

Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment

Draft revised after the Expert Group meeting on 22-23 November 2012

Statistical framework for measuring quality of employment

Summary

This document presents a statistical framework for the statistical measurement of quality of employment. It is prepared by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe's Expert Group on the Measurement of Quality of Employment. The statistical framework distinguishes 7 dimensions and 12 sub-dimensions that - according to the Expert Group - cover the quality of employment: safety and ethics of employment, income and benefits from employment, working time and balancing work and non-working life, security of employment and social protection, social dialogue, skills development and training, and workplace relationships and work motivation. The final report of the Expert Group will comprise the statistical framework, the list of indicators and indicator sheets specifying operational definitions and methodological guidelines for each of the indicators.

I. Introduction

1. Quality of employment is an important issue for society, policy makers, governments and researchers. In many countries, the heterogeneity of employment types has increased over the last decades. Non-standard types of employment have substantially grown while the share of standard full-time jobs with open ended contract has decreased. These issues underscore the importance of collecting more systematic information on the quality of employment in order to complement the well-established quantitative labour market indicators.
2. Countries have established labour laws and regulations which prohibit or limit certain forms of work. Some types of employment such as forced or child labour are deemed illegal, while other rules regulate the workforce. Maximum working hours and worker safety regulations are examples of such measures.
3. Employment is central to the life of people in many countries not only in terms of time and providing income. Employment does influence quality of life in many respects. It is often the key to social and economic advancement; it provides identity to people and opportunities to socialise with others. At the same time, employment is not without risk. Some types of employment can have negative implications on health and also restrict opportunities in the realm of non-working life.¹
4. In many countries, there are significant differences regarding the employment situation of different demographic and social population groups. For example, the characteristics of

¹ See e.g. Stiglitz, Joseph; Sen, Amartya; Fitoussi, Jean-Paul, 2009: *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. At www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr, p. 49

employment of men and women deviate in many respects. Hence, quality of employment needs to be measured not only for all employed persons, but also for relevant sub-groups, e.g. for men and women, young and old workers as well as natives and migrants.

5. Many international organisations emphasise the importance of quality of employment in their work. Promoting decent work is the main purpose of the work of the International Labour Organization (ILO): “*The primary goal of the ILO is to promote opportunities for men and women to obtain decent and productive work*”². This statement makes it clear that the ILO’s work goes beyond a concern for the quantity of employment to include a focus on worker rights, social protection, and social dialogue between workers’ organizations, employers’ organizations and governments. In Europe, the Europe 2020 strategy identified employment and job quality as essential elements for smart, sustainable, and inclusive growth.³ The promotion of quality of work is a “guiding principle” in the Social Policy Agenda of the European Union (EU). In 2000, heads of State and Governments of the EU set the “*overall goal of moving to full employment through creating not only more, but also better jobs*”.⁴ Subsequent meetings of the European Council have also concluded that promoting quality and productivity at work is a priority for the EU.

6. A recent development is the work fostered by the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress established by French President, Nicolas Sarkozy, in 2008.⁵ Based on this Commission’s report on how to improve measures of well-being and progress, the European Commission issued a communiqué “GDP and beyond” in September 2009 which also influenced the monitoring of the EU 2020 Strategy. The OECD has launched important activities to follow up on the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission through the OECD ‘Better Life Initiative’ as well as a project on defining, measuring and assessing job quality. In the report *How’s Life?* there are several components of well-being related to the measurement of the quality of employment (e.g. jobs and earnings, work and life balance) and due reference is given to the UNECE’s work on the topic.⁶ Several initiatives to implement the recommendations of the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi-Commission took the UNECE’s work on measuring quality of employment as reference frame for this part of their work.⁷ In Australia, a large scale consultation about the indicator set “Measures of Australia’s Progress” (MAP) confirmed the importance of quality of paid work as essential part of people’s lives. The consultation identified income, job satisfaction, flexible arrangements, safe and healthy working conditions, as well as effective industrial relations environment as elements of quality jobs⁸

7. To assist countries to monitor and develop their policies to improve the quality of work and employment, both the ILO and the EU have developed sets of statistical indicators. The ILO indicators for the measurement of decent work cover the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda: employment creation, guaranteeing rights at work, extending social

² Juan Somavia, former ILO Director-General, as stated at <http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/mission-and-objectives/lang--en/index.htm>, October 25, 2012.

³ European Commission: Employment and Social Developments in Europe 2011. At http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esde/2011.

⁴ Lozano, Esteban. *Quality in work: Dimensions and Indicators in the Framework of the European Employment Strategy*, UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Seminar on the Quality of Work, Geneva, May 11 to 13, 2005, p. 2.

⁵ Stiglitz, Joseph; Sen, Amartya; Fitoussi, Jean-Paul, 2009: *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. At www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr

⁶ OECD: *How’s Life ? Measuring Well-Being*. OECD, Paris, 2011.

⁷ See, e.g., *Monitoring Economic Performance, Quality of Life and Sustainability*. Joint Report as requested by the Franco-German Ministerial Council. Paris, Wiesbaden 2010.

⁸ Australian Bureau of Statistics: *Measures of Australia’s Progress. Aspirations for our nation: A conversation with Australians about progress*, p. 91. At <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/1370.0.00.002>

protection, and promoting social dialogue and are grouped under eleven substantive elements. Within the EU two sets of indicators are used. One set of indicators is maintained by the European Commission for monitoring labour market policies. Another set was developed and is being used by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound).

8. The purpose of UNECE's work on quality of employment, which dates back to 2000, is to develop a statistical framework for measuring quality of employment. In contrast to the other existing indicator sets, the statistical framework is not linked to a particular purpose or policy agenda. It could be applied flexibly according to the specific policy requirements and institutional background of countries. It has been developed as a statistical toolbox that can be used in various contexts and does not aim to monitor progress towards targets in a given policy agenda. In the development of the framework, two Task Forces were, subsequently, created in 2005 and 2007 under the auspices of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) in order to work on the methodology for measuring quality of employment. The 2007 Task Force developed a framework for measuring quality of employment with 7 dimensions and over 50 indicators, following a series of implementation studies. The framework was implemented by at least 9 countries by the end of the Task Force's term. A first version of the present document was drafted by the 2007 Task Force.⁹

9. The current Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment was established in February 2012 comprising Azerbaijan, Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Germany (chair), Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Netherlands, Switzerland, Eurostat, Eurofound, ILO, OECD, UNECE (secretariat) and Women in Informal Economy Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO). This Expert Group has the following objectives: (i) review and revise the conceptual structure of measuring quality of employment as outlined in the *Report on Potential Indicators for Measurement of Quality of Employment*; (ii) revise the set of indicators of quality of employment in order to reflect the issues that were raised at the 58th CES plenary session, in country reports and during the Expert Group meeting on 31 October-2 November 2011; and (iii) develop operational definitions and computation guidelines (including on data sources and limitations) for quality of employment indicators.

10. This document introduces the statistical framework for measuring quality of employment, specifies the objectives and structure of the framework chosen, and introduces a list of recommended indicators for measuring quality of employment. The annexes include the list of indicators, detailed indicator definition sheets for each of the indicators as well as a list of context indicators that are proposed that would allow a basic snapshot of the socio-economic context.

II. The concept of quality of employment

11. The present statistical framework follows the definition of employment endorsed by the 13th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS). According to the ICLS, employment encompasses the production of economic goods and services as defined by the United Nations Systems of National Accounts (SNA).¹⁰ [to be updated after decision on revised resolution]

⁹ UNECE: *Measuring Quality of Employment, Country Pilot Reports*. UNECE, Geneva, 2010.

¹⁰ *Resolution concerning statistics of the economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment*, adopted by the Thirteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians (October 1982). A revision of this resolution will be discussed at the 19th ICLS in 2013.

12. Quality of employment is a complex concept. Its definition and components depend on the perspective taken; i.e. whether the quality of employment is assessed from the societal, the corporate or the individual point of view.¹¹

13. Therefore, in order to have a more tangible definition of quality of employment one has to determine the perspective of quality of employment. The societal perspective of quality employment focuses on the social spin-offs of “good” or “bad” quality of employment. “Good” quality employment for the society may refer to employment adequate to the qualifications of the labour force, leading to high productivity rates and enhancing social cohesion. From the corporate point of view, “good” quality employment may correspond to having a skilled and efficient workforce. Individual workers may rate the quality of their employment high if certain conditions such as safety, health and security of employment are met and if the remuneration is favourable. Of course there is an overlap between the societal and corporate views and the views of the worker on what is high quality employment. Both employers and workers would, for example, presumably have a strong interest to reduce accidents in employment. Likewise, workers usually have an interest to work for a profitable enterprise. However, one can also imagine contrasting views. For example, what an employee might see as “high wages” (to his benefit) the employer might view as high labour costs weighing down the firm’s profits.

14. The Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment adopts the individual’s perspective on quality of employment. In other words, quality of employment refers to the conditions, ethics, working time arrangements, monetary and non-pecuniary benefits associated with the employment and affecting work and non-working life of an individual. In this sense, the quality of employment for a person with more than one job would ideally take important characteristics of secondary jobs of the person into account.

15. Quality of employment is a multidimensional concept. Employment is characterised by many different traits or dimensions which relate to human needs in various ways. Thus, to measure quality of employment, several dimensions should be taken into consideration. The dimensions are not hierarchical. No single dimension is more important than others. For example, income and benefits from employment as well as security of employment and social protection are both dimensions of quality of employment. However, it is difficult to argue that decent pay is more important than a secure job or vice versa. Albeit closely interlinked, the dimensions are also to some degree independent from one another, i.e. the situation in one dimension cannot necessarily be deduced from the situation in others.

16. Even when adopting the perspective of the individual worker, quality of employment is determined at several institutional levels that might be referred to as macro, meso and micro.¹² Some elements of quality of employment are linked to regulations at the political (“macro”) level, e.g. via minimum working conditions, minimum wages or provisions regarding the prevention of accidents at work. Other elements are mainly determined at the meso level of the sector or the enterprise. Such elements would include the specific working time and pay arrangements (e.g. via collective agreements). Further elements are inherent to a specific job, such as the tasks to be carried out, the autonomy of the worker, relationship with superiors and colleagues or work motivation. It should be noted that this distinction is an analytical one, whereas empirically there will be quite strong interrelationships between the levels.

¹¹ Vermeylen, Greet, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. *Quality in work and employment in the European Working Conditions Survey*, Working Paper no. 4 UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Seminar on the Quality of Work, Geneva, May 11 to 13, 2005, p.2. at <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/2005/05/labour/wp.4.e.pdf>

¹² see Cloutier, Luc: *La qualité de l’emploi au Québec, développements conceptuels et création d’une typologie. État actuel de la réflexion*, Québec, Institut de la statistique du Québec, 2008.

Furthermore, the allocation of the elements to the levels will, to some extent, depend on the institutional and cultural context. Taking the perspective of the individual worker should not be confused with taking only indicators at the micro level.

17. Any assessment of quality of employment will to some degree depend on the point of view taken. There is no objective answer to the question as to whether a specific type of employment is per se “good” or “bad”. Employers might have a different view than trade unions and the meaning could also differ from country to country. The assessment will also be influenced by the specific socio-economic context: as an example, a country’s view of the quality of employment for those with few hours of work may differ during a situation of recession compared to a period of strong growth. Similarly, the definition of “good” or “bad” jobs across countries may, e.g., differ depending on average levels of income across countries.

18. Quality of employment also has a subjective component. An employment characteristic may be perceived as highly rewarding by one worker and as stressful by another. For example, working part-time might be seen as a good opportunity to combine work and family life by some, whereas others might rather emphasise reduced income opportunities of part-time jobs or implications for the level of social security. A job perceived as favourable in one phase of life, might be viewed differently in another one.

19. Official statistics should compile and release data on an objective basis determined by statistical considerations only. While statisticians should not make value judgements what is considered “good” or “bad” employment, official statistics has an important role to play by providing relevant, reliable, and impartial statistical information that can be used to understand and interpret the elements of quality of employment.

20. In the process of identifying dimensions and relevant indicators, statisticians can draw on existing international standards as well as a rich international research. Internationally, there is a broad consensus that some types of employment should be abolished. This is, e.g., the case of child labour and forced labour, dangerous or hazardous work and excessive working hours that are subject to international standards. Saying that the framework avoids value-judgement does not mean that such cases are in any way relativized. Furthermore, a body of international research over many decades has provided evidence that specific employment situations can adversely affect a person’s health or certain aspects of quality of life more often than others.¹³ For example, working long hours can have negative health implications and is often bad for the work-life-balance. This does however not imply that certain types of employment are considered as being per se of “bad” quality. The impact will depend on both the institutional and cultural context as well as the personal characteristics and preferences of the worker. The presentation of the indicators in section V. and annex II. includes references to existing research whenever possible.

¹³ For recent examples, see, e.g. Green, Francis, 2006: *Demanding work. The paradox of job quality in affluent economy*. Princeton and Oxford: Oxford University Press. Kalleberg, Arne L., 2011: *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs. The rise of polarized and precarious employment systems in the United States, 1970s to 2000s*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Guillén, Ana M. and Svenn-Åge Dahl (eds.), 2009: *Quality of Work in the European Union. Concept, Data and Debates from a Transnational Perspective*. Brussels: Peter Lang. Gallie, Duncan (ed.), 2007: *Employment Regimes and the Quality of Work*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Muñoz de Bustillo, Rafael et al, 2011: *Measuring More Than Money – The Social Economics of Job Quality*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

III. Elements and principles of the statistical framework

21. The statistical framework presented in this paper aims to provide a structured and coherent system for measuring quality of employment. It specifies the concept of quality of employment in seven dimensions. The dimensions are further subdivided in sub-dimensions where appropriate. For measuring quality of employment in each of the dimensions and sub-dimensions, the framework proposes a list of statistical indicators. Detailed descriptions of each indicator – indicator sheets – have been developed to provide guidance for the computation and interpretation of the indicators. The details on the dimensions and the sub-dimensions of the statistical framework are given in the next section; the list of indicators is included in annex I of this document. Grounded in a review of the existing literature as well as in-depth analyses on quality of employment in the countries represented, the Expert Group believes that the framework is comprehensive enough to support work by a diverse set of countries to monitor levels and trends in quality of employment.

22. The framework provides a conceptual structure which can be used to give a comprehensive picture of quality of employment. It can be seen as a toolbox for compiling data and calculating indicators on quality of employment. The statistical indicators supply users with the information relevant to describe main qualitative aspects of employment. The dimensions and the indicators proposed are selected on the basis of recognised research on quality of employment and studies in countries. The dimensions have been selected to ensure that the main aspects of quality of employment are covered, while the indicators of the dimensions aims to support proper measurement by providing definitions and practical guidance. The framework does not include qualitative labels attached to the indicators, such as stating that part-time work is “good” or that fixed-term contracts are “bad”. The indicator definition sheets in annex II [to be added at a later stage] include more information on why the indicators have been selected and suggest guidelines for the interpretation. Any value-judgement is left to the users of the data.

23. Some information related to quality of employment may be available in one country but not in another. In the view of the Expert Group, it may not be possible or efficient for each country to produce exactly the same information. Rather, the approach here is to provide a comprehensive set of indicators which countries may draw from.

24. Another element to consider is that some indicators of quality of employment may show a trend considered as favourable while others may be judged to show a negative trend. In interpreting the indicators presented in this document, users may wish to take a holistic view on the direction of change in the overall quality of employment.

25. In order to measure quality of employment, it is important to look at all relevant dimensions simultaneously. As a result, the framework will not yield a black or white picture of quality of employment but rather reflect the complexity of the issue being measured.

26. The statistical framework is designed to measure quality of employment from the individual’s perspective. In other words, the framework for measuring quality of employment is based on the components (dimensions and sub-dimensions) of quality of employment that are of relevance for the employed person. This approach is quite similar to what is proposed in recent conceptual work where it is proposed to define job quality as the characteristics of employment that affect the well-being of the worker.¹⁴

¹⁴ Muñoz de Bustillo, Rafael et al., 2011: *Measuring more than money: The social economics of job quality*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham 2011.

27. While several related international frameworks exist, each suits a particular purpose or policy agenda. None attempts to produce a broad, overall framework for the measurement of quality of employment as such. The difference of the statistical framework for measuring quality of employment from other existing frameworks (such as that of Decent Work or of the European Union¹⁵) is that this framework has been developed as a statistical toolbox that can be used in various contexts and does not aim to monitor progress towards targets in a given policy agenda.

28. In the case of the Decent Work measurement framework presented at the 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) in 2008, a set of statistical indicators is combined with “indicators” on the legal framework. Countries may select from these indicators in order to measure progress towards national strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda. Within the EU, two frameworks are used. One set of indicators is maintained by the European Commission for monitoring labour market policies. Another was developed and is being used by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions for their work on this topic.

29. Interested countries can use the relevant components of the statistical framework based on their requirements and according to the policy needs in their country. Despite the different objectives of other international frameworks, the former Task Forces and the current Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment have reviewed the underlying concepts and variables used in other frameworks in order to ensure conceptual consistency to the greatest extent possible.

30. The following principles were followed in the development of the statistical framework for measuring quality of employment:

(1) The dimensions, sub-dimensions and indicators of quality of employment are organised using a transparent, logical structure;

(2) All dimensions, sub-dimensions and indicators should have a clear relationship with quality of employment;

(3) The dimensions, sub-dimensions and indicators for measuring quality of employment should be sufficiently broad to allow a maximum choice for countries;

(4) Each indicator of quality of employment should be of sufficient importance at least within a group of countries to justify measurement;

(5) The statistics of quality of employment should be technically feasible to produce, but the current availability of data should not drive the selection of indicators. While designed to draw from existing sources, countries may need to consider expanding the collection of statistics on quality of employment where desirable;

(6) The indicators should be developed, wherever possible, using international recommendations and guidelines on classifications, concepts, definitions and computation methods and definitions. The indicators should be those for which both National Statistical Offices (NSOs) and other statistics-producing bodies find appropriate in providing the data.

31. The first principle relates to the organization of the indicators. The indicator list needs a clear structure and the structure chosen here is based on individual needs from employment. The seven dimensions of the framework reflect established theories in the field of human motivation which, e.g., have been extensively applied in the field of Quality of Work Life

¹⁵ Lozano, Esteban. *Quality in work: Dimensions and Indicators in the Framework of the European Employment Strategy*, UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Seminar on the Quality of Work, Geneva, May 11 to 13, 2005, p. 2.

research. This view offers a logical structure to the quality of employment indicators and ensures all aspects of quality of employment are covered.

32. The second, third and fourth principles ensure that comprehensive, varied indicators will allow countries the opportunity to measure quality of employment for workers by age, economic activity, occupation group, or status in employment. Countries may find that not all parts of the framework are applicable, as it has been developed with a broad approach to the measurement of quality of employment.

33. The fifth principle ensures practicality, suggesting simple indicators which can be produced using data collection programmes common in many countries, such as population censuses or household surveys (e.g. labour force surveys). This aims to facilitate ease of use, although it should be of lower priority in terms of a guiding principle; practicality is important but simply choosing what is currently available would not encourage statistical development. There are important aspects of quality of employment which are rarely measured by NSOs. For those aspects, indicators are proposed where, in principle, measurement is considered to be feasible. All indicators have been measured in at least one country [needs to be checked after revision of the indicator list], as reflected in the “Country Pilot Reports” commissioned by the earlier Task Force and in other country reports published to date.¹⁶

34. The sixth principle relates the indicators to the international standards which are currently in place. This brings two advantages – first, there is no point in duplication of effort; second, this principle facilitates the identification of good practices on which to construct an international standard, should the international community decide to proceed in this direction.

35. A logical consequence of taking the perspective of the individual is that indicators of quality of employment should be defined in such a way that allows assessing the situation for specific sub-populations such as: women compared to men, young or old compared to middle aged, lower compared to higher educated, migrants compared to nationals, etc. This implies that the indicators should be defined, as far as possible, independently from these categories.

36. The statistical framework includes two types of indicators: “objective” as well as “subjective” indicators. The former describe the actual conditions shaping the quality of employment, e.g. the number of hours worked. The subjective type of indicators focus on how workers perceive quality of employment or specific aspects of it. As in the broader area of quality of life, comprehensively measuring quality of employment requires both objective and subjective indicators. This is in line with the recommendations of the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi-Commission.¹⁷

37. The conceptual framework focuses on qualitative aspects of employment. For this reason, general labour market indicators, such as employment or unemployment rates, are considered outside the scope of the framework. However, one should not ignore the general labour market conditions when using this framework to produce an analysis of the state of quality of employment in a country. To get a full picture of the labour market situation of a country, the framework on quality of employment should be accompanied by context indicators covering the population, employment, unemployment, persons not in the labour force as well as other indicators.

¹⁶ See for instance, *Measuring Quality of Employment, Country Pilot Reports*. UNECE, Geneva, 2010 or *Quality of Employment in Switzerland* available at <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/en/index/news/publikationen.html?publicationID=4515>.

¹⁷ See Stiglitz, Joseph; Sen, Amartya; Fitoussi, Jean-Paul, 2009: *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. At www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr, p. 15-19, 43-45.

38. These indicators, in particular those which reflect access to employment of certain vulnerable groups of the population, should be taken into account. In turn, qualitative measures can assist in interpreting conventional indicators of employment and unemployment - certain qualitative aspects of the employment available, for example, can result in lower labour market participation, especially for groups like school-leavers, re-entrants or elderly. To facilitate the consideration of these aspects, a suggestion for a list of context indicators that may be taken into account is attached in an annex to the framework. The list includes a proposal for indicators relating to the legal and institutional framework developed by a tripartite meeting of experts and presented to the 18th ICLS as part of the set of Decent Work measurement framework indicators.¹⁸ They are descriptive and aim to summarise legal information including the social security system, worker's rights and the system of industrial relations. The aim of these indicators is to give a snapshot of the legal regulations in the areas covered by the statistical indicators. Use of these indicators may help in interpreting the statistical indicators on quality of employment within the given institutional context.

39. The framework should be kept up-to-date. It should be periodically reviewed whether the list of indicators needs to be updated to remain relevant in the light of changes of employment forms and patterns. (we may keep this here, but could also consider later whether to move it to the section on future work (as it supports the proposal of having regular future meetings).

IV. Defining the dimensions of quality of employment

40. After establishing the principles for the statistical framework of measuring quality of employment the next step is to define the dimensions and sub-dimensions of the framework. The structure of the framework is intended to cover human needs that may be satisfied through employment. The proposed seven dimensions of quality of employment are illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1: The dimensions of quality of employment

¹⁸ See International Labour Organization, 2012: *Decent work indicators: concepts and definitions*. ILO manual. Geneva: ILO, pp. 19-21.



41. The dimensions and sub-dimensions of the framework for measuring quality of employment are presented below. It is important to note that the ordering of the dimensions does not imply any hierarchy among the dimensions and each may be considered equally important.

- 1 Safety and ethics of employment
 - (a) Safety at work
 - (b) Child labour and forced labour
 - (c) Fair treatment in employment
- 2 Income and benefits from employment
 - (a) Income
 - (b) Non-wage pecuniary benefits
- 3 Working hours and balancing work and non-working life
 - (a) Working hours
 - (b) Working time arrangements
 - (c) Balancing work and non-working life
- 4 Security of employment and social protection
 - (a) Security of employment
 - (b) Social protection
- 5 Social dialogue
- 6 Skills development and training
- 7 Workplace relationships and work motivation
 - (a) Workplace relationships
 - (b) Work motivation.

1. Safety and ethics of employment

42. The dimension on safety and ethics of employment focuses both on physical safety and conditions at work, and the rights and treatment of the person in employment. In this way, the dimension is a fundamental component of quality of employment, as physical well-being and the application of internationally accepted human rights and labour conventions are essential to ensure good quality. The indicators under this dimension provide general information on workplace injuries and deaths, and forms of labour such as child and forced labour, as well as unfair treatment like discriminatory or harassing work situations.

43. The physical safety and health aspect of quality of employment is covered by the sub-dimension Safety at work. Risks of injury or death can exist across all types of work, and thus indicators of the safety of work are an important element of quality of employment. The sub-dimension covers indicators regarding the frequency of occupational injuries as well as the share of employed persons working in hazardous economic activities and occupations. One further indicator in this sub-dimension, the percentage of employed persons who feel significant levels of stress related to their job, covers an important aspect of mental well-being at work.

44. The sub-dimensions Child and forced labour and Fair treatment in employment refer to the ethics of employment. The 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (24 November-5 December 2008) adopted the Resolution concerning statistics of child labour, which contains concepts, definitions and methods of data collection on child labour, including its worst forms. The ILO in the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) has worked extensively in this area. The ILO Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour (SIMPOC), which is the statistical arm of IPEC, provides statistics on the level, characteristics and determinants of child labour. Forced labour covers those indicators that provide information on any “work or service that is extracted from any person under the menace of any penalty and for which the said person has not offered himself or herself voluntarily”.¹⁹ This includes such practices as slavery, bonded labour and involuntary labour resulting from human trafficking. The term child labour, according to the resolution of the 18th ICLS, reflects “the engagement of children in prohibited work and, more generally, in types of work to be eliminated as socially and morally undesirable” as guided by national legislation and international standards. Children engaged in child labour include all persons aged 5 to 17 years who, during a specified time period, were engaged in one or more of the following categories of activities: (a) worst forms of child labour, (b) employment below the minimum age, and (c) hazardous unpaid household services.²⁰

45. The ethics of employment dimension would not be complete without considering discrimination. Issues of discrimination are captured in the sub-dimension Fair treatment in employment²¹, which is aimed at showing how fairly subpopulations are treated in employment. Attention should be paid to differences between men and women, various age groups, people of certain ethnic origins, people with physical or mental disabilities, indigenous populations and migrant populations. The sub-dimension covers three specific indicators that should be consulted when dealing with discrimination of specific population groups: occupational segregation, the pay gap between groups and the representation of

¹⁹ International Labour Organization, Convention No. 29.

²⁰ ILO, *Resolution concerning statistics of child labour*. 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians, Report of the Conference, pp. 56-66. Geneva 2009.

²¹ Elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation is part of the ILO's 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and covered by the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100) and the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111).

specific population groups in managerial positions. It should be noted that discrimination is only one driving factor that could explain group-specific differences regarding these indicators. Other factors include differences in career patterns, qualification and occupational preferences. In addition to these three indicators, in order to assess the level of fair treatment in employment in principle all aspects should be considered for all of the meaningful demographic and social categories in the population. Since the framework takes the perspective of the individual, in principle data should be collected and indicators be calculated at the level of the person. This allows disaggregation of the relevant quality of employment indicators per sub-population for which one might have concerns regarding their fair treatment, and compare those groups with each other or to the results for the general population. This could be done by producing profiles of quality of employment for selected subpopulations.

46. The approach to fair treatment advocated here was well-implemented in the country case studies prepared so far. For many of the indicators, countries highlighted the differences in quality of employment indicators due to sex and age. Additional important variables in these studies were immigrant/non-immigrant status and geographic region.

2. Income and benefits from employment

47. An obvious important component of quality of employment is the employment-related income that people receive. The concept of income is framed broadly to include not only income and earnings but also the benefits that an employer might provide (and pay for). People value the payment for their work, but they also consider the leave, the health coverage and other benefits provided by their work when asking themselves “what is a good job?”.²²

48. This dimension provides information on the earnings paid to employees, or income from self-employment. This compensation may take the form of wages and salaries or other remuneration such as bonuses, commissions, gratuities, remuneration income in kind, taxable allowances, retroactive wage payments and stock options. This remuneration could be calculated both on a “gross” and a “net” basis – that is, before and after deductions such as contributions to income tax, employment insurance, pension funds etc.

49. The sub-dimension Non-wage pecuniary benefits supplementary medical benefits provided by the employer, but also other types of non-monetary benefits provided such as the entitlement and actual use of paid sick leave and paid annual leave. Although both kinds of benefits are frequently regulated through labour law and collective agreements, they are nevertheless included under Income and benefits from employment. This is also justified by the fact that there might be a trade-off between income and non-wage pecuniary benefits, e.g. in countries in which employees can chose an increased salary in lieu of entitlements to paid leave.

3. Working hours and balancing work and non-working life

50. The number of hours worked and their scheduling is another important aspect of the quality of employment. Excessively long or involuntary short hours of work may have a

²² In a survey conducted on about 2,500 Canadians, over half of the respondents said that benefits were “very important” in a job, while over 6 in ten said that good pay was very important. Interestingly, the same survey compared what workers want in a job to what they feel they actually get. The largest “job quality deficits” were noted in pay, benefits and the related concept of advancement opportunities.

significant impact on human well-being.²³ The same applies to the percentage of employed persons working in more than one job.²⁴

51. In addition to the number of working hours, the timing or when the hours are worked may also be relevant. Working at unsocial hours over a long period could impact on health. For this reason, a separate sub-dimension on working time arrangements makes sense. It includes information regarding the share of employed persons working in the evening, at night or on the weekend. The sub-dimension furthermore covers the use of flexible work schedule. Although not always having univocal implications on quality of employment, the flexibility to schedule the working time may have a major impact on well-being.

52. In addition to the number and timing of working, another aspect of interest is work schedules' compatibility with other personal requirements, e.g. with family-related activities. The access of employed persons to child care as well as the possibility to work at home are important arrangements that could facilitate reconciling paid work with household duties and child care. The employment rates of mothers and fathers provide information on differences in reducing employment activities due to parenthood. Furthermore, the mean duration of commuting from home to work can have significant impact on the work-life balance as it adds to the working time and restricts the time available for non-working life.

4. Security of employment and social protection

53. Security of employment and social protection dimension assesses the threats to employment security as well as the measures/safety nets that can offset possible risks that come with short or long spells of unemployment or inactivity and retirement. The feeling of insecurity will often adversely affect well-being, as a large number of empirical studies have impressively proven.²⁵

54. Security of employment essentially refers to how likely a person is to lose his/her job(s). It involves information on the degree of permanence and tenure of the work, status in employment, and the formal or informal nature of employment. Information on the perceived job security is an important element to complement information available, e.g., on fixed-term contracts or persons employed via temporary employment agencies.

55. Social protection may be available in a variety of forms including unemployment insurance and pensions. The components of social protection covered here are distinct from those in Income and benefits from employment, as the former are more directly linked with the security of employment (e.g. likelihood of pregnant women losing employment, etc.) and often the cost of these benefits is born not solely by the employer. Other functions of social protection such as health insurance and long-term care insurance are further important elements that should be taken into account when studying quality of employment. However, as the institutional settings in countries are highly varied, indicators relating to these areas should be defined according to national circumstances.

²³ It was an important incentive to develop a EC directive on working time: Directive 2003/88/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 November 2003 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time Official Journal L 299 , 18/11/2003 P. 0009 - 0019

²⁴ See, e.g., ILO: *Decent Working Time: Balancing Workers' Needs with Business Requirements*. Geneva: International Labour Office 2007.

²⁵ For a recent overview, see Green, Francis. *Demanding work. The paradox of job quality in affluent economy*. Princeton and Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006, pp. 126-149.

5. Social dialogue

[This section will be reviewed and updated after the revision of the list of indicators.]

56. The degree to which the freedom to organize, strike and collectively bargain exists, and the degree to which employed people are able enter into social dialogue with employers and governments is an aspect of quality of employment that facilitates the improvement of conditions of employment covered in the other dimensions of the statistical framework. Social dialogue encompasses freedom of association and the right to organize and bargain collectively. Social dialogue includes all types of negotiation, consultation or simply exchange of information between representatives of governments, employers and workers, on issues of common interest relating to economic and social policy.

6. Skills development and training

[This section will be reviewed and updated after the revision of the list of indicators.]

57. The dimension skills development and life-long learning refers to the personal development opportunities of the individual employed. This dimension comprises indicators that show the degree to which workers are trained, and whether employed people are under or over-qualified for their work. This dimension of quality of employment should focus on indicators of training. Skills are not just a function of the abilities and training of the worker, but also reflect the growth possibilities at work.

7. Workplace relationships and work motivation

[This section will be reviewed and updated after the revision of the list of indicators.]

58. Workplace relationships and work motivating characteristics of the work are considered as elements of quality of employment since they directly affect the well-being of the individual employed.²⁶ Two sub-dimensions are distinguished: workplace relationships and work motivation. The first relates to the social characteristics of the work and the second comprises the more individual motivational characteristics.²⁷

59. A modern-day concern is how well we get along with our co-workers. The sub-dimension on workplace relationships focuses on inter-employee dialogue and relationships, as well as communications between employee and their supervisors. Work motivation provides information on characteristics of employment which provide motivation and/or make the worker feel comfortable and taken seriously. It captures elements of employment such as having valuable goals, competence, autonomy, and sufficient feedback from the supervisor. This sub-dimension covers two subjective indicators, namely: Share of workers who feel they do useful work and Share of workers who feel satisfied with their work.

²⁶ Lowe, Grahame S., and Grant Shellenberg, What's a Good Job? The Importance of Employment Relationships, Canadian Policy Research Networks, Study No. W05, Ottawa, 2001.

²⁷ See for example: Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D. & Morgeson, F. P.. *Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature*. Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 92 (2007) no. 5, 1332–1356.

V. The list of indicators of measuring quality of employment

60. The Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment took as basis the list of indicators formulated by the previous Task Force in *Potential indicators for measurement of quality of employment* (ECE/CES/2010/9)²⁸. This list of indicators was tested in a number of ways:

(a) Quality of Employment Country Pilot Profiles: Nine country profiles were prepared sponsored by the International Labour Organization, using funds provided by the European Union (specifically Canada, Israel, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Mexico, Moldova and Ukraine). Authors of the reports were asked to produce interpretive analysis of each aspect of quality of employment, using the proposed indicators as determined during earlier meetings of the Task Force. Feedback reports and presentations provided to the fifth UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Meeting on the Measurement of Quality of Employment showed general support for the indicators. The indicators presented below reflect comments made at that meeting. The country profiles are published in this collective volume and are also available on the UNECE website

(<http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/qualityofemployment/>).

(b) The Validation Study: this study by the Italian National Statistical Institute (ISTAT) used Principal Component Analysis to test the completeness/redundancy and validity of the quality of employment indicators selected for analysis. It highlighted the relevance of indicators suggested by the Task Force as well as provided evidence of the quality of employment indicators' applicability to the ILO's Decent Work agenda. The Validation study is available on the UNECE website at the link above.

Further independent country reports have also applied these indicators in different national contexts.²⁹

61. The current Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment proposed revisions of this list of indicators in order to incorporate comments given at the 58th Plenary Session of the CES³⁰, reflect issues raised in the country reports to date and at the Sixth Meeting of the Group of Experts on Measuring Quality of Employment (31 October-2 November 2011)³¹. In the revision exercise, the Expert Group through extensive electronic consultations and at its meeting 22-23 November 2012, renamed the indicators to improve accuracy in title and/or scope, as well as to achieve consistency with the terminology used by the ILO. Against the background of the experiences made in the countries represented in the Expert Group, further suggestions were agreed to revise, remove or to add or replace indicators to enhance relevant measurement in all dimensions of quality of employment. The current list of indicators is available the Annex 1 to this document.

²⁸ See *Potential indicators for measurement of quality of employment* (ECE/CES/2010/9) presented at the Conference of the European Statisticians, Fifty-eighth Plenary Session. Paris 8-10 June, 2010. Available at: <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/ece/ces/2010/9.e.pdf>

²⁹ See for instance Quality of Employment: *Earning money and what else counts?* Federal Statistical Office of Germany, 2011. Available at:

https://www.destatis.de/EN/Publications/Specialized/LabourMarket/QualityEmployment.pdf?__blob=publicationFile

³⁰ See *Report of the Conference of the European Statisticians, Fifty-eighth Plenary Session* (ECE/CES/79). Paris 8-10 June, 2010. Available at: <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/ece/ces/2010/zip.12.e.pdf>

³¹ See *Report, Group of Experts on Measuring Quality of Employment, Sixth Session*. Available at: http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/ece/ces/ge.12/2011/CES_GE.12_2011_2.pdf

VI. Future work and research issues

62. The labour markets do constantly change. Research of the impacts of work will lead to new results. New forms of employment are emerging, new working time patterns structure the working day of the employed and the technology used for work is under constant change. To keep the framework relevant under such changes, it should regularly be checked whether the list of indicators needs to be updated to remain relevant.

63. Also regarding the statistical input, changes will take place. New data sources might become available enabling the compilation of new indicators. To take into account such developments, the necessity of an adaptation of the framework should be examined in regular intervals.

64. Some indicators included in the list are still earmarked as experimental, either because further effort is needed to clarify the concepts or because the operationalization of the indicators in data collection requires further methodological research. The list of indicators should stimulate such research. Research areas identified by the Expert Group so far include the following [list to be continued and complete after the seventh meeting on measuring quality of employment and the second Expert Group meeting]:

- Additional payments, bonuses and non-wage benefits (dimension 2)
- Requirements for an implementation of the concept of “precarious employment” from the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-93) (dimension 4) [to be updated after possible revision of the ICSE-93]
- Application and operationalisation of informal employment according to the Guidelines concerning a statistical definition of informal employment endorsed by the 17th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) (dimension 4)
- Coverage of the population by (basic) health care provision (dimension 4)
- Presentation of the indicators (e.g. in the form of dashboards, aggregated or core indicators)

65. Regular meetings on quality of employment should be established to facilitate an ongoing international dialogue.

VII. How to use the indicators

66. Numerous rounds of exercises and revisions have been undertaken to confirm the current statistical framework and the indicators for measuring quality of employment. Country reports (15 at the time of the Sixth meeting of the Group of Experts on Measuring Quality of Employment) proved the practicability of the dimensions and the indicators. However, this is not to say that the list of indicators cannot be modified with changing needs and possibilities as long as the changes are well-justified. It is acknowledged that the list is a dynamic system that will require adaptations to changing circumstances and environments in the future.

67. In applying the indicators, it is proposed that countries consider all aspects of quality of employment indicators and decide for themselves which indicators are the most relevant. The Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment is currently working on preparing detailed indicator sheets. This contains sections on the definition, formula, recommended data sources, measurement objective, recommended metadata and interpretation guidelines. This will give guidance to countries. The entire set of indicator sheets is included as Annex 2 of this report.

68. At the national level, the indicators can be also used to identify labour market trends. In cases of economic downturn, for example, it is useful to know how the labour market adapts not only in terms of changes in the quantity of work but also possibly through changes in the quality of work. Secondly, the indicators are especially useful to identify groups with less favourable labour market situations. Many different sub-populations could be considered in this context: sex, age categories, ethnic minorities, level of educational attainment, persons with a disability, regions, etc. This requires of course that the indicators are measured for the categories in question, allowing a breakdown for the quantitative indicators. Finally, a possible application of the list of indicators would be to use it to compare the quality of employment in different sectors of economic activity.

69. Another important comparison between different categories of employed persons, at least for certain dimensions of quality of employment, is that of status in employment: employees; employers, own-account workers; contributing family workers and employees. They may face different issues with respect to issues of quality of employment. It is important to note that the quality of employment indicators aim at covering both persons in paid employment and the self-employed and for that reason many of the indicators are defined in terms of all employed persons. While some sub-dimensions are by definition more relevant for employees, countries should in principle cover all employed when measuring quality of employment.

70. Finally, it is recognized that movement, up or down, in some indicators could have a different meaning in different contexts. For example, an increase in the numbers of hours worked per employee for a given economic activity may mean a reduction in the quality of employment in a country where policy-makers' view is that employees are overworked, compared to another country where there may be a general lack of employment opportunities. The users of the indicator should decide for themselves whether or not quality of employment is improving. Again, as suggested earlier, that assessment should be done using the maximum number of variables available and relevant for an individual country making use of the proposed list of context indicators.

VII. Context indicators

71. Since the quality of employment for the individual the subject of this statistical framework, "access to employment" was a dimension considered, but determined to be outside the scope. However, one should not ignore the general labour market conditions when using the indicators to produce analysis of the state of quality of employment in a country. To get a full picture of the labour market situation of a country, the indicators on quality of employment should ideally be accompanied by context indicators. The list included as annex 3 of this report recommends statistical context indicators as well as legal framework indicators.

72. The statistical context indicators cover a set of well-established labour market indicators concerning the population, the labour market participation and employment rate of various population groups, unemployment and persons not in the labour force. Further statistical context indicators relate to migration, working time at household level, social protection, income distribution and the short-term economic trends. These indicators do not provide information on quality of employment as such, but rather quantitative information on the development of the number of employed persons and other relevant socio-economic developments. This kind of information nevertheless often needs to be taken into account to understand changes regarding quality of employment.

73. Furthermore, the legal and institutional framework in a given country often should be taken into consideration. For example, the legal provisions for the termination of employment

is important background information for the interpretation of the percentage of employees with fixed-term contracts. The Expert Group recommends that countries consider the list of legal framework indicators developed in the ILO's Decent Work measurement framework, referring to the ILO Manual, *Decent work indicators: concepts and definitions*.³² The legal framework indicators are not indicators in the statistical sense of the term. Rather, they provide descriptive information to be consulted when studying the results of quality of employment indicators.

³² http://www.ilo.org/stat/Publications/WCMS_183859/lang--en/index.htm

Annex 1: Draft revised list of Indicators for the Measurement of Quality of Employment³³

| <i>Dimension</i> | <i>No.</i> | <i>Suggested Indicators</i> |
|------------------------------------|------------|--|
| 1. Safety and ethics of employment | | |
| (a) Safety at work | 1a1 | Rate of fatal occupational injuries per 100,000 employed persons |
| | 1a2 | Rate of nonfatal (with lost workdays) occupational injuries per 100,000 employed persons |
| | 1a3 | Percentage of employed persons working in hazardous economic activities and occupations |
| | 1a4 | Percentage of employed persons who feel significant levels of stress related to their job |
| (b) Child labour and forced labour | 1b1 | Percentage of employed persons who are below the minimum age for work |
| | 1b2 | Percentage of employed persons below a certain age (e.g., 18 years) in “hazardous” industries and occupations (to be defined by countries) |
| | 1b3 | Percentage of employed persons below a certain age (e.g. 18 years) with working hours exceeding a specific threshold |
| | 1b4 | Percentage of children working in household chores which exceed a specified threshold of hours |
| | 1b5 | Percentage of children engaged under hazardous conditions |
| | 1b6 | Percentage of employed or recently-employed migrant population who were deceived during recruitment to/by an employer |
| | 1b7 | Percentage of employed or recently-employed migrants who felt they were forced or coerced during their employment |

³³ Dimensions 1 to 4: Draft proposed by the Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment, 22-23 November 2012; dimensions 5 to 7: as presented to the 58th Conference of European Statisticians in June 2010 (review ongoing)

| <i>Dimension</i> | <i>No.</i> | <i>Suggested Indicators</i> |
|--|------------|---|
| (c) Fair treatment of employment | | <p>For the measurement of fair treatment, users interested in the measurement of fair treatment should consider the demographic or social groups relevant given the national circumstances. It is recommended to always provide breakdowns by sex and age groups.</p> <p>Groups for whom fair treatment could be an issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sex Ethnic groups Immigrants Indigenous population Persons with disabilities Age groups Geographic Regions <p>Furthermore, the following specific indicators on fair treatment should be included:</p> |
| | 1c1 | Occupational segregation (e.g. by sex) |
| | 1c2 | Pay gap between groups (e.g. Gender pay gap) |
| | 1c3 | Percentage of employed women in managerial occupations (ISCO-08 major group 1) |
| 2. Income and benefits from employment | | |
| (a) Income from employment | 2a1 | Mean nominal monthly / hourly earnings of employees (local currency) |
| | 2a2 | Percentage of employees with low pay |
| | 2a3 | Nominal monthly / hourly earnings of employees by deciles (local currency) |
| | 2a4 | Employment-related income of self-employed by deciles (local currency) |
| (b) Non-wage pecuniary benefits | 2b1 | Percentage of employees entitled to paid annual leave |
| | 2b2 | Mean number of days of paid annual leave per year to which employees are entitled |
| | 2b3 | Mean number of days of paid annual leave used per employee per year |
| | 2b4 | Percentage of employees entitled to paid sick leave |
| | 2b5 | Mean number of days of paid sick leave per year to which employees are entitled |
| | 2b6 | Mean number of days of paid sick leave used per employee per year |

| <i>Dimension</i> | <i>No.</i> | <i>Suggested Indicators</i> |
|--|------------|--|
| | 2b8 | Percentage of employees with supplemental medical insurance plan |
| 3. Working hours and balancing work and non-working life | | |
| (a) Working hours | 3a1 | Mean weekly hours usually worked per employed person |
| | 3a2 | Percentage of employed persons usually working 49 hours or more per week |
| | 3a3 | Percentage of employed persons working few hours per week involuntary (Involuntarily part-time) |
| | 3a4 | Employment by weekly hours usually worked (quintiles) |
| | 3a5 | Percentage of employed persons working more than one job |
| (b) Working time arrangements | 3b1 | Percentage of employed persons who usually work at night |
| | 3b2 | Percentage of employed persons who usually work in the evening |
| | 3b3 | Percentage of employed persons who usually work on the weekend |
| | 3b4 | Percentage of employees with a flexible work schedule |
| (c) Balancing work and non-working life | 3c1 | Percentage of parents receiving maternity/ paternity/ family leave benefits |
| | 3c2 | Percentage of women, resp. men aged 20-49 years who are employed with and without children under compulsory school age |
| | 3c3 | Percentage of employed persons whose working arrangements offer the possibility to work at home |
| | 3c4 | Percentage of households with at least one employed parent with access to child care |
| | 3c5 | Mean duration of commuting time between work and home |
| 4. Security of employment and social protection | | |
| (a) Security of employment | 4a1 | Percentage of employees 25 years and older with fixed term contract |
| | 4a2 | Precarious employment rate-(experimental) |
| | 4a3 | Percentage of employed persons over a certain age (e.g. 25 years) whose number of years of tenure at the current employer is (1) < 1 year, (2) |

| <i>Dimension</i> | <i>No.</i> | <i>Suggested Indicators</i> |
|-----------------------|------------|--|
| | | 1 - 5 years (3) 5 - 10 years and (4) >= 10 years |
| | 4a4 | Percentage of employed persons who are own-account workers |
| | 4a5 | Percentage of self-employed workers with only one client |
| | 4a6 | Informal employment rate (experimental) |
| | 4a7 | Perceived job security (e.g. percentage of employed persons who state that they might lose their job in the next six months) |
| | 4a8 | Percentage of persons employed via a temporary employment agency |
| | 4a9 | Percentage of employees without formal contracts |
| (b) Social protection | 4b1 | Percentage of economically active population contributing to a pension scheme |
| | 4b2 | Percentage of employees covered by unemployment insurance |
| | 4b3 | Mean unemployment insurance payment as a percentage of mean earnings |

Dimensions 5 to 7 as presented to the 58th Conference of European Statisticians in June 2010 (review by the Expert Group ongoing)

| | |
|--|---|
| 5. Social dialogue | Share of employees covered by collective wage bargaining |
| | Share of enterprises belonging to employer organisations |
| 6. Skills development and training | Share of employed people who received job training within a period of time (e.g., the last 12 months) |
| | Share of employed people who received job training by type of job training (e.g. job-related, done on one's own initiative) |
| | Share of employed people in high skilled occupations |
| | Share of employed people who have more education than is normally required in their occupation |
| | Share of employed people who have less education than is normally required in their occupation |
| 7. Workplace relationships and work motivation | |
| (a) Workplace relationships | Share of employed people who feel they have a |

strong or very strong relationship with their co-workers

Share of employed people who feel they have a strong or very strong relationship with their supervisor

Share of employed people who feel they have been a victim of discrimination at work

Share of employed people who feel they have been harassed at work

(b) Work motivation

Share of employed people who are able to choose order of tasks or methods of work

Share of employed people who receive regular feedback from their supervisor

Share of employed people who feel they are able to apply their own ideas in work

Share of employed people who feel they do "useful" work

Share of employed people who feel satisfied with their work

Annex 2: Indicator definition sheets³⁴

³⁴

Currently under development by the Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment

Annex 3: Potential context indicators for measurement of quality of employment³⁵

I. Statistical variables, indicators and indices

| <i>Topic</i> | <i>No.</i> | <i>Suggested Indicators</i> |
|---|------------|--|
| 1. Population, working-age population, and labour force | 1.1 | Total population by sex and age (Persons) |
| | 1.2 | Working age population by sex, age and education (Persons) |
| | 1.3 | Working age population by sex and geographical coverage, urban and rural (Persons) |
| | 1.4 | Economically active population by sex and age (Persons) |
| | 1.5 | Labour force participation rate, by sex and age (Percentage) |
| 2. Employment | 2.1 | Number of employed persons by sex and age (Persons) |
| | 2.2 | Employment rate by sex and age (Percentage of total population) |
| | 2.3 | Employed women as a percentage of total employment (Percentage) |
| | 2.4 | Employment by economic activity (ISIC-04) and sex (Persons and percentage) |
| | 2.5 | Female share of employment by economic activity (ISIC-04) |
| | 2.6 | Employment by occupation group (ISCO-08) and sex (Persons and percentage) |
| | 2.7 | Employment by status in employment (ICSE-93) and sex (Persons and percentage) |
| | 2.8 | Share of wage employment in non-agricultural employment by sex (Percentage) |
| 3. Unemployed and not in the labour force | 3.1 | Unemployment by level of education and sex (Persons) |
| | 3.2 | Unemployment rate by sex (Percentage) |
| | 3.3 | Youth unemployment rate, 15-24 years (Percentage) |
| | 3.4 | Youth not in education and not in employment, 15–24 years (Percentage) |
| | 3.5 | Persons marginally attached (persons and percentage) |
| | 3.6 | Persons outside the labour force who want a job |

³⁵ Draft proposal for discussion in the Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment

| <i>Topic</i> | <i>No.</i> | <i>Suggested Indicators</i> |
|-------------------------------|------------|--|
| | | (Persons and percentage) |
| | 3.7 | Discouraged workers (Persons and percentage) |
| 4. Migrant workers | | |
| | 4.1 | Resident population by sex and country of origin, total and migrant population (Persons) |
| | 4.2 | Employed persons by sex and by country of origin, total and migrant population (Persons) |
| | 4.3 | Inflows of employed migrants by sex and country of origin (Persons) |
| | 4.4 | Outflows of employed nationals by sex and country of destination (Persons) |
| 5. Working time per household | | |
| | 5.1 | Mean weekly hours usually worked per household (Hours) |
| | 5.2 | Mean household size (Number of persons) |
| | 5.3 | Work intensity index, by household structure |
| | 5.4 | Work intensity index, by number of children |
| 6. Income distribution | | |
| | 6.1 | Economically active population living in households with incomes below the nationally-defined poverty line as a percent of the economically active population, by sex (Percentage) |
| | 6.2 | Employed population living in households with incomes below the nationally-defined poverty line as a percent of the total employed population, by sex (Percentage) |
| | 6.3 | Income inequality (percentile ratio P90/P10, income or consumption) |
| | 6.4 | Percentage of individuals in the population whose incomes fall below the nationally defined poverty line (Headcount poverty ratio) |
| 7. Social protection | | |
| | 7.1 | Public social security expenditure as a percentage of GDP |
| | 7.2 | Percentage of persons at or above the statutory retirement age (or 65 and over) who are employed |
| | 7.3 | Percentage of unemployed persons receiving regular periodic social security unemployment benefits (contributory and non-contributory schemes) |
| | 7.4 | Percentage of employed population covered by a (basic) health care provision |
| 8. Labour inspection | | |
| | 8.1 | Registered work places that could be selected for labour inspection (Work places) |

| <i>Topic</i> | <i>No.</i> | <i>Suggested Indicators</i> |
|---|------------|---|
| | 8.2 | Number of labour inspectors (Persons) |
| | 8.3 | Labour inspection visits to work places during the year (cases) |
| 9. Other statistical context indicators | | |
| | 9.1 | Children not in school (% by age) (Percentage) |
| | 9.2 | Education of adult population (adult literacy rate, adult secondary-school graduation rate) |
| | 9.3 | Estimated percentage of working age population who are HIV positive |
| | 9.4 | Inflation rate (CPI) |
| | 9.5 | Labour productivity (GDP per employed person, level and growth rate) |
| | 9.6 | Labour share in GDP (Percentage) |
| | 9.7 | Real GDP per capita in PPP\$ (level and growth rate) |
| | 9.8 | Children not in school (% by age) (Percentage) |

II. Suggested legal framework indicators

Labour Administration

Government commitment to full employment

Unemployment insurance

Statutory minimum wage

Maximum hours of work

Paid annual leave

Maternity leave

Parental leave

Child Labour

Forced Labour

Termination of employment

Equal opportunity and treatment

Equal remuneration of men and women for work of equal value

Employment injury benefits (Income replacement in case of employment injury)

Occupational safety and health labour inspection

Pension (public/private)

Incapacity for work due to sickness / sick leave (Income replacement in case of sickness / sick leave)

Incapacity for work due to invalidity (Income replacement in case of invalidity)

Freedom of association and the right to organise

Collective bargaining right

Tripartite consultations