patriarchy’ as an organising concept. It was argued that the concept cannot avoid problems relating to ahistoricism and essentialism. These critiques were developed in the context of debates relating to state policies (see 9 Section 6 below). More generally, however, information gathering related to the gender and welfare debate has made an essential contribution to the contextualisation of our analyses of the ISSP data (see 1, 3, 4, 12 Section 6 below).

The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) is an ongoing programme of cross-national attitudinal research, which fields (in addition to a set of core questions) module(s) relating to different topics each year, using a suite of mutually agreed questions (Davis et al 1989). Advance copies of the ISSP Family and Gender Roles Module, gathered in 1994-5, were obtained for Britain, Norway and the Czech
Republic. Analyses of these data revealed considerable variation in gender role attitudes, with Norway being the most liberal in attitude and the Czech Republic the most conservative, with Britain somewhere in between. It has been argued, however, the processes of globalisation are in the process of making national differences in gender relations (of which attitudes are an important component) relatively less significant, whereas regional differences are assuming considerably more importance (Duncan 1995). Using the ISSP data, we developed an index of gender role attitudes (GRA) which was used to demonstrate that the differences in attitudes between the three countries, as noted above, were statistically significant. However, when GRA was measured against regional breakdowns the differences were not statistically significant. We conclude, therefore, that national differences are more important, and that these national differences can be systematically related to national variations in policies relating to gender and employment. Attitudes, however, are not necessarily reflected in actual behaviour. The ISSP data provide information relating to the gender distribution of a series of household tasks, and these data indicated that more liberal attitudes in relation to gender roles were indeed reflected in a less stereotypical gender division of labour within the household.

We subsequently developed a binary measure of relatively more or less ‘traditional’ domestic divisions of labour (DDL). We dichotomised GRA and, using the technique of logistic regression, have demonstrated that at the level of the household, more ‘liberal’ gender role attitudes are indeed associated with a less traditional domestic division of labour in each of the countries under investigation. Our investigations were further developed using the coded interview material. This demonstrated that the doctors were more likely to have a traditional domestic division of labour than the bankers. Gender role attitudes, gender relations, and the nature of the domestic division of labour, are clearly inter-related. Our investigations have demonstrated that both national institutions and occupational particularities are of significance in shaping them.

We would argue that the occupational differences in gender role behaviour that we established are related to the contrast between ‘professional’ and ‘managerial’ occupations, and the characteristic possibilities they open up for combining employment and family lives (see 8 Section 6 below). Medical careers require forward planning, and many women doctors ‘choose’ specialties which facilitate an employment-family combination, often in anticipation of a relatively conventional domestic division of labour. In contrast, managers build careers by responding to organisational requirements. Over the last decade, the banking industry has been in a process of almost constant restructuring (Halford et al 1997). Many of the women interviewed had benefited (in career terms) from restructuring, but they had been constrained to accommodate their domestic lives to organisational imperatives. A common pattern was that this had been achieved with the aid of a co-operative partner, and domestic divisions of labour were less traditional in consequence. Women bankers also had (statistically) significantly fewer children than doctors. What aggregate level information we were able to locate suggests that there are, indeed, considerable occupational variations in fertility amongst women (Strand et al 1996). It should be noted that these occupational similarities cross-cut national differences, and were maintained from country to country.

Both macro and meso level structures (i.e. nation and occupation), therefore, are
significant is shaping gender role attitudes and behaviour, and thus gender relations. However, as described in previous sections, our perspective also included a focus on the way in which gender, and gender relations, is and are actively changed and constructed by individuals in the course of their lives (see Connell 1987, Marshall 1994). Our biographical interviews provided considerable insights into these processes. In a commentary on a debate instigated by Hakim (1996), in which she argued that women’s employment patterns are largely an outcome of the ‘choices’ made by different ‘types’ of women (see 6,7 Section 6 below), we have demonstrated both occupational variations in the constraints on women’s ‘choices’, as well as the significance of individual behaviour. This can include both rejections of and attempts to transform prevailing systems of gender relations, as well as their reproduction.

In-depth analyses of the interviews, following holistic coding, has identified two clusters which cut across the occupational continuities in work-life biographies we have discussed above. One group of women had deliberately given priority to their careers, rather than their domestic lives. This behaviour presents little challenge to prevailing structures of gender relations, as the women in question have essentially behaved as ‘surrogate men’. In contrast, another group of women, equally well represented amongst doctors and bankers, had sought to resist conventional gender codings relating to the division of labour in respect of both their employment and domestic careers. Analysis is still in progress, but the further investigation of this group showed that they had been particularly encouraged by their families as children (see 13 Section 6 below).

Finally, our research has made a contribution to debates concerning gender and the professions (see 5 and 14, Section 6 below). Medicine has from its inception been a male-dominated profession, but now more than a half of doctors in training are women. Some have argued that the medical profession will be transformed in consequence (Davies 1996). We would be rather cautious of such arguments, and will be exploring them further in future research.

To summarise briefly in relation to the research objectives described in Section 2 above: we have demonstrated the impact of both national and occupational structures on the constitution and patterning of gender relations. There is not here the space to go into detail, but it would seem that policies developed under the influence of second wave feminism, such as in Norway, have had a positive impact as far as gender equalisation is concerned. However, the entry of women into higher-level occupations has been accompanied by the further development of intra-occupational segregation (i.e., not androgyny). Nevertheless, the status quo has not simply been reproduced either. The biographical interviews have facilitated investigations into the consequences for individual identities and personal relationships of the entry of women into higher-level employment. We have also begun to establish how particular features of individual biographies contribute to change, as well as stability.

5. Activities

Papers have been presented to a wide range of conferences including: ‘The Globalisation of Production and the Regulation of Labour’, University of Warwick, 1996; ISA Working Group 02, University of Nottingham 1996, GEDDIST, IRESCO, Paris December 1996. During an academic visit to Australia in 1997 R Crompton
presented papers to the universities of Sydney, Queensland, Tasmania, Newcastle, Melbourne and the Australian National University. A paper was given to the second conference of the European Sociological Association University of Essex, 1997, and the Gender Work and Organisation Conference, UMIST, 1998. Other papers given during 1998 include the University of Wolverhampton, the University of Nottingham, the ESRC Stratification seminar, (Manchester), and the Institutt for samsfunnsforsknings, Oslo.

We were invited to join ESF network ‘Gender Inequality in the European Regions’. Papers were presented at seminars in Barcelona (January 1996) and Finland (September 1996). Both have resulted in publications (3, 9 Section 6).

6. Outputs

Publications are listed below. Items 12, 13 and 14 have already been completed in draft. It is intended to include them in item 15. A dataset relating to the interviews will be deposited with the Data Archive.

1. R Crompton and F Harris (March 1996) Women’s Employment, Gender Attitudes and the Household in the UK, Norway and the Czech Republic. Discussion Papers in Sociology No. S96/2, University of Leicester


7. Impacts

No commercial interest has been expressed.

8. Future Research Priorities

This project has proved to be successful in generating further research. One weakness (which was entirely due to economic constraints) of the original research design was that it focused on women only. The opportunity arose to carry out interviews with a matched sample of male doctors and bankers in Norway and France. Funds were successfully applied for in order to co-ordinate research and carry out interviews with a matched sample of male doctors and bankers in Britain (R000222283, R000222504). This research will explore in greater depth feminist arguments relating to the ‘gendering’ of occupations and careers, and will include a cross-national evaluation of different approaches to equal opportunity in employment. As described above, the biographical interviews have allowed us to begin to unravel some of the complexities of combining paid employment with caring responsibilities, how they are negotiated, how they can change. The women interviewed on this project illustrate the range of possibilities available in moving beyond the ‘male breadwinner’ model of employment and family life. A further project, which will include comparative case studies of employers as well as of individuals, has been incorporated into a proposal (‘Employment and Caring’, with Prof C Ungerson (Southampton) and Prof S Yeandle (Sheffield Hallam)) within the ESRC ‘Future of Work’ research programme. This proposal has got through to the second round of the research competition.
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This last category is not taken from Esping-Andersen’s framework. The ex – ‘state socialist’ countries are an interesting comparative case in that their regimes had formally espoused women’s equality in the public sphere – which included full employment for women – whilst gender relations in the private sphere remained highly conventional. See Buckley 1989
GENDER RELATIONS AND EMPLOYMENT: A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY

Interview Guide

Listed below are the topics which should be covered during the interview. The interview need not necessarily be confined to these topics.

1. DEMOGRAPHICS:

Self/Family:
Age
Secondary Education (note: elite establishment?)
University/professional qualifications (note: elite establishment(s)?)
Mother: main occupation
  worked when respondent was pre-school/at school?
  full-time/part-time?
Father: main occupation
Sibling(s): main occupation(s)
Members of (present) household, and relationship to respondent
Relationship(s)/marriages
  duration
  main occupation of partner/age
  employment (full-time/part-time?)
Children
  number/age
  childcare

Employment:
Employment history. For each job leading to and including main occupation:
  duration
  employer (eg public/private sector)
  job title (including occupational level)
  full-time/part-time

Geographical Mobility:
With family of origin (reasons - eg. job move of parent)
When adult (reasons - eg. to gain further qualifications, own job move, partner job move)

2. TOPIC LIST

(a) Childhood and early socialisation:
  was the interviewee particularly encouraged by one parent or the other? Was there any other relative or key individual (eg. teacher) who had a significant influence upon the development of their aspirations and occupational choices?
  what is their recollections of male/female relations in their household of origin-conventional division of labour? male dominant? female dominant?

(b) Childhood and career/occupational decision making:
  was the interviewee orientated towards a particular career from an early (eg school) age? If so, why?
  if not - what contingent factors contributed to their eventual destination?
  did the interviewee take anticipated marriage and childrearing into account in making their career decisions?
(c) Education, qualification and entry into employment:
were these processes (i) linear or (ii) intermittent and many-stranded?
has the sex of the interviewee ever been an overt or covert issue in the course of education and career
development?
were there identifiable constraints or barriers which were gender-related?

(d) Employment career:
is the interviewee happy (or not) with developments so far?
are there any barriers perceived to present or future progress?
what would the interviewee eventually like to achieve? (in terms of employment).
has the interviewee made any significant career changes and if so, why?

(e) Occupational change:
Have there been any significant changes in the interviewees' occupation whilst they have been
qualifying/working in it? Do they think there are likely to be any important changes in the future?

(f) Domestic and family life:
made or in a relationship? anticipate being married or in a relationship?
was the nature of the domestic division of labour anticipated prior to entering a relationship (implicitly,
explicitly?)
what is the nature (actual, anticipated) of the interviewees' domestic division of labour?
childcare arrangements (actual, anticipated?): role of grandmother?
impact of domestic sphere (marriage, children, other responsibilities) on employment career (actual,
anticipated).
any impact (actual, anticipated) of domestic arrangements on partners' employment career?
if the respondent had a daughter, would she recommend that she followed the same career as her own?
has the interviewee achieved/what would they like to achieve - in respect of domestic and family life?

(g) Have there been any changes in attitudes to women and gender relations since the ending of state socialism?
Are things better, or worse?

3. Fill in Life Line.
GENDER RELATIONS AND EMPLOYMENT:  
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RECORDING DOCUMENT

1. Interviewer ................................ 2. Date......................................................

3. Country ........................................................................................................

RESPONDENT:

4. Occupation ....................................................................................................

5. Name (or pseudonym) ......................... Number

6. Date of Birth .................................

7. City/Town/Region..............................................................

8. Mother: main occupation

no occupation ........................................................................

In employment when respondent was:

9. pre-school: f-t .............................................

10. p-t ..............................................................

11. school: f-t ................................................

12. p-t ..............................................................

13. Father: main occupation................................................

14. Brothers and sisters no ..............................................

15. yes (number)

16.(l) sex ....... 17. d.o.b. ........... 18. main occupation

..........................
19.(2) sex ........ 20. d.o.b. ............ 21. main occupation
..............................................................
22.(3) sex ........ 23. d.o.b. ............ 24. main occupation
..............................................................
25.(4) sex ........ 26. d.o.b. ............ 27. main occupation
..............................................................
28.(5) sex ........ 29. d.o.b. ............ 30. main occupation
..............................................................

(RESPONDENT)

31. Married or in a Partnership: no ..............................................
       yes ..............................................
32. previous long-term relationships no ..............................................
33. Previous long-term relationships yes (brief details)
       ..............................................
34. yes (brief details) ..............................................
35. ..............................................................
36. ..............................................................
37. Any Children? no ..............................................
38. yes (number) ..............................................
39. Yes(1) d.o.b. ...... 40. sex ...... 41. school/occupation..............................................................
40. sex ...... 41. school/occupation..............................................................
41. school/occupation..............................................................
42. (2) d.o.b. ...... 43. sex ...... 44. school/occupation..............................................................
43. sex ...... 44. school/occupation..............................................................
44. school/occupation..............................................................
45. (3) d.o.b. ...... 46. sex ...... 47. school/occupation..............................................................
46. sex ...... 47. school/occupation..............................................................
47. school/occupation..............................................................
48. (4) d.o.b. ...... 49. sex ...... 50. school/occupation..............................................................
49. sex ...... 50. school/occupation..............................................................
50. school/occupation..............................................................
51. (5) d.o.b. ...... 52. sex ...... 53. school/occupation..............................................................
(RESPONDENT)

54. Secondary School: type .......................................................................................
55. ............................................................................................................................... (elite?)
56. School leaving qualifications ......................................................................................
57. University/Professional qualifications .........................................................................
58. Further qualifications ....................................................................................................
59. University/Professional School: .................................................................................... (elite?)

.................................................................

EMPLOYMENT (adult)

61.(1) dates ............ 62. occupation .................. 63. employer ...............................................
64.(2) dates ............ 65. occupation .................. 66. employer ...............................................
67.(3) dates ............ 68. occupation .................. 69. employer ...............................................
70.(4) dates ............ 71. occupation .................. 72. employer ...............................................
73.(5) dates ............ 74. occupation .................. 75. employer ...............................................
76.(6) dates ............ 77. occupation .................. 78. employer ...............................................

.................................................................
**GEOGRAPHICAL MOBILITY** (i.e. change of Town or Region)

79.(1) date .......................... 80. reason ..............................................................

81.(2) date .......................... 82. reason ..............................................................

83.(3) date .......................... 84. reason ..............................................................

85.(4) date .......................... 86. reason ..............................................................

87.(5) date .......................... 88. reason ..............................................................

89.(6) date .......................... 90. reason ..............................................................

**TOPIC EXTRACTS** (see Interview Guide)

91. (a) **Childhood and early socialisation:**
92. (b) **Childhood and career/occupational decision-making:**

93 (c) **Education, qualification, and entry into employment:**
94 (d) Employment career:

95 (e) Occupational change:
96 (f) *Domestic and family life: (record membership of present household) (Satisfaction with/hopes for domestic and family life).*

97 (i) *domestic division of labour anticipated?*
98 (ii) **nature of domestic division of labour:**

99 (ii) **childcare arrangements:** (grandparental care)
100 (iii) **impact of family on employment:**

101 (iv) **any impact on partner's career?**
102 (v) **daughter to follow same career?**

103 **Other relevant verbatim extracts:**
(Including changes in gender relations since the end of state socialism.)
On the following diagram, could you please summarize your educational and work history up to the present?

Use the abbreviations below and indicate:

(a) when you worked outside the home, studied, worked at home  
(b) your age  
(c) when you had children  
(d) when you made a major geographical move  
(e) work history

**KEY:**  
WFT = work full time  
SPT = study part time  
WPT = work part time  
H = house work  
SFT = study full time  
U = unemployed

The following is an example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>SFT</th>
<th>SPT</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>WFT</th>
<th>WPT</th>
<th>WPT + SPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

16 18 20 25 30 35 40 50 60

65
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable name</th>
<th>variable name</th>
<th>variable code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>id</td>
<td>case number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>Country:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>England</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occup1</td>
<td>Occupation 1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occup2</td>
<td>Occupation 2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital doctor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General practitioner or equivalent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Mainstream' retail bank</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private bank (eastern europe)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mumocc</td>
<td>Mother's Occupation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unskilled/semi-skilled worker (factory worker; waitress; farm worker; shop assistant)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled/craft/lower clerical (hairdresser; telephonist; clerk; secretary)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower professional/managerial (nurse; primary school teacher; office supervisor)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher professional/managerial (secondary/university teacher; doctor; lawyer; senior manager)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurial, family business (including small farmer)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No recorded occupation; housewife</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwk_psch</td>
<td>Mother worked pre-school:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes - pt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes - ft</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mother worked school:**

- yes - pt: 1
- yes - ft: 2
- no: 3
- missing: -1

**Father’s Occupation:**

- Unskilled/semi-skilled worker (fisherman; factory worker; agricultural worker; labourer): 1
- Skilled/craft worker (Engineer; Plumber, carpenter, maintenance work): 2
- Lower professional/managerial (civil service administrator; junior school teacher; clerical supervisory; technologist): 3
- Higher professional/managerial (doctor; academic; diplomat; higher managerial): 4
- Entrepreneurial (business, including farming): 5
- Missing: -1

**Siblings:**

- Brothers: 1
- Sisters: 2
- Brothers and sisters: 3
- None (only child): 4
- Missing: -1

**Marital/domestic status:**

- Married: 1
- Living in partnership (not married): 2
- Divorced/separated/widowed: 3
- Single: 4
- Missing: -1

**Previous permanent relationships** (most usually, marriage) (number)

**Household:** (see 96f)

- Independent household (single family or person): 1
- Shared/extended household (eg parents): 2
- Missing: -1

**Partners' Occupation:**

- Unskilled/semi-skilled worker (fisherman; factory worker; agricultural worker; labourer): 1
- Skilled/craft worker (Engineer; Plumber, carpenter, maintenance work): 2
Lower professional/managerial (civil service administrator; junior school teacher; clerical supervisory; technologist) 3
Higher professional/managerial (doctor; academic; diplomat; higher managerial) 4
Entrepreneurial (business, including farming) 5
Not applicable (no partner) 6
Missing -1

**no_kids**  
**Children:** (number)

**age_cld1**  
Age child 1  
Age child 2  
Age child 3  
Age child 4  
Age child 5  
0=no child

**ageatfch**  
age at birth of first child  
0=no children

**sumcode**  
**Child summary code** (youngest child only):  
Child under school age 1  
Child young school age 2  
Child older school age 3  
Child over school age 4  
No children 5  
Handicapped/special needs 6  
Missing -1

**stepkids**  
**Stepchild/children:**  
Responsibility:  
Continuous 1  
Occasional 2  
Little/none 3  
No stepchildren 4  
Missing -1

**educ**  
**Education level:** Code *highest* level on leaving *full-time* education  
School leaving age qualification (GCSE or equivalent) 1  
Higher leaving age qualification (A level, BTec, Bac, Artium or equivalent) 2  
Graduate (Degree, Medical Degree) 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Medicine: specialist qualifications (eg: second attestation; fellowship of Royal College, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Banking: Professional qualification (eg: IOB etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Further course (ie not professional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No further qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment:**
Number of jobs before present job (do not count job moves with the same employer). Code no employer moves 0.

**Career change (ie previous jobs in different job/occupation to present job)**
No career change (ie always in same kind of job)

**Adult Geographical mobility (code non-local moves only):**
Yes: own job related
Yes: partner/domestic related
Yes: own job and partner/domestic
No geographical mobility
Missing

**Childhood (91 and 92)**
**Parental encouragement:**
Respondent encouraged particularly by mother
Respondent encouraged particularly by father
Respondent encouraged by both parents
Respondent encouraged by other family member
No parental/family encouragement
Missing

**Parental domestic division of labour:**
Mother had all or major responsibility for domestic work/father absent
Mother most - father some help
Mother and father shared domestic work
Others did domestic work
father did most
No mention of domestic division of labour in childhood home
### Career/occupational orientation:
- Clear career/occupational orientation - carried through: 1
- Clear career/occupational orientation - subsequently modified: 2
- No clear career/occupational orientation: 3
- Career orientation not mentioned: -1

### Education and Entry into employment (93 and 94)
#### Entry into employment:
- High flyer at school/found exams easy, no problems getting entrance to further education/employment: 1
- Some problems getting exams, didn't get first choice etc.: 2
- School career not distinguished: 3
- No mention of school career: -1

### Gender bias:
- Mention of gender bias: not concerned: 1
- Mention of gender bias: seen as problematic: 2
- Mention of absence of gender bias: 3
- Gender not an issue: 4
- Missing: -1

### Career intentions:
- Long-term employment career not intended at start of paid work: 'just drifted'; 'didn't think about it': 1
- Employment career shaped/chosen by anticipated family responsibilities ('balanced'): 2
- Anticipated family responsibilities paramount: 3
- Employment career first consideration: 4
- No mention of employment career: -1

### Present employment: market work only
- 'Satisficing': happy with present/average situation, no desire for dramatic change/development: 1
- 'Achiever' - has realised employment aspirations: 2
- Pro-active - wants to go further, get promotion, etc.: 3
- Missing: -1

### Employment career/occupational change (94 and 95)
#### General:
- Mention of occupational change: things are better: 1
- Mention of occupational change: things are worse: 2
- Both better and worse: 3
- Missing (ie neither better nor worse): -1
oc_chge2  Personal:
Occupational change: better for self  1
Occupational change: worse for self  2
Both better and worse  3
Missing -1

fam_life  Domestic and family life (96)
Lives alone  1
Lives with parents: single  2
Lives with partner: no dependent children  3
Lives with partner: dependent children  4
Lives with partner; child(ren); (grand)parent  5
Lives with child(ren), no partner  6
Lives with child(ren), no partner, (grand)parent  7
Lives with partner, parents, no dependent children  8
Missing -1

 ddl_now  Domestic division of labour: now (summary) 97, 98
'Traditional' division of labour, women do most  1
Shared  2
Men do most  3
Third party  4
Lives alone  5
Missing -1

dl_hist1  Domestic division of labour (is or has been married or in partnership):
'Traditional', remained so, not resented, no conflict  1
'Traditional', remained so, resented, conflict  2
Began traditional, became more egalitarian  3
Egalitarian, remained so  4
Egalitarian, became more traditional (eg, when children arrived)  5
Not married or in partnership  6
Untypical: man does most  7
Paid for, never had conflict  8
not married/in a partnership  9
Missing -1

dl_hist2  Repeat code for earlier partnerships if mentioned  0=no previous partnerships
### Anticipated domestic division of labour, single respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not married or in partnership: anticipated ddl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Traditional' - woman does most</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian, shared</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man does most</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not thought about it, can’t say</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or in a partnership, or has been</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Childcare (past and present: 99, see also 96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self main/sole responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some help from husband</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from other relative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared equally</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband carer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paid childcare: (multiple code)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid child care: nanny, nursemaid</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid child care: Kindergarten</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No paid child care</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed: nanny and kindergarten</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact of family on (own) employment:(respondents with children only, 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent changed own working arrangements to fit in with family responsibilities (eg switch to part-time work, stopped going on courses/trips)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact - partner cared/shared</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact - other family members cared</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact - extensive paid help available</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coped with difficulty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both partners compromised (equally)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no children</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Respondents without children:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipates changes in working arrangements (eg part-time)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipates no changes/paidcare/family care</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not planning for kids/too old for kids</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part_car</td>
<td><strong>Impact on partner’s career:</strong> (101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No impact; partner’s career ‘first’; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner changed/modified work arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No comment, missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>daughter</th>
<th><strong>Daughter to follow own career?</strong> (102)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would not stop them - but current problems, job not what it was, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would advise against (too hard, not so secure, no jobs, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would not give advice, ‘they must do what they want’, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No comment, missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>po_wom1</th>
<th><strong>Position of women:</strong> (103)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position of women better today - but its not gone far enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=no mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>po_wom2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women expected to do too much, too many pressures on them, have to be ‘superwomen’, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=no mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>po_wom3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better for women since ’89 - can get jobs (Eastern Europe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=no mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>po_wom4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not a feminist, not interested in feminist issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=no mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>po_wom5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women happiest with home and family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=no mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>po_wom6</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men still discriminate against women, men get the best jobs, still a ‘men’s club’, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=no mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>po_wom7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminism has gone too far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=no mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>po_wom8</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference feminist values: caring, ‘feminine’ skills and qualities undervalued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=no mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>discrim1</code></td>
<td>Emphasises no problems with discrimination, 'anybody who wants to can get ahead’, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>discrim2</code></td>
<td>Has had personal experience of gender discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>discrim3</code></td>
<td>Is aware of gender discrimination but has practised avoidance (eg. not going for 'male' jobs, modifying behaviour, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>discrim4</code></td>
<td>Is aware of and opposed to gender discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>discrim5</code></td>
<td>Discrimination not an issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| `rel_qual` | **Relationships summary code**  
Present relationship good/harmonious | 1  
Some tensions in present relationship | 2  
Present relationship poor | 3  
Not in relationship | 4  
No information (missing) | -1 |
wk_rel  Work/relationships summary code
Has never had/expresses no/ problems with work/family/household combination (and has had/is in/ a relationship) 1
Has had problems with work/family/household combination, relationship damaged/ended in consequence 2
Has had problems with work/family/household combination (‘it got too much for me’, etc.), self changed behaviour (eg went part-time) 3
Has had problems with work/family/household combination, partner adjusted behaviour (changed hours, started to do more in house, etc) 4
Has changed relationship as a result of problems (present husband better, more help, etc) 5
Not in a relationship, nor has been 6
Rejects family life because of pressure of combining both 7
No information (missing) -1

matleave  Maternity leave/return to work code
stat. maternity leave/return f/t 1
stat. maternity leave/return p/t or flexible working (E.E.) 2
more than 1yr maternity leave 3
No children 4

marstat  2nd partnership coding (detailed)
married 1
single 2
divorced & remarried 3
divorced & single 4
divorced/separated in another partnership 5
widowed & single 6
widowed & remarried 7
widowed & in partnership 8
partnership 9
lesbian partnership 10

nukids  number of children

kidsum  number of children (summary variable)
one or one child 1
more than one child 2

intface  interface between home and work life
domestic first 1
satisficer 2
maximiser 3
careerist by choice 4
careerist by necessity 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>famhelp</th>
<th>level of domestic/childcare help from family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extensive &amp; moderate help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>little or no help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>missing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unclear/undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no children -1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>epiphany</th>
<th>change in work/life biography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family/life course change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>external/organisational shock/change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal life (crisis) change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self-development change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>childcare</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nanny</td>
<td>nanny - in own home 1=used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chldmind</td>
<td>childminder 1=used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kindrgtn</td>
<td>kindergarten or nursery 1=used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td>relative 1=used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husband</td>
<td>husband 1=used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chldbrk</td>
<td>child break from employment 1=used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ptwk</td>
<td>part time working 1=used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>missing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unclear/undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no children -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>missing information -2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>