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## Executive summary

The Macedonian labour market is characterised by high overall unemployment, and low employment and participation rates. Within this comprehensively difficult situation at the labour market, women are much more exposed to low participation rate and low employment. Moreover, for those who are already in the labour market and employed, the evidence shows that they earn less due to persistent gender wage gap. The overall inequality of women in the labour market likely corresponds to their economic dependence, lack of decision making power in the household (including decisions for spending funds on education and child healthcare), greater tolerance to gender-based violence, etc.

Despite the general awareness of gender differences in the labour market, the issue of low participation of women has not received large interest in the public debate so far. There is also lack of well-documented, large-scale research in this area, leaving us with little understanding of the phenomenon and its underlying causes. The aim of this study is to describe and profile "female labour market inactivity", as well to unveil the main factors behind the low female participation in the Macedonian labour market, with the final objective to provide evidence for creation of policies. Readers should note that the term "labour market inactivity" is used by statistical offices and in the labour-market literature as referring to cases where the person is unemployed and is not seeking employment. On the other hand, from a feminist-economics perspective, it does not aim to refute the unpaid work done by women within the household. This is the first study that examines the female inactivity in detail, based on a large, representative sample of women in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Data enables us to develop a profile of the "typical" inactive woman in the country, which can be then used to design policies to promote increased participation of women in the labour market, with particular emphasis on those women whose inactivity is not their individual choice.

The findings of the study are in relation to the a priori expectations and theoretical foundations, albeit parts oppose some of the widely accepted beliefs. Below we present the main findings of the study related to the female characteristics, as well as labour market status and activity. Although in the Executive summary data are shown cumulatively for all the interviewed women, there are significant differences among them, based on their age, ethnicity and place of residence. The study elaborates in details in the subsequent chapters those differences.

General characteristics of working-age women. More than one third of the women (34\%) have completed high school (post-secondary, non-tertiary education). Approximately one
fifth of them hold a tertiary education diploma and additional fifth have completed only primary education. Approximately $12 \%$ of working-age women have completed 4 -years secondary education. Nevertheless, there are differences in the educational structure of working-age women, relative to the labour market status, such that the active women have on average better educational structure as compared to the inactive ones.

Large majority of women ( $91 \%$ ) reported to have very good or good health. Approximately $8 \%$ stated to have bad health and $0.9 \%$ stated to have very bad health.

## Labour market indicators of women in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The survey shows that the employment ratio of women in the country is $40.9 \%$, while their inactivity rate is $41 \%$. Of the inactive women, about $11 \%$ are still in education and $6 \%$ are retired.

Employed women. Most women (53\%), reported to earn wages between 10,000 and 19,999 MKD. Approximately 18.3\% earn between 20,000-29,999 MKD, and $9.6 \%$ earn up to 9,999 MKD (as a note, some of these women work less than 40 hours per week). Approximately $12 \%$ of the employed women have not received any salary in the last three months. Most women ( $43.8 \%$ ) work forty hours per week which is considered as standard working week by the labour legislation. Slightly below $30 \%$ of women work overtime.

Perceptions of the gender roles. Survey results show that women themselves make strong distinction between the gender roles within the household, and in the society in general, which can also be an important impediment to female participation in the labour market. About one third of women believe that their primary role is to give birth and take care of the home and family, rather than work. Similarly, $38.2 \%$ of them believe that it is very difficult for women to be managers, politicians, or achieve other top positions, as compared to men. Majority of women (57.2\%), agree that there are barriers to greater engagement of women in the labour market and employment. Economically inactive women hold more conservative views on the gender roles in the labour market and family, relative to those of the active women. In particular, they are more likely to believe that women are discriminated as compared to men; that women are second-class workers; that the natural role of women is to take care of the family; but also that they face large barriers when it comes to being employed.

Discrimination. Large share of respondents (46,6\%) believe that there is discrimination against women in the labour market. Of those who reported that there was discrimination, one fifth have experienced discrimination themselves. Most of them ( $51,2 \%$ ) believe that women face more difficulties in finding a job, compared to men, or that given equal qualifications of men and women, employers give priority to male workers.

Social interactions, use of time and unpaid carework. Data confirm that women are quite socially active i.e. have intensive social contacts with their children, parents, relatives, friends, neighbours. This holds true both for economically active and inactive women. Women report to spend large part of their time on household activities and care of children, on daily basis, duties which are usually unpaid. As a striking finding, active women spend almost equal amounts of time on the above activities as inactive ones. Active women are slightly less engaged in household activities and care of the elderly relatives, but these minor differences do not have potential to explain the differences in the labour market activity. This points out to a phenomenon of modern gender discrimination, in which women work and also have to provide complete care of the household.

Culture. Data related to the culture indisputably show the prevalence of traditional, conservative culture and beliefs, which then transfers into low participation in the labor market and high share of unpaid care work. Almost half of the women believe that although it is good that a woman works, still many women prefer to take care of the children and the home. Close to $40 \%$ believe that working mothers cannot establish as good relationship with their children as non-working mothers, and $32.6 \%$ state that a mother should stay with the child until it reaches a school age. Though, large share of women (83.7\%) agree that "having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person, and that "both husband and wife should contribute to the family budget" ( $86.3 \%$ agree). Still, at the same time, $36.6 \%$ of women think that the fathers cannot take as good care of children as the mothers. Majority of women $(52.8 \%)$ agree that the household responsibilities prevent women from having a paid job, outside the house. Still, there are differences between the (self-reported) culture of inactive and active women. In particular, active women are more likely to support the equal role of women and men within the household, the economic independence of the women through work, and to believe that working mothers can have close relationship with their children.

Childcare services. The study does not find strong evidence that the availability of childcare services, the cost of those services and distance from home are an important constraint to labour market activity of women. When asked to rate each element of childcare services, $20.3 \%$ of women with children reported the number of kindergartens (access to childcare) as most problematic aspect of the childcare provision, followed by quality of the services. This general satisfaction with the childcare provision is probably related to the large support that families receive from the grandparents, as well as that large share of women are not engaged in paid employment, thus perform carework themselves. In particular, 43.4\% of mothers reported they received daily support by their parents for the care of the children. Almost $60 \%$ stated that their husband assists them in taking care of children. Of those who
do not receive any help, $27.7 \%$ stated that their husband worked and was tired afterwards so he could not help, and $23 \%$ reported that their husband thought it was the duty of the mother to take care of children or that mothers are better in raising children than fathers.

Inactive women and their labour market experience. Two fifths of working-age women in the country are inactive. $21.7 \%$ of those women stated they would like to work, even though they did not look for a job. More than half (54\%) responded that if they were offered a job, they would have been able to start working in two-weeks time. This is unexpectedly large share of inactive women, given that, for instance, $52 \%$ reported they were not engaged in the labour market because of household duties and illness. The last two categories of women were not ready to start working within a two weeks period. Moreover, only $15 \%$ ever applied for a job, and only $9.7 \%$ went for a job interview. Majority of inactive women (68.5\%) never had a job in their lifetime.

Main reasons for inactivity. The main reasons behind the inactivity of women are household duties and providing care for children and the elderly, reported by $34.5 \%$ of women. $17.4 \%$ reported they had health issues that prevented them from working or seeking a job. The other two large reasons include lost hope of finding a job (reported by 16.3\%) and low self-esteem because they did not feel sufficiently qualified (10.3\%). Indeed, these categories of inactive women which are discouraged to seek work should be the target of the public policies that aim to raise women participation in the labour market. The underdeveloped flexible forms of work and the distance of the work position from home have very low importance. Contrary to the widely held beliefs, remittances that women receive from abroad have been identified by only $3.3 \%$ as a reason for inactivity.

Relative importance of each potential barrier to activity. Most respondents (60.3\%) agreed that household chores (including child care) are the main barriers to their activity. Still, many women (55\%) report that they believe they do not possess the right skills / qualifications to find a job. Half of inactive women agree that the lack of flexible working options keep them away from the labour market, and $45 \%$ complained about the unavailability of childcare facilities.

Conservative views of the inactive women. The study shows that inactive women hold traditional views related to the gender roles, which in turn acts as an important barrier to their labour market activity. Indeed, inactive women for instance, believe that it is very hard for any working woman to balance work and family responsibilities ( $68.4 \%$ reported they agreed or completely agreed with that statement). Half of them thought that working women should give the earned salary to the head of the household, and should not to have a say in the
spending decisions. A staggering $46 \%$ believed women should not seek work as it might annoy their husband.

Reservation wage. Only $15 \%$ of the inactive women stated that they had in mind some minimum wage below which they would not accept a job offer (i.e. the reference wage). This shows that high reservation is not an important reason or constraint to female participation in the labour market. For those who reported a reference wage, it ranged 10,000-19,999 MKD for $67.5 \%$ of respondents and 20,000-29,999 MKD for $20.8 \%$ of them.

Factor analysis. The factor analysis enables us to statistically determine factors (combinations of variables) which have an important effect on the inactivity of women. The analyses identified four such factors, out of 23 potential explanations/variables. The first factor has major importance and explains $38.2 \%$ of the total variance of the inactivity. Major part of this factor relates to the traditional patriarchal cultural setting in which a woman is perceived as a housewife, which also matches her own beliefs and perceptions about the role of women. This factor shows that there is large connection between the culture, household duties, perceptions of inequality in the labour market, and discouragement. These elements are reinforcing each other. The second factor is the care of the elderly which can be more easily tackled by the policymakers. The third factor relates to fears and stereotypes. Again, this factor shows that there is reinforcement between the stereotypes and the perceptions about the discrimination in the labour market.

Profile of a "typical" inactive woman. We use econometric technique to develop a profile of the "typical" inactive woman in the country. The analyses shows that the typical inactive woman is aged over 50, of Albanian ethnicity, more frequently the woman is married (or in partnership), with primary education, living in poor household, and residing in Skopje or in the other large inner towns.

Regression analysis of the major determinants of inactivity. Overall, results robustly suggest that female labour market inactivity increases with age and marriage, and reduces with education. There is risk that women from poorer households and with unemployed husbands fall into the vicious cycle of poverty, unemployment and inactivity. Women with conservative cultural beliefs are more prone to inactivity. Presence of children and lack of basic household devices support female inactivity. Inactivity is prevalent in larger inner towns of the country. A smaller share of inactive women are those who are younger, better educated and live in Skopje, who likely created high professional expectations, which lead to their inactivity.

The findings provide important evidence for the policymakers to design measures that can increase female activity and their contribution to the future development of the country.

There are several insights related to the policy recommendations. Firstly, there are differences across inactive women in many aspects, such as education, household factors, culture, social capital, etc. Hence, from policy perspective there are three type/groups of inactive women: those who are not looking for a job mainly due to discouragement and low self-esteem; those who are facing barriers to enter the labour market due to the unpaid carework burden in the form of household duties, child care and care for the elderly; and those whose major barrier is their cultural norms and beliefs, conservative views and traditional household power relations. Secondly, from policy perspective, the easiest goal is to implement programme and measures to support the first group of women to enter the labour market, whereas it is very difficult, if not impossible, to increase the activity of the last category. Culture and traditions are the slowest moving and most difficult category to change. This especially holds true for the ethnic Albanian and Roma women. Thirdly, supporting women's participation in the labour market would in all instances involve improvement of the overall provision of childcare services and services for care of the elderly.

We design the recommendations group-by-group as follows:

## 1. Activation of discouraged categories of women

- Public interventions to improve women's skills and qualifications either through formal or informal education and training;
- Provision of small scale training targeting inactive women, such as training in job search skills, employability skills, self-assessment tests, etc., which should be implemented on local level. Similar programs are delivered currently but only for the registered unemployed individuals. Local women organizations can be important mediator between the local/central government and inactive women;
- Strengthening the activation policies for the poor who are recipients of some social assistance programmes since the study shows that they stay in the vicious cycle of low education, inactivity, poverty and dependence on social assistance. This mainly holds true for ethnic Roma, but also in general;


## 2. Activation of housewives and carers

- Provision of, and raising awareness on flexible forms of employment, including parttime work, work from home, job-sharing, etc. which allow for greater work-family balance. Married men should also be encouraged to consider flexible working arrangements;
- Employers should be incentivized to introduce flexible working arrangements;
- Further investment in kindergartens and day care centres, as well as incentivizing (including through general campaigns) the utilization of their services, especially in areas where home nurturing of children is still considered best solution for child development;
- Increase investment in, and upgrading of the services for elderly care;
- Supporting women to acquire higher education can be an important tool for reducing their inactivity, with having a direct effect on their supply of labour or, indirectly, through affecting their culture and beliefs (the next set of recommendations)
- Revising the policies for maternal, paternal and parental leave so as to ensure that fathers as well have the right, the opportunity and the obligation to take part in the care of their newborns;


## 3. Activation of women whose major barrier is their culture

- Increasing awareness about the need to change the traditional division of gender roles. Previous experiences, including those from developed Western countries, showed that awareness raising campaigns and gender-sensitive public education can have an important impact on gender equality and female activation;
- Relying on role-models and champions may also be used to challenge culture, perceptions and attitudes;
- Rising awareness about redistribution of the care work and sharing of responsibilities between family members;
- Promote/raise awareness about the importance of pre-school education for children has on their socialization.
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## 1. Introduction

The Macedonian labour market is characterised by high overall unemployment, and low employment and participation rates. Within this overall difficult situation, women are much more exposed to inactivity and low employment. Moreover, for the working women, the evidence shows that there is a significant gender wage gap. The overall inequality of women on the labour market leads to their economic dependence, lack of decision making power in the household (including expenditures for education and health of the children), greater tolerance to domestic violence, and so on. Moreover, low female activity presents a lost growth and developmental potential of the society and the economy.

Despite the general awareness of the gender differences in the labour market, the issue did not receive large interest in the public debate so far. Moreover, there is lack of welldocumented, large-scale research in this area, leaving us with little understanding of the phenomenon and the underlying causes. In this regard, the aim of this study is to thoroughly describe the low female participation in the Macedonian labour market and unveil the main factors behind it, so as to provide evidence for the policymaking. This is the first study that examines female inactivity in details, based on a large, representative sample of female citizens in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Data enable us to develop a profile of the "typical" inactive woman in the country, which can be then used to design policies to promote female activity, with particular emphasis on women whose inactivity is not their individual choice.

The study is structured as follows. Section 2 examines the characteristics of the Macedonian labour market with respect to gender. Section 3 assesses the legislative and general environment in the country related to gender equality and females' labour market prospects, whereas Section 4 investigates in detail the theory and evidence on the main determinants of female inactivity worldwide. Section 5 explains the methodology and the underlying data of the study. Section 6 presents the main findings from the descriptive analyses of the collected data, with focus on all potential aspects of female inactivity. Section 7 provides three different econometric techniques which statistically examine the facets and the underlying causes of low participation of women in the labour market. Section 8 concludes and provides policy recommendations.

## 2. Characteristics of the labour market with respect to gender

The Macedonian labour market is characterised by high overall unemployment, and low employment and participation rates. Within this overall difficult situation in the labour market, women are still much more exposed to inactivity and low employment. The overall inequality of women on the labour market leads to their economic dependence, lack of decision making power in the household (including expenditures for education and health of the children), greater tolerance to domestic violence, and so on.

Only half of the women at the working-age (15-64) were active in 2014, compared to about $78 \%$ of the men. Hence, the gender gap in activity is 25 percentage points (p.p.), which is more than twice the EU-28 average gender gap (11,6\% in 2014). The gender activity gap substantially declines with the level of education. At the level of primary education and less (i.e. low education), females' activity is 40 p.p. lower than that of males, whereas the gap at the tertiary level is only 3.5 p.p. Apparently, less educated women are those that are most likely to be out of the labour market as their opportunity cost of non-working seems to be very low. The low educated women are also more likely to be married with low educated men and live in traditional families which influence both their decision to further their education and to work.

When assessed by age groups, the gender activity gap is lowest among young workers (14.2 p.p.) whose activity in general is very low. For the prime age group (25-54) the employment gap is about 26.8 p.p. with relatively high activity rates of both women and men (even $93.2 \%$ for men). The participation gap is largest for older workers which can be a generational issue, from the past when women, in particular from rural areas and specific ethnic communities, were traditionally housewives who were not extensively involved in education.

Macedonian society is characterized by being patriarchal where women are perceived to have a primary role of taking care of the household and dependents (children and the elderly) and are hence less likely to take an active part in the labour market (MojsoskaBlazevski et al., 2015). Angel-Urdinola and Macias (2008) and ETF (2008) find that the most important reason for female inactivity in the country is household responsibilities. In particular, $55 \%$ of inactive women are housewives, though the effect of this factor on inactivity is magnified at the lower levels of education.

An important element when assessing the low female labour market participation in the is the ethnicity. Unfortunately, the State Statistical Office (SSO) does not publish labour market data disaggregated by ethnicity since 2011. According to the LFS 2000, the participation rates of women from Albanian and Roma speaking language were $11 \%$ and $36 \%$,
respectively, compared to $51 \%$ for Macedonian speaking women. World Bank (2008a) finds that Tetovo, a city traditionally populated by ethnic Albanians displays lowest participation of women in the labour market, due to norms and stereotypes deeply rooted in the family traditions and culture. Similarly, the study of Shenaj et al. (2015) shows that ethnic Macedonian women are $15 \%$ more likely to participate in the LM relative to women form the other ethnicities, mainly ethnic Albanian women who on average live in more traditional households. In addition to ethnic minorities, rural and unskilled women are also experiencing large inactivity.

Apart from the participation gender gap, there is also a large gap in employment between men and women, with only $37.4 \%$ of working-age women holding a job (compared to $56 \%$ of men). As with the participation, this gap declines with the education. In addition, females in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia are much less likely to work part-time (5\% of employed women worked part-time in 2014) compared to $32 \%$ of their European counterparts. There are studies showing high correlation between female employment rates, in general, and share of women working in part-time jobs. In this context, the unavailability of part-time jobs in the country (and other flexible forms of employment), may give a rise to the low female employment and participation.

## 3. Institutional and social context for female employment and equality of opportunity

### 3.1. National policy for gender equality

The country has started to establish an institutional framework for ensuring gender equality only in recent years. In particular, the Law on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men (Official Gazette No.66/2006 and 6/2012) aims at ensuring equal opportunities and equal treatment of both genders. It rules the jurisdictions, tasks and obligations of the parties responsible for ensuring equal opportunities, the procedure for identifying unequal treatment of women and men and the rights and duties of the Advocate/Attorney for Equal Opportunities for women and men, which is a function that has been set up in the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy to implement the Law. The Law on the Prevention of and Protection against Discrimination (including the discrimination based on sex) lays the ground for the establishment of an independent seven-member non-professional Antidiscrimination Commission (Official Gazette No. 50/2010). The competences of the Commission partly overlap with those of the Ombudsman, as well as those of the Advocate/Attorney for equal opportunities. If a person feels they are the victim of any form of discrimination (including sex) they can complain to the Antidiscrimination Commission, which then discusses and provides advice and recommendations on the available measures in the courts and other institutions. The Commission is also engaged in some research activities related to sex discrimination.

Still, the EU Progress Report 2014 asserts that there is a need to further improve the capacity of the main antidiscrimination bodies in the country. According to the Report, the female participation and employment rates remain very low compared with the EU average, and despite some improvement, the Department for Equal Opportunities within the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy still lacks appropriate resources. There are limited efforts and measures to improve the situation of Roma women. Moreover, women in rural areas are still subject to discriminatory customs, traditions and stereotypes. As assessed by the Gender Inequality Index ${ }^{1}$, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was ranked at the $36^{\text {th }}$ place out of 188 countries in 2015, with an Index of 0.160 , with largest gender gap in the labour market participation (the ranking declined from $33^{\text {rd }}$ place in 2014).

In 2013, the Government adopted the Strategy on Gender Equality 2013-2020, with an aim to promote equal opportunities for men and women in the overall social and economic life in the country. ${ }^{2}$ The vision of the Strategy is to increase quantitatively and qualitatively women

[^0]participation in the public and political life, as well as in the private sector reaching the levels recommended by the Council of Europe and the European Union. The Strategy aims at greater involvement of women in education and labour market, ensuring better balancing between work and private life, etc., as well as increasing public awareness of the importance of equal opportunities for overall development of the social and democratic life, leading to drastically reduced stereotypes and prejudices. The implementation of the Strategy in the first period is guided by the Action Plan for Gender Equality, 2013-2016. The Action Plan sets three strategic objectives:

- Strategic Objective 1: Establish an effective and efficient system for achieving gender equality through functional support mechanisms at national and local level, harmonized indicators to measure progress on gender equality;
- Strategic Objective 2: Improving the level of gender equality in priority thematic areas;
- Strategic Objective 3: Nourishing/Building a culture of equal opportunities and promoting equal treatment and non-discrimination on grounds of sex.


### 3.2. Social and cultural context for female labour market activity

Besides the antidiscrimination framework and policy, the overall situation of women in the labour market is also influenced by some other policies and institutions, such as the maternity (and paternity) leave provisions, access to the pre-school childcare facilities, flexibility of working arrangements, and so on, but also, more generally, by the social norms, culture and traditions. All these elements need to be analysed in conjunction (and aligned with the findings from the survey data to be collected) as to understand in greater details the main barriers to greater female participation in the labour market.

Maternity leave provisions are important in women's decisions whether to supply their labour (participate in the labour market), but also in terms of hours of labour supply/work. According to the Labour Law (articles 161-171, Official Gazette 167/15), female workers are entitled to nine months of paid maternity leave ${ }^{3}$ (up to 15 months in case of multiple births), with compulsory maternity leave starting of 28 days before birth (which can be extended to 45 days prior to birth). The country thus meets the ILO standards of 14 and 18 -weeks maternity leave laid down in the ILO Convention No. 183 and Recommendation No.191, respectively. In 2014, changes were made in the legislation entitling mothers to three additional months of unpaid leave during which the state covers the health insurance. In 2015, a possibility was

[^1]introduced for an additional unpaid leave of 3 months in total until a child reaches the age of 3. The benefit level that mothers receive while on maternity leave is $100 \%$ of their base salary prior to the leave (laid down in the Law on Health Insurance). The legislation (Labour Law, article 166) provides financial stimulus for mothers to get back to their work before the end of the maternity leave period, an option used by about $5 \%$ of women (ILO, 2014).

In 2015, a possibility was introduced for engagement of replacement workers for female workers that are on maternity leave intended to reduce the discrimination of women at recruitment or throughout the career. Employers are exempted from paying social contributions for the replacement worker. This measure aims at reducing the costs to employers related to the maternity leave of their female workers, which should promote greater female employment. From the data provided by the State fund for health insurance, in 2015, 54 employers engaged replacement workers, while in 2016 the number increases to 262.

Fathers have a right to a paid leave of up to 7 days for the birth of a child (though, this article is more general, as it also includes a leave for other personal and family matters). Fathers are also entitled to use paternity leave in case mothers do not, but the use of paternity leave is very marginal, at about $0.1-0.2 \%$ of the total number of maternity leaves (ILO, 2014). ${ }^{4}$ There are no incentives for fathers to take leave. This suggests that there is no equality between women and men and mothers are perceived as primary caregiver of the child. In addition, given the relatively large size of the informal employment in the country ( $18.5 \%$ of total employment in 2016, and $15 \%$ of female employment $)^{5}$, there are still many mothers left without the mandated protection.

Furthermore, data on time use further show that there is no shared responsibility between the spouses in a typical Macedonian household. In particular, the data from the time use survey of the SSO (2015) shows that during a day, women spend more than three times more time on household activities than men (for instance, when comparing couples with children, or when comparing women and men in the age group 25-44). Though, this unequal division of home activities is also found among the EU countries, where women spend three and a half times more time relative to males on domestic work, and two times more time on caring activities (Eurofound, 2012).

We can conclude that the legislation and the institutions responsible for gender equality are relatively new and are still in the initial stages of functioning. The rights of women in the

[^2]labour market are generally protected, although there are no incentives (through legislation) to promote the equality of women and men, for instance, in terms of paternity leave. However, in the broader social context, the norms and gender roles assign the household and caring responsibilities to women.

## 4. Literature review on the factors that may affect female labour market participation

This section examines the main factors that can be expected to significantly affect the female decision whether to participate or not in the labour market. It is based on the previous studies in this respective area in general, including several specific studies previously conducted for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

According to the neoclassical economic theory the decision of a person to participate in the labour market is related to the utility maximization over the work-leisure choice. The key determinant of labour supply in this approach is the market (or potential) wage, which represents the opportunity cost of leisure, i.e. of non-working. Considering leisure as a "good", there are in principal two effects that arise from an increase in the prevailing wage rate on the quantity of labour supplied: income effect (as wages are higher, the demand for leisure, a normal good, increases) and substitution effect (higher wage rate increases the opportunity cost of leisure and hence workers will supply more labour). The net effect depends which one is stronger.

According to the theory of time allocation of Gary Becker, the decision whether a woman joins the labour market is collectively made within the household. The household maximizes the joint utility function taking into account the time constrains, i.e. the need to allocate time to home-work, workplace and leisure of the individuals (Heckman, 2015). In this respect the time allocated to the workplace (i.e. labour market participation) will depend on number of personal, household characteristics and overall economic and labour market conditions (Tsani et al., 2012).

Feminist economists (Nelson, 2003) have challenged mainstream economics as it:
a) Focuses on the production sphere of the economy and neglects the reproductive sphere. The reproductive sphere, primarily structured as a female realm of the economy in patriarchal division of labour, is left out of the field, despite the interconnected nature of productive and reproductive spheres;
b) Household is assumed to have a unified structure and used as the unit of analysis. This assumption overlooks the differences in the division of labour, the command over resources and the decision-making, in sum of hierarchical structure and dependency within households;
c) Women are underrepresented in the field as researchers and as the research question. Hence, neither the assumptions on individual behaviour resemble women's behaviour nor the questions asked. The data collected and the economic policies equally ignore what women need
to be researched and applied as policies. The gender bias in knowledge production clearly reflects the social hierarchies and is the outcome of the male dominance in the field.

Feminist economists challenged the definition of homoeconomicus and argued that models of free individual choice cannot explain the real life phenomena in a world of dependence, tradition and power. Homoeconomicus separated from physical and social constraints, deciding solely on the basis of material well-being is criticized, as it describes an individual separated from the world, which is contrary to what is needed to be studied. For feminist economists there are four economic spheres that are built upon each other and are in continuous mutual interaction. Finance and production are the monetized, and reproduction and nature are the non-monetized spheres. Conventional economics analyses only the monetized spheres whereas feminist economics describes economics as a discipline concerned with all four spheres (Nelson, 1993).

However, the literature finds some other potential explanations for the labour market participation decision of women, besides the prevailing wage rates and the household decision on time allocation. We refer to those below.

### 4.1. Education

According to the predictions of the neoclassical theory of labour supply, more educated women would have higher labour market activity as their opportunity cost of non-working is higher than that of the less educated women. There is a vast empirical literature confirming the positive relationship between education of a woman and her labour force participation in both developed and developing countries (Saget, 1999; Aromolaran, 2004; Pagani and Marenzi, 2008; Pastore and Verashchagina, 2008; Contreras and Plaza, 2010; Euwals et al., 2011; Posadas and Vidal-Fernandez, 2012; Tsani et al., 2012). Though, there are studies showing that the relationship between education and female activity is not that straightforward but also depends on the age of a woman (Münch et al., 2009).

### 4.2. Marital status and fertility

Some studies find that marriages reduce female LM participation, though the link is stronger in patriarchal and classical types of households (Euwals et al., 2011; Klasen and Pieters, 2012).

The link between motherhood and LM participation is on the other hand well documented in the literature. Though, this relationship between LM participation and fertility may be
influenced jointly, by similar, exogenous factors, such as culture and social norms, preferences, access and affordability of childcare, wealth of a household, etc. (Engelhardt et al., 2004; Gutierrez-Domenech, 2005; Holland and Del Valk, 2014). The explanation for the negative association between children and LM participation lies in the Becker' human capital theory where the loss of human capital while woman are absent from the labour market i.e. their employment is interrupted leads to permanent reductions in their future wages.

Del Boca et al. (2009) argue that increasing women labour market participation across European countries over recent decades (and declining fertility rates) can be explained by increasing female earnings power (as a result of growing educational attainment of woman, gender equality policies, etc.) which increases the opportunity cost of non-working and childrearing. Consequently, a woman/household chooses less children and leisure, while more work (Bloom et al., 2009; Euwals et al., 2011; Posadas and Vidal-Fernandez, 2012). Studies find that the effect of children on female LM activity largely depends on the number of children in the household (larger families being associated with lower participation of women) and on the age of the children (the negative relationship being stronger for women with younger children).

### 4.3. Household income and wage

The individual decision of women whether to participate in the labour market will also depend on the household income and wealth. The so-called income effect implies that when household income increases, women may decide to withdraw from the labour market (or work fewer hours); negatively impacting female activity in the labour market. The opposite effect, substitution effect, means that as the wage (income) of women increases, their leisure becomes more expensive (i.e. the opportunity cost of non-working increase) so they decide to be active or work more hours. The empirical evidence on the impact of the household income and wealth on female LM participation is though not conclusive. It can be that the effect is non-monotonic, i.e. that substitution effect prevails until certain level of household income (stimulating increase in female participation in the labour market), and then, after the household enjoys certain living standard, income effect dominates.

### 4.4. Culture and norms

The culture and social norms, and the extent to which a society is traditional in terms of the relationships within the family but also interactions with the rest of the society has an important effect on the female LM participation. In the so-called "classical" type of household
(see Eckstein and Lifshitz, 2012), the husband is the main decision-maker with respect to employment decisions, so that the wife's allocation of time, including in employment, is treated as a residual. In the traditional societies, women are mainly perceived as second bread-winners, so that their decision to enter the labour market is determined jointly by the household rather than being individual decision related to the opportunity cost of working vs. non-working. From the perspective of social norms and traditions, women in the country are mainly perceived as second breadwinners so that their labour market decisions are to some extent conditional on those of their spouses/partners (see Mojsoska-Blazevski et al. 2015). In other words, they accommodate their labour market behaviour and preferences so as to balance family and work.

### 4.5. Ethnicity

Ethnicity may play an important role in the LM activity of women. The link between ethnicity and LM participation is most likely associated with the culture and traditions to which a woman/household belongs. For instance, women from ethnic communities that are generally more traditional and patriarchal tend to be less active in the labour market. However, as the educational profile of women from traditional households improve and their earnings potential rise, one may expect that their LM participation will also increase. In other words, the interaction between ethnicity and education has to be considered as well.

One of the few studies focused on female participation in the labor market which considered ethnicity (World Bank, 2008b) showed that ethnic Albanian women: i) have relatively high reservation wage (the lowest wage at which a women will accept the job) and ii) do not want to work as they afterwards have to share their earnings with the family (the head of the household collects all income and decides on its use) and still have to do all the household activities; again boiling down to cultures and traditions.

### 4.6. Social capital

Social capital has been argued to determine the structure of people's relationships. The extent of social capital of a person depends on the extent of social relationships and the amount and quality of capitals of the people with whom the individual is related (Bourdieu, 1983). An individual women's stock of social capital is likely to have an effect on the probability of their being in work. The extended internal labour market is likely to be particularly important in the country (along with the other Western Balkan countries), reflecting both the excess supply of labour and widespread nepotism (Shenaj, 2013). Hence,
women with more relatives and friends in employment are likely to have more accurate and extensive information about present and forthcoming employment opportunities. Higher social capital in the form of internet use and linguistic skills are also likely to increase the efficiency of job search and hence raise female employment rates (Brook, 2005).

### 4.7. Childcare/elderly care

Theoretical and empirical studies suggest that the availability of childcare services significantly affects women's preferences for non-market time versus time spent in paid work (Hallberg and Klevmarken, 2002, Pagani and Marenzi, 2008). The theoretical underpinning of the positive effect of available childcare directly follows from the neoclassical theory of labour supply. Besides the availability of childcare, another factor that matters is its cost. Viitanen (2005) and Cortes and Tessada (2011) find that a reduction in childcare costs will significantly influence the labour force participation of low-productivity mothers and raise overall hours of working. The availability of grandparents and other informal providers of childcare have been found by Pagani and Marenzi (2008), Posadas and Vidal-Fernandez (2012) and Arpino et al. (2012) to have a positive effect on mothers' supply of market labour, especially amongst less-educated women.

In the country, few children attend childcare facilities, in particular the net enrolment rate for children aged 0-6 in 2013/2014 was only $18 \%$. ${ }^{6}$ Such low pre-school participation is related to availability of childcare facilities, cost but also to the family traditions. For instance, in 2014 there were 57 public kindergartens in 46 municipalities (out of 84 municipalities) in the country pointing to low access to childcare. Nurseries that provide care for children aged 9 months to 2 years olds are scarce and geographically not equally dispersed. The availability of the childcare facilities is particularly low in rural areas, which may be a large constrain to female labour market participation. The cost of the childcare facilities is not an important impediment to access, with monthly costs for full board at $5.7 \%$ of the average net wage, or $14 \%$ of the minimum wage; though it becomes significant in households with more children.

This situation is further exacerbated by a low provision of facilities for the care of elderly and disabled. Indeed, Viertel (2008) finds that low availability of care for elderly and disabled persons is an important constrain to female LM participation in thecountry. This is further strengthened by the dominant and divided family roles, in which woman are responsible for the care for the home and the dependents.

[^3]
### 4.8. Availability of flexible work and flexible working arrangements

Women's decisions over the labour supply are also affected by the flexibility of the working time and arrangements. There are only few options for flexible working time and schedules (for instance, work from home) available in the country. Flexibility is mainly understood as flexible start- and end-time of the working day. Moreover, the share of females working parttime is also low, $5 \%$ in 2014 (the average for the EU-28 is $32 \%$ ). The low availability of parttime work (and other forms of flexible working schedules) in the country can be one of the reasons for relatively low participation of women in the labour market.

Eurostat data show that among females in the country working part-time, $34 \%$ report they could not find a full-time work, $19.5 \%$ that they work part-time due to other family and personal responsibilities, $5.5 \%$ report to work part-time due to taking care after child or elderly, and $35 \%$ state that there are some other reasons. What is appealing in the data is that women are much less likely to report they work-part time as they need to combine the work with taking care of children or elderly (only $5.5 \%$ ) compared to an average of $27 \%$ of women in EU-28 countries who claim that. Given the relatively low provision of childcare, this implies that the support of the family in taking care of young children is much stronger in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia than in the EU. There are no specific family policies in the country which can help mothers and promote shared responsibilities.

### 4.9. Age

Within this individual framework women's age is also considered as a relevant factor in the female labour force participation (FLFP). Models of the FLFP usually include women's age and age squared, because the impact of age is typically not linear but has a hump- shaped pattern. This implies that women's participation increases in their youth (aged 20-30), decreases in their 30s as women temporarily leave the labour market to have children and later, in their 40s, return to the labour market when the participation reaches the highest level (Balleer et al., 2009). The non-linear effect of age on female LM participation is found in both developed and developing countries (Pagani and Marenzi, 2008; Contreras et al., 2010; Balleer et al., 2009; Del Boca et al. 2009; Narayana and Shongwe, 2010).

### 4.10. Discrimination

A (perceived to be) discriminatory labour market can also discourage woman from participating in the labour market. Viertel (2008) found that some women in the country are deterred from the labour market from the discrimination of employers towards them in their
hiring practices and weak enforcement of the legislation that should prevent discriminatory practices. Additional discouragement for women comes from the disregard of existing legislation by many employers. Viertel argues that the discrimination in recruitment in the country is especially high for married women and women with children.

### 4.11. Overall unemployment and informality

General lack of jobs may also discourage women from LM participation (Tsani et al., 2012). Still, the effect of unemployment on women LM participation depends on the relative strength of two effects, the discouraged-worker effect and the added-worker effect. The former states that when unemployment is high, women are less likely to find a job, job search costs (economic and psychological) are high, so that unemployment negatively affects female participation. On the other hand, the added-worker hypothesis stipulates that when unemployment is high and men lose jobs, women may step in and try to compensate for the lost family income. However, discouraged-workers effect is more likely to outpace the added-worker effect (Tsani et al., 2012).

Widespread informality may discourage many women from participating in the LM, as the informal sector does not provide social insurance and protection, for instance, during pregnancy, birth, breastfeeding, etc.

In conclusion, there are some important barriers to female participation in the labour market in the country (non-flexible working arrangements, low access to childcare and elderly facilities, etc.), but they are somewhat compensated by the support of families. Women are mainly second-bread winners which leads them to having (on average) lower career aspirations than men, have interruptions in the career due to child birth (for mothers), and are likely to accumulate less human capital and networks during their career.

## 5. Methodology

This section outlines the questionnaire and sample designs, sample selection and data adjustment procedures. In the final part, it outlines the methodologies used for data analysis.

### 5.1. Questionnaire design

The issue of female inactivity is only superficially covered in the existing (standard) surveys. Namely, all of them identify inactive persons, but do not investigate reasons for inactivity.

Table 1 gives a brief summary of the issues covered in various existing surveys.
Table 1 - Female inactivity in the existing surveys

| Existing surveys | Coverage |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. Labour Force Survey (LFS) | - Identification of inactive persons <br> - Interference with the ESA in terms of using assistance or pursuing some training program <br> - Identification of economic status (including inactivity) a year ago |
| 2. Survey of Income and Living Conditions (SILC) | - Identification of the household, incl. economic status (student, pensioner, disabled, housewife, other inactive person) <br> - Active search for job / readiness to accept job in 2 weeks if offered <br> - Identification of unpaid family workers <br> - Change in economic status (from any to inactivity) <br> - Reason for resignation or change of job: the need to raise a child or take case of an older person, or other reason for transferring to inactivity |
| 3. Survey for the time usage | - Identification of the household, incl. economic status (student, pensioner, disabled, housewife, other inactive person) <br> - Active search for job / readiness to accept job in 2 weeks if offered <br> - Utilization of kindergarten for the children - time per week and per day <br> - Identification of unpaid family workers |
| 4. Household Budget Survey (HBS) | - None |
| 5. School to Work Transition Survey (SWTS) | - Identification of the economic status (student/intern, being trained, household tasks (child-raising), other inactive person - disability) <br> - Transition to inactivity |
| urce: Authors' compilation based on information from the State Statistical Office. |  |

Therefore, for the purpose of this analysis, the design of the questionnaires started from scratch. Two surveys have been designed: one for household-level information, and another one for individual-level information. The former is designed to be answered by a senior
female in the household, preferably aged 30-64 who likely has detailed information on household members and the earning and spending patterns. This questionnaire contains the following topics: demographic and educational profile of the household; employment and labour market; household income and consumption. The individual survey, on the other hand, is designed to be answered by all women in the household aged 15+. The topics covered in this survey included: demographics, health and education; employment, labour market and discrimination; social inclusion; culture, norms and participation in public life; access to care facilities for children and elderly; specific questions on inactivity. Both questionnaires are provided in Annex 1.

### 5.2. Sample design and selection

### 5.2.1. Sample Size Determination

The dwelling unit for this project is the household. For computing the number of selected sample dwelling units (number of households), the following temporary sample size determination formula is used:

$$
n^{*}=\frac{\chi_{0.05,1}^{2}[P(1-P)]}{\left(\chi_{0.05,1}^{2}[\operatorname{se}(p)]\right)^{2}}=\frac{3.8416[(0.5)(0.5)]}{(0.0195)^{2}}=\frac{0.96}{0.00038}=2526
$$

The ultimate sample size computation (which is corrected with the total population size) for the number of sample dwelling units is as follows:

$$
n^{T}=\frac{n^{*}}{1+\frac{n^{*}}{N^{T}}}=\frac{2526}{1+\frac{2526}{502936}}=\frac{2526}{1.005} \cong 2500
$$

The overall sampling fraction for this design will be, $f=n^{\top} / N^{\top}=2500 / 502936 \cong 1 / 200$. Here, $\left(N^{\top}\right)$ is the total number of Housing Units (HUs) in the population (as a tentative estimate the mean household size is taken as 4 persons), and $\left(\mathrm{n}^{\top}\right)$ is the total number of Housing Units (HUs) in the selected sample. For self-weighting sample designs, the sampling fraction for any domain will be the same as any other domain in the design. Furthermore, this is also equal to one another within any domain as well as the total population.

### 5.2.2. Stratification

The selection of the sample is based on a stratified random selection approach. It is convenient that the first stratification variable are regions. The Former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia has eight planning regions. The next stratification variable is the geographic settlement (urban-rural). Table 2 presents the population by regions and by settlement. As SSO does not publish figures about the urban-rural and ethnic divide at the level of a region, these two additional levels may be approximated only after data collection (poststratification).

Table 2 - Breakdown of the total population by region and settlement

| Regions $(h)$ | Urban <br> domain | population <br> $\left(M_{h}^{U}\right)$ | Rural <br> domain |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| population | Total population of <br> the region <br> $\left(M_{h}^{T}\right)$ |  |  |
| 1 Vardar | 89463 | 39865 | 129328 |
| 2 East | 124146 | 78548 | 202694 |
| 3 Southwest | 103960 | 115746 | 219706 |
| 4 Southeast | 79095 | 92351 | 171446 |
| 5 Pelagonia | 157467 | 81019 | 238486 |
| 6 Polog | 88762 | 217087 | 305849 |
| 7 Northeast | 92324 | 80463 | 172787 |
| 8 Skopje | 385378 | 188857 | 574235 |
| Total | 1120595 | 893936 | 2014531 |

Source: State Statistical Office of Macedonia (2002)
The total number of dwelling units $\left(N_{h}^{T}\right)$ for urban $\left(N_{h}^{U}\right)$ and rural $\left(N_{h}^{R}\right)$ areas are obtained by dividing the related population size by the average household size $(\bar{H})$ of that domain.

$$
N_{h}^{U}=M_{h}^{U} / \bar{H} \quad N_{h}^{R}=M_{h}^{R} / \bar{H} \& N_{h}^{T}=M_{h}^{T} / \bar{H}
$$

In this design, the average household size was taken as $\bar{H}=4.0$ in all strata \& domains. The breakdown of the total number of dwelling units in the population is given in Table 3, by regions and domains.

Table 3 - Breakdown of the total number of dwelling units in the population by region and settlement

| Regions $(h)$ | Urban dwelling <br> units $\left(N_{h}^{U}\right)$ | Rural <br> dwelling units <br> $\left(N_{h}^{R}\right)$ | Total dwelling <br> units $\left(N_{h}^{T}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 Vardar | 22366 | 9966 | 32332 |
| 2 East | 31037 | 18937 | 49974 |
| 3 Southwest | 25990 | 28937 | 54927 |
| 4 Southeast | 19774 | 23088 | 42862 |
| 5 Pelagonia | 39367 | 20255 | 59622 |
| 6 Polog | 22191 | 54272 | 76463 |
| 7 Northeast | 23081 | 20116 | 43197 |
| 8 Skopje | 96345 | 47214 | 143559 |
| Total | 280151 | 222785 | 502936 |

Source: Authors' calculations.

Due to the related laws of thecountry, details of dwelling unit information cannot be released to outsiders from the SSO. Therefore, sample design and selection procedures are modified. The sample design is based on $\mathrm{E}=2930$ available National List of Election Wards (Electoral Units). The National List of Election Wards are stratified by the region and settlement. Then, within each stratum, a random sample of election wards is selected with proportional allocation, which has created a self-weighting sample design, having a total number of e= 265 sample election wards.

Proportional allocation technique is used for the sample size allocation into strata. Number of dwelling units which are selected by proportional allocation, and their allocation into sample strata ( $n^{T}$ ) is made by the following method.

$$
n_{h}^{T}=\left(\frac{N_{h}^{T}}{N^{T}}\right) n_{\&}^{T} n_{h}^{U}=\left(\frac{N_{h}^{U}}{N_{h}^{T}}\right) n_{h}^{T} \quad n_{h}^{R}=\left(\frac{N_{h}^{R}}{N_{h}^{T}}\right) n_{h}^{T} \text { where } n_{h}^{T}=n_{h}^{U}+n_{h}^{R}
$$

Here, total, urban, and rural sample sizes are allocated accordingly.

### 5.2.3. Sampling Fractions

Sampling fractions are given below. Here, the overall sampling fraction (= sample selection probability) will be the same in all sample strata in the case of proportional allocation, which is given in Table 4.

$$
f=\frac{n}{N}=\frac{n_{h}}{N_{h}}=f_{h} \quad \forall h \quad \text { and } \quad f=f_{h}=\frac{n_{h}}{N_{h}}=\frac{1}{F_{h}}
$$

Table 4 - Breakdown of the selected number of sample dwelling units (households) by region and settlement
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{llll}\hline \text { Regions }(h) & \begin{array}{l}\text { Urban } \\
\text { dwelling units } \\
\left(n_{h}^{U}\right)\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Rampl } \\
\text { dwelling units } \\
\left(n_{h}^{R}\right)\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Total } \\
\text { dwelling units }\end{array}
$$ <br>

\left.\hline ( n_{h}^{T}\right)\end{array}\right]\)| sample |
| :--- |

Source: State Statistical Office of Macedonia (2016)

The selection of the Enumeration Areas (EAs) within each stratum was carried out by a Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) design. The measure of size was represented by the number of households living within each EA. The Second Stage Units were selected by systematic sampling. Within each selected PSU, 15 HUs were initially selected, 10 of them will form the base sample, while the remaining 5 will be considered as the available random substitute dwelling units. The list of cluster addresses can only be provided by SSO. These addresses will be updated in several ways. "Independent Field Screening" is used as an alternative to "Half Open Interval Technique" during the field operation.

During the fieldwork operation, a total number of $n^{\top}=2456$ dwelling units (households) has been interviewed by the I $\cong 50$ enumerators. The outcome of the results is given in Table 5, by region and settlement.

Table 5 - Breakdown of the enumerated number of sample dwelling units (households) by region and settlement

| Regions $(h)$ | Urban <br> dwelling units <br> $\left(n_{h}^{U}\right)$ | Rural <br> dwelling units <br> $\left(n_{h}^{R}\right)$ | Total <br> dwelling unitssample <br> $\left(n_{h}^{T}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 Vardar | 119 | 40 | 159 |
| 2 East | 141 | 99 | 240 |
| 3 Southwest | 139 | 164 | 303 |
| 4 Southeast | 112 | 122 | 234 |
| 5 Pelagonia | 180 | 81 | 261 |
| 6 Polog | 107 | 259 | 366 |
| 7 Northeast | 89 | 68 | 157 |
| 8 Skopje | 497 | 239 | 736 |
| Total | 1384 | 1072 | 2456 |
| Source: GfK Survey Company, Skopje, (2016) |  |  |  |

In order to achieve / complete these 2500 interviews and because we do not have in the country eligible source for addresses (where to send the interviewers and avoid any kind of bias) we additionally conducted enumeration = poll of addresses of objects / possible places of living for households, before the start of the fieldwork for conducting and completing the interviews as per sample.

For doing the enumeration = poll of addresses, we used as sampling units the electoral points (points used for voting since they are clearly defined by borders and streets, villages etc.). For this purpose, we draw 265 points from the list of all the electoral points, by random choice in each of the 16 strata. The number of points for enumeration = poll of addresses per strata. In each of these electoral units / sampling points we enumerated / polled approx. 20 addresses. And the distribution of all enumerated addresses / polled addresses is in the above table.

When we compare the outcomes from Table 4 and Table 5, we can evaluate our results as response rates. Household response rates for this survey is given in Table 6, by region and settlement. For the household survey, the "Non-response Rate = 1 - Response Rate" relationship also provided very valuable information on the domain basis.

Table 6 - Household Response rates by regions and domains
$\left.\begin{array}{llllll}\hline \text { Regions }(h) & \begin{array}{l}\text { Urban } \\ \text { response } \\ \left(R R_{h}^{U}\right)\end{array} & \begin{array}{r}\text { sample } \\ \text { rates }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Rural } \\ \text { response } \\ \left(R R_{h}^{R}\right)\end{array} & \begin{array}{r}\text { sample } \\ \text { rates }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Total } \\ \text { response } \\ \left(R R_{h}^{T}\right)\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{r}\text { sample } \\ \text { rates }\end{array}\right]$

Source: Authors' calculations.

The reason for doubling the number of enumerated (= polled) addresses is because we know by experience that the average response rate in the country is approx. $50 \%$. So, we have to collect / enumerate / polled, twice more addresses than needed for achieving 2500 completed interviews.

The general response rate rule (WFS, 1975) is that, the response rates within each survey
stratum should be greater than 0.90 that is ( $90 \%$ and over). Consequently, non-response rates within each survey stratum will be less than 0.10 . This can be accepted as a threshold value for considering not weighting the survey results for avoiding from the non-response bias, as is the predominant case here.

### 5.2.4. Survey Expansion Factors

Due to the special nature of the sample selection for this survey, we can provide two different sample selection probabilities. The first can be based on the representation of the sample election wards. The second type of sample selection probability can be obtained by taking the ratio of stratum values from Table 4 and Table3; we can obtain the sample selection probabilities for the stated domains again. When examining the stratum probability values, which are very close between strata, it is clear that the sample design is selfweighting, naturally.

Expansion factors will be the inverse of the sample selection probabilities (= overall sampling fractions) for the design.
$F_{h}^{T H}=\frac{N_{h}^{T}}{n_{h}^{T}}=\frac{N^{T}}{n^{T}}=F^{T H}$
for self-weighting designs
The household survey expansion factors can be computed as: $F_{h}^{U H}=N_{h}^{U} / n_{h}^{U}$ and $F_{h}^{R H}=N_{h}^{R} / n_{h}^{R} \& F_{h}^{T H}=N_{h}^{T} / n_{h}^{T}$ and the results are given in Table 7.

Table 7 - Breakdown of the household survey expansion factors by region and settlement

| Regions $(h)$ | Urban <br> household <br> survey <br> expansion <br> factors $\left(F_{h}^{U H}\right)$ | Rural household <br> survey <br> expansion <br> factors $\left(F_{h}^{R H}\right)$ | Total survey <br> expansion <br> factors $\left(F_{h}^{T H}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 Vardar | 186.38 | 142.37 | 170.17 |
| 2 East | 238.75 | 210.41 | 227.15 |
| 3 Southwest | 173.27 | 206.69 | 189.40 |
| 4 Southeast | 152.11 | 256.53 | 194.83 |
| 5 Pelagonia | 207.19 | 184.14 | 198.74 |
| 6 Polog | 158.51 | 193.83 | 182.05 |
| 7 Northeast | 192.34 | 223.51 | 205.70 |
| 8 Skopje | 181.78 | 174.87 | 179.45 |
| Overall | 185.53 | 195.43 | 189.79 |
| Source: Authors' calculations. |  |  |  |

The sample design is self-weighting, therefore weighting adjustments can only apply to nonresponse and post-stratification weighting. They also can be used within specified threshold limits.

Expansion factors are used to generalize the sample strata frequencies to the corresponding population strata estimates of the population totals for a given variable. When the population total estimates are not required, then household survey expansion factors need not to be used.

The results of the number of interviewed sample household persons are given in Table 8, for the survey regions and geographic strata.

Table 8 - Breakdown of the enumerated number of sample household members by region and settlement

| Regions $(h)$ | Urban sample <br> household <br> members $\left(m_{h}^{U}\right)$ | Rural sample <br> household <br> members $\left(m_{h}^{R}\right)$ | Total sample <br> household <br> members $\left(m_{h}^{T}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 Vardar | 451 | 161 | 612 |
| 2 East | 451 | 320 | 771 |
| 3 Southwest | 537 | 668 | 1205 |
| 4 Southeast | 388 | 484 | 872 |
| 5 Pelagonia | 565 | 303 | 868 |
| 6 Polog | 477 | 1133 | 1610 |
| 7 Northeast | 316 | 262 | 578 |
| 8 Skopje | 1975 | 1031 | 3006 |
| Overall | 5160 | 4362 | 9522 |

Source: Authors' calculations.

The individual survey expansion factors can be computed as: $F_{h}^{U I}=M_{h}^{U} / m_{h}^{U}$ and $F_{h}^{R I}=M_{h}^{R} / m_{h}^{R} \quad \& F_{h}^{T I}=M_{h}^{T} / m_{h}^{T}$ and the results are given in Table 9.

Table 9 - Breakdown of the individual survey expansion factors by region and settlement

| Regions $(h)$ | Urban <br> individual <br> expansion <br> $\left(F_{h}^{U I}\right)$ | domain <br> survey <br> factors | Rural <br> individual <br> expansion <br> $\left(F_{h}^{R I}\right)$ | domain <br> survey <br> factors |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Regional <br> survey <br> factors <br> $\left(F_{h}^{T I}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
| individual <br> expansion |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Vardar | 198.37 | 247.61 |  |  |
| 2 East | 275.27 | 245.46 | 211.32 |  |
| 3 Southwest | 193.59 | 173.27 | 262.90 |  |
| 4 Southeast | 203.85 | 190.81 | 182.33 |  |
| 5 Pelagonia | 278.70 | 267.39 | 196.61 |  |
| 6 Polog | 186.08 | 191.60 | 274.75 |  |
| 7 Northeast | 292.16 | 307.11 | 189.97 |  |
| 8 Skopje | 195.13 | 183.18 | 298.94 |  |
| Overall | 217.17 | 204.94 | 191.03 |  |
| Soun |  | 211.57 |  |  |

Source: Authors' calculations

Individual survey expansion factors will be used, if the individual sample survey results for domains are intended to be generalized to their population totals.

### 5.3. Data collection

The data collection took place between September 15, 2016 and October 31, 2016. Survey was conducted by GfK Skopje.

### 5.4. Data analysis

The analysis is composed of two parts: descriptive analysis (Section 6) and econometric analysis (Section 7).

The descriptive analysis is based on calculation of measures of central tendency, proportions and correlations, presented through summary and contingency tables, as well as graphs.

The econometric analysis is based on specific econometric methods: namely, factor analysis, multinomial logistic analysis and probability analysis. The details of these methods are provided in the respective parts of Section 7, for facilitating the readability of this report.

## 6. Descriptive analysis

### 6.1. Description of the surveyed households

### 6.1.1. Households' basic characteristics

The survey was administered to 2,456 households. Table 10 presents the distribution of the surveyed households by geographic region and settlement. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is divided on eight planning regions, and the distribution of the households by region is uneven, but corresponds to the population distribution across regions. Hence, the Skopje region is represented by $30 \%$ of the total households, followed by the Polog and Southwest regions. With regard to the settlement, the urban rural division is approximately 44:56; however, within the urban division, we disentangle Skopje from the other inner towns, which are further split on small and large towns. Large towns are represented by $34 \%$ in the total number of households, followed by Skopje, $20 \%$ while small towns are with tiny representation, $2 \%$.

Table 10 - Distribution of households by geographic regions and settlement

|  |  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Region |  |  |
| Skopje | 736 | 29.97 |  |
| Pelagonija | 261 | 10.63 |  |
| Vardar | 159 | 6.47 |  |
| Polog | 366 | 14.9 |  |
| Northeast | 157 | 6.39 |  |
| East | 240 | 9.77 |  |
| Southeast | 234 | 9.53 |  |
| Southwest | 303 | 12.34 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Village | 1,072 | 43.65 |  |
| Small town (below 10.000 | 44 | 1.79 |  |
| inhabitants) | 842 | 34.28 |  |
| Town (over 10.000 inhabitants) | 498 | 20.28 |  |
| Skopje |  |  |  |

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

Figure 1 presents the distribution of the households by the interviewer judgment on the type and condition of the household. Expectedly, $86 \%$ of households are situated in a house, while the remaining part in flats (collective housing). Almost no surveyed household lived in movable or makeshift home. This distribution resonates the housing picture in the country, whereby households, irrespective of their income status, possess their own home usually inherited from older generations. It is also common that two or three generations of the
family live in same house, especially in in inner towns and in the villages. The right panel of Figure 1 suggests that only $5 \%$ of the households lived in poor residences, while the remaining lived under acceptable or good housing standard.

Figure 1 - Type and condition of surveyed households
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Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
6.1.2. Demographic and educational profile of households

Table 11 presents the distribution of the surveyed households by the number of household members: we present the distribution when the total number of household members is considered, as well when only female (15+) (surveyed) household members are considered. The distribution of the households by the number of their members is expectedly normally distributed, four-member households taking the largest share of our sample ( \(27.5 \%\) ), followed by three members (21.9\%), two members (17.8\%), five members (14.5\%) and six members ( \(9.4 \%\) ). There are few households composed of one and seven and more members. The table further suggests that a large part of the households contain only one female older than 15 years of age - 65.2\%, followed by two-female households \(-24.8 \%\) and three-female households \(-8.3 \%\). The rest of the households (1.8\%) are composed of more than three females.

Table 11 - Distribution of households by the number of members
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrr}
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{c}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
All household \\
members
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Only female members } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Number of \\
household \\
members
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Number of \\
households
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Percent of \\
households
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Number of \\
households
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Percent of \\
households
\end{tabular} \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{1}\) & 80 & 3.26 & 1,600 & 65.15 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2}\) & 436 & 17.75 & 609 & 24.8 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{3}\) & 537 & 21.86 & 203 & 8.27 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{4}\) & 676 & 27.52 & 33 & 1.34 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{5}\) & 357 & 14.54 & 8 & 0.33 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{6}\) & 230 & 9.36 & 2 & 0.08 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{7}\) & 87 & 3.54 & 1 & 0.04 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{8}\) & 23 & 0.94 & 0 & 0.00 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{9}\) & 13 & 0.53 & 0 & 0.00 \\
\hline & 9 & 0.37 & 0 & 0.00 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 0}\) & 7 & 0.29 & 0 & 0.00 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 1}\) & 1 & 0.04 & 0 & 0.00 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 2}\) & 80 & 3.26 & 0 & 0.00 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 3}\) & 2,456 & 100 & 2,456 & 100 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

Table 12 shows that the average age of nearly \(30 \%\) of the households is between 30 and 40 , while the share of those with average age of 20-30 and 40-50 hovers around \(20 \%\). Few households (5.8\%) are dominated by children, hence their average age is below 20, while older households (over 50) account for a bit more than 20\%. Strikingly, though, half of the households are without children (defined to be up to 18 years of age), while those with kids are mostly with one or two (each \(21 \%\) ). Only \(5.9 \%\) of the households have three children, while households with more than three children are rare.

Table 12 - Average age of the households
\begin{tabular}{rrr}
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Age \\
groups
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Number of \\
households
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Percent of \\
households
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 0 - 2 0}\) & 143 & 5.82 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2 0 - 3 0}\) & 540 & 21.99 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{3 0 - 4 0}\) & 730 & 29.72 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{4 0 - 5 0}\) & 500 & 20.36 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{5 0 - 6 0}\) & 291 & 11.85 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{6 0 - 7 0}\) & 242 & 9.85 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{7 0}\) & 10 & 0.41 \\
\hline Total & 2,456 & 100 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

We turn now to discussing some characteristics of the household head. The upper left panel of Figure 2 presents the ethnic structure of our households: it largely mimics the ethnic structure of the entire country according to the figures of the last available census. \(66 \%\) of the households are headed by Macedonian, 26\% by Albanian, 3\% by Roma, 2\% by Turk and the rest are other. Given that mixed marriages are not so common, the ethnicity of the head could be considered ethnicity of the entire household. The upper right panel presents the gender structure of the household head, suggesting that the sample is composed of equal number of male- and female-headed households. Lower left panel presents the educational structure of the household head: majority heads have high school as their highest-completed educational level (33\%), followed by primary education (24\%) and higher education (18\%). Finally, the lower right panel presents the marital structure of the heads: large majority of \(80 \%\) are married, \(15 \%\) are widowed or divorces, while only few, \(4 \%\) are single. This resonates the common feature of the Macedonian households where children live with their parents at least until they get married, although in the inner towns of the country they continue living with their parents in the same households even afterwards.

Figure 2 - Demographic characteristics of the household head


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

\subsection*{6.1.3. Employment}

To observe the labour-market behaviour of surveyed households, we consider only workingage persons, i.e. those between 15 and 64 . Table 13 presents the distribution of the households by the number of working-age individuals within the household. Majority of the households, \(37.3 \%\) have two working-age members, followed by three such members (22.5\%) and four (21.9\%).

Table 13 - Households' distribution by number of members in working age
\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Number of \\
household \\
members in \\
working age
\end{tabular} & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Number of \\
households
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
Percent of \\
households
\end{tabular} \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{2}\) & 221 & 9 \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{3}\) & 553 & 22.52 \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{4}\) & 537 & 21.86 \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{5}\) & 160 & 6.51 \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{6}\) & 52 & 2.12 \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{7}\) & 8 & 0.33 \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{8}\) & 4 & 0.16 \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{9}\) & 5 & 0.2 \\
\hline Total & \(\mathbf{1 1}\) & 1 & 0.04 \\
\hline & & 2,456 & 100
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

Table 14 - Employment ratio at the household level
\begin{tabular}{lrr}
\begin{tabular}{l} 
Employment \\
rate
\end{tabular} & Freq. & Percent \\
\hline \(\mathbf{0 \%}\) & 402 & 16.37 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 - 1 9 . 9 9 \%}\) & 15 & 0.61 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2 0 - 2 9 . 9 9 \%}\) & 201 & 8.18 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{3 0 - 3 9 . 9 9 \%}\) & 192 & 7.82 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{4 0 - 4 9 . 9 9 \%}\) & 61 & 2.48 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{5 0 - 5 9 . 9 9 \%}\) & 602 & 24.51 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{6 0 - 6 9 . 9 9 \%}\) & 283 & 11.52 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{7 0 - 7 9 . 9 9 \%}\) & 104 & 4.23 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{8 0 - 8 9 . 9 9 \%}\) & 14 & 0.57 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{9 0 - 1 0 0 \%}\) & 582 & 23.7 \\
\hline Total & \(\mathbf{2 , 4 5 6}\) & 100 \\
\hline Source: Female & Inactivity & Survey \\
& & \(\mathbf{2 0 1 6 .}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The household employment ratio within our sample, calculated as the ratio of all employed and all working-age individuals within a household has been estimated at \(53 \%\). The distribution is presented in Table 14. The table is indicative, as it suggests that either none of the working-age persons works (16.4\%), or all work (23.7\%), or only half work (24.5\%). Given that the share of households with two working-age persons is prevalent (Table 13), such aggregation of the household employment rate on the corners and around the middle is expected.

The remaining part of our working-age sample, \(47 \%\) are non-employed, comprising of individuals who search for a job (unemployed) and those who are inactive. Working-age respondents were first asked about the reason for non-employment in order to disentangle unemployment from inactivity in a subtle manner.

Figure 3 presents the responses: only one option was pointing out to unemployment (seeking for a job), while all the rest 11 reasons were related to forms of inactivity. 33.6\% of the non-employed persons responded they were actively seeking for a job, bringing the unemployment rate to \(23 \%\), closely resonating the latest figure of the State Statistical Office of \(24 \%\) at the end of the second quarter of 2016. The rest of the non-employed working-age sample (66.4\%) are considered inactive.

Figure 3 suggests that the most prevalent reason for inactivity is studying (19\%), followed by managing household tasks (14.7\%) and retirement (12\%). However, if managing of the household is considered together with the care for children and elderly, then this merge category has the highest share into inactivity of \(24.3 \%\). As this is a very large share, likely dominated by women (see section 1.2), this report will deal with the issue of female inactivity thoroughly. Interestingly, the shares of respondents who claimed other reasons for inactivity - no employment opportunities, inability to commute, low salary in the area, remittances and social assistance - are fairly low, contradicting the common perceptions in the society about the importance of these factors for the decision one to seek a job or not. The share of the discouraged workers (those discouraged to seek employment as they believe there are not available jobs) in total inactive is \(2.4 \%\), which matches the discouraged workers from the LFS (at 2.6\% in 2015). \({ }^{7}\)

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{7}\) http://www.stat.gov.mk/PrikaziPoslednaPublikacija.aspx?id=3.
}

Figure 3 - Reasons for non-employment


\section*{Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.}

To verify these figures, the survey asks two additional questions: whether the non-employed person seeks a job or not; and whether s/he has been registered with the Employment Service Agency.

Figure 4 presents the labour-market status based on the answers of these two questions which paints very similar picture to the previous one: \(20 \%\) of the working age population responded to be unemployed and \(27 \%\) to be inactive. As answers on both questions are almost identical, we consider these figures to be more correctly reflecting the actual status. According to these figures, the unemployment rate is estimated at \(27.6 \%{ }^{8}\)

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{8}\) As a reminder, unemployment rate is calculated as the share of unemployed in the labor force (the latter is the sum of employed and unemployed).
}

Figure 4 - Labour-market status


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

\subsection*{6.1.4. Household consumption and income}

Figure 5 presents data on reported monthly spending (consumption) of the households. Blue bars present the total spending reported by the household, the red ones present a sum of all specific categories of expenses that respondents reported (food, household expenses, etc.). We see that the latter category is in most cases smaller, but the difference is not that substantial, i.e. likely reflects the fact that we were not able to classify households who did not report disaggregated consumption, fully or partially.

Figure 5 - Distribution of two measures of consumption


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

Namely, about 300 households did not report their consumption disaggregated by categories. So, in the further analysis, we will predominantly rely on the total spending reported. Majority of households (60.3\%), have monthly spending of 10,000-29,999 Macedonian denars (MKD). Additional 23.9\% of the households spend between 30,00039,999 MKD. About 3.4\% of the households spend very little, below 9,999 MKD.

Figure 6 - Distribution of household income


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
Figure 6 presents the distribution of households by income. Most of the households are scattered in the income range between 10,000 and 49,999 MKD. However, large share of the households (around 250 or 10.6\% of all) reported not to have any income, which is not expected as all surveyed households were having decent housing.

Based on the data, we retrieve the relative poverty at \(22.5 \%\) (almost same as that of SSO) based on the consumption. \({ }^{9}\) On the other hand, the relative poverty based on income is slightly higher, at \(28.8 \%\), given that it is common that households underreport income. The distribution of household income and consumption (Figure 7) shows that the poorest households spend as much as they earn which is expected given that the face borrowing constraints. Households with below average income in the sample consume more than they earn, meaning they borrow to finance their consumption (or, they misreport their income). Richer households manage to save part of their income.

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{9}\) Commonly, the relative poverty line is calculated at \(60 \%\) of the median income/consumption.
}

Figure 7 - Distribution of household income and consumption (in their logs)


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
Second largest spending category is household expenses (electricity, water, heating, etc.), which constitutes slightly higher share in poorest households. Poorest households spend higher share of their income on medicines, although not less in absolute amount. As expected, richer households spend more on clothes and entertainment.

The Gini index of inequality calculated based on this data is \(37.6 \%\). Using another measure of inequality, the S80/S20, the study shows that total income received by the \(20 \%\) of the population with the highest income (top quintile) is 11.6 times higher than that received by the \(20 \%\) of the population with the lowest income (lowest quintile).

About 10\% of the surveyed households reported they received remittances, on average 850 EUR per year.

\subsection*{6.2. Description of the surveyed women}

\subsection*{6.2.1. General characteristics of women}

This section provides descriptive data and analyses for the sample consisting of women(from the individual questionnaire, for all female members of the household aged \(15+\) ). Given that the sample of women is representative of all women at working age in the country, we are able to make statistical inferences for the overall female population based on
the data obtained from the sample. We first provide some general information about working-age women and then switch to the labour market data.

More than third of women (34\%) have completed high school (post-secondary, non-tertiary education). About a fifth holds a tertiary education diploma and additional fifth have completed only primary education. About \(12 \%\) of working-age women completed 4 -year secondary school. There are, though, differences in the educational structure of working-age women, relative to the labour market status. Indeed, Figure 8 shows that active women have higher share among the more educated women, relative to inactive ones.

Figure 8 - Education structure of women by labour market status


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

Figure 9 presents the labour-market status (active versus inactive) of women disaggregated by ethnicity. Note that we present the data for the four largest ethnicities: Macedonian, Albanian, Turk and Roma, since observations dissipated for the others. The figure corroborates the general notion that inactivity reduces with education. However, the reduction is faster within Macedonian ethnicity, than with the other three.

Figure 9 - Education structure of women by labour market status and ethnicity


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
Similarly, Figure 10 presents disaggregation by geographic settlement. In order to prevent dissipation of data, we only provide the urban-rural division (i.e. abstract from division between small, large towns and the capital). Labour-market activity is apparently lower in urban areas, especially in the left side of the education distribution, at the expense of inactivity due to studying and retirement.

Figure 10 - Education structure of women by labour market status and settlement


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
There is high correlation of 0.7 between the education of a woman and the education of her partner/spouse. In other words, more educated women are more likely to marry more educated men, and vice versa.

Figure 11 presents data on knowledge of English language (left panel) and use of Internet (right panel) among our respondents. About 43\% of the adult women know English language either very well or quite well. Additional \(22.5 \%\) have some knowledge of English whereas one third of women do not know English at all. More than half of them (52.4\%) use Internet every day, and additional \(12.8 \%\) use it quite frequently. A quarter of the women do not use Internet at all. This data show that women, on average, have relatively good everyday skills which are important in terms of employability.

Figure 11 - Distribution of general skills across women respondents (reading and speaking English, left; usage of internet, right)


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
Large majority of respondents (91\%) reported to have very good or good health. About 8\% stated to have bad health and \(0.9 \%\) (only 31 individuals) stated to have very bad health. This is also reflected in the question related to the visits to a doctor (in the last three months) which shows that \(40 \%\) of the women did not visit a doctor in the last three months and \(25.8 \%\) visited doctor only once. On the other hand, \(7.3 \%\) of the respondents visited a doctor more than three times in the last three months.

\subsection*{6.2.2. Labour market characteristics of women}

Data on employment status of women can be derived both from the household level questionnaire (where oldest women reports the employment status of all family members) and from the individual one (where each female aged 15+ answers herself whether she holds a job). Questions related to employment in the individual questionnaire follow the ILO
definition of employment. Both questionnaires give very close information about the employment rates of women According to the individual questionnaire, the employment rate of women in the country is \(40.9 \%\), and \(39.6 \%\) based on the household questionnaire. Given that the former is more accurate (individuals themselves report their employment status), we proceed to work with that one. The calculated employment rate very much resembles the LFS employment rate which in 2015 was \(38.8 \%\) (women aged \(15-64\) ). \({ }^{10}\) This again adds large confidence in our results.

About \(85 \%\) of the employed women, who are married, have a spouse who works as well. In other words, there are few cases (15.2\%) of employed women whose spouse is not working. On the other hand, non-working and non-active women are less likely to have an employed spouse. This suggests that there is some "matching" between the spouses by education (as we argued in section 6.2.1) and by employment probability/status.

Table 15 - Distribution of monthly wages of working women
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Wage level } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No. of \\
females
\end{tabular} & Share \\
\hline No income & 168 & \(11.8 \%\) \\
\hline up to \(\mathbf{9 9 9 9}\) & 136 & \(9.6 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 0 0 0 0 - 1 9 9 9 9}\) & 754 & \(53.0 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2 0 0 0 0 - 2 9 9 9 9}\) & 260 & \(18.3 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{3 0 0 0 0 - 3 9 9 9 9}\) & 67 & \(4.7 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{4 0 0 0 0 - 4 9 9 9 9}\) & 13 & \(0.9 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{5 0 0 0 0 - 5 9 9 9 9}\) & 7 & \(0.5 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{6 0 0 0 0 - 6 9 9 9 9}\) & 13 & \(0.9 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{7 0 0 0 0 - 7 9 9 9 9}\) & 5 & \(0.4 \%\) \\
\hline Total & \(\mathbf{1 4 2 3}\) & \(\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016

Figure 12 - Distribution of wages of employed women


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

About \(12 \%\) of the employed women did not receive any salary in the last three months (employed women were asked to report the average monthly net salary earned in the last three months). Most of them (53\%) reported to earn wage between 10,000 and 19,999 MKD. About 18.3\% earned between 20,000-29,999 MKD, and 9.6\% earned up to 9,999 MKD, while a total of only \(2.7 \%\) earn 40,000 MKD and more (as a note, some of these women work less than 40 hours per week). \({ }^{11}\) The minimum wage in the economy in 2016 is 10,080 MKD and 9,080 MKD in few sectors of the economy (textile, apparel and leather industry),

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{10} \mathrm{http}: / / w w w . s t a t . g o v . m k / P r i k a z i P o s l e d n a P u b l i k a c i j a . a s p x ? i d=3\).
\({ }^{11}\) The data are not adjusted for the number of working hours, but reflect total monthly wage.
}
although women are overrepresented in the latter sectors. Table 16 presents income distribution by ethnicity and settlement. It suggests that it is similar between Macedonian and Albanian ethnicity, despite more Albanian women do not earn any income. Turk women feature worse, as three fourths of them earn between 10 and 20 thousand MKD, while Roma women feature the worst, since two third do not earn any income, which could be related to their highly disadvantaged position on the labour market and deep involvement in the informal and communal sector. In terms of the geographical position, women in the villages are slightly worse positioned on the income ladder than urban women.

Table 16 - Distribution of monthly wages of working females and by ethnicity and settlement
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline & \multicolumn{4}{c}{ Ethnicity } & & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Settlement } \\
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ Wage level } & Macedonian & Albanian & Turk & Roma & Rural & Urban \\
\hline No income & \(7.3 \%\) & \(13.0 \%\) & \(6.3 \%\) & \(65.0 \%\) & \(8.3 \%\) & \(9.8 \%\) \\
\hline up to \(\mathbf{9 9 9 9}\) & \(3.2 \%\) & \(7.6 \%\) & \(6.3 \%\) & \(35.0 \%\) & \(6.1 \%\) & \(3.2 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 0 0 0 0 - 1 9 9 9 9}\) & \(59.1 \%\) & \(43.5 \%\) & \(75.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(62.1 \%\) & \(52.3 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2 0 0 0 0 - 2 9 9 9 9}\) & \(24.8 \%\) & \(32.3 \%\) & \(12.5 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(20.4 \%\) & \(28.7 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{3 0 0 0 0 - 3 9 9 9 9}\) & \(4.0 \%\) & \(3.6 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(2.6 \%\) & \(4.3 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{4 0 0 0 0 - 4 9 9 9 9}\) & \(0.8 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.2 \%\) & \(0.9 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{5 0 0 0 0 - 5 9 9 9 9}\) & \(0.2 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.2 \%\) & \(0.1 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{6 0 0 0 0 - 6 9 9 9 9}\) & \(0.4 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.5 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{7 0 0 0 0 - 7 9 9 9 9}\) & \(0.1 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.0 \%\) & \(0.1 \%\) \\
\hline TOTAL & \(100.0 \%\) & \(100.0 \%\) & \(100.0 \%\) & \(100.0 \%\) & \(100.0 \%\) & \(100.0 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
Figure 12 shows that the distribution of wages of women is skewed towards lower levels of wages, where small shares of employed women receive higher wage levels. Petreski and Mojsoska-Blazevski (2015) estimated the gender wage gap and also confirmed the presence of such wage distribution for women.

Table 17 shows that most women (43.8\%) work forty hours per week which is considered as standard working week by the labour legislation. Slightly below \(30 \%\) of them work overtime ( \(21.4 \%\) work \(41-49\) hours per week and \(7.6 \%\) work \(50+\) hours). Some women (6\%) work unusually short hours (less than 9 hours per week) which is probably related to casual and unpaid work. \({ }^{12}\)

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{12}\) Within the ILO definition of employment, even one hour of paid work during a working week is considered as employment.
}

Table 17 - Distribution of employed women by hours worked per week
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Hours \\
worked
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No. of \\
employe \\
d
\end{tabular} & Share \\
\hline \(\mathbf{0}\) & 14 & \(1.0 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 - 9}\) & 67 & \(5.0 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 0 - 1 9}\) & 71 & \(5.3 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2 0 - 2 9}\) & 91 & \(6.8 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{3 0 - 3 9}\) & 120 & \(9.0 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{4 0}\) & 584 & \(43.8 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{4 1 - 4 9}\) & 286 & \(21.4 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{5 0}\) and & 101 & \(7.6 \%\) \\
\hline over & 1334 & \(100.0 \%\) \\
\hline Total & &
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey
2016.

LFS data show that there is large gender disparity in terms of labour market participation/activity. In particular, in 2015, \(48 \%\) of women at the working age were inactive whereas that was the case for \(22.5 \%\) of men. Indeed, that is one of the major motivations for the present study. Data from the female inactivity survey show that based on the individual survey, the inactivity rate of women is \(41 \%\). The household survey gives very similar estimate of inactivity at \(42 \%\). The following Table 18 presents the inactivity rates based on the individual survey, by ethnicity and settlement. It suggests that inactivity is considerably larger of the Albanian women than for the rest three, while the one of Macedonian women is the lowest. The female inactivity is larger in the villages than in the towns probably due to the larger share of unpaid work. We proceed with thorough description of and detailed analyses for the main reasons related to inactivity in Sections 6 and 7.

Table 18 - Inactivity rate by ethnicity and settlement
\begin{tabular}{lclc}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Ethnicity } & & Settlement \\
\hline Macedonian & \(31.7 \%\) & Rural & \(48.2 \%\) \\
\hline Albanian & \(61.5 \%\) & Urban & \(37.9 \%\) \\
\hline Turk & \(42.2 \%\) & & \\
\hline Roma & \(41.8 \%\) & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{l}{ Source: } & Female Inactivity Survey 2016. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Besides the calculations of employment, unemployment and participation rates that are based on the ILO definitions, the survey also asked women in which category of certain labour market statuses they belong (i.e. subjective labour market status). Table 19 shows that \(34 \%\) of the women reported to be in wage employment (employees), and additional 6\% working occasionally or as self-employed/business owner, which resembles the employment
rate of \(41 \%\) which we presented at the beginning of this section. Although, if we add the category of those that responded to be engaged in agriculture, the employment rate increases to \(44 \%\). One fifth of respondents reported that they are unemployed (do not hold a job but are actively looking for one) and \(15 \%\) reported to be inactive. \({ }^{13}\) In the standard ILO definition of inactivity, the category of inactive individual is combined with pensioners (6\%), those in education (11\%), but also housewives (2\%). The latter category (housewife) should be part of the category "no job and not looking for one", but some respondents added this answer explicitly (in the category other of the questionnaire). We can expect that housewives are spread across those two categories.

Table 19 - Self-determined labour market status
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline Self-reported status & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No. of \\
respondents
\end{tabular} & Share \\
\hline Working for an employer & 1214 & \(34 \%\) \\
\hline Occasionally working for several employers & 58 & \(2 \%\) \\
\hline Self-employed/business owner & 127 & \(4 \%\) \\
\hline Trying to start my own business & 29 & \(1 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{lc} 
No job, but looking for a job and ready to start \\
to work
\end{tabular} & 710 & \(20 \%\) \\
\hline No job and not looking for one & 529 & \(15 \%\) \\
\hline Attending a school/university & 396 & \(11 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Attending a training (foreign language, \\
computers, cooking, sewing, beautician, etc.)
\end{tabular} & 15 & \(0 \%\) \\
\hline Other & 95 & \(3 \%\) \\
\hline Pension & 205 & \(6 \%\) \\
\hline Agriculture & 161 & \(4 \%\) \\
\hline Housewife/ taking care for the household & 79 & \(2 \%\) \\
\hline Total & 3618 & \(100 \%\) \\
\hline Soure: Feme & &
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

\subsection*{6.2.3. Perceptions about labour market discrimination}

Large share of women (46.6\%) believe that there is discrimination against women in the labour market. Of those who reported that there was discrimination, one fifth have experienced discrimination themselves (Figure 13). One quarter stated they heard about discrimination from friends/relatives, 20\% heard about that in general, and for one third, that was just their personal opinion.

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{13}\) These are not rates (for example, employment rate), but frequencies of the answers for each category.
}

Figure 13 - Source of information on the gender discrimination


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
All respondents were also asked to share their perception (agreement/disagreement) about several statements related to the labour market discrimination, but also the general opinion about the roles of women and men in the labour market and the household. Majority of women (51.2\%) believe that they have more difficulty in finding a job relative to men (we report the sum of the categories fully agree and agree) (Table 20, see all women). This statement gives information about the women's perception about inequality, but it does not truly relate to discrimination. The second one, on the other hand, is representing discrimination, i.e. a situation in which two individuals with same labour market characteristics have different employment probabilities, due to their sex. Slightly less than half ( \(45.6 \%\) ) of women agree that there is discrimination in the labour market which corresponds with the earlier expressed opinion that there was a discrimination (46.6\% reported that there is a discrimination). About \(43.5 \%\) believe that women are paid less than men, although this does not necessarily mean there is a gender pay gap (the latter should account for different labour market characteristics of individuals). Majority of women disagree with the statement that women are second class workers ( \(70.5 \%\) of the respondents).

Table 20 - Female perceptions about the gender roles in the labour market and the household (\% of total)
\begin{tabular}{lccccccc}
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ All women } & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Active } & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Inactive } \\
\hline Statement & DA & A & DA & A & DA & A \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
It is harder for women to find a job than it is for \\
men
\end{tabular} & 46.5 & 51.2 & 49.3 & 49.5 & 32.9 & 63.0 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
If a man and a woman with the same \\
qualifications both apply for the same job, \\
companies tend to give priority to men
\end{tabular} & 49.9 & 45.6 & 51.8 & 44.6 & 40.8 & 52.8 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Women are less paid than men
\end{tabular} & 50.9 & 43.5 & 52.2 & 43.6 & 43.4 & 48.9 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Women are less paid than men for the same or \\
similar job
\end{tabular} & 53.0 & 40.7 & 54.6 & 40.4 & 45.6 & 46.4 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Women are second class workers
\end{tabular} & 70.5 & 27.2 & 71.4 & 27.2 & 62.3 & 33.6 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Women, by nature, were created to give birth and \\
raise children and to take care of the home and \\
the family, not to work
\end{tabular} & 68.7 & 30.4 & 71.2 & 28.3 & 57.1 & 41.9 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
It is much harder for a woman to be a manager, \\
company owner, politician, than it is for a man
\end{tabular} & 58.9 & 38.3 & 61.9 & 35.9 & 46.6 & 50.7 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Women are eager to work, but face barriers and \\
increasing need for care for the children and the \\
household
\end{tabular} & 40.3 & 57.2 & 43.1 & 54.9 & 30.3 & 67.6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
Note: The difference between 100 and the sum of the "agree" and "disagree" answers is related to non-answers. DA - Disagree; A - Agree.

The next group of statements explores if women females believe that there are naturally different gender roles in the society and the household, which can also be an important impediment to female activity (in case females prefer family activities rather than the world of work). Data show that about one third of women believe that their primary role is to give birth and take care of the home and family, rather than to work. \(38.3 \%\) think that it is harder for women to be at the top layer of occupations (manager, company owner, and politician) relative to men. However, large share of them (57.2\%) agree that there are barriers to greater engagement of women in the labour market and employment.

The last four columns in the table present the views of the active women and inactive ones (the latter category excludes pensioners and those still in education). Data clearly show that the views of the inactive women on the gender roles related to the labour market and family differ from the views of the active women. \({ }^{14}\) In particular, they are more likely to believe that women are discriminated relative to men; woman are second-class workers; the natural role of woman is to take care of the family; but also that women face large barriers to working.

Table 21 presents the disagreeing intensity of women disaggregated by ethnicity and settlement. We restrict the table to the disagreement answers, due to space. It indicates that the level of disagreement on the issues related to discrimination is consistently higher in the Macedonian ethnic community and in urban areas. This may be related to the general awareness and information dissemination.

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{14} \mathrm{We}\) do not test for the significance of these differences.
}

Table 21 - Female perceptions about the gender roles in the labour market and the household, by ethnicity and settlement (\% of total)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Ethnicity} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Settlement} \\
\hline Statement & MK & AL & TR & RO & RUR & URB \\
\hline It is harder for women to find a job than it is for men & 56.0 & 30.3 & 39.8 & 41.8 & 39.9 & 51.8 \\
\hline If a man and a woman with the same
qualifications both apply for the same job, companies tend to give priority to men & 53.1 & 46.2 & 37.4 & 38.8 & 43.8 & 54.7 \\
\hline Women are less paid than men & 51.1 & 53.6 & 33.7 & 28.4 & 47.0 & 54.1 \\
\hline Women are less paid than men for the same or similar job & 54.6 & 53.0 & 36.2 & 30.6 & 48.7 & 56.5 \\
\hline Women are second class workers & 73.5 & 65.3 & 73.5 & 58.2 & 66.5 & 73.6 \\
\hline Women, by nature, were created to give birth and raise children and to take care of the home and the family, not to work & 74.5 & 60.5 & 69.9 & 48.5 & 64.6 & 71.9 \\
\hline It is much harder for a woman to be a manager, company owner, politician, than it is for a man & 64.5 & 52.1 & 50.6 & 31.4 & 54.8 & 62.1 \\
\hline Women are eager to work, but face barriers and increasing need for care for the children and the household & 45.4 & 34.6 & 32.5 & 17.9 & 33.9 & 45.3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

Negligible share of respondents (6.7\%) reported they heard about some government measure/policy aimed at assisting women to find a job or to enter the labour market. Those few women had greatest awareness for the government programme for self-employment (support for the start-up businesses), as reported by \(21.4 \%\) of the respondents who heard about these measures. About \(10 \%\) reported measures related to the support of establishment of associations of women, programme for support to women entrepreneurship ( \(7.8 \%\) ), support of the BESA political party \((7.8 \%)^{15}\), the Government-run employment programme called "Macedonia employs" ( \(5,8 \%\) of respondents), and so on.

\subsection*{6.2.4. Social inclusion and time use}

This section presents main findings related to the social inclusion and activity of women. Table 22 presents the frequency of contacts of women with their family members (children, parents and relatives) and friends and neighbours. It confirms that females in Macedonia are quite socially active i.e. have intensive social contacts. \(77 \%\) of them who have kids reported to meet them quite frequently (daily or weekly). Still, \(15 \%\) reported that they saw them yearly or never which may indicate that their children have emigrated, but it may also indicate lost contact with the children (which is quite rare in the country). Women often meet with their

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{15}\) The BESA party was established in 2014 with an aim to increase the rights of the ethnic Albanian population. We are though not aware of any specific measure/policy that they implement to increase the employment chances of ethnic Albanian women.
}
parents, either daily (30\%) or weekly (40\%). \(10 \%\) reported that they met parents yearly or never. There are relatively strong bonds with the close relatives, with about \(50 \%\) having regular weekly contacts. Still, most frequent contacts of women are with their friends and neighbours, which is the case for \(81 \%\) of the women.

Table 22 - Social contacts of women
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{With your kids} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{With your parents} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Close
relatives} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Friends/ neighbours} \\
\hline &  &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \frac{0}{\omega}
\end{aligned}
\] &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\otimes}{\pi} \\
& \frac{0}{\omega}
\end{aligned}
\] &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{\omega} \\
& \frac{\omega}{\omega}
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1 Daily & 930 & 55\% & 690 & 30\% & 281 & 8\% & 1,267 & 36\% \\
\hline 2 Weekly & 373 & 22\% & 914 & 40\% & 1,732 & 49\% & 1,583 & 45\% \\
\hline 3 Monthly & 143 & 8\% & 450 & 20\% & 1,202 & 34\% & 490 & 14\% \\
\hline 4 Yearly & 131 & 8\% & 111 & 5\% & 267 & 8\% & 146 & 4\% \\
\hline 5 Never & 120 & 7\% & 111 & 5\% & 26 & 1\% & 25 & 1\% \\
\hline 6 I don't have such relatives/ outside my household & 1,641 & & 1,168 & & 92 & & 84 & \\
\hline 7 I don't know & 280 & & 174 & & 18 & & 23 & \\
\hline 8 Total that reported contacts & 1,697 & & 2,276 & & 3,508 & & 3,511 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
Women were also asked if they can rely on someone in certain circumstances and, if so, on whom. Husbands are greatest support for women in the country. In each of the four specific situations, they would first turn to their husbands, either for assistance related to the household or in case of illness, in case they needed advice, felt depressed, or in case they needed to borrow (see 23). Other female family members are the second most important supporter of women. There is some variation related to the third most important supporter, depending on the issue women faced. In case females need to urgently borrow, they will turn to other male family member (after considering the first two options), in case they feel depressed they will rely on friend, and in some cases they will also seek support from their male or female child.

Table 23 - Main supporters of women in different situations
\begin{tabular}{ccccc}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
If you need \\
assistance for \\
the household \\
or you are sick
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
If you need \\
advice for \\
important \\
personal or \\
family matter
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
If you feel \\
depressed and \\
you need to \\
talk to \\
someone
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
If you need to \\
urgently \\
borrow money
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Husband & \(43.6 \%\) & \(51.1 \%\) & \(37.5 \%\) & \(33.6 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Other female \\
family member
\end{tabular} & \(34.1 \%\) & \(26.3 \%\) & \(26 \%\) & \(18.6 \%\) \\
\hline Female child & \(9.5 \%\) & \(5.2 \%\) & \(15 \%\) & \(15.3 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

Table 24 disaggregates by ethnicity and settlement. The husband remains the strongest supporter when the woman is sick and needs advice, with slightly more pronounced role in the Macedonian ethnic community. The role of husband declines but remains crucial in cases when the woman feels depressed and needs to borrow money, albeit husband predominates in these situations in the Albanian community. Other female members have more pronounced supportive role in the non-Macedonian communities, while female children have a stronger role to play for Roma. Advice for family matters, talking in depression and borrowing money are the cases where the husband plays a stronger role in rural areas, while the roles of other female household members and female children are stronger in urban areas.

Table 24 - Main supporters of women in different situations, by ethnicity and settlement (\% of total)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Ethnicity} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Settlement} \\
\hline & MK & AL & TR & RO & RUR & URB \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{If you need assistance for the household or you are sick} \\
\hline Husband & 49.3 & 35.5 & 32.5 & 36.6 & 45.3 & 43.2 \\
\hline Other female member & 27.3 & 45.5 & 41.0 & 36.6 & 33.2 & 35.7 \\
\hline Female child & 9.0 & 9.8 & 8.4 & 12.7 & 9.9 & 9.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{If you need advice for important personal or family matter} \\
\hline Husband & 53.6 & 50.2 & 48.2 & 48.5 & 55.7 & 49.2 \\
\hline Other female member & 23.4 & 30.7 & 33.7 & 29.9 & 24.5 & 27.8 \\
\hline Female child & 5.5 & 3.0 & 2.4 & 6.0 & 3.8 & 5.2 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{If you feel depressed and you need to talk to someone} \\
\hline Husband & 35.6 & 42.0 & 19.3 & 41.8 & 41.5 & 34.3 \\
\hline Other female member & 22.3 & 32.8 & 27.7 & 17.9 & 23.9 & 27.6 \\
\hline Female child & 10.4 & 5.0 & 12.1 & 4.5 & 7.7 & 8.9 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{If you need to urgently borrow money} \\
\hline Husband & 27.4 & 47.3 & 33.7 & 18.7 & 39.0 & 29.3 \\
\hline Other female member & 19.8 & 17.2 & 19.3 & 13.4 & 16.3 & 20.4 \\
\hline Female child & 3.6 & 2.0 & 1.2 & 0.8 & 3.1 & 2.9 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Most frequent activity of women which they perform without any compensation, outside the paid job, is the household chores. \(68 \%\) of women reported that they are daily engaged in these household-related activities (cleaning, cooking, supplies shopping, etc.; seeTable 25). Additional \(10.9 \%\) of women quite often engage in household activities. \(18 \%\) of women take care of children aged 0-6 on daily basis, and about same percent of females does the same for children aged 6-15. 5.7\% of women are involved in farming on daily bases, and additional \(7 \%\) quite frequently. Women are also much engaged in taking care of older family members such that \(6.7 \%\) do this activity on daily basis, and additional \(5.4 \%\) quite frequently. Negligible shares of women are frequently involved in taking care of disabled or sick relative. All this work is under the economic sphere of reproduction of care which is unpaid and performed by women.

Table 25 - Main non-paid activities of females, outside of their paid work (in case they work)
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline Activities & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Daily \\
basis
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Often (3-4 \\
times per \\
week)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Often (1-2 \\
times per \\
week)
\end{tabular} & Never \\
\hline Household chores & 68.1 & 10.9 & 10.0 & 6.3 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Care and education of \\
children aged 0-6
\end{tabular} & 18.0 & 1.6 & 1.1 & 62.9 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Chre and education of \\
children aged 6-15
\end{tabular} & 18.5 & 2.6 & 1.4 & 61.1 \\
\hline Farming & 5.7 & 3.4 & 3.5 & 72.0 \\
\hline Care of older relatives & 6.4 & 2.6 & 2.8 & 72.7 \\
\hline Soure & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
Note: These are the activities in which females engaged without any remuneration, and outside of their paid job.

As a striking finding, active women spend almost equal amounts of time on the above activities as inactive women. Active women are slightly less engaged in household activities and care of older relatives, but these small differences may have little potential to explain the differences in labour market activity. We return to this issue in Section 7.

Women are, on average, quite satisfied with their family life. Of the respondents, \(80.3 \%\) stated they were very satisfied or satisfied with the family life. \(73 \%\) of females were satisfied with their home/place of residence and \(61.2 \%\) with their social life. On other hand, slightly more than half of them ( \(56 \%\) ) were satisfied (either very satisfied or satisfied) with their living standard. Of those who provided answer to the question \({ }^{16}\) related to their satisfaction with the career/professional life, \(54.4 \%\) stated they were satisfied with their job and \(21.6 \%\) were not satisfied (the remaining part being neutral on this issue).

\subsection*{6.2.5. Culture and norms}

This section examines the culture and norms held by women as there is a growing research literature which finds a strong link between culture and female participation in the labour market (see section 3).

Table 26 provides the opinion of women on several statements which can provide a good approximation on the type of culture present in the country. Although in most cases majority of women agree with statements which are related to more gender equal society (i.e. less masculine society), still large proportion of them also hold the opposite views. For instance, \(58.8 \%\) of the women agree that working mothers can be as close to their children as non-

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{16} 32 \%\) of the respondents did not provide answer to this question (used the option "I do not know", meaning they do not work.
}
working mothers, but at the same time a high share (38.6\%) of women disagrees with the statement. Similarly, \(32.6 \%\) of women agree that for the sake of children, women should stay at home until the child starts a school. However, this initial detachment from the labour market (extended maternity leave) will significantly reduce the employment chances of the mother latter on. In addition, it also raises the question of the lack of early socialization of children and the scars it may cause later in life.

Table 26 - Culture-related answers of the respondents
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline Statement & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Agree \\
(either fully \\
agree or \\
agree)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Disagree \\
(either fully \\
disagree or \\
disagree)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
A working mother can have as close relationship with \\
her children as the mother who doesn't work
\end{tabular} & 58.8 & 38.6 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
It is much better for a pre-school child if the mother \\
doesn't work
\end{tabular} & 65.2 & 32.6 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
It is good to work, but women prefer to take care of the \\
home and the children
\end{tabular} & 46.4 & 51.1 \\
\hline To be a housewife is as fulfilling as having a paid job & 43.4 & 53.8 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Having a job is the best way for a woman to be an \\
independent person
\end{tabular} & 83.7 & 14.3 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Both the husband and the wife should contribute to the \\
household income
\end{tabular} & 86.3 & 12.2 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
In general, fathers can take care of the children as good \\
as the mother
\end{tabular} & 61.0 & 36.6 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Men should have the same responsibility in the home \\
and around the children as women
\end{tabular} & 84.7 & 13.7 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Taking care for the others by women doesn't leave \\
enough time to work outside of the house
\end{tabular} & 52.8 & 42.8 \\
\hline Source Female Inactivity Surver 2016
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
The difference between 100 and the sum of agree and disagree is related to neutral answers.

Almost half of women believe that although it is good that a woman works, still many women prefer to take care of children and home. There is a strong agreement with the statements that "having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person" (83.7\% of women agree with this statement), and that "both husband and wife should contribute to the family budget" ( \(86.3 \%\) agree). High shares of them believe that fathers can take good care of children (61\%) and that men should also have responsibility around the house (84.7\%). Still, at the same time, \(36.6 \%\) of women think that fathers cannot take as good care of children as mothers. Majority of women (52.8\%) agree that the household responsibilities prevent women from working in paid job, outside the house. There are, though, differences between the (self-reported) culture of inactive and active women. In particular, active women are more likely to support the equal role of the genders within the household, the economic
independence of women through work, and to believe that working mothers can have close relationship with their children. On a positive side, younger women who are inactive for educational purposes hold less conservative views and beliefs, even compared to the active women.

Table 27 disaggregates by ethnicity and gender and presents only the disagreeing share, due to space. Albanian and Turkish women tend to disagree more than Macedonian and Roma ones on the statement that working mother could have as close relationship with children as non-working one. In the same line, largest share of Macedonian women disagree that a non-working mother is a better option for the child than a pre-school attendance. Albanian and Roma women tend to enjoy the household roles more than Macedonian and Turks. However, there is fairly large agreement across all ethnicities that the job is the road to independence of women. The key role of women in the household is obvious for all nonMacedonian ethnicities, as larger shares of them disagreed that both parents should be contributing to the household income and the carework. Differences in the urban-rural divide are less pronounced.

Table 27 - Disagreeing culture-related answers of the respondents, by ethnicity and settlement
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Ethnicity } & & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Settlement } \\
\hline Statement & MK & AL & TR & RO & RUR & URB \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
A working mother can have as \\
close relationship with her \\
children as the mother who \\
doesn't work
\end{tabular} & 31.8 & 52.7 & 55.4 & 23.1 & 42.4 & 35.7 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
It is much better for a pre- \\
school child if the mother \\
doesn't work
\end{tabular} & 37.9 & 28.5 & 12.1 & 7.5 & 31.4 & 33.5 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
lt is good to work, but women \\
prefer to take care of the home \\
and the children
\end{tabular} & 55.9 & 44.0 & 50.6 & 35.1 & 50.1 & 65.0 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
To be a housewife is as \\
fulfilling as having a paid job
\end{tabular} & 65.5 & 33.7 & 59.0 & 14.2 & 48.8 & 57.7 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Having a job is the best way for \\
a woman to be an independent \\
person
\end{tabular} & 11.5 & 21.8 & 4.8 & 4.5 & 15.0 & 13.7 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Both the husband and the wife \\
should contribute to the \\
household income
\end{tabular} & 7.5 & 22.5 & 26.5 & 44.8 & 15.0 & 15.1 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
In general, fathers can take \\
care of the children as good as \\
the mother
\end{tabular} & 31.5 & 45.1 & 36.1 & 35.8 & 39.7 & 51.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Men should have the same responsibility in the home and around the children as women \(9.7 \quad 22.4\) 4.8 6.7 16.7 19.1

Taking care for the others by women doesn't leave enough time to work outside of the \(\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { house } & 48.0 & 34.8 & 21.7 & 20.2 & 39.5 & 45.5\end{array}\)
Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

The participation of women in some voluntary organizations/community is quite low, with only \(9.3 \%\) of women having participated so far in some voluntary engagement (currently or in the past). Of those that have or had such activity, \(29.8 \%\) did so in womens' association within a political party, \(24.5 \%\) in some NGO and \(15.8 \%\) in self-standing associations of women. In most cases, this engagement was monthly (for \(45 \%\) of respondents), few times per year (24.8\%) or daily to weekly (23.6\%).

\subsection*{6.2.6. Childcare services: usage and access}

In our sample, \(86 \%\) of women do not have their own small children (aged 6 or below). Figure 14 suggests that out of the rest of women - mothers of small children aged 6 or below - only
\(23.3 \%\) use some childcare service, either kindergartens, other centres for pre-school education of children or persons who are paid to take care of children.

Figure 14 - Use of kindergartens


Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
\(23.8 \%\) of mothers of children aged 6 or below have declared to be inactive in the labour market, which is still lower than the overall inactivity rate. Only \(6.6 \%\) of these mothers used the services of kindergartens, which may imply that kindergartens are heavily underused by inactive mothers of children aged 0-6.

Table 28 shows that the price of the childcare facilities, distance from home and their working hours are not a big problem for nearly half the respondents. The most problematic aspects of the childcare provision is the number of kindergartens (access to childcare) reported by \(20.3 \%\) of women and the quality, reported by \(19 \%\) and \(14 \%\) of mothers with children aged 6-15 and 0-6, respectively. On the other hand, the affordability of the kindergartens is relatively high given that the price of public kindergartens is about \(5 \%\) of the average wage; this is also shown by the responses of the participants. Still, a considerable proportion of the women reported that each of the given aspects of the childcare is a small to medium problem (again, largest share of respondents provided this answer for the number of kindergartens). There is a surprising tendency that the mothers with children aged \(0-6\) report almost all aspects of kindergarten provision to be less problematic relative to mothers on children aged 6-15.

Table 28 - To what extent are some aspects of childcare provision problematic?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Mothers of children aged 6-15} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Mothers of children aged 0-6} \\
\hline Problem & \[
\] &  & \[
\frac{\frac{\varepsilon}{0}}{0} \frac{0}{0}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \pi \frac{\varepsilon}{0} \\
& \frac{0}{0} \\
& Z \frac{0}{0}
\end{aligned}
\] &  & \[
\frac{\frac{\varepsilon}{0}}{\frac{0}{0}}
\] \\
\hline No. of kindergartens/paid persons & 32.4 & 47.3 & 20.3 & 35.3 & 45.9 & 18.9 \\
\hline Price of kindergartens/paid persons & 49.3 & 40.5 & 10 & 54.9 & 38.5 & 6.6 \\
\hline Quality of kindergartens/paid persons & 35 & 46 & 18.9 & 39.3 & 46.7 & 13.9 \\
\hline Distance from home & 48.7 & 37.2 & 14.2 & 54.9 & 34.4 & 10.6 \\
\hline Working hours & 50 & 41.9 & 8.1 & 57.4 & 33.6 & 9.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
Mothers conveyed that they receive support from their husbands related to the care of the children (in \(59 \%\) of cases) and from their parents (reported by 30.8\%). Apparently, there is slightly larger share of inactive women who responded that they take care for their children alone (Figure 15). Still, \(5.1 \%\) reported they received help from their husbands for the care of children only occasionally-monthly, and around \(2 \%\) that the support was occasionally-yearly. Any differences in this regard between active and inactive females were found small and insignificant. Of the mothers reporting help from fathers only monthly and yearly, \(38.5 \%\) reported that the main reason for such small support was the absence of the father (either emigrated, absent from home or deceased), \(27.7 \%\) stated that their husband worked and was tired afterwards so he could not help, and \(23 \%\) reported that their husband thought it was mother's duty to take care of children or that mothers were better in raising children than fathers. These answers give a grasp of the traditional gender role within some households.

Figure 15 - Help for child-raising


Mothers receive quite large support for the care of their children from the grandparents, a fact that is commonly known but have never been quantified. In particular, \(43.4 \%\) of mothers reported they received daily support by their parents for the care of the children, \(14 \%\) that they received help 3-4 times per week and 13.8\%, once-twice per week. The high percentage of support by grandparents supports the need for provision of public care services; the notion that women are not profiling it as an issue is probably because they became accustomed to "things have always been like this and grandparents provide support". However, the growing trends of aging and having children at advanced age implying older grandparents - increases the need for care services progressively.

\subsection*{6.2.7. Inactive women}

This section has specific focus on women who reported that they were unemployed and were not searching for a job, i.e. to be inactive on the labour market - the primary group of interest for this study. As we showed in Section 6.2.2, around \(40 \%\) of women are inactive. In terms of the ethnicity, largest inactivity rate of \(45.7 \%\) is found among ethnic Albanians, followed by Roma (40.3\%). On the other hand, women from Wallach ethnicity and ethnic Macedonians are least inactive, \(28.6 \%\) and \(31 \%\), respectively. The inactivity rates of ethnic Serbian and Turkish women are \(32.5 \%\) and \(35 \%\).

Table 29 presents the main reasons for inactivity of women. For more than third of them, it is the care of the household and the dependents (either children or adults) that diverts them from activity in the labour market. This category of inactive women is very difficult to be activated. Though this question does not provide enough information if the household responsibilities are women's own choice or determined by the circumstances. 17.4\% reported they had health issues that prevented them from working or seeking a job. The other two larger categories have lost hope of finding a job (reported by 16.3\%) and that the respondent never worked so she thinks she is not qualified enough (10.3\%). Indeed, these categories of inactive women which are showing discouragement to seek work should be the target of the public policies that aim to raise female participation in the labour market. The following categories also show important findings for the inactivity of women. We learn that underdeveloped flexible forms of work are a constraint to labour market activity only for \(5 \%\) of inactive women. For the same share, the main constraint is the distance of the work from home. Contrary to the widely held beliefs, remittances that women receive from abroad have been identified by only \(3.3 \%\) as a reason for inactivity.

Table 29 - Main reasons for women's inactivity
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline & Number & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Share in \\
total inactive
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
You're taking care of household, children or adults who \\
need help
\end{tabular} & 232 & \(34.5 \%\) \\
\hline You are ill/incapable to work & 117 & \(17.4 \%\) \\
\hline You've lost hope of finding a job & 110 & \(16.3 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
You never worked and you don't think you are qualified \\
enough
\end{tabular} & 69 & \(10.3 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
The labour market does not offer a job that I could do (for \\
instance, to work 3-4 hours a day, or 2-3 days a week, or to \\
work from home
\end{tabular} & 32 & \(4.8 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
There is no job opportunity in a reasonable distance from \\
home and/or commuting is difficult/expensive
\end{tabular} & 32 & \(4.8 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
You are receiving remittances on regular basis from a \\
closed relative from abroad and you don't think you need \\
another
\end{tabular} & 22 & \(3.3 \%\) \\
\hline You are studying/training & 5 & \(0.7 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
You are receiving social assistance from the government \\
and you are afraid of losing it if opting for a job
\end{tabular} & 5 & \(0.7 \%\) \\
\hline Other & 49 & \(7.3 \%\) \\
\hline Total answers (multiple answers were possible) & 673 & \(100 \%\) \\
\hline Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016. & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.
Note: The question allowed for multiple answers.
In addition to this more general question, where women had to state the most important reason(s), they were asked to assess the importance of some specific (potential) barriers to activity, for each one individually. Based on those answers, most respondents (60.3\%) agreed (agreed and completely agreed) that household chores (including care of children) is the main barrier to their activity. \(55 \%\) reported they believed that they were not holding the right skills/qualifications to find a job. The public measure can target these women through improving their skills and qualifications either through formal or informal education and training. \(51 \%\) agreed that the lack of flexible working options distract them from the labour market, and \(45 \%\) complained about the unavailability of childcare facilities.

The questionnaire collected additional information on the perception of the inactive women towards the gender roles, in order to assess if their culture (actually, family culture and tradition) is something that withholds them from the labour market. Indeed, these women, for instance, believe that it is very hard for any working women to balance work and family responsibilities ( \(68.4 \%\) reported they agreed or completely agreed with that statement). Half of them thought that working women should give the earned salary to the household head and not to have a say in the spending decisions. A staggering \(46 \%\) believed women should not seek work as it might annoy their husband.

Around \(22 \%\) of inactive women stated they would like to work although they did not search for a job. More than half (54\%) responded that if they were offered a job, they would have been able to start working in two-week time. This is unexpectedly large share of inactive women, given that, for instance, \(52 \%\) reported they were not engaged in the labour market because of household duties and illness, two categories of women which were not easy to start working in the following two weeks. Still, this raises the question of multitude barriers to female inactivity, along with some discouragement and lack of appropriate institutions. In other words, if increasing female activity is a government priority, a comprehensive package of reforms and measures has to be designed so as to achieve success. For those who answered they could not accept a job offer, the main constraint were household duties and care of children (for 49\% of them), illness/disability (for 21.8\%) and care for elderly (10\%).

Majority of inactive women (68.5\%) never had a job in their lifetime. \(17.3 \%\) held only one job and \(7.6 \%\) held two jobs so far. Of those that worked in the past, \(50 \%\) had tenure of about 1030 months.

Table 30 - Perception of inactive women about the quality of jobs and workplace
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline Statement & Agree & Disagree \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
In the workplace, the workers work in inhumane conditions, in \\
general
\end{tabular} & 47.9 & 52.1 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Workplaces often include mobbing (psychological abuse) & 56.6 & 43.4 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Employers don't care that the employees have children or \\
need to care for elderly people, etc.
\end{tabular} & 59.5 & 40.5 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
The employers, partially or completely, disobey the provisions \\
from the Law on working relations, such as the right to a paid \\
annual leave, maternity leave, non-discrimination, etc.
\end{tabular} & 55.3 & 44.7 \\
\begin{tabular}{l} 
Workers, especially females, are frequently exposed to \\
harassment on the workplace
\end{tabular} & 38.1 & 61.9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{tabular}

Source: Female Inactivity Survey 2016.

Table 30 shows the perceptions of inactive women about the quality of jobs and workplace. Responses suggest that inactive women have relatively negative perceptions/views about the workplaces, which can keep them detached from the labour market. Close to half of them think working conditions are poor, that there is mobbing, employers do not care about family-work balance and that they do not comply with the legislation. \(38.1 \%\) also believe that workers are exposed to harassment

Despite some of the inactive women stated they would like to work, only \(15 \%\) ever applied for a job, and only \(9.7 \%\) were to a job interview. Of those who went to a job interview, one quarter stated they were asked about their future family plans, which is prohibited by the labour legislation. Only \(15 \%\) of the inactive women stated they had in mind some minimum
wage below which they would not accept a job offer (i.e. the reference wage). This shows that high reservation wage is not an important reason or constraint to female participation in the labour market. For those who reported a reference wage, it ranged 10,000-19,999 MKD for \(67.5 \%\) of respondents and 20,000-29,999 MKD for \(20.8 \%\) of them.

\section*{7. Econometric analysis}

This section presents the results of selected more rigorous econometric analyses. There are three objectives of the section, which are answered in three separate subsections: i) to disentangle the relative importance of the different concepts/facets of inactivity; ii) to understand the significance of the differences in labour-market status of women by various demographic and household characteristics, hence profiling the inactive women; and iii) to investigate the various determinants of female labour force participation.

\subsection*{7.1. Underlying concepts of female labour market inactivity}

Our first quantitative analysis aims to disentangle the relative importance of the various facets of female labour market inactivity. Hence, we first define these factors as follows:
- Household duties;
- Childcare;
- Care for elderly;
- Illness and/or incapability;
- Stable source of income from abroad;
- Social assistance receipt;
- Perception of inadequate/insufficient economic opportunities;
- Fear of discrimination, mobbing or physical abuse on the workplace;
- Stereotypes;
- Culture, norms and traditions, divided on those related to housework and to childand elderly care.

To measure the various factors of inactivity, we use several variables available in our survey, given inTable 31. Note that we recode the variable, so that all are measured on a scale where the lowest values refers to disagreement/absence/low value and the highest one agreement/ presence/ high value. Still, the factor analysis does not require such adjustment.

Table 31 - Inactivity factors and their corresponding questions
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Concept & Question in the questionnaire \\
\hline Household duties & \begin{tabular}{l}
- How often are you involved in house-related work, without remuneration? ( \(1=\) never to \(4=\) everyday) (cl3_3) \\
- Household-related duties affect my decision not to search for job (1=not affecting at all to 4=affects entirely)(nz2_2)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Childcare & \begin{tabular}{l}
- How often are you involved in childcare (0-6), without remuneration? (1=never to 4=everyday) (cl3_1) \\
- How often are you involved in childcare (6-15), without remuneration? (1=never to 4=everyday) (cl3_2)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Care for elderly & \begin{tabular}{l}
- How often are you involved in care for elderly, without remuneration? (1=never to 4=everyday) (cl3_5) \\
- How often are you involved in care for disabled relatives, without remuneration? (1=never to 4=everyday) (cl3_6) \\
- How often are you involved in care for ill relatives, without remuneration? (1=never to 4=everyday) (cl3_7)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Illness and/or incapability & - How would you assess your own health (1 = very bad to \(4=\) excellent) (d12) \\
\hline Stable source of income from abroad & - To what extent is the assistance you obtain from abroad (remittances) important? (1= unimportant at all to 4= very important) (he11) \\
\hline Social assistance receipt & - The share of social benefits income in total household income (social income/total income and then classified in 4 categories: \(1=\) very low or none to \(4=\) very high) \\
\hline Discouragement & \begin{tabular}{l}
- What would you do if you were invited for an interview tomorrow? (1=better not going to \(3=\) will go without hesitation) (nz13) \\
- Women think they are insufficiently educated / qualified (1=not affecting at all to 4=affects entirely)(nz2_4)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Perception of inadequate/insufficient economic opportunities & - Inexistence of flexible working arrangements affects my decision not to search for job (1=not affecting at all to 4=affects entirely)(nz2_4) \\
\hline Fear of discrimination, mobbing or physical abuse on the workplace & \begin{tabular}{l}
- If man and woman with the same qualifications apply for the same job, firms give priority to men (1=fully disagree to 4 =fully agree) (e11_2) \\
- Frequently, there is a mobbing on the workplace (1=fully disagree to 4 =fully agree) (nz10_2) \\
- Employees, especially women, are frequently exposed to abuse at the workplace ( \(1=\) fully disagree to 4 =fully agree) (nz10_5)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Stereotypes & \begin{tabular}{l}
- Women are second class workers (1=fully disagree to 4 =fully agree) (e11_5) \\
- Women, by nature, are created to give birth and raise children,
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
as well to take care of the house and the household, and not to work ( \(1=\) fully disagree to \(4=\) fully agree) (e11_6)

Culture, traditions and norms (related to housework)
- It is often women who work to give the whole salary to the husband (the head of the household) and cannot determine how to spend money (1=unimportant at all to 4=very important) (nz3_2)
- Women may be prevented of looking for a job or of working, because this may make the husband angry ( \(1=\) unimportant at all to 4=very important) (nz3_3)
- To be housewife is fulfilling, equally as if one has a paid job ( \(1=\) fully disagree to \(4=\) fully agree) (cn1_4)

Culture, traditions and norms (related to child and elderly care)
- It is better for the children in kindergarten age is the mother does not work (1=fully disagree to 4 =fully agree) (cn1_2)
- Taking care for the others by women doesn't leave enough time to work outside of the house (1=fully disagree to \(4=\) fully agree) (cn1_9)

For this analysis, we work only with the women who responded that did not have a job nor sought for one, who amount to 529 individuals. \({ }^{17}\)

We start the analysis by providing estimates of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and the Bartlett's test of sphericity (Snedecor and Cochran, 1989). Both tests are important to determine if data are good to be grouped in several underlying factors; in particular, the KMO test indicates if data factor well. Table 32 provides a KMO value of 0.665 , which is above the threshold of 0.6 suggesting that we could proceed with factor analysis in this case. Similarly, the Bartlett's test rejects the null hypothesis that variables are not correlates, providing grounds for conducting a factor analysis.

Table 32 - Tests for data factoring
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Test } & Value \\
\hline Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy & 0.673 \\
\hline Bartlett's test of sphericity & 0.000 \\
H0: variables are not inter-correlated (p-value) & \\
\hline Source: Authors'calculations.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Source: Authors' calculations.}

Next, we proceed with the factor analysis. As usual in the literature, we consider only the factors whose estimated eigenvalue is higher than 1, and retain only factor loadings whose absolute value exceeds 0.35 . Based on this, we obtain the following output. Table 33 presents the identified factors (23, equal to the number of used variables); only the first four factors have an eigenvalue greater than 1, so that we continue with these factors. In addition, they explain the entire variance in our data, supporting the notion that four concepts (factors) are sufficient to explain our data.

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{17}\) The analysis excludes pensioners and those still in education.
}

Table 33 - Identification of factors
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline Factor & Eigenvalue & Difference & Proportion & Cumulative \\
\hline Factor1 & 2.3069 & 0.67184 & 0.3818 & 0.3818 \\
\hline Factor2 & 1.63506 & 0.3663 & 0.2706 & 0.6523 \\
\hline Factor3 & 1.26876 & 0.25593 & 0.21 & 0.8623 \\
\hline Factor4 & 1.01283 & 0.39747 & 0.1676 & 1.0299 \\
\hline Factor5 & 0.61536 & 0.15935 & 0.1018 & 1.1317 \\
\hline Factor6 & 0.45601 & 0.13989 & 0.0755 & 1.2072 \\
\hline Factor7 & 0.31612 & 0.11881 & 0.0523 & 1.2595 \\
\hline Factor8 & 0.19731 & 0.06226 & 0.0327 & 1.2922 \\
\hline Factor9 & 0.13505 & 0.02366 & 0.0223 & 1.3145 \\
\hline Factor10 & 0.11138 & 0.06676 & 0.0184 & 1.3329 \\
\hline Factor11 & 0.04463 & 0.04152 & 0.0074 & 1.3403 \\
\hline Factor12 & 0.00311 & 0.06158 & 0.0005 & 1.3408 \\
\hline Factor13 & -0.05847 & 0.04065 & -0.0097 & 1.3312 \\
\hline Factor14 & -0.09911 & 0.0294 & -0.0164 & 1.3148 \\
\hline Factor15 & -0.12852 & 0.01714 & -0.0213 & 1.2935 \\
\hline Factor16 & -0.14566 & 0.02798 & -0.0241 & 1.2694 \\
\hline Factor17 & -0.17364 & 0.0168 & -0.0287 & 1.2407 \\
\hline Factor18 & -0.19045 & 0.01398 & -0.0315 & 1.2091 \\
\hline Factor19 & -0.20443 & 0.01892 & -0.0338 & 1.1753 \\
\hline Factor20 & -0.22335 & 0.02937 & -0.037 & 1.1383 \\
\hline Factor21 & -0.25272 & 0.01281 & -0.0418 & 1.0965 \\
\hline Factor22 & -0.26552 & 0.05224 & -0.0439 & 1.0526 \\
\hline Factor23 & -0.31776 &. & -0.0526 & 1 \\
\hline Sourc: & \(0.2 a\) &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Source: Authors' calculations.}

Table 34 presents the factor loadings on the various variables we use throughout the analysis. The results are quite indicative, as all four identified factors could be clearly connected with the potential underlying manifestations of female inactivity in the country.

The first factor has major importance and explains \(38.2 \%\) of the total variance. Major part of this factor relates to the cultural setting in which woman is thought of as a housewife, which also matches her own beliefs and perceptions about the role of women. This factor shows that there is a large connection between the culture, household duties, perceptions of inequality in the labour market, and discouragement. This can be expected as both the literature review and our descriptive analysis showed that there may be some reinforcement between several elements that cause inactivity of women. In other words, a typical inactive women is faced with multiple barriers to activity. This factor also includes external factors, i.e. unavailability of flexible working arrangements, which can be taken as a straightforward policy recommendation, but given the multitude barriers to entry (and especially, the large influence of the culture), that specific measure cannot have a large impact. Overall, the
finding provides evidence that culture and tradition in which women are seen as housewives is translated into actual work as a housewife, as well as into adverse perceptions of women about the labour market.

Table 34-Factor loadings


Source: Authors' calculations.

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{18}\) See
}
for questions that relate to each of the factors.

The second factor has loadings on the care for elderly variables only, suggesting that this is second important factor for inactivity. The second factor explains additional \(27.1 \%\) of the total variance in our data. This factor can be more easily tackled by the policymakers, by increasing the availability and affordability of institutions for elderly care.

The third factor relates to fears and stereotypes. Note that within the 'fear' group, not all responses are related to own experience, but may only reflect beliefs, hence may also be considered stereotypes. Again, this factor shows that there is reinforcement between the stereotypes and the perceptions about the discrimination in the labour market: the women who are more inclined to stereotypes also perceive the labour market as being discriminatory, and hence stay deterred of it. The third factor explains additional \(21 \%\) of the total variance. Finally, the fourth factor is clearly depicting the time spent for childcare. It explains the remaining variance in our data.

Overall, the factor analysis suggests that in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, there are four common themes underlying female labour market inactivity (in order of significance): the culture and tasks related to the household, household duties, care for elderly and children, and fears and stereotypes. In the case of the first factor, cultural beliefs according to which it is naturally for women to be housewives translate into actual housework, while in the case of the other factors, it is only the general stereotypes present in the society, as well the actual time spent on child- and elderly-care which bring about female inactivity. Still, in the case of the third factor, one of the stereotypes relates to the expected role of women in the society to give birth and raise children, and it could be related to the factor representing the actual hours devoted to childcare.

\subsection*{7.2. Profiling the inactive woman}

The second quantitative analysis is a multinomial analysis. Namely, we use a classification method that generalizes logistic regression to multiclass problems, i.e. problems where there is more than two possible categorical (discrete) outcomes. In our case, we deal with the labour market status which is defined at four levels (contrary to the usual definition at three levels): employed, unemployed, inactive and other inactive individuals. Namely, we divide all inactive women on those who did not have a job nor searched for one (inactive) and other inactive (students, pensioners and similar categories). By doing so, we are interested to disentangle the 'natural' inactivity out of the one determined by schooling or retirement; i.e. we assume the two are distinct categories with distinct underlying factors and determinants. With the multinomial logistic method, we predict the probabilities of the four distinct
outcomes of a categorically-distributed dependent variable (labour-market status), given a set of independent variables.

We construct a linear predictor function constructing a score from a set of weights which are linearly combined with the explanatory variables of a given observation, as follows:
\[
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{core}\left(X_{i}, k\right)=\beta_{k} \cdot X_{i} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
\]

Whereby \(X_{i}\) is the vector of explanatory variables describing observation \(i, \beta_{k}\) is a vector of regression coefficients corresponding to outcome \(k\), and \(\operatorname{score}\left(X_{i}, k\right)\) is the score associated with assigning observation \(i\) to category \(k\). Maximum a posteriori estimation is used to estimate the coefficients. As explanatory variables, we use the following demographic characteristics: age, education, ethnicity, marital status, geographic settlement and poverty status of the household. As we would like to produce graphs, we consider that all explanatory variables are in groups/categories, as follows:

Table 35 - Variables for the multinomial analysis
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline Variable & Categories \\
\hline Labour market status & Employed \\
& Unemployed \\
& Inactive \\
& Other inactive (student, retiree) \\
\hline Age & Below 25 \\
& \(25-49\) \\
& \(50-64\) \\
& Above 64 \\
\hline Education & Primary or less \\
& Secondary \\
& Tertiary or more \\
\hline Ethnicity & Macedonian \\
& Albanian \\
& Turk \\
& Roma \\
& Serbian \\
& Wallach \\
& Other \\
& Married \\
& In partnership \\
& Single \\
& Divorced \\
& Village \\
& Small town \\
& Large town \\
& Skopje (the capital) \\
\hline Geographic settlement & Household above the poverty line \\
& Household below the poverty line \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

In estimating our model (1), we arbitrarily specify 'employment' to be our base category, i.e. we will be interpreting the results with respect to this category. The results are given in the following Table 36; it presents the relative risk ratios, which are easier for interpretation.

Table 36 - Relative risk ratios from the multinomial logistic regression

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Marital status (ref.cat = married)} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{In partnership} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Ref.cat} & -1.076 & -0.0218 & 0.484 \\
\hline & & (0.796) & (0.685) & (0.601) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Single} & & 0.493*** & -0.531** & 1.804*** \\
\hline & & (0.145) & (0.239) & (0.184) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Widow/Divorced} & & -0.224 & -0.0472 & 1.531*** \\
\hline & & (0.262) & (0.212) & (0.194) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Education (ref.cat = primary or less)
\begin{tabular}{lllll}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{ Secondary } & \(-0.437^{* * *}\) & \(-0.907^{* * *}\) & \(-0.542^{* * *}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 5 } & \multirow{2}{*}{\((0.137)\)} & \((0.136)\) & \((0.150)\) \\
\cline { 3 - 4 } & Tertiary or more & \(-1.167^{* * *}\) & \(-2.750^{* * *}\) & \(-1.586^{* * *}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 5 } & \((0.156)\) & \((0.216)\) & \((0.185)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Poverty status (ref.cat \(=\) non-poor)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Poor} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Ref.cat} & 0.249* & 0.575*** & 0.385*** \\
\hline & & (0.129) & (0.132) & (0.143) \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Geographic settlement (ref.cat = village)} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Small town} & \multirow{6}{*}{Ref.cat} & 0.720* & 0.127 & 0.511 \\
\hline & & (0.399) & (0.578) & (0.480) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Large town} & & 0.143 & 0.225* & 0.515*** \\
\hline & & (0.118) & (0.133) & (0.136) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Skopje} & & -0.222 & 0.484*** & 0.314** \\
\hline & & (0.142) & (0.151) & (0.157) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Constant} & & -0.474** & -1.325*** & -0.161 \\
\hline & & (0.225) & (0.313) & (0.245) \\
\hline Observations & & 3,616 & 3,616 & 3,616 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Note: *, ** and \({ }^{* * *}\) denote statistical significance at the 10, 5 and 1\% level, respectively. Standard errors given in parentheses.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Several conclusions could be drawn from the table above. The expected risk of being inactive, relative to being employed:
- Is higher for older women (50-64 and 64+) relative to younger ones;
- The risk of being unemployed reduces with age, while the risk of other inactivity (student, retiree) is expectedly lower for the age span (25-64), but significantly increases for the age group (64+).
- Is higher for ethnic Albanians than for Macedonians, and especially higher for Roma. Similarly, unemployment and other inactivity are more probable for ethnic Albanians than for Macedonians, as is the unemployment for Roma.
- Is lower for singles than for married women. Unemployment and other inactivity are though more likely for singles.
- Declines with educational level. Similarly, education reduces the likelihood of both unemployment and other inactivity.
- Is higher for women living in poor households. Similarly, the probability of poverty is larger for unemployed and other inactive females, compared to employed women.
- Increases when moving from village to larger town, and further above to Skopje. This is against the hypothesis that lack of child- and elderly-care facilities may explain female inactivity in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, as actually most of them are located in larger towns and in Skopje. But most of them rely on grandparents and they are not able to determine whether lack of services influences their choices.

To better comprehend the findings of our multinomial analysis, we calculate the predicted probabilities of choosing each labour market status at each level of the included explanatory variables, holding all other variables at their means. We then plot the predicted probabilities, for each labour market status, for each explanatory variable (grouped by the latter, for securing comparisons).

The graphs are given in Figure 16.. For simplicity, we only focus on the labour market status of interest to this study - inactive women. Throughout the graphs, this category is consistently presented through a green line. Graphs are helpful in defining the most prevalent profile of inactive women. Namely, predominantly, inactive women are aged over 50, of Albanian ethnicity, more frequently married (or in partnership), with primary education, living in poor households, and residing in Skopje or in the other large inner towns.

Figure 16 - Predicted probabilities of choosing the labour market status, by explanatory variable

Source: Authors' calculations.
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\subsection*{7.3. Determinants of female labour market participation}

In this section, we further investigate the determinants of female labour force participation in the country, in a more comprehensive manner. We design our economic model in the following way:
\[
\begin{equation*}
i=F\left(\propto_{i}+\beta_{i} X_{i}+\gamma_{i} Z_{i}+\delta_{j} M_{j}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
\]

Where F is the cumulative distribution function of standard normal distribution and \(\propto_{i}\) captures the individual effect. We operate with three vectors of explanatory variables, as follows.
\(X_{i}\) is a vector of variables at the individual level. These reduce does to those used in Section 7.2: age, education, ethnicity, marital status. These have been extensively discussed in Section 2.
\(Z_{i}\) is a vector of variables at the household level. First, we use the total income of the household, excluding the own income of the respective female member. Household income has been established as important determinant: according to the income hypothesis, in the initial stages of development, higher household income may enable space for the woman to withdraw from the labour force, while later participation to increase as well, as affordability (with respect to household income) of services increase, as well as the education gender gap narrows down (Boserup, 1970; Mammen and Paxon, 2000). Therefore, we use the log of the household income in both linear and quadratic term. We next consider the labour market status of the husband (in case the woman is married). Next, we add the number of young children up to six years old and between 5 and 15 years of age. The former may prevent female inclusion in the labour force, while the latter may support it, as older children are expected to contribute to the raising of younger children (OECD, 2012; Sorsa, 2015). We also use the number of female children (6-15), to reflect the notion that girls contribute to the household tasks. We use an indicator of whether the household is a recipient of remittances or now. Finally, the \(Z\) vector encompasses variables related to the general condition of the household and its access to basic services. Namely, we define two indicators: the first one is access to clean tap water and electricity, as their affordability may theoretically determine the time disposal of women for outside work. The second indicator is the availability of at least two of the following: a washing machine, dishwasher, vacuum cleaner or electric stove, to reflect the time required for household duties of women, as hence for their participation on the labour market.
\(M_{j}\) is a vector of variables at the regional level. First, we include a geographical settlement division on urban, rural and capital-located households. Second, we use a set of variables at
the regional level, using the identification of households in the eight distinct planning regions in the country. These variables include labour supply and demand factors: regional unemployment rate; the share of value added in agriculture, manufacturing and services in total value added; and the share of graduates in the regional population as proxy for the high-skilled labour supply. In addition, we use the share of children in kindergartens in total children per region, to approximate the affordability of childcare services.

We use a probit model to estimate the coefficients in our equation (2). For this analysis, we drop students and pensioners, i.e. we retain only employed, unemployed and those who reported them nether work nor search for a job. This reduced the sample to 2.699 women.

Results are given in Table 37. Marginal effects are reported. We add the above variables group by group, in order to observe any changes, as well for robustness checks.

Table 37 - Determinants of female inactivity
Dependent variable: 1 = inactive female; \(0=\) otherwise
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) \\
\hline & & dual varia & & & \\
\hline Age (i) & & 0.007*** & 0.007*** & \(0.007^{* * *}\) & \(0.007^{* * *}\) \\
\hline & & (0.001) & (0.001) & (0.001) & (0.001) \\
\hline & Albanians & 0.151*** & 0.145*** & 0.151*** & 0.148*** \\
\hline & & (0.020) & (0.021) & (0.021) & (0.025) \\
\hline & Turks & 0.024 & 0.012 & 0.013 & 0.028 \\
\hline & & (0.042) & (0.040) & (0.040) & (0.041) \\
\hline - & Roma & 0.065 & 0.043 & 0.006 & -0.011 \\
\hline \(\pm\) & & (0.042) & (0.039) & (0.036) & (0.035) \\
\hline & Serbs & -0.049 & -0.045 & -0.042 & -0.062 \\
\hline & & (0.053) & (0.051) & (0.051) & (0.048) \\
\hline & Other & 0.037 & 0.016 & 0.021 & -0.009 \\
\hline & & (0.050) & (0.048) & (0.048) & (0.043) \\
\hline & In partnership & 0.04 & 0.01 & 0.026 & 0.033 \\
\hline \(\underset{\sim}{\square}\) & & (0.072) & (0.068) & (0.071) & (0.074) \\
\hline \% & Single & -0.036 & -0.052* & -0.056** & -0.057** \\
\hline TIN & & (0.024) & (0.027) & (0.027) & (0.027) \\
\hline \[
\sum^{\frac{5}{01}}
\] & Widow/Divorced & 0.016 & -0.008 & -0.014 & -0.015 \\
\hline & & (0.027) & (0.028) & (0.028) & (0.028) \\
\hline & Secondary & -0.104*** & -0.094*** & -0.096*** & -0.105*** \\
\hline ¢ & & (0.023) & (0.023) & (0.024) & (0.024) \\
\hline 㐌 & Tertiary or more & \(-0.237^{* * *}\) & \(-0.222^{* * *}\) & -0.224*** & -0.230*** \\
\hline & & (0.023) & (0.024) & (0.024) & (0.025) \\
\hline & & ehold variab & & & \\
\hline Poor & hold (1 = relatively & 0.070*** & 0.079*** & \(0.064^{* * *}\) & 0.059*** \\
\hline p & & (0.019) & (0.019) & (0.019) & (0.019) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Cultural index ( 1 to 4 , growing = more conservative culture)} & \(0.042^{* * *}\) & 0.049*** & \(0.052^{* * *}\) & 0.050*** \\
\hline & (0.012) & (0.012) & (0.012) & (0.012) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Log of household income (minus personal income)} & & 0.000 & -0.006 & -0.010 \\
\hline & & (0.013) & (0.013) & (0.013) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Log of hh income squared} & & 0.001 & 0.001 & 0.002 \\
\hline & & (0.001) & (0.001) & (0.001) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Employment status of husband (1=employed)} & & -0.059*** & -0.056*** & -0.054*** \\
\hline & & (0.017) & (0.017) & (0.017) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Number of children aged 6 or below} & & 0.051*** & 0.051*** & 0.047*** \\
\hline & & (0.011) & (0.011) & (0.011) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Number of children aged between 6 and 15} & & 0.026** & 0.026** & 0.023* \\
\hline & & (0.013) & (0.013) & (0.013) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Number of daughters aged between 6 and 15} & & -0.030 & -0.029 & -0.029 \\
\hline & & (0.020) & (0.020) & (0.019) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Remittances (1=the household receives remittances)} & & 0.004 & 0.009 & 0.020 \\
\hline & & (0.022) & (0.022) & (0.022) \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Settlement/Services variables} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Lives in a household with tap water and electricity access} & & & -0.153 & -0.221 \\
\hline & & & (0.196) & (0.197) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Possesses at least two of four household devices} & & & \(-0.061^{* * *}\) & -0.060*** \\
\hline & & & (0.020) & (0.020) \\
\hline Small town & & & -0.017 & 0.034 \\
\hline & & & (0.058) & (0.068) \\
\hline 읃 Large town & & & 0.019 & 0.049*** \\
\hline boo & & & (0.016) & (0.019) \\
\hline © © Skopje & & & 0.061*** & -0.029 \\
\hline & & & (0.019) & (0.021) \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Regional variables} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Unemployment rate} & & & & -0.005 \\
\hline & & & & (0.003) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Agricultural share in total value added} & & & & -0.009 \\
\hline & & & & (0.008) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Industrial share in total value added} & & & & -0.020** \\
\hline & & & & (0.009) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Service share in total value added} & & & & -0.008 \\
\hline & & & & (0.008) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Number of graduates per 1000 inhabitants} & & & & 0.085*** \\
\hline & & & & (0.027) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Share of children in kindergartens} & & & & -0.003 \\
\hline & & & & (0.002) \\
\hline Observations & 2,699 & 2,699 & 2,699 & 2,699 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Source: Authors' calculations. \\
Note: *, ** and *** signify statistical signifi errors are given in parentheses. Results
\end{tabular} & nce at the robust to & 5 and \(1 \%\) eroskedastic & el, respectiv ty. & y. Standard \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

We first note that the obtained coefficients and their significances do not vary across columns, suggesting that the addition of other variables does not affect the previous finding, hence serving a robustness check. There is only one slight exception, which we mention below.

Age is expectedly significant: an additional year of age increases the chances for inactivity by \(0.7 \%\). For instance, if the age increases from the current average in the sample of about 41 to 51 , then the probability for inactivity increases by \(7 \%\). This finding is in line with the observation in section 7.2 that older women are usually more prone to inactivity. In the ethnicity group, it is only ethnic Albanians who have statistically different inactivity than Macedonians: ethnic Albanian women face about \(15 \%\) higher probability to be inactive than Macedonian woman, ceteris paribus. The distinctions between all other ethnicities are insignificant. Similarly, there is only a distinction between married women and singles, in terms on their activity on the labour market: singles have lower probability to become inactive than married women by about \(5.6 \%\). Expectedly, education pays off even in terms of inactivity, being a very strong predictor of inactivity: secondary-educated women have lower probability of inactivity than primary-educated ones by about \(10 \%\), while tertiary-educated by about \(23 \%\).

Living in poor household increases the probability for inactivity; these poor families may actually fall into the vicious cycle of poverty and joblessness, and probably receipt of some form of social assistance, which could be likely addressed by supportive, activation programmes. The more conservative female's perception about the culture and norms is, the more likely she will stay inactive. The significance of the cultural index suggests that culture, norms, tradition and stereotypes play a strong role for female inactivity in the country.

The coefficient on the employment status of the husband suggests that women whose spouses work have lower probability of falling into labour market inactivity, which is concomitant with the previous finding that women from poorer households are more inclined to inactivity. The number of children present in the household is found to be a significant predictor of inactivity, along our discussion in section 7.1. On the other hand, the presence of daughters aged \(6-15\) is insignificant, i.e. does not affect inactivity status, despite properly negatively signed (daughters of this age may already help in raising smaller siblings or even around household tasks hence reducing the likelihood of inactivity).

Results further suggest that if the woman has on disposal at least two out of four household devices (washing machine, dishwasher, vacuum cleaner and electric stove), then the probability of inactivity drops by about \(6 \%\). On the other hand, living in household with
access to tap water and electricity is not significant for inactivity, as only small share of households do not have access to such facilities nowadays.

There is an interesting pattern of findings related to the geographic settlement of households. At first sight (column 3), the likelihood of inactivity is only higher in the capital, by \(6.1 \%\) compared to rural areas. As this may be indeed peculiar is shown in column (4), when the regional variables are added. One of the regions is Skopje itself. So, the addition of the regional variables takes out the significance of Skopje in terms of the primacy in female inactivity. It boils down to the fact that female inactivity is most prevalent in large cities, by \(4.9 \%\) compared to villages, which could be likely explained with the long-lasting deindustrialization.

Observing the regional variables brings interesting insights. Only two are significant. Regions which are more industrialized provide lower probability for inactivity, than regions which are less industrialized. On the other hand, the higher the number of graduates in a region, the higher the inactivity propensity. As this vanishes the significance of Skopje in the geographical settlement, it could be argued that it is mostly in the Skopje region where graduates do not enter the labour market instantly once they finish school, and they are actually the group that does not corroborate to the general profile of inactive women in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (see section 7.2). This finding may suggest that investing in education by young women probably drives their expectations and reservation wages, afterwards bringing disappointment and forcing labour market passivation. This patters in likely prevalent for Skopje only.

Overall, results robustly suggest that female labour market inactivity increases with age and marriage, and reduces with education. There is a risk that women from poorer households and with unemployed husbands fall into the malicious cycle of poverty, unemployment and inactivity. Women with conservative cultural beliefs are more prone to inactivity. Presence of children and lack of basic household devices support female inactivity. Depicted this way, inactivity is prevalent in larger inner towns of the country. A smaller share of inactive women are those who are younger, better educated and live in Skopje, who likely created high expectations, which lead to their inactivity.

\section*{8. Conclusions and policy recommendations}

Despite the relatively high inactivity of women in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, there is lack of well-documented, large-scale research in this area, leaving us with little understanding of the phenomenon and the underlying causes. In this regard, the aim of this study is to thoroughly examine the low female participation in the Macedonian labour market and to unveil the main factors behind it, so as to provide evidence for the policymaking. This is the first study that examines female inactivity in details, based on a large, representative sample of women in the country. Data for the study were collected through a special survey, designed for the purpose of this particular study, based on the literature review and theoretical foundations related to the female inactivity in the labour market. The questionnaire was distributed to a representative sample of 2,456 households, in which a total of 3,618 women aged 15+ provided their responses.

The findings of the study are in general following the a priori expectations and theoretical foundations, although at the same time, the study does not provide support for some widely accepted beliefs in related to female inactivity. The study finds that the main reasons behind inactivity of women are household duties and the stereotypes related to the gender role within the family and society. Findings suggest that the traditional and conservative views related to the gender roles act as an important barrier to the labour market activity of inactive women. The next important reasons for female inactivity are child care elderly care. This is followed by poor health and discouragement (either lost hope of finding a job or a woman believes that she is not qualified enough to find a job). Contrary to the widely held beliefs, remittances that women receive from abroad, as well the reference wage, have not been identified as significant reasons for inactivity.

The factor analysis determined the factors which have an important effect on the inactivity of women. The analyses identified four such factors. The first factor has major importance and explains \(38.2 \%\) of the total variance of the inactivity, and relates to the cultural setting in which a woman is perceived as a housewife, which also matches her own beliefs and perceptions about the role of women. This factor shows that there is a large connection between the culture, household duties, perceptions of gender inequality in the labour market, and discouragement. These elements are reinforcing each other. The second factor is the care of the elderly which can be more easily tackled by the policymakers. The third factor relates to fears and stereotypes. Again, this factor shows that there is reinforcement between the stereotypes and the perceptions about the discrimination in the labour market. The last factor is the hours spent on care for the elderly.

The findings further suggest that the typical inactive woman in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is aged over 50, of Albanian ethnicity, more frequently she is married (or in partnership), with primary education, living in poor household, and residing in the large inner towns. The regression analysis corroborates this profiling. Female labour market inactivity increases with age and marriage, and reduces with education. There is risk that women from poorer households and with unemployed husbands fall into the vicious cycle of poverty, unemployment and inactivity. Women with conservative cultural beliefs are more prone to inactivity. Presence of children and lack of basic household appliances support female inactivity. Inactivity is prevalent in larger inner towns of the country. A smaller share of inactive women are likely those who are younger, better educated and live in Skopje, who likely created high expectations, which leads to their inactivity.

The findings provide important evidence for the policymakers as to designing measures that can increase female activity and hence help women contribute more to the future development of the country. However, they clearly show that there are distinct groups of inactive women, such that some can be relatively easily activated (the discouraged ones), but for the others, those who face multiple barriers to activity and are prone to adhering to stereotypes, government support should target different elements of the overall social and economic environment, services, culture, social support, etc.

There are several insights related to the policy recommendations. Firstly, there are differences across inactive women in many aspects, such as education, household factors, culture, social capital, etc. Hence, from policy perspective there are three types/groups of inactive women: those who are not searching for a job mainly due to discouragement and low self-esteem; those who are facing barriers to activity mainly due to unpaid care work in a form of household duties, child care for the elderly; and those whose major barriers are their culture, conservative views and traditional household relations. Secondly, from policy perspective, the easiest goal is to implement programme and measures to activate the first group of women, whereas it is very difficult, if not impossible, to increase the activity of the last category. Culture and traditions are the slowest moving and most difficult category to change. This especially holds true for the ethnic Albanian and Roma women. Thirdly, activating women would in all instances involve improvement of the overall provision of childcare services and services for elderly care.

We design the recommendations group-by-group, as follows:

\section*{1. Activation of discouraged categories of women}
- Public interventions to improve women's skills and qualifications either through formal or informal education and training;
- Provision of small scale training targeting inactive women, such as training in job search skills, employability skills, self-assessment tests, etc., which should be implemented on local level. Similar programs are delivered currently but only for the registered unemployed individuals. Local women organizations can be important mediator between the local/central government and inactive women;
- Strengthening the activation policies for the poor who are recipients of some social assistance programmes as the study shows that they stay in the vicious cycle of low education, inactivity, poverty and dependence on social assistance. This mainly holds true for ethnic Roma, but also in general;

\section*{2. Activation of housewives and carers}
- Provision of, and raising awareness on flexible forms of employment, including parttime work, work from home, job-sharing, etc. which allow for greater work-family balance. Married men should also be encouraged to consider flexible working arrangements;
- Employers should be incentivized to introduce flexible working arrangements;
- Further investment in kindergartens and day care centres, as well as incentivizing (including through general campaigns) the utilization of their services, especially in areas where home nurturing of children is still considered best solution for child development;
- Increase investment in and upgrading of the services for care of elderly;
- Supporting women to acquire higher education can be an important tool for reducing their inactivity, with having ldirect effect on their supply of labour, or, indirectly, through affecting their culture and beliefs (the next set of recommendations)
- Revising the policies for maternal, paternal and parental leave so as to ensure that fathers as well have the right, the opportunity and the obligation to take part in the care of their newborns;

\section*{3. Activation of females whose major barrier is their culture}
- Increasing the awareness about the need to change the traditional division of gender roles. Previous experiences, including those from developed Western countries, showed that awareness raising campaigns and gender-sensitive public education can have important impact on gender equality and female activation;
- Relying on role-models and champions may also be used to challenge culture, perceptions and attitudes;
- Rising awareness about redistribution of the care work and sharing of responsibilities between family members;
- Promote/raise awareness about the importance pre-school education for children has on their socialization.
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\section*{10. Annex 1}

\subsection*{10.1. Household survey}

\section*{501/PCA0809}

Start the selection procedure from here
We interview a senior woman in the household. Preferably, this should be a female belonging to the age span 30-64, irrespective of whether she works or not.

Date \(\qquad\) ; Time \(\qquad\) Date \(\qquad\) ; Time \(\qquad\)

M1. Questionnaire number: \(\qquad\)

M2. Department number: \(\qquad\)

M3. Municipality: \(\qquad\)

M4. Region:
1. Skopje
4. Polog
7. South-east
2. Pelagonija
5. North-east
8. South-west
3. Vardar
6. East

M5. Place of residence:
1. Village
2. Small town (below 10.000 inhabitants)
3. Town (over 10.000 inhabitants
4. Skopje

M6. The interview was completed on the:
1. First visit
2. Second visit
3. Third visit

M10. Interviewer's code: \(\qquad\) (TO BE FILLED BY THE INTERVIEWER)

M11. Supervisor's code: \(\qquad\) (TO BE FILLED BY THE SUPERVISOR)

M12. The time of the start of the interview (use the \(\mathbf{2 4}\) hour format): \(\qquad\) : _ _
(FILL ALL FOUR NUMBERS)

Da. Where does the respondent live?
(ONE ANSWER ONLY) (DO NOT ASK)
1. House
2. Flat
3. Movable house (trailer, tent)
4. Makeshift home/cabin

Db. Based on your judgment, in which category does the respondent's home belong?
(ONE ANSWER ONLY) (DO NOT ASK)
1. Well maintained, good standard
2. Acceptable standard
3. Bad standard, poor residence

\section*{1. DEMOGRAPHICS}

I would like to start with a few questions related to your household.

D1. Including you, how many family members live in this household: \(\qquad\)

\section*{DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE HOUSEHOLD:}

D2. Starting with you personally, could you tell me your age, ethnic affiliation and marital status? Furthermore, could you tell me the same for the other members of the household, starting from the eldest member?

WRITE DOWN ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD
TABEL 1
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline XX1_ & \begin{tabular}{c} 
IN1_... \\
(Initials of \\
family \\
members)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
DH2_1. \\
Age
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
DH2_2. \\
Ethnic \\
affiliation
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
DH2_3. \\
Sex \\
(1=male \\
2= female)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
DH2_4. \\
Relation to the \\
respondent \\
(see the \\
codes)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
DH2_5. \\
Marital \\
status
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 Respondent & & & & & & \\
\hline 2 & & & & & & \\
\hline 3 & & & & & & \\
\hline 4 & & & & & & \\
\hline 5 & & & & & & \\
\hline 6 & & & & & & \\
\hline 7 & & & & & & \\
\hline 9 & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{2. EDUCATIONAL PROFILE OF THE HOUSEHOLD}

D3. Starting with you, could you answer some questions related to your education? Furthermore, could you tell me about the education of the other members of the household, starting with the oldest member? (WRITE DOWN ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD)
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline xx3_ & \begin{tabular}{c} 
uH3_... \\
(Initials of \\
family \\
members)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
D3_1.The \\
highest level of \\
completed \\
education \\
(see the codes)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
D3_2. Does \\
he/she still attend \\
school/course/trai \\
ning \\
(1=yes 2=no)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
D3_3.Reasons for \\
interrupting or \\
non-continuing \\
school (see the \\
codes)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline\(\ldots 1\). RESPONDENT & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 2\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 3\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 4\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 5\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 6\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 7\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 8\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 9\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 10\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 11\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 12\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 14\) & & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 15\) & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{ED1 ... EDUCATION CODES}
1. No education
2. Incomplete primary
3. Primary
4. Incomplete secondary
5. A 3-year secondary vocational school
6. A 4-year secondary vocational school
7. High school
8. Post-secondary
9. Higher
10. Postgraduate-Masters
11. PhD

ED3...
1. Marriage
2. Childbirth
3. Started working
4. Work at family business/farm
5. School was far from home
6. Parents did not allow studying in another city
7. Not enough money to continue studying

\section*{3. EMPLOYMENT AND LABOUR MARKET}

Please list all family members in your household over the age of 18 (STARTING WITH THE RESPONDENT AND MOVING FORWARD BASED ON THEIR AGE, USING THE SAME ORDINAL NUMBER AS IN TABLE 1) and answer few questions related to their employment status for me
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ONLY IF EMPLOYED} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{ONLY IF UNEMPLOYED} \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\vdots \\
\tilde{N}^{\prime} \\
\times \times
\end{gathered}
\] &  &  &  &  &  &  &  &  &  &  \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
RESP \\
ONDE \\
NT
\end{tabular} & & EM11. yes 1 \(\Rightarrow\) no 2 & EM21. & EM31. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { EM } \\
& 31 .
\end{aligned}
\] & EM41 & EM51. yes 1 no 2 & EM71. & EM81 yes 1 no 2 & EM91. yes 1 no 2 \\
\hline ... 2 & & EM12 yes 1 \(\Rightarrow\) no 2 & EM22. & EM32. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { EM } \\
& 32 .
\end{aligned}
\] & EM42 & EM52. yes 1 no 2 & EM72. & \begin{tabular}{l} 
EM82 \\
yes 1 \\
no 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & EM92. yes 1 no 2 \\
\hline ... 3 & & \begin{tabular}{l}
EM13. yes 1 \(\Rightarrow\) \\
no 2
\end{tabular} & EM23. & EM33. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EM } \\
& 33 .
\end{aligned}
\] & EM43 & EM53. yes 1 no 2 & EM73. & \begin{tabular}{l}
EM83 \\
yes 1 \\
no 2
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
EM93. \\
yes 1 \\
no 2
\end{tabular} \\
\hline ... 4 & & \begin{tabular}{l}
EM14 \\
yes \\
\(1 \Rightarrow\) \\
no 2
\end{tabular} & EM24. & EM34. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EM } \\
& 34 .
\end{aligned}
\] & EM44 & EM54. yes 1 no 2 & EM74. & \begin{tabular}{l}
EM84 \\
yes 1 \\
no 2
\end{tabular} & EM94. yes 1 no 2 \\
\hline ... 5 & &  & EM25. & EM35. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { EM } \\
& 35 .
\end{aligned}
\] & EM45 & EM55. yes 1 no 2 & EM75. & EM85
yes 1
no 2 & \begin{tabular}{l}
EM95. \\
yes 1 \\
no 2
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{EM2 - OCCUPATION CODES based on the LFS}

\section*{EM3 - CODES FOR}

\section*{EMPLOYMENT CONTRACTS}
1. Permanent Contract
2. Fixed-term contract with time limited to a maximum of 12 months
3. Fixed-term Contract, 12 months or longer
4. Temporary Work Contract arranged by an employment agency 5. Internship or other training program 6. No contract in writing
7. Other

\section*{EM4 - CODES FOR} ECONOMIC STATUS
1. Employed
2. Employer
3. Self-employed with no
employees
4. Unpaid family worker
\begin{tabular}{l} 
EM5 - CODES FOR TYPES OF EMPLOYERS \\
1. An enterprise (trading-company) or other type of private \\
company \\
2. A trade-company or a limited liability company \\
established for the sole purpose of the bankruptcy \\
manager doing his job \\
3. Individual agricultural company \\
4. Individual owner (Independent agent) or a co-owner \\
5. Physical entity with a license for a bankruptcy manager \\
6. Representative by law (manager of a trading-company) \\
7. In a state-owned entity \\
8. In a public enterprise \\
9. In a private household \\
Other \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{4. HOME AND HOUSEHOLD EXPENCES}

HE1_1. What is the approximate monthly spending in your household?
\(\qquad\) denars (enter only numerical amounts, in denars)

Approximately, how much did your household spent the last month on the following ...
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Amount \\
(denars)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline HE1_2. Food & \\
\hline HE1_3. Alcohol and cigarettes & \\
\hline HE1_4. Clothes you really needed & \\
\hline HE1_5. Household expenses (electricity, water, heating, phone bills) & \\
\hline HE1_6. Medicines and medical services & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
HE1_7. Everyday household items such as hygiene products, \\
detergents, including female hygiene items
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline HE1_8. Transport & \\
\hline HE1_9. Entertainment (going out to have coffee, travel, cinema) & \\
\hline HE1_10. Permanent goods (TV, computer...) & \\
\hline HE1_11. Other expenses (weddings, funerals) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

HE2. How many of your family members earned money in the last month and from which source?

Starting with you, could you answer a few questions related to your personal income for me? Furthermore, could you tell me about the incomes of the other household members, starting with the eldest?
(WRITE DOWN ALL THE HOUSEHOLD MEMBER OLDER THAN 15)
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline XX4_ & \begin{tabular}{c} 
UH4_... \\
(Family \\
member \\
initials)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
HE2_1. Primary \\
source of income
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
HE2_2. The \\
amount from the \\
primary source \\
of income
\end{tabular} \\
\hline\(\ldots 1\) RESPONDENT & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 2\) & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 3\) & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 4\) & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 5\) & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 6\) & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 7\) & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 8\) & & & \\
\hline\(\ldots 10\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

HE3. Do you in your household currently receive some of the following compensations/assistance from the State?
(ONLY ONE ANSWER IN EACH ROW)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|c|c|c|l|}
\hline & & & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Who \\
receives \\
the \\
assistance? \\
(put
\end{tabular} \\
yes & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Monthly \\
amount \\
thber hh \\
nember \\
from D2)
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline HE3_1 & Social welfare assistance & 1 & 2 & & \\
\hline HE3_2 & Permanent financial assistance & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_3 & Financial compensation for caregiving & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_4 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Compensation for war invalids from the \\
conflict in 2001
\end{tabular} & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_5 & Guardianship & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_6 & Unemployment compensation & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_7 & Free health insurance & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_8 & Child benefits & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_9 & Child benefits for children with special needs & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_10 & Support for third born child & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_11 & Maternity compensation & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_12 & Compensation for veteran war invalids & 1 & 2 & & - \\
\hline HE3_13 & Other & & & & - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

HE4. If you think of your total monthly income in the household, does your household make the ends meet..?
(ONE ANSWER ONLY)
1. Very easy
2. Easy
3. Not easy, nor hard
4. With some difficulties
5. With great difficulties
\(\qquad\)
8. Doesn't know/refuses to answer (ILLEGIBLE)

HE5. Does your household have access to the following services?
(ONE ANSWER IN EACH ROW)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|c|c|c|}
\hline & & yes & no & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Refuses to \\
answer \\
(ILLEGIBLE)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline HE5_1 & Clean tap water & 1 & 2 & 9 \\
\hline HE5_2 & Power from the city grid & 1 & 2 & 9 \\
\hline HE5_3 & Fixed phone line & 1 & 2 & 9 \\
\hline HE5_4 & Electricity heating & 1 & 2 & 9 \\
\hline HE5_5 & Sewer & 1 & 2 & 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

HE6. Does your household rent or own land that you use for agriculture or food production? (ONE ANSWER ONLY)
1. Owns
2. Rents (go to HE7)
3. Owns and additionally rents from others
4. Owns and part rents to others
5. No, doesn't own, nor rent (go to HE7)
\(\qquad\)
8. Doesn't know/refuses to answer (ILLEGIBLE)

HE6a. Who, from the household, owns the land?
\(\qquad\) (put the household member's number form D2).

HE7. I will read out loud a few items that your household might possess. Could you tell me if your household possesses these items and if not, is it because you cannot afford it or because you do not need it?
(ONE ANSWER IN EACH ROW).
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|}
\hline & & Yes & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No, \\
don't \\
need \\
it/don't \\
want it
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No, I \\
can't \\
afford \\
it
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Refuses to \\
answer \\
(ILLEGIBLE)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline HE7_1 & Car & 1 & 3 & 4 & 9 \\
\hline HE7_2 & Washing machine & 1 & 3 & 4 & 9 \\
\hline HE7_3 & Fridge & 1 & 3 & 4 & 9 \\
\hline HE7_4 & Air-conditioning unit & 1 & 3 & 4 & 9 \\
\hline HE7_5 & Computer & 1 & 3 & 4 & 9 \\
\hline HE7_6 & Fixed-line telephone & 1 & 3 & 4 & 9 \\
\hline HE7_7 & Dishwasher & 1 & 3 & 4 & 9 \\
\hline HE7_8 & Vacuum cleaner & 1 & 3 & 4 & 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

HE8. Has your household received any financial aid from abroad in the last 6 months? (EXPLAIN WHAT FINANCIAL AID MEANS-FOREIGN CURRENCY REMMITTANCE; ONE ANSWER ONLY)
1. Yes \(\Rightarrow\) HE8_1. What is the approximate amount \(\qquad\) den.
2. No (go to section 5)
\(\qquad\)
8. Doesn't know/refuses to answer (ILLEGIBLE)

HE9. How often do you receive financial aid from abroad?
1. Every month and more often than that
2. Every other month
3. 3-4 times a year
4. 1-2 times a year
5. Once in a few years, rarely
6. Doesn't know/refuses to answer (ILLEGIBLE)

HE10. Who sends you financial aid from abroad?
1. Spouse
2. Son/daughter
3. Mother/father
4. Other relative
5. Friend
6. Doesn't know/refuses to answer (ILLEGIBLE)

HE10a. Who receives the money and decides on its spending?
\(\qquad\) (put the household member's number form D2).

HE11. According to your opinion, how important would you say this financial aid from abroad is for your household?
1. Very important
2. Important
3. Not so important
4. Not important at all

\subsection*{10.2. Individual survey}

Start the selection procedure from here
Respondents are all the female members of the household 15 years of age and older.

Date \(\qquad\) ; Time \(\qquad\)

Date \(\qquad\) ; Time \(\qquad\)

M1. Identification of the female respondent
Number \(\qquad\)
(The person should appear in Table D2 from the Households Questionnaire)
1. DEMOGRAPHICS, EDUCATION, HEALTH

I would like to start with a few questions related to your informal education.

D6. Have you attended any course or training in the last 6 months?
(ONE ANSWER ONLY)
1. Yes (go to D7)
2. No (go to D9)

D7. What kind of a course/training was it?
(ONE ANSWER ONLY)
1. Traineeship
2. Training organised by your employer, other than traineeship
3. Training organised by the State Employment Agency
4. Training organised by the local government
5. Training organised by an NGO
6. Training courses which are part of the formal education system
7. Other (write down) \(\qquad\)
98. No answer (ILLEGIBLE)

D7a. What were you hoping to accomplish by undertaking such a training?
1. I was aiming at getting higher salary at my job
2. I just had spare time and decided to devote to acquiring knowledge
3. I needed specific training in order to get a job (either a new job or job promotion)
4. I was required or recommended to take the training by somebody else
5. Needed to finish my formal education

\section*{D8. How long did the course/training last?}

Write down \(\qquad\) days
98. No answer (ILLEGIBLE)

D9. Based on your opinion, how well can you read and understand an English language newspaper?
(ONE ANSWER ONLY)
1. Very well
2. Quite well
3. Not so well
4. Not at all
9. I don't know/No answer (ILLEGIBLE)

D10. Which of the following best describes the level of internet usage in the last month?
(ONE ANSWER ONLY)
1. I use the Internet every day or almost every day
2. I use the Internet few times a week
3. I use the Internet from time to time
4. I don't use the Internet at all
9. I don't know/No answer (ILLEGIBLE)

D11. In the last three months, how many times have you visited a doctor for a check-up or a procedure?
\(\qquad\) times

D12. How would you assess your health?
1. Great
2. Good
3. Bad
4. Very bad

\section*{2. EMPLOYMENT AND LABOUR MARKET}

\section*{Labour-market status}

E1. Over the past week, have you worked for a paid job or did any other activity for money or for another type of income (in change for cash, goods or services) that lasted for at least one hour (including work on a family property/family company) even if no income was created or nothing was produced in that particular week?
1. Yes (go to E5)
2. No

E2. Do you have such a job but were absent the last week and your intention is to return again?
1. Yes (go to E5)
2. No

E3. Over the course of the last week, did you do any unpaid job (in a company, as part of your professional practice or on agricultural land owned by a family member and from which the owner generates a salary or an income, even though you didn't produce/earn anything)?
1. Yes (go to E5)
2. No

E4. Over the course of the last week, were you hired to work in agriculture, hunting, fishing or collecting snails, mashrooms, fire wood, or any other similar work?
1. Yes
2. No (go to E8)

\section*{Working hours and salary}

E5. How many hours have you worked per week, on average, in the last three months?
\(\qquad\) (enter only positive and round number of hours)

E6. What is the amount of the net salary you were getting, on average, in the last three months, in denars?
\(\qquad\) denars (enter only positive and round number expressed in denars)

\section*{Subjective status on the labour market}

E7. Which of the following statements best describes your current status on the labour market?
1. Working for an employer
2. Occasionally working for several employers
3. Self-employed/business owner
4. Trying to start my own business
5. No job, but looking for a job and ready to start to work
6. No job and not looking for one
7. Attending a school/university
8. Attending a training (foreign language, computers, cooking, sewing, beautician, etc.)
9. Other. What? \(\qquad\)

\section*{Questions on discrimination}

E8. Do you think there is a discrimination (injustice) against women on the labour market?
1. Yes
2. No (go to question E11)

\section*{E9. How big is the discrimination (injustice) against women on the labour market?}
2. Economy widespread
3. Present in certain subpopulations (age groups, ethnicities, occupations, industries)
4. Limited to individual cases

\section*{E10. What is your answer based on?}
1. Personal past experience
2. My relative's/friend's/aquittance's experience
3. On a case I have heard of by chance (in a conversation, on TV, etc.)
4. On personal convictions and viewpoints
5. Other: \(\qquad\) (explain)

E11. I will read a few statements for you. Rank them on a scale from 1 to 4, based on how much you agree ( 1 - I do not agree at all, to 4 -I completely agree):
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l} 
I do not \\
agree at all
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
I do not \\
agree
\end{tabular} & I agree & \begin{tabular}{l} 
I completely \\
agree
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
E11_1. It is harder for women to find a job \\
than it is for men
\end{tabular} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
E11_2. If a man and a woman with the \\
same qualifications, both apply for the same \\
job, companies tend to give priority to men
\end{tabular} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline E11_3. Women are less paid than men & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
E11_4. Women are less paid than men for \\
the same or similar job
\end{tabular} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline E11_5. Women are second class workers & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
E11_6. Women, by nature, were created to \\
give birth and raise children and to take \\
care of the home and the family, not to work
\end{tabular} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
E11_7. It is much harder for a woman to be \\
a manager, company owner, politician, than \\
it is for a man
\end{tabular} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
E11_8. Women are eager to work, but face \\
barriers and increasing need for care for the \\
children and the household
\end{tabular} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

E12. Have you ever heard of a government policy supporting women to enter the labour market/get a job?
1. Yes
2. No (go to Section 3)

E13. Can you name that policy/measure?

\section*{3. SOCIAL INCLUSION}

SI1 In average, when it comes to people living outside your household, how often do you have a direct contact with them (face to face)?
(If you have more than one child, answer about the one you have contact with the most)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & Daily & Weekly & Monthly & Yearly & Never & I don't have such relatives/l don't have such relatives outside my household & I don't know (ILLEGIBLE) \\
\hline SI1_1 & Some of the childr & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline SI1_2 & Your mother or yo father & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline SI1_ & Close relatives & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline SI1_4 & Someone from your friends or neighbours & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

SI2 Who would give you MOST support in each of the following situations? Choose the most important person for each situation
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & &  &  &  &  &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{0} \\
& \frac{0}{9} \\
& \frac{0}{4} \\
& 4
\end{aligned}
\] &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \underset{\mathbf{Z}}{2}
\end{aligned}
\] &  \\
\hline SI2_1 & If you needed help around the house or if & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 999 \\
\hline SI2_2 & If you needed an advic on a serious personal family thing & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 999 \\
\hline SI2_3 & If you felt slightly depressed and wanted to talk to someone & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 999 \\
\hline SI2_4 & If you needed to borrow money for an emergency & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 999 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

SI3. How often are you involved in the following activities, without pay, aside from your paid job (if the person works)?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \lambda \\
& \overline{\bar{\sigma}} \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { む } \\
& \stackrel{\text { IJ }}{2}
\end{aligned}
\] &  \\
\hline SI3_1a & Care and education for children the age 0-6 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline SI3_1b & Care and education for children the age 6-15 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline SI3_2 & Work around the house (cleaning, shopping, cooking etc.) & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline SI3_3 & Work on the land/farm & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline SI3_4 & Taking care of elderly relatives & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline SI3_5 & Taking care of a disabled relative & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline SI3_6 & Taking care of ill relatives & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

SI4. In average, how many hours a week are you involved in the following activities?
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|c|c|}
\hline & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Enter the number of \\
hours per week
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
I don't know \\
(ILLEGIBLE)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline SI4_1 & Care and education for children under the age of 15 & - & 9 \\
\hline SI4_2 & Work around the house & - & 9 \\
\hline SI4_3 & Work on the land/farm & - & 9 \\
\hline SI4_3 & Taking care of elderly relatives & - & 9 \\
\hline SI4_4 & Taking care of a disabled relative & - & 9 \\
\hline SI4_5 & Taking care of ill relatives & - & 9 \\
\hline SI4_6 & Self-care and leisure & & 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

SI5. Could you tell me, on a scale from 1 to 5, how satisfied are you by each of the following items, where \(1=\) very unsatisfied, 2 = somewhat unsatisfied, 3 = not satisfied, nor unsatisfied, 4 = somewhat satisfied, \(5=\) very satisfied..?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & &  &  &  &  &  &  \\
\hline SI5_1 & Your current living standard & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 9 \\
\hline SI5_2 & Your accommodation/ place of residence & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 9 \\
\hline SI5_3 & Your family life & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 9 \\
\hline SI5_4 & Your social life & & & & & & \\
\hline SI5_5 & Your career/ professional life (if employed) & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{4. CULTURE AND NORMS, PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC LIFE}

Today we speak more often about the changed roles of men and women. Please indicate how much do you agree with each of the statements that I am about to read.
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

CN10. Do you, or have you ever, participate in any type of association or community?
1. Yes
2. No (go to Section 5)

\section*{C11. What kind of organization is that?}
1. Non-profit organization / association of any kind
2. Self-standing association of women
3. Informal club of women (informal gathering of women) with specific purpose
4. Religious organization
5. Association of women within political party
6. Municipal / community engagement, paid or unpaid
7. School/parent council
8. Other, please specify: \(\qquad\)

C12. How often have you interacted with this organization?
1. Daily to weekly
2. Monthly
3. Few times per year
4. Once per year or occasionally
5. Very rarely

\section*{5. ACCESS TO CARE FASCILITIES FOR CHILDREN AND ADULTS}

UZ1. If the person has her own child (or her husbands' child) not older than 15 years of age that lives in the household

Do you use the services of kindergartens, other centres for children or any services of persons hired and paid to take care of children (outside the obligatory school)?
1. Yes
2. No (go to UZ3)

UZ2. To what extent do you consider the following aspects to be gaps in the childcare services?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\frac{\frac{c}{0}}{\frac{0}{0}}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon \frac{\varepsilon}{\bar{D}} \\
& \frac{\bar{O}}{0} \\
& \sum \frac{0}{0}
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  \\
\hline UZ2_1. The number of or the services of the kindergartens, other centres for children or persons paid to take care of children & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline UZ2_2. The price of the services of the kindergartens, other centres for children or persons paid to take care of children & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline UZ2_3. The quality of the services of the existing childcare centres or the persons paid to take care of children & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline UZ2_4. The distance from your home of the services of the existing childcare centres or the persons paid to take care of children & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline UZ2_5. The working hours of the services of the existing childcare centres or the persons paid to take care of children & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

UZ3. Who else, besides you, takes care of your children?
1. Children's father
2. Children's grandparents
3. Children's relatives (your aunt, uncle)
4. I have no children

UZ4. How often do you get help from the following persons, without pay, with taking care of your children?
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ UZ4_1. Children's father } & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
UZ4_2. Children's \\
grandparents
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
UZ4_3 Children's relatives \\
(your aunt, uncle)
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline 1. On daily basis & 1. On daily basis & 1. On daily basis \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
2. On regular basis, 3-4 times \\
a week
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
2. On regular basis, 3-4 times \\
a week
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
2. On regular basis, 3-4 times \\
a week
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
3. On regular basis, 1-2 times \\
a week
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
3. On regular basis, 1-2 times \\
a week
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
3. On regular basis, 1-2 times \\
a week
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 4. Occasionally, monthly & 4. Occasionally, monthly & 4. Occasionally, monthly \\
\hline 5. Occasionally, once a year & 5. Occasionally, once a year & 5. Occasionally, once a year \\
\hline 6. I don't know (ILLEGIBLE) & 6. I don't know (ILLEGIBLE) & 6. I don't know (ILLEGIBLE) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

UZ5. List the MOST IMPORTANT reason of why is your husband (children's father) not taking care of the children?
1. He is employed and very tired after his work
2. My husband thinks that it is mother's duty to take care of children/mothers are better in raising children than fathers
3. We both agree that it is mother's duty to take care of children
4. We both agree that mothers are better in raising children than fathers
5. We live with my/his parents so I get a lot of support from them (no need for my husband to help me)

\section*{6. INACTIVE WOMEN}

You stated that you don't have a job and you are not looking for one. I would like to ask you a few questions about that.

\section*{NZ1. Why are you not looking for a job?}
(DO NOT READ IT OUT LOUD, LET HER SAYIT - multiple answers possible)
1. You are ill/incapable to work
2. You're taking care of children or adults who need help
3. You are studying/training
4. You've lost hope of finding a job
5. You are receiving remittances on regular basis from a closed relative from abroad and you don't think you need another income
6. You are receiving social assistance from the government and you are afraid of losing it if opting for a job
7. The labour market does not offer a job that I could do (for instance, to work 3-4 hours a day, or 2-3 days a week, or to work from home)
8. There is no job opportunity in a reasonable distance from home and/or commuting is difficult/expensive
9. You never worked and you don't think you are qualified enough
10. Other. What? \(\qquad\)

NZ2. I will read a few statements out loud. Rank them on a scale from 1 to 4 based on the influence they have on your decision not to look for a job (1 - no influence at all, 4 - complete influence):
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline NZ2_1. Lack of adequate and acceptable childcare services & & & & \\
\hline NZ2_2. Household and care responsibilities & & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NZ2_3. Lack of adequate and acceptable centres for ill, old \\
or disabled persons
\end{tabular} & & & & \\
\hline NZ2_4. Lack of jobs with flexible working hours, in general & & & & \\
\hline NZ2_5. Do not feel to be educated/qualified enough & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

NZ3. I will read a few statements from working women. Rank them, on a scale of 1 to 4, based on how important they are for the women in our society ( 1 - insignificant, to 4 - very important):
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NZ3_1. It would be very hard for a working woman to \\
complete all of her domestic errands
\end{tabular} & & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NZ3_2. It often happens that a working woman has to give \\
her entire salary to the husband (the head of the household) \\
and to not be able to decide on how the money is spent
\end{tabular} & & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NZ3_3. The woman could be prevented from looking for a job \\
or working, because that could enrage the husband
\end{tabular} & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

NZ4. Even though you were not looking for a job, would you like to work?
1. Yes
2. No (go to NZ6)

NZ5. If you were offered a job, would you be able to start to work in the next two weeks?
1. Yes
2. No (go to NZ7)

\section*{NZ6. Why can't you start to work?}
1. Studying/training
2. Illness/disability
3. Taking care of children or adults
4. Other. What? \(\qquad\)

NZ8. How many job positions have you occupied previously and what is your total length of service?

NZ8_1 Job positions \(\qquad\) (it has to be a whole number)
Length of service \(\qquad\) (NZ8_2a) years and \(\qquad\) (NZ8_2b) months
(If there are no years, write 0 , if there are no months, write 0 )

NZ9. In general, to what extent has your previous working experience contributed to your decision not to look for a job now?
1. Quite a lot
2. A lot
3. A little
4. The previous working experience has nothing to do with my decision not to look for a job now (go to NZ12)

NZ10. I will read a few statements out loud. Rank them on a scale of 1 to 4, based on the extent to which you agree or disagree ( 1 - I do not agree at all, to 4 - I completely agree) (only for those with previous work experience)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NZ10_1. In the workplace, the workers work in inhumane \\
conditions, in general
\end{tabular} & & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NZ10_2. Workplaces often include mobbing (psychological \\
abuse)
\end{tabular} & & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NZ10_3. Employers don't care that the employees have children \\
or need to care for elderly people, etc.
\end{tabular} & & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NZ10_4. The employers, partially or completely, disobey the \\
provisions from the Law on working relations, such as the right to \\
a paid annual leave, maternity leave, non-discrimination, etc.
\end{tabular} & & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NZ10_5. Workers, especially females, are frequently exposed to \\
harassment on the workplace
\end{tabular} & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

NZ11. How many job applications have you submitted in the past and how many job interviews have you been to, that you were not subsequently offered the job?

NZ13_1. Applications \(\qquad\) (a whole number)

NZ13_2. Interviews \(\qquad\) (a whole number)

NZ12 Have you ever been asked during an interview if you had any children or you were planning to have children?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't remember

NZ13. If you were to be invited for an interview tomorrow....
1. I would go without hesitation
2. I would go, but I think I would be rejected again
3. I wouldn't bother going

NZ14. Have you decided on the minimum salary that you would accept for the job?
1. Yes
2. No (end of the interview)

NZ15. What is that salary in denars?
\(\qquad\) denars

M13. Time of the end of the interview (use the \(\mathbf{2 4}\) hour format): \(\qquad\) : \(\qquad\) (FILL IN ALL THE FOUR NUMBERS)

M14. The duration of the interview in minutes:
(IF THE DURATION OF THE INTERVIEW IS MORE THAN 99 MINUTES, WRITE 99)

\section*{FOR THE INTERVIEWER}
"Thank you for your participation in the survey. Do you have any questions? My supervisor might call you in the next few days to check the quality of my work and to answer your questions, if any, regarding the interview. To help him/her do that, please give us your phone number."

\section*{Information on the respondent:}

Name: \(\qquad\)

Address: \(\qquad\)
PHONE
Phone number \(\qquad\)
97. Doesn't have a phone
98. Refuses to answer

\section*{TO BE FILLED BY THE INTERVIEWER}

B1. (CIRCLE, DO NOT ASK). The number of people present during the interview, including you and the respondent.

B2. (CIRCLE, DO NOT ASK) How would you describe the behaviour of the other people during the interview?
1. They didn't bother us at all
2. They had a few comments and offered their opinion
3. They had significant participation and suggestions in giving answers
4. The significantly disrupted us and it was almost impossible to cooperate with the respondent
5. There was no one else

B3. (CIRCLE, DO NOT ASK). Which of the following claims best describes the level of understanding the survey questionnaire by the respondent?
1. The respondent understood all the questions
2. The respondent understood most of the questions
3. The respondent understood most of the questions, but with my help to some extent
4. The respondent had difficulties in understanding most of the questions, even with my help

B5. What method for interview control was used?
1. Direct supervision during the interview
2. The interview was checked by the supervisor personally
3. The interview was checked over the phone by the supervisor
4. The interview was not checked

B6. Code of the coder \(\qquad\)
```


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ http://hdr.undp.org/en/composite/GII. The index consists of few measures: maternal mortality ratio, adolescent birth rate, women seats in parliament, population with at least some secondary education (by gender) and labor force participation (by gender).
    ${ }^{2}$ Prior to the Strategy, the Government has implemented a National Plan of Action for Gender Equality 20072012.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ The precise legislative terminology of maternity leave is "leave for pregnancy, birth and parenthood".

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ For a comparative study on maternity and paternity leave practices around the world, see ILO (2014).

    5 State Statistical Office (2017) Labour Force Survey 2016. Available at: http://www.stat.gov.mk/PrikaziPoslednaPublikacija.aspx?id=3.

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ Net enrollment rate is defined as a ration between number if children aged 0-6 attending pre-school and the total number of children at that age.

