

# DIGITALES ARCHIV

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft  
*ZBW – Leibniz Information Centre for Economics*

## Book

### Reconciliation between work and family life : labour force survey: reference year 2018

#### Provided in Cooperation with:

National Statistics Office Malta, Valletta

*Reference:* (2020). Reconciliation between work and family life : labour force survey: reference year 2018. Lascaris, Valletta, Malta : National Statistics Office.  
[https://nso.gov.mt/en/publicatons/Publications\\_by\\_Unit/Documents/C2\\_Labour\\_Market\\_Statistics/Reconciliation%20between%20work%20and%20family%20life%202018.pdf](https://nso.gov.mt/en/publicatons/Publications_by_Unit/Documents/C2_Labour_Market_Statistics/Reconciliation%20between%20work%20and%20family%20life%202018.pdf).

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11159/4920>

#### Kontakt/Contact

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft/Leibniz Information Centre for Economics  
Düsternbrooker Weg 120  
24105 Kiel (Germany)  
E-Mail: [rights\[at\]zbw.eu](mailto:rights[at]zbw.eu)  
<https://www.zbw.eu/>

#### Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieses Dokument darf zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Sofern für das Dokument eine Open-Content-Lizenz verwendet wurde, so gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

<https://savearchive.zbw.eu/termsfuse>

#### Terms of use:

*This document may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes. You are not to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. If the document is made available under a Creative Commons Licence you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the licence.*



# Reconciliation between work and family life

Labour Force Survey: Reference year 2018

Published by  
National Statistics Office  
Lascaris, Valletta VLT 2000  
Malta  
Tel.: (+356) 2599 7000  
e-mail: [nso@gov.mt](mailto:nso@gov.mt)  
website: <http://www.nso.gov.mt>

#### CIP Data

Reconciliation between work and family life, 2018 –  
Valletta: National Statistics Office, Malta, 2020  
vi, 56p.

ISBN: 978-99957-29-87-5

NSO publications are available from:

Communication and Dissemination Unit  
National Statistics Office  
Lascaris  
Valletta VLT 2000  
Malta  
Tel: (+356) 2599 7219  
email: [nso@gov.mt](mailto:nso@gov.mt)

For further information about the content of this publication, please contact:

Unit C2: Labour Market and Information Society Statistics  
National Statistics Office  
Lascaris  
Valletta  
Tel: (+356) 25 99 76 69  
email: [labourmarket.nso@gov.mt](mailto:labourmarket.nso@gov.mt)

# CONTENTS

		Page
	Section 1 EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE .....	5
	Section 2 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS .....	11
	Section 3 WORK INTENSITY .....	21
	Section 4 RECONCILIATION BETWEEN WORK AND FAMILY LIFE .....	31
	Section 5 FORMAL CARE SERVICES TO FACILITATE ONE'S WORK LIFE BALANCE .....	39
	Section 6 CAREER BREAKS .....	47
	ANNEX .....	53





The European Union flag, featuring a circle of twelve gold stars on a blue field, is partially visible on the left side of the image. It is set against a background of a cloudy sky.

# Section

# 01

## European perspective



## EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE

According to LFS estimates, in 2018, 32.0 per cent of persons residing in Malta between the age of 18 and 64 reported care responsibilities. These responsibilities involved caring for own or partner's children under 15 years of age (82,153 persons or 26.4%), ill, elderly or disabled relatives (10,938 persons or 3.5%) or both (6,449 persons or 2.1%). This is slightly lower than the EU-28 figure as 34.2 per cent or 106 million out of 310 million persons in the EU reported care responsibilities.

Care responsibilities among the EU 28<sup>1</sup>


Among the EU 28, 28.7 per cent had childcare responsibilities, a further 4.1 per cent took care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives while 1.4 per cent had both types of care responsibilities. The largest share of childcare responsibilities was recorded in Ireland (35.2%), Sweden (34.3%) and France (32.9%) while Bulgaria (22.5%), Germany (23.9%) and Greece (24.4%) registered the lowest shares. This comprised personal care, homework assistance, playing games, reading, going out, giving a ride and supervision among others.

Denmark, Romania and Germany had the lowest rates of ill, elderly or disabled relatives' care responsibilities (0.7%, 1.8% and 2.0% respectively). Such care included personal care, physical help, giving them a ride, helping with paperwork or financial matters and domestic help. Meanwhile, Greece (7.7%), Netherlands (7.7%) and Croatia (6.5%) had the largest share of this kind of care responsibility.

The share of persons caring for both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives was relatively low among all European countries. Lithuania registered the lowest share of 0.6 per cent followed by Czechia, Slovenia, Austria and Denmark where a share of 0.7 per cent was recorded. Meanwhile, Netherlands (2.3%), Estonia (2.2%) and Ireland, Luxembourg and Malta (2.1%) reported the largest shares of both types of care responsibilities.

A gap of 13.6 percentage points was recorded between Germany, the country with the lowest share of care responsibilities (26.7%) and Ireland, the country with the highest share of care responsibilities (40.3%). Malta ranked the 8th country with the lowest share of care responsibilities (32.0%) (Chart 1).

Chart 1. The share of persons between 18 and 64 years with care responsibilities across European Union countries <sup>2</sup>



<sup>2</sup> Some countries do not add up to 100% due to non-response.

1 The EU 28 aggregate is used for this adhoc module since in 2018 the United Kingdom was still part of the European Union.



## EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE

TABLE 1. Number of persons between 18 and 64 years by type of care responsibility and sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Taking care of children	40 452	24.9
Taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives	3 838	2.4
Taking care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives	2 561	1.6
No care responsibilities	115 756	71.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>162 607</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Taking care of children	41 701	28.0
Taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives	7 100	4.8
Taking care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives	3 888	2.6
No care responsibilities	96 128	64.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>148 817</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Taking care of children	82 153	26.4
Taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives	10 938	3.5
Taking care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives	6 449	2.1
No care responsibilities	211 884	68.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>311 424</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE

TABLE 2. Share of persons between 18 and 64 years by type of care responsibility across the European Union<sup>1</sup>

	No care responsibilities	Taking care of children	Taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives	Taking care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives
	per cent			
Ireland	49.6	35.2	3.0	2.1
Luxembourg	58.2	30.6	3.7	2.1
Estonia	60.3	32.2	5.4	2.2
France	61.8	32.9	4.0	1.3
Sweden	62.1	34.3	2.8	0.8
Netherlands	62.3	27.7	7.7	2.3
Poland	62.7	30.7	4.9	1.8
Greece	62.8	24.4	7.7	2.0
United Kingdom	63.4	31.1	4.0	1.5
Portugal	64.0	28.0	4.6	1.4
Latvia	64.1	29.4	4.8	1.5
Cyprus	64.7	30.5	4.0	0.9
Spain	64.8	28.2	5.1	1.8
<b>EU 28</b>	<b>65.1</b>	<b>28.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>1.4</b>
Belgium	65.1	29.9	3.0	1.9
Italy	65.4	26.9	5.9	1.8
Czechia	65.5	31.0	2.8	0.7
Romania	66.4	30.9	1.8	0.9
Slovenia	66.6	29.8	2.9	0.7
Croatia	66.9	24.8	6.5	1.9
Slovakia	67.2	27.8	3.4	0.9
<b>Malta</b>	<b>68.0</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>2.1</b>
Lithuania	68.2	27.9	3.3	0.6
Hungary	68.3	27.2	3.7	0.8
Finland	68.5	27.8	2.9	0.8
Austria	68.9	26.7	3.7	0.7
Denmark	69.1	29.5	0.7	0.7
Germany	69.7	23.9	2.0	0.8
Bulgaria	71.2	22.5	4.2	1.0

<sup>1</sup> Some countries do not add up to 100% due to non-response.





# Section

## 02

### Demographic characteristics




## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

### Demographic Details

Overall, LFS estimates showed that a larger number of females had childcare responsibilities (41,701 females). Yet, the share of males who reported childcare duties was still significant (40,452 males). The estimate of females with care responsibilities for ill, elderly or disabled relatives was almost double the amount recorded for males (7,100 and 3,838 respectively) (Chart 2).


Persons coping with the challenge of multi-generational care are referred to as the 'sandwich generation'. The ad hoc module findings indicated that this phenomenon was more common among females than males (3,888 females and 2,561 males respectively).

Chart 2. Type of care responsibilities by sex



The average age of persons with care responsibilities was 40 years; 41 for males and 39 for females. However, the mean age varied according to the type of care responsibility. On average, persons with child care responsibilities were 39 years old whereas the average age of carers for the ill, elderly or disabled was 48 years. Meanwhile, the average age of carers with both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives care was recorded to be 40.

Chart 3. Type of care responsibilities by age group





## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

More than half of males and nearly half of the females with childcare responsibilities were between 35 and 44 years (53.3% and 47.4% respectively). Similarly, caregivers of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives were mostly between the age of 35 and 44 years (55.5%). The age bracket changed for those who took care of ill, elderly and disabled relatives only and in fact, the majority with this type of care responsibility were between 55 and 64 years (38.5% for males and 38.4% for females) (Chart 3).

### Education

Overall, LFS figures showed that 44.0 per cent of caregivers achieved a low level of education, 29.6 per cent attained a medium level of education while 26.4 per cent obtained a high level of education. Nearly three out of four persons with care responsibilities who were not in employment achieved a low level of education (72.4%).

The share of employed males with care responsibilities decreased among those with higher educational attainment. In fact, 43.5 per cent of males achieved a low level of education, 29.8 per cent obtained a medium level of education while 26.7 per cent held a tertiary level of education (Chart 4).

Chart 4a. Employed males with care responsibilities by level of education





Chart 4b. Total males with care responsibilities by level of education



## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

By contrast, employed females with a higher level of education had a higher share of care responsibilities when compared to females with a lower educational attainment. In fact 26.4 per cent of employed female caregivers attained a low level of education, 35.2 per cent achieved a medium level of education whereas 38.4 per cent obtained a high level of education.

Chart 5a. Employed females with care responsibilities by level of education





Chart 5b. Total females with care responsibilities by level of education




Furthermore, the majority of females who were not in employment achieved a low level of education (71.6%) and a further 20.4 per cent attained a medium level of education. This indicates that the females' level of education has an important influence on employment and caregiving patterns. The higher the level of education the higher the probability for females to be employed, in spite of their caring responsibilities.

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

### Labour Status

Among the 82,153 persons with childcare responsibilities, 66,259 were employed and 15,894 were not employed. A further 10,938 persons took care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives (6,601 employed and 4,337 not employed). Whereas 6,449 persons had caring responsibilities of both children and ill, elderly or disabled (4,976 employed persons and 1,473 persons without employment).

Chart 6. Share of persons by labour status and type of care responsibilities



Even though the majority of both male and female caregivers were employed (94.1% and 64.1% respectively), a greater share was recorded for males. The discrepancy between male and female caregivers amounted to 30 percentage points (Chart 6).

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

TABLE 3. Average age of persons with care responsibilities by type of care responsibility and sex

	Males	Females	Total
	Average		
Taking care of children	40.4	37.7	39.0
Taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives	46.0	49.5	48.3
Taking care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives	40.4	39.0	39.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>40.9</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>40.1</b>

TABLE 4. Number of persons by type of care responsibility, age group and sex

Age groups	Males		Females		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
<b>Taking care of children</b>						
18 to 24 years	:	:	1 386 <sup>u</sup>	3.3 <sup>u</sup>	2 104	2.6
25 to 34 years	7 750	19.2	13 482	32.3	21 232	25.8
35 to 44 years	21 579	53.3	19 774	47.4	41 353	50.3
45 to 54 years	8 677	21.5	6 038	14.5	14 715	17.9
55 to 64 years	1 728	4.3	1 021 <sup>u</sup>	2.4 <sup>u</sup>	2 749	3.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>40 452</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>41 701</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>82 153</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives</b>						
18 to 24 years	:	:	:	:	:	:
25 to 34 years	:	:	:	:	1 090 <sup>u</sup>	10.0 <sup>u</sup>
35 to 44 years	:	:	1 122 <sup>u</sup>	15.8 <sup>u</sup>	1 670 <sup>u</sup>	15.3 <sup>u</sup>
45 to 54 years	824 <sup>u</sup>	21.5 <sup>u</sup>	2 626	37.0	3 450	31.5
55 to 64 years	1 476	38.5	2 728	38.4	4 204	38.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 838</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>7 100</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>10 938</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Taking care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives</b>						
18 to 24 years	:	:	:	:	:	:
25 to 34 years	:	:	:	:	:	:
35 to 44 years	1 399 <sup>u</sup>	54.6 <sup>u</sup>	2 182	56.1	3 581	55.5
45 to 54 years	:	:	630 <sup>u</sup>	16.2 <sup>u</sup>	1 284 <sup>u</sup>	19.9 <sup>u</sup>
55 to 64 years	:	:	:	:	:	:
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 561</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>3 888</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>6 449</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>						
18 to 24 years	995 <sup>u</sup>	2.1 <sup>u</sup>	1 706 <sup>u</sup>	3.2 <sup>u</sup>	2 701	2.7
25 to 34 years	8 971	19.1	14 747	28.0	23 718	23.8
35 to 44 years	23 526	50.2	23 078	43.8	46 604	46.8
45 to 54 years	10 155	21.7	9 294	17.6	19 449	19.5
55 to 64 years	3 204	6.8	3 864	7.3	7 068	7.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>46 851</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>52 689</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>99 540</b>	<b>100.0</b>

: Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

TABLE 5. Number of persons with care responsibilities by labour status, education and sex

Education	Males		Females		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
<b>Employed</b>						
Low	19 183	43.5	8 907	26.4	28 090	36.1
Medium	13 119	29.8	11 886	35.2	25 005	32.1
High	11 785	26.7	12 956	38.4	24 741	31.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>44 087</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33 749</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>77 836</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Not employed</b>						
Low	2 149 <sup>u</sup>	77.7 <sup>u</sup>	13 557	71.6	15 706	72.4
Medium	:	:	3 858	20.4	4 420	20.4
High	:	:	1 525 <sup>u</sup>	8.1 <sup>u</sup>	1 578 <sup>u</sup>	7.3 <sup>u</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 764</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18 940</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>21 704</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>						
Low	21 332	45.5	22 464	42.6	43 796	44.0
Medium	13 681	29.2	15 744	29.9	29 425	29.6
High	11 838	25.3	14 481	27.5	26 319	26.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>46 851</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>52 689</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>99 540</b>	<b>100.0</b>

: Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

TABLE 6. Number of persons with care responsibilities by labour status and sex

Labour status	Males		Females		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Employed	44 087	94.1	33 749	64.1	77 836	78.2
Not Employed	2 764	5.9	18 940	35.9	21 704	21.8
<i>Unemployed</i>	:	:	:	:	1 435 <sup>u</sup>	1.4 <sup>u</sup>
<i>Inactive</i>	2 209	4.7	18 060	34.3	20 269	20.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>46 851</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>52 689</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>99 540</b>	<b>100.0</b>

: Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

TABLE 7. Number of employed persons with care responsibilities by type of care responsibility and sex

Type of care responsibility	Males		Females		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
<b>Employed</b>						
Taking care of children	38 620	87.6	27 639	81.9	66 259	85.1
Taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives	2 906	6.6	3 695	10.9	6 601	8.5
Taking care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives	2 561	5.8	2 415	7.2	4 976	6.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>44 087</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33 749</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>77 836</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Not employed</b>						
Taking care of children	1 832 <sup>u</sup>	66.3 <sup>u</sup>	14 062	74.2	15 894	73.2
Taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives	932 <sup>u</sup>	33.7 <sup>u</sup>	3 405	18.0	4 337	20.0
Taking care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives	:	:	1 473 <sup>u</sup>	7.8 <sup>u</sup>	1 473 <sup>u</sup>	6.8 <sup>u</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 764</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18 940</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>21 704</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>						
Taking care of children	40 452	86.3	41 701	79.1	82 153	82.5
Taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives	3 838	8.2	7 100	13.5	10 938	11.0
Taking care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives	2 561	5.5	3 888	7.4	6 449	6.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>46 851</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>52 689</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>99 540</b>	<b>100.0</b>

: Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.





A person wearing a blue suit and a black watch is holding a brown leather briefcase. The image is partially covered by a semi-transparent orange rectangle. Inside this rectangle, the text 'Section 03' and 'Work intensity' is written in white.

# Section

## 03

**Work  
intensity**



## WORK INTENSITY

### Employment and care intensity

LFS results showed that care responsibilities have a bearing on the hours worked for females. In fact females with care responsibilities worked on average 34.3 hours per week. However, males with the same care responsibilities worked an average of 42.2 hours per week, that is 8 hours more than their female counterparts.


### Hours worked

Females who took care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives worked an average of 41.6 hours per week. Those with child care responsibilities worked 8 hours less per week that is an average of 33.6 hours. Moreover, females who took care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives, thus implying a higher care intensity, worked a mean of 31.2 hours per week.

In contrast, males with care responsibilities worked an average of 42.2 hours per week irrespective of the type and intensity of their care responsibilities. A reason for this difference is due to the share of males and females with a full-time job. In fact, 96.3 per cent of all employed males with care responsibilities had a full-time job as opposed to 66.7 per cent of females.

Moreover, LFS results indicated that a third of females with care responsibilities were employed on a part-time or a full-time with reduced hours basis (33.3%). This type of employment is considered a family-friendly measure aimed to facilitate the reconciliation between work and family life. Nearly nine out of ten women took this decision due to family-related reasons. In fact, 44.9 per cent chose part-time work for other family or personal responsibilities while 41.9 per cent took this decision to look after children or ill, elderly or disabled relatives (Chart 7).

Chart 7. Reasons for part-time work among females




## WORK INTENSITY

### Occupation

A difference in the proportion of males and females with care responsibilities in managerial positions is also evident. In fact, of all managerial jobs, 69.9 per cent were taken up by males as opposed to 30.1 per cent taken by females. Comparisons by sex for each job occupation, showed that more females were employed as professionals (57.7% as opposed to 42.3%), as sales assistants (57.7% as opposed to 42.3%) or in clerical occupations (63.3% as opposed to 36.7%) (Chart 8).


Chart 8. Share of males and females by occupation



### Effect of care on employment

The majority of persons between 18 and 64 years indicated that their care responsibilities did not affect their employment (65.5%). This was more significant for males (77.0%) rather than females (49.8%). Among the 34.5 per cent of employed persons who stated that their care responsibilities affected their employment, 13.1 per cent stated that they changed their job to increase their income, 9.5 per cent worked less hours and 4.7 per cent changed job, employer or took on less demanding tasks to facilitate reconciliation (Chart 9).

Chart 9. Main effect of care responsibilities on one's employment



## WORK INTENSITY

LFS findings indicated that the adaptations to employment are different for males and females with the onset of care responsibilities. Almost one in five females reduced their working time whereas 12.7 per cent of males resorted to ways in which they could increase their income. Such arrangements were probably sought to compensate for the decrease in their partner's working hours. Different adaptations can be made to increase one's income such as an increase in one's working hours in the same job, taking up a second job, or taking a job with more responsibilities thus yielding a higher salary.

The share of males with care responsibilities undertaking a second job or having shift employment are both likely to increase one's income. The proportion of males with care responsibilities having a second job was higher when compared to those without care responsibilities (6.2% and 3.6% respectively). In addition, the share of males with care responsibilities working on a shift basis was double the proportion of females; 20.3 per cent and 10.3 per cent respectively.

Persons with care responsibilities worked less overtime when compared to those without such commitments (41.6% as opposed to 58.4%). In addition, a lower share of persons with care responsibilities who wished to work more hours was reported (7.2%) when compared to those without care responsibilities (8.8%).

TABLE 8. Average normal hours worked by type of care responsibility and sex

	Males	Females	Total
	Mean		
Taking care of children	42.3	33.6	38.7
Taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives	41.3	41.6	41.4
Taking care of both children and ill, elderly or disabled relatives	41.5	31.2	36.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>42.2</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>38.8</b>

TABLE 9. Number of employed persons with care responsibilities by type of employment and sex

Type of employment	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Full-time	42 443	96.3
Full-time with reduced hours or part-time	1 644 <sup>u</sup>	3.7 <sup>u</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>44 087</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Full-time	22 494	66.7
Full-time with reduced hours or part-time	11 255	33.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>33 749</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Full-time	64 937	83.4
Full-time with reduced hours or part-time	12 899	16.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>77 836</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.



## WORK INTENSITY

TABLE 10. The main reason for part-time work for females with care responsibilities

	Number	Per cent
Look after children or disabled adults	4 713	41.9
Other family or personal responsibilities	5 052	44.9
Other reasons (specify)	1 490	13.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>11 255</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## WORK INTENSITY

TABLE 11. Number of employed persons with care responsibilities by occupation and sex

Occupation	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Armed Forces	:	:
Managers	7 692	17.4
Professionals	5 289	12.0
Technicians and associate professionals	6 966	15.8
Clerical support workers	3 100	7.0
Service and sales workers	6 306	14.3
Skilled Agricultural workers	:	:
Craft and related trades workers	7 479	17.0
Plant and machine operators, and assemblers	2 663	6.0
Elementary occupations	3 418	7.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>44 087</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Armed Forces	:	:
Managers	3 312	9.8
Professionals	7 212	21.4
Technicians and associate professionals	4 697	13.9
Clerical support workers	5 346	15.8
Service and sales workers	8 592	25.5
Skilled Agricultural workers	:	:
Craft and related trades workers	:	:
Plant and machine operators, and assemblers	1 643 <sup>u</sup>	4.9 <sup>u</sup>
Elementary occupations	2 219 <sup>u</sup>	6.6 <sup>u</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>33 749</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Armed Forces	:	:
Managers	11 004	14.1
Professionals	12 501	16.1
Technicians and associate professionals	11 663	15.0
Clerical support workers	8 446	10.9
Service and sales workers	14 898	19.1
Skilled Agricultural workers	:	:
Craft and related trades workers	8 173	10.5
Plant and machine operators, and assemblers	4 306	5.5
Elementary occupations	5 637	7.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>77 836</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>:</sup> Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

## WORK INTENSITY

TABLE 12. Main effect of childcare on employment by sex

Main effect	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
No effect	31 704	77.0
A change to increase income	5 225	12.7
Less working hours	:	:
Other effects	2 123	5.2
Changed job or less demanding tasks to facilitate reconciliation	1 285 <sup>u</sup>	3.1 <sup>u</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>41 181</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
No effect	14 966	49.8
A change to increase income	4 075	13.6
Less working hours	5 942	19.8
Other effects	2 999	10.0
Changed job or less demanding tasks to facilitate reconciliation	2 072	6.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>30 054</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
No effect	46 670	65.5
A change to increase income	9 300	13.1
Less working hours	6 786	9.5
Other effects	5 122	7.2
Changed job or less demanding tasks to facilitate reconciliation	3 357	4.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>71 235</b>	<b>100.0</b>

: Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

## WORK INTENSITY

TABLE 13. Number of employed persons who worked overtime by care responsibilities and sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Without care responsibilities	3 296	54.5
With care responsibilities	2 751	45.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>6 047</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Without care responsibilities	1 648	68.0
With care responsibilities	:	:
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 425</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Without care responsibilities	4 944	58.4
With care responsibilities	3 528	41.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>8 472</b>	<b>100.0</b>

: Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.

TABLE 14. Time-under employment by care responsibilities and sex

Wish to work more hours	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
	Males		Females		Total	
<b>Without care responsibilities</b>						
No	84 354	90.3	56 936	92.7	141 290	91.2
Yes	9 106	9.7	4 452	7.3	13 558	8.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>93 460</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>61 388</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>154 848</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>With care responsibilities</b>						
No	40 868	92.7	31 401	93.0	72 269	92.8
Yes	3 219	7.3	2 348	7.0	5 567	7.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>44 087</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33 749</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>77 836</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>						
No	125 222	91.0	88 337	92.9	213 559	91.8
Yes	12 325	9.0	6 800	7.1	19 125	8.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>137 547</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>95 137</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>232 684</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## WORK INTENSITY

TABLE 15. Number of employed persons with a second job by care responsibilities and sex

Second job	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
	Males		Females		Total	
<b>Without care responsibilities</b>						
Yes	3 399	3.6	1 363 <sup>u</sup>	2.2 <sup>u</sup>	4 762	3.1
No	90 061	96.4	60 025	97.8	150 086	96.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>93 460</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>61 388</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>154 848</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>With care responsibilities</b>						
Yes	2 748	6.2	:	:	3 361	4.3
No	41 339	93.8	33 136	98.2	74 475	95.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>44 087</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33 749</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>77 836</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>						
Yes	6 147	4.5	1 976 <sup>u</sup>	2.1 <sup>u</sup>	8 123	3.5
No	131 400	95.5	93 161	97.9	224 561	96.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>137 547</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>95 137</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>232 684</b>	<b>100.0</b>

: Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

TABLE 16. Number of employed persons working on shift by care responsibilities and sex

Shift employment	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
	Males		Females		Total	
<b>Without care responsibilities</b>						
Yes	19 409	20.8	10 194	16.6	29 603	19.1
No	74 051	79.2	51 194	83.4	125 245	80.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>93 460</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>61 388</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>154 848</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>With care responsibilities</b>						
Yes	8 971	20.3	3 481	10.3	12 452	16.0
No	35 116	79.7	30 268	89.7	65 384	84.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>44 087</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33 749</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>77 836</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>						
Yes	28 380	20.6	13 675	14.4	42 055	18.1
No	109 167	79.4	81 462	85.6	190 629	81.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>137 547</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>95 137</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>232 684</b>	<b>100.0</b>



# Section

## 04

**Work-life  
balance**





## WORK LIFE BALANCE

Family friendly measures such as flexible hours, reduced hours or teleworking arrangements facilitate the balance between work and family responsibilities.


LFS figures showed that the majority of persons between 18 and 64 years never needed family friendly measures (90.6%). The share was higher for males (54.4%) when compared to females in the same age bracket (45.6%). A further 3.0 per cent never used such measures as either it was not accepted by their employer (0.8%) or due to other reasons (2.2%). This included situations where one chose not to work, terminated their employment to take care of children or such family friendly measures were not available at that point in time.

Yet, 6.5 per cent of all persons between 18 and 64 years used family friendly measures during their employment. The share was much higher for females (73.5%) when compared to their male counterparts (26.5%).

### Flexible working arrangements

In 2018, 1 in every 3 employees with care responsibilities reported flexible working arrangements (32.8%). Overall, nearly half of all employees with care responsibilities could vary the start and end of their working day to facilitate care responsibilities (48.0%). However, it was less possible to organise one's working time in order to take whole days off for care reasons (53.6%). Moreover, a larger share of females (56.2%) had the possibility to vary the start and end of their working day when compared to their male counterpart (40.6%). Similarly, females reported more flexibility in organising their working time to take whole days off (41.1% females as opposed to 31.2% males) (Chart 10).

Chart 10. Flexible working arrangements for employees by sex




## WORK LIFE BALANCE

### Teleworking arrangements

Teleworking is a further working arrangement intended to facilitate work and family life. However, LFS figures showed that only a minority of employed persons made use of telework (14.0%). Among these persons 8.4 per cent reported usual teleworking arrangements while 5.6 per cent used telework on an occasional basis. A discrepancy was found between males and females as the latter comprised a larger share of persons with teleworking arrangements when compared to their male counterparts (17.4% and 11.4% respectively) (Chart 11).

Chart 11. Use of teleworking arrangements by sex




### Obstacles for work and family reconciliation

The majority of employed persons with care responsibilities did not find any difficulties to reconcile their work and family responsibilities (59.3%). This was more significant for males rather than females (60.5% and 57.7% respectively).

However the largest obstacle faced by persons with care responsibilities in their current job resulted from long working hours (21.8%), followed by other obstacles such as lack of support from employers and colleagues (9.4%), unpredictable or difficult tasks at work (3.7%), a demanding or exhausting job (3.2%) or due to a long commute (2.7%) (Chart 12).

Chart 12. Main obstacle for reconciliation between work and family life



## WORK LIFE BALANCE

TABLE 17. Number of persons aged between 18 and 64 who made use of family friendly measures by sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Yes	5 327	3.3
No, never needed	153 513	94.4
No, it was not accepted by the employer	967 <sup>u</sup>	0.6 <sup>u</sup>
No, due to other reasons	2 800	1.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>162 607</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Yes	14 786	9.9
No, never needed	128 591	86.4
No, it was not accepted by the employer	1 499 <sup>u</sup>	1.0 <sup>u</sup>
No, due to other reasons	3 941	2.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>148 817</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Yes	20 113	6.5
No, never needed	282 104	90.6
No, it was not accepted by the employer	2 466	0.8
No, due to other reasons	6 741	2.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>311 424</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

TABLE 18. Employees' possibility to vary the start and end of their working day by sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Generally possible	14 176	40.6
Rarely possible	4 832	13.9
Not possible	15 867	45.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>34 875</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Generally possible	17 326	56.2
Rarely possible	2 933	9.5
Not possible	10 552	34.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>30 811</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Generally possible	31 502	48.0
Rarely possible	7 765	11.8
Not possible	26 419	40.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>65 686</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## WORK LIFE BALANCE

TABLE 19. Employees' possibility to organise their working time to take whole days off by sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Generally possible	10 882	31.2
Rarely possible	3 953	11.3
Not possible	20 040	57.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>34 875</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Generally possible	12 660	41.1
Rarely possible	3 002	9.7
Not possible	15 149	49.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>30 811</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Generally possible	23 542	35.8
Rarely possible	6 955	10.6
Not possible	35 189	53.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>65 686</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 20. Employees' possibility to vary their working hours and organise their working time to take whole days off by sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Generally possible	9 261	26.6
Rarely or not possible	25 614	73.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>34 875</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Generally possible	12 307	39.9
Rarely or not possible	18 504	60.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>30 811</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Generally possible	21 568	32.8
Rarely or not possible	44 118	67.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>65 686</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## WORK LIFE BALANCE

TABLE 21. Number of employed persons with care responsibilities by frequency of telework and sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Usually	2 237 <sup>u</sup>	5.1 <sup>u</sup>
Sometimes	2 773	6.3
Never	39 077	88.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>44 087</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Usually	4 293	12.7
Sometimes	1 599 <sup>u</sup>	4.7 <sup>u</sup>
Never	27 857	82.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>33 749</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Usually	6 530	8.4
Sometimes	4 372	5.6
Never	66 934	86.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>77 836</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

## WORK LIFE BALANCE

TABLE 22. Main obstacle for employed persons with care responsibility to reconcile work with family care by sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
No obstacle	26 655	60.5
Long working hours	10 401	23.6
Unpredictable or difficult work schedules	1 527 <sup>u</sup>	3.5 <sup>u</sup>
Long commute	1 024 <sup>u</sup>	2.3 <sup>u</sup>
Demanding or exhausting job	1 482 <sup>u</sup>	3.4 <sup>u</sup>
Other obstacles	2 998	6.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>44 087</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
No obstacle	19 483	57.7
Long working hours	6 556	19.4
Unpredictable or difficult work schedules	1 358 <sup>u</sup>	4.0 <sup>u</sup>
Long commute	1 066 <sup>u</sup>	3.2 <sup>u</sup>
Demanding or exhausting job	1 003 <sup>u</sup>	3.0 <sup>u</sup>
Other obstacles	4 283	12.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>33 749</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
No obstacle	46 138	59.3
Long working hours	16 957	21.8
Unpredictable or difficult work schedules	2 885	3.7
Long commute	2 090 <sup>u</sup>	2.7 <sup>u</sup>
Demanding or exhausting job	2 485	3.2
Other obstacles	7 281	9.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>77 836</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.



A child's hand in a blue and white striped shirt is shown placing a yellow block with a cartoon car on top of a stack of other colorful blocks. The blocks feature various cartoon illustrations, including a bear in a car, a bear with an umbrella, a hippo, and several small cars. The background is a blurred indoor setting.

# Section

## 05

**Formal care  
services to  
facilitate one's  
work-life  
balance**



**FORMAL CARE SERVICES TO FACILITATE ONE'S WORK LIFE BALANCE**

Formal child care services and day centres for ill, elderly or disabled relatives may further facilitate the work life balance of persons with care responsibilities.


**Formal childcare**

In 2018, 1 in every 4 persons with childcare responsibilities used childcare services (25.2%) of which 13.7 per cent used the service for some of the children while 11.5 per cent used the service for all children. The remaining 74.9 per cent did not use any formal childcare services.

The labour status of persons with childcare responsibilities affected their use of childcare services. In fact, 28.2 per cent of employed persons and 12.5 per cent of non employed persons used childcare services.

The adhoc module findings showed that the use of formal childcare decreased with the person's age. In fact, 30.2 per cent of persons between 18 and 34 years used childcare services when compared to 25.8 per cent and 16.8 per cent of persons with childcare responsibilities aged between 35 and 44 years and 45 and 64 years respectively (Chart 13). This pattern is practically linked to the children's age.


**Chart 13. Making use of formal childcare by caregivers' age**



## FORMAL CARE SERVICES TO FACILITATE ONE'S WORK LIFE BALANCE

LFS results indicated that 78,446 persons (38,370 males and 40,076 females) between the age of 18 and 64 years with child care responsibilities did not use formal childcare services for all their children. The lack of use of such service was linked to the fact that most persons with childcare responsibilities arranged care alone or with their partner (60.2%). A further 12.7 per cent claimed that children could take care of themselves while 11.6 per cent had informal support in their children's care namely grandparents' help. Almost 10 per cent of persons with childcare responsibilities did not make use of childcare services due to personal reasons. This included situations when formal care for some of the children was enough. A further 4.4 per cent did not find an accessible or vacant childcare service including situations where there was no service in the catchment area, existing centres had no vacancies, the existing services were full, or the child was not eligible to use the service due to one's age. Only a minority of respondents did not use formal childcare due to the costs or quality of the service provided (Chart 14).

Chart 14. Main reason for not using formal child care services for some or all children



### Care services for ill, elderly and disabled relatives

One third of persons aged between 18 and 64 who took care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives would have liked to keep doing it themselves (33.0%). This implied a higher share of informal care among persons between 18 and 64 years.

Yet, a large share of this population believed that paid family leave benefits would facilitate one's work life balance (27.7%). A further 21.2 per cent felt that higher workplace flexibility such as the possibility for teleworking arrangements, flexi-time and a compressed working week would yield a better balance with work and family responsibilities. The remaining 18.1 per cent stated that day centres at community level, better quality in the current service provided as well as other measures would help to achieve a desired work life balance.

## FORMAL CARE SERVICES TO FACILITATE ONE'S WORK LIFE BALANCE

TABLE 23. Number of persons using childcare services by sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
No	32 107	74.6
Yes, for some children	6 263	14.6
Yes, for all children	4 643	10.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>43 013</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
No	34 235	75.1
Yes, for some children	5 841	12.8
Yes, for all children	5 513	12.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>45 589</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
No	66 342	74.9
Yes, for some children	12 104	13.7
Yes, for all children	10 156	11.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>88 602</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 24. Number of persons using childcare services by age group

	Number	Per cent
<b>No formal childcare</b>		
18 to 24 years	1 550 <sup>u</sup>	2.3 <sup>u</sup>
25 to 34 years	15 774	23.8
35 to 44 years	33 325	50.2
45 to 54 years	13 275	20.0
55 to 64 years	2 418	3.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>66 342</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Yes, for some or all children</b>		
18 to 24 years	:	:
25 to 34 years	6 854	30.8
35 to 44 years	11 609	52.2
45 to 54 years	2 724	12.2
55 to 64 years	:	:
<b>Total</b>	<b>22 260</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
18 to 24 years	2 177	2.7
25 to 34 years	22 628	23.8
35 to 44 years	44 934	46.8
45 to 54 years	15 999	19.5
55 to 64 years	2 864	7.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>88 602</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>u</sup> Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

## FORMAL CARE SERVICES TO FACILITATE ONE'S WORK LIFE BALANCE

TABLE 25. Share of formal childcare use by labour status

	Number	Per cent
<b>Employed</b>		
No formal childcare	51 153	71.8
Yes, for some or all children	20 082	28.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>71 235</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Not employed</b>		
No formal childcare	15 189	87.5
Yes, for some or all children	2 178	12.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>17 367</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
No formal childcare	66 342	74.9
Yes, for some or all children	22 260	25.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>88 602</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 26. Main reason for not using childcare services for some or all children

	Number	Per cent
Care is arranged alone/with partner	47 216	60.2
Children take care of themselves	9 955	12.7
Care is arranged including further informal support	9 129	11.6
Other personal reasons	7 456	9.5
No service accessible/vacant	3 417	4.4
Other service related obstacle (including cost and quality)	1 273 <sup>u</sup>	1.6 <sup>u</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>78 446</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

## FORMAL CARE SERVICES TO FACILITATE ONE'S WORK LIFE BALANCE

TABLE 27. Measures to facilitate the work life balance of persons with ill, elderly or disabled relatives' care

	Number	Per cent
I would like to keep taking care of persons who are 15 years or more who are disabled, sick or elderly	5 731	33.0
Paid family leave benefits	4 812	27.7
Workplace flexibility (e.g. telework, flexi-time, compressed working week)	3 688	21.2
Other measures	3 156	18.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>17 387</b>	<b>100.0</b>







# Section

## 06

### Career breaks




## CAREER BREAKS

### Career breaks and parental leave for childcare reasons

The majority of persons aged between 18 and 64 stated that despite being employed and having children they did not take a career break (66.1%). Career break refers to the interruption in a person's employment during their course of life for at least one month to take care of their children. This was predominant among males with care responsibilities (96.5%). With respect to females, 38.0 per cent stated that they never took a career break to take care of their children. A further 4.9 per cent never worked; either due to childcare responsibilities (3.9%) or due to other reasons (1.0%). Yet, findings showed that 29.0 per cent of persons aged between 18 and 64 took a career break at one point in their employment history, with females making up 96.1 per cent of all those who used such an arrangement.

In most cases, respondents' career breaks lasted up to 6 months (63.5%). A further 10.9 per cent interrupted their employment for more than 6 months up to one year. Longer career breaks were availed of by 25.6 per cent of the target population. In fact, 6.0 per cent stopped working for more than 1 year up to 2 years; and 5.8 per cent took a career break of more than 2 years up to 3 years. A further 9.3 per cent were on a career break of more than 3 years up to 5 years while 4.5 per cent stopped their employment for 5 years or more (Chart 15).

Chart 15. Length of career break for childcare reasons



Results showed that 26.9 per cent availed of maternity or paternity leave, 16.5 per cent made use of a combination of family leave (maternity, paternity and parental leave) while 9.3 per cent used parental leave only. Yet, the majority of persons between 18 and 64 years who took a career break did not use family leave (47.3%).


## CAREER BREAKS

## Career breaks and family leave for disabled, ill and elderly care

Nearly one in every five persons between 18 and 64 years who used to work or are currently in employment had to take care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives (18.0%). The majority did not make any changes to their employment (14.3%). However, 2.5 per cent stated that they had to stop working while taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives and a further 1.2 per cent reduced their working time.

A greater share of females experienced an interruption in their employment when compared to males (3.5% and 1.6% respectively). On the contrary, a larger share of males did not reduce their working hours or terminate their employment even though they had to take care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives (17.9% as opposed to 10.3%). This implied a larger burden on males with care-giving responsibilities since they had to take care of their relatives and manage their work responsibilities simultaneously (Chart 16).

Chart 16. Main effect on one's employment for persons with ill, elderly or disabled relatives' care responsibilities by sex



## CAREER BREAKS

TABLE 28. Number of persons between 18 and 64 years who had children and made use of a career break by sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Yes	2 073 <sup>u</sup>	2.4 <sup>u</sup>
Never worked; for childcare reasons	889 <sup>u</sup>	1.0 <sup>u</sup>
No (but was/is employed and has children)	84 306	96.5
Never worked; for other reasons	:	:
<b>Total</b>	<b>87 371</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Yes	50 596	53.7
Never worked; for childcare reasons	6 167	6.5
No (but was/is employed and has children)	35 756	38.0
Never worked; for other reasons	1 666 <sup>u</sup>	1.8 <sup>u</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>94 185</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Yes	52 669	29.0
Never worked; for childcare reasons	7 056	3.9
No (but was/is employed and has children)	120 062	66.1
Never worked; for other reasons	1 769	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>181 556</b>	<b>100.0</b>

: Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

TABLE 29. Number of persons by duration of one's career break

	Number	Per cent
Up to 6 months	33 424	63.5
More than 6 months up to 1 year	5 739	10.9
More than 1 year up to 2 years	3 168	6.0
More than 2 years up to 3 years	3 037	5.8
More than 3 years up to 5 years	4 920	9.3
More than 5 years	2 381	4.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>52 669</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## CAREER BREAKS

TABLE 30. Type of family leave used as part of one's career break

	Number	Per cent
Parental leave only	4 877	9.3
Combination of family leaves	8 705	16.5
Maternity or paternity leave only	14 186	26.9
No family leave	24 901	47.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>52 669</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 31. Main effect of ill, elderly or disabled care responsibilities on one's employment by sex

	Number	Per cent
<b>Males</b>		
Yes, stopped work	2 625	1.6
Yes, reduced working time	1 950	1.2
No, neither stopped working nor reduced working time in spite of having relatives in need	29 180	17.9
No, I never had to take care of sick, elderly or disabled relatives	127 102	78.2
No, never worked	1 750	1.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>162 607</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Females</b>		
Yes, stopped work	5 177	3.5
Yes, reduced working time	1 689	1.1
No, neither stopped working nor reduced working time in spite of having relatives in need	15 331	10.3
No, I never had to take care of sick, elderly or disabled relatives	118 251	79.5
No, never worked	8 369	5.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>148 817</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>		
Yes, stopped work	7 802	2.5
Yes, reduced working time	3 639	1.2
No, neither stopped working nor reduced working time in spite of having relatives in need	44 511	14.3
No, I never had to take care of sick, elderly or disabled relatives	245 353	78.8
No, never worked	10 119	3.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>311 424</b>	<b>100.0</b>



The background is a complex, abstract composition of overlapping geometric planes and rectangular blocks. Some surfaces have a dark wood-grain texture, while others are a solid light gray. The perspective is dynamic, with lines converging and diverging, creating a sense of depth and architectural structure. A semi-transparent gray rectangle is centered over the image, serving as a backdrop for the text.

**Annex**



## ANNEX

## Methodological Notes

1. The data provided in this release is based on the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 2016/2236 specifying the technical characteristics of the 2018 ad hoc module on 'Reconciliation between work and family life'. The data was partly financed through EU grants.
2. During 2018, the ad hoc module was carried out on a sample of persons between 18 and 64 years taking part in the LFS survey for the first and fourth time.
3. The Labour Force Survey (LFS) is carried out on an ongoing basis using a quarterly gross sample of 3,200 private households. The objective is to have a continuous assessment of labour market trends given that the reference weeks are evenly spread throughout the 13 weeks of the quarter. One-fourth of the sample is made up of households who have been selected to participate in the LFS for the first time. Three-fourths of the quarterly sample is made up of households who were selected to participate in the survey in previous instances, either one quarter before, or one year before, one year and a quarter before (2-(2)-2). Unless otherwise indicated, figures provided in this release refer to persons aged 15 and over and living in private households during the reference period. All criteria used for this survey match international methodologies used by the International Labour Organisation (ILO).
4. The LFS is designed to satisfy the concepts and definitions as outlined by Eurostat. This allows the comparability of results with other EU member states and countries following ILO definitions of employment and unemployment. Occupations are classified according to the ISCO-08 classification (International Standard Classification of Occupations) whereas the economic activity is classified according to NACE Rev. 2 (Nomenclature générale des Activités économiques dans les Communautés Européennes). Education attainment is classified according to ISCED 2011.
5. Definitions:
  - **Career break:** refers to the interruption in a person's employment during their course of life for at least one month to take care of their children.
  - **Education Attainment:**
    - **low:** comprising persons with no schooling, primary education, schools for children with special needs, and persons who attained a secondary level education and have less than 5 ordinary level qualifications or equivalent. In the context of the ISCED classification, 'low' includes ISCED 0 to 2.
    - **medium:** comprising persons with a secondary level education and having 5 ordinary level qualifications or equivalent or more, persons with a post secondary level attainment who have at least obtained 1 intermediate or advanced level qualification or equivalent. In the context of the ISCED classification, 'medium' refers to ISCED 3 and 4.
    - **high** - comprising persons with a tertiary level education and with qualifications ranging from diploma to doctorate level. In the context of the ISCED classification, 'high' refers to ISCED 5 to 8.
  - **Employees:** are defined as persons who work for a public or private employer and who receive compensation in the form of wages, salaries, fees, gratuities, payment by results or payment in kind.
  - **Employed persons:** all persons aged 15 and over who, during the reference week, were in one of the following categories:
    - **paid employment:** includes those who during the reference week worked for at least one hour for a wage or salary, in cash or in kind.
    - **were employed but absent from work:** due to sick leave, bad weather, were undergoing training or education, did not work due to a labour dispute, were on maternity or parental leave, did not work due to slack work for technical or economic reasons, were absent from work for a period of less than 3 months, or were not working because on layoff and receiving at least 50 per cent of the salary/wage.
    - **self-employed:** covers persons who run a trade or business, rather than working as an employee for someone else. A person is self-employed if s/he is a sole proprietor or a partner working in a business.
    - **unpaid family workers:** refers to people who worked without pay in a family business or farm. Excluded from this definition are housewives.

## ANNEX

- **Family friendly measures:** refers to measures that facilitate the reconciliation of work and family life. This includes teleworking arrangements, flexible work schedules, reduced hours and career breaks.
- **Inactive persons:** all persons who are not classified as employed or unemployed are defined as inactive.
- **Normal hours worked:** refers to the number of usual hours worked per week in the main job over a long reference period, excluding weeks when an absence from work occurs (e.g. holidays, vacation leave or sick leave).
- **Not employed persons:** all persons who are classified as unemployed or inactive.
- **Part-time employment:** a part-time worker is an employed person whose normal hours are less than those of comparable full-time workers. Persons employed on a full-time with reduced hours basis are included in this category.
- **Persons taking care of children:** refers to persons who look after their own(natural, adopted or fostered) or their spouse's children up to the age of 14 who live both inside or outside the household. The latter is included in case of regular care which lasts for at least some hours per week.
- **Persons taking care of ill, elderly or disabled relatives:** refers to persons who look after or provide help to relatives who are 15 years and over and are in need of care because they are sick, elderly or disabled includes the relatives of the spouse/cohabiting partner and is irrespective of whether they live in the same household or not.
- **Time-related under-employment:** refers to the number of persons having a main job but willing/wishing to work more than the number of hours currently worked in their job.
- **Unemployed persons:** all persons above 15 years of age who, during the reference week, satisfied the following criteria:
  - without work
  - actively seeking work during the previous 4 weeks: example of active job search include contacting Jobsplus, applying directly with an employer, contacting a private employment agency, inserting or answering to an advert in a newspaper.
  - currently available for work: available to start work within 2 weeks of the reference week.

## Key

: Unreliable - less than 20 sample observations.

<sup>u</sup> Under represented - between 20 and 49 sample observations.

6. Percentage totals may not add up due to rounding.
7. Absolute changes between one survey estimate and another must be treated with caution since minor changes (i.e. less than 2,100 persons) might be the result of sampling error.
8. More information is available from the NSO upon written request.
9. More information relating to this news release may be accessed at:  
 Statistical Concepts: <http://nso.gov.mt/metadata/concepts.aspx>  
 Metadata: <http://nso.gov.mt/metadata/reports.aspx?id=33>  
 Classification: <http://nso.gov.mt/metadata/classificationdetails.aspx?id=NACE Rev. 2>  
                   <http://nso.gov.mt/metadata/classificationdetails.aspx?id=ISCO 2008>  
                   <http://nso.gov.mt/metadata/classificationdetails.aspx?id=ISCED%202011>
10. References to this news release are to be cited appropriately.
11. A detailed news release calendar is available on:  
[https://nso.gov.mt/en/News\\_Releases/Release\\_Calendar/Pages/News-Release-Calendar.aspx](https://nso.gov.mt/en/News_Releases/Release_Calendar/Pages/News-Release-Calendar.aspx)









