

Rights perceived and practiced 2nd Part
Results of the surveys carried out in Brazil, India, Mozambique and
the United Kingdom, as part of the project
“Domestic Work and Domestic Workers Interdisciplinary and
Comparative Perspectives”

Pierre Guibentif
March 2011

WP n.º 2011/02

DOCUMENTO DE TRABALHO

WORKING PAPER



Rights perceived and practiced
2nd Part

Results of the surveys carried out in
Brazil, India, Mozambique and the United Kingdom,
as part of the project
“Domestic Work and Domestic Workers
Interdisciplinary and Comparative Perspectives”

Working Paper

[ISCTE-IUL – Dinâmia-CET, 2nd Draft]

Contents:

Introduction.....	3
A. Characteristics of interviewees and of their activity’s context and nature (independent variables).....	4
a) Main personal variables (Tables 0.1).....	4
b) Main variables characterizing the activity (Tables 0.2).....	6
B. The reality of domestic work (dependent variables).....	8
a) Experiences of discomfort (Tables 1.1).....	9
b) Specific situations encountered (Tables 1.2).....	10
c) Global level of satisfaction (Tables 1.3).....	11
d) Practices against the law (Tables 2.1).....	12
e) Relationship to the law (Tables 3.1.).....	13
Concluding remarks – A first attempt.....	15
References.....	17
Annex 1: Typology of activities (Quick Cluster).....	19
Tables	25
Notes to the tables	27

Pierre Guibentif

Lisbon, ISCTE-IUL - Dinâmia-CET, April 2011

Introduction

The following analysis gives an account of the data collected in Brazil, India, Mozambique, and United Kingdom within the framework of the research project *Domestic Work and Domestic Workers*¹. The annexed tables on which it is based are structured exactly the same way as the ones presenting the data collected in Portugal, introduced in a former working paper (Guibentif, 2011).

Financed by a Portuguese entity, and sustained mainly by a team based in Lisbon, the project was in condition to collect a considerable amount of data in Portugal, where we could interview a sample of nearly 700 people. For financial and organizational reasons, it was impossible to carry out a comparable research operation in other countries. With the efficient support of colleagues involved in the international research network set up for the project, we succeeded in applying the same questionnaire as in Portugal to more modest samples in Brazil, India, Mozambique, and United Kingdom. We want to express here our warm thanks to Maria Lígia Barbosa, from Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Ramapriya Gopalakrishnan, from Chennai, India, and Nelson Chapananga, from Nampula, Mozambique, who organized these surveys².

Given the more limited number of questionnaires under analysis, it is not possible to draw conclusions comparable to those that could be derived from the analysis of the Portuguese data. In Portugal, without being in condition to measure the precise representativeness of our sample, we can show that interviewees' characteristics correspond to some extent to what we know nowadays about domestic workers in this country. And the plausibility of the information collected on several questions allows us to make a positive global evaluation of the data's quality. This is not the case for the data collected in other countries. So our aim here is merely to identify the main common features, as well as the main differences, always keeping in mind the results of the Portuguese survey, as a frame of interpretation. As far as the features of domestic work in the countries analyzed are concerned, our data can not lead us to conclusions, but to hypotheses to be confirmed, when possible, by other researches carried out in the compared countries. However, we are in condition to formulate statements on domestic work in general, as conditioned by different societal and national contexts.

¹ Project financed by the *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* – FCT, reference PTDC/JUR/65622/2006. For more details on the topic of the project, see in particular Blétière 2008a, and Blétière, 2008b. A special thank here to António Velez for his extremely valuable help in the production of the tables, and to Valdemar Ferreira, for the careful editing of the manuscripts.

² Due to personal reasons, the sociologist initially involved in the project for the coordination of research operations in the United Kingdom had to drop from the network. Thus, the questionnaire had to be applied there under the direct supervision of the Lisbon team. This is why we have only a small number of questionnaires from this country.

In taking advantage of the Portuguese data, we have to cope with an important limitation. In the analysis of these data, the treatment of one variable proved to be particularly fruitful: the nationality of the person interviewed. In three countries analysed, all interviewees have the same nationality. Only in the United Kingdom we found a different picture. But the small number of questionnaires completed there makes it difficult to draw reliable conclusions from a comparison between the groups formed by different nationalities.

A. Characteristics of interviewees and of their activity's context and nature (independent variables)

a) Main personal variables (Tables 0.1)

Table 0.1(All) compares the samples of the four countries, using four variables: gender, age, schooling, and social status of employers.

Gender: Domestic work, in many countries, is carried out mainly by women. In India, all interviewees are women; in Brazil and United Kingdom the overwhelming majority are women too (Brazil: 113 out of 116; United Kingdom: 24 / 25; similar proportion in Portugal: 681 / 684). The remarkable exception here is Mozambique, where the majority of interviewees are men (40 / 50).

Age: The distribution of interviewees among age categories is comparable in two countries, and similar to Portugal: Brazil and United Kingdom (age of interviewees on average 43,2 years old in Portugal, 41,2 in the United Kingdom, 42,2 in Brazil). Interviewees in India are younger (average 36,1). Again, the case of Mozambique is quite different, with about 80% of interviewees below 30 years old and an average of 24,7. Actually, this is why it made sense to depart, in the tables on Mozambique, from the structure applied to the other countries: here the youngest category ("up to 30") was split into two categories: "up to 20" (26 people) and "21-30" (14 people).

Schooling: In Brazil, we find people with an average of 7,4 years in school, close to what we observe in Portugal (7,2). Below this level, we find India and Mozambique, with an average of schooling years of 5,6 and 4,0; above this level, United Kingdom with an average duration of schooling of 11 years. In Mozambique, about 25% of the people interviewed report to be illiterate

Social status of employers: The analysis of Portuguese data suggested a possible way of reconstructing the social status of employers, on the basis of the number of rooms,

number of employees, rate of occupation of bedrooms, and existence of an office at home, according to criteria summarized in the following table³.

lower	up to two bathrooms, and a bedroom rate of occupation above 1,25.
middle (without office)	All other cases, without office
middle (with office)	All other cases, with office
upper	three or more bathrooms, two or more employees, and a bedroom rate of occupation of one person or less per room.

In Portugal, it was possible to evaluate the accuracy of these criteria taking into account other researches on social stratification in this country, and being in condition to interpret the collected data on the background of a substantial knowledge of social reality in Portugal. These conditions are not satisfied for the data collected in other countries. And there are good reasons to admit that the material criteria chosen might acquire rather different meanings in different cultural contexts. The usual number of bathrooms, and the rate of occupation of bedrooms are figures likely to be, to a significant extent, shaped by cultural factors. And this is even more probably the case when it comes to define what an office is, and under what conditions it makes sense to give this qualification to a room in a private house. In other words, the question of the ways to reconstruct the social position of employers would have to be discussed later in a broader framework, and this discussion could lead to the construction of different criteria according to the compared countries. In a first approach, however, we take the risk of applying the same criteria as in Portugal. In any case, they allow the construction of separated categories of people who may be presumed as living in different – more or less favourable – economic conditions.

In Brazil and the United Kingdom, the distribution across the four categories constructed is similar to the one observed in Portugal: low figures for the “lower” and “upper” categories; a majority in the intermediate categories. Differences could be explained by the social situation of each country (higher proportion of the middle class “without office” in Brazil, lower in United Kingdom, as well as in Portugal). Quite a different distribution is to be found in India and Mozambique. In India, two categories are strongly represented: the “upper” category and the intermediate “without office”. In Mozambique, almost all interviewees are employed in houses belonging to the intermediate category, without office. In both cases, figures indicating an employer belonging to the “lower” category are rare (IN: 2/ MZ: 1). These figures could correspond to a social situation in which people in lower social position usually are not in condition to afford the costs of hiring a domestic worker. The comparatively higher proportion of employers occupying a high social position in India could be an effect of the social stratification prevailing in that country, but it also could be an effect of social norms conditioning the construction of houses, or of other cultural factors modifying the meaning of our criteria defining here the “upper” social position. Such factors could explain some differences, in particular between data from Brazil and from India, as we shall see.

³ For a more detailed justification of this variable, see Guibentif (2011).

In order to develop a more precise picture of the interviewees, it is worth crossing the variables up to now discussed separately. This more detailed analysis is offered by the tables 0.1 produced for the different countries. The result of these crossings is difficult to interpret in the case of Mozambique, where there is a strong concentration on some few values: most interviewees are younger than 30 years old, and almost all employers are presumed to belong to the lower middle class. Let us just note that women interviewed are, on average, older than men, and younger people (under 20) seem to have had a slightly longer schooling time than the older (21-30). This could be due to the fact that in many aspects the development of the country took off in recent years, after the end of civil war in 1992.

A similar relationship between age and schooling is to be found in Brazil and in United Kingdom, as far as the figures in the table allow an interpretation. Interestingly, these two variables are related differently in the case of India. In that country, people of the youngest age category have more frequently a short schooling time than people belonging to the older categories; and people with a longer schooling time do less frequently belong to the younger category (Table 0.1 [IN], columns [C] to [F]; rows [13] compared with [14] and [15]). One possible explanation could be the following: the strong development of the country over the last decade could have created more professional opportunities for younger people, so that a lower proportion of trained young people seek a job as domestic worker. But if this explanation applies to India, there should be a similar trend in Brazil, which recent economic evolution is probably comparable to the one of India. But this is not the case.

Other relationships worth being characterized: age and schooling, on the one hand, employers' social status, on the other (Mozambique and United Kingdom are not considered here). In Brazil, we encounter a fairly strong relationship: the higher the social status, the younger the employees, and the higher their schooling. A similar relationship is to be found in Portugal. Here, again, the case of India is different: if there are signs of a significant difference between the two categories of employers represented, it would be a reverse relationship: the upper category hires slightly older people, their schooling level seems to be slightly lower. Here we have to remember that the construction of the category "employer belonging to an 'upper' social category" might have led to the formation of, sociologically speaking, quite different categories in Brazil and India, which could partly explain the difference here observed.

b) Main variables characterizing the activity (Tables 0.2)

Table 0.2(All) compares the countries according to three variables characterizing the activity of the people interviewed: the number of houses where they work; the profile of the activity; the average duration of the employment relationship.

Number of houses where the interviewees work: first we should separate here two very different situations: Mozambique, on the one hand; the other countries on the other. Our data suggest – which is obviously subject to confirmation – that in Mozambique, at least in the region where the survey was conducted, a huge majority

of domestic workers are employed in one sole house. In the other countries, data show an important proportion of domestic workers employed in two or more houses. There are differences, however, between the three cases where sufficient data is available. In Portugal, the proportion of people working in only one house is about 44%; in Brazil it is considerably higher: 65%; in India lower: 32%.

Activity profile: having tested the potentialities of the cluster analysis in the Portuguese case, and once the interpretation of our data was possible by the construction of a typology of six categories⁴, we opted, in a first step, for producing a typology through the same statistical procedures, applied here to the whole set of data (see annex 1, to be compared with annex 1 of Guibentif, 2011). Results are convincing insofar that we find the same six categories, just as meaningfully differentiated as in the case of Portugal. In this procedure, however, national features are not adequately taken into account. This is why the present paper has to be considered as provisional on this point. In a next step of our analysis, we shall produce separate typologies for each country and base our comparison on these different typologies.

The case that departs more visibly from an approximately even distribution – like the one we found in Brazil, United Kingdom, and Portugal – is the one of India. We have there a particularly strong group of workers (63%) employed almost exclusively for cleaning, that is without having to care for people or for plants and animals, and without having to prepare meals. This difference should be confirmed by other data. If confirmed, it could indicate a conception of domestic work in that country quite different from the one prevailing in the other countries compared. In Mozambique, none of the interviewed domestic workers reported to have to take care for dependent people. This seems plausible considering the demographic features of the country.

Average duration of the employment relationship: Here we find comparable figures in all countries, again with the exception of Mozambique. The shorter average duration there might be explained by the recent social and economic normalization after the civil war. We dare to interpret the comparable figures in the other countries as a modest sign of the reliability of the collected data.

The crossing of these last variables with the main personal variables discussed before (tables 0.2) allows the following comments. In Mozambique, female domestic workers are more frequently employed where the preparation of meals is included among the committed tasks. As far as the number of houses is concerned, a consistent relationship shows that employers of upper social categories are more likely to be the only employer of their domestic workers. This seems plausible, since they also are more likely to have available economic means to pay a full time employee. The crossing between age and number of employers shows a comparable pattern, even if not so visible: it seems to be less probable for younger and older domestic workers to be employed in many houses than for domestic workers of intermediate age categories. This could be due to the fact that a person needs time to acquire the capacity to better deal with the market, and that in the latest years of one's career,

⁴ See Guibentif (2011), point A-c, and Annex 1.

there is a tendency to reduce as far as possible work commitments. The crossing of the number of houses and the duration of schooling shows, at least in Brazil, that a higher level of education is to some extent related to a higher probability of working for one only house. This fact could be explained by the better chances such people have to be hired by employers of a higher social standing, more likely to employ them on a full time basis. Figures in the table concerning India could allow a similar interpretation, even if the correlation is less strong.

The crossing of the activity profile with the personal variables deserves the following comments. Domestic workers who have to take care of children do more frequently belong to younger age categories; those who have to take care of dependent people tend to have a longer schooling time; people hired mainly for cleaning activities, a shorter schooling time. In India, employers that we qualify as belonging to the middle class seem to require more often their domestic workers also to prepare meals. This could mean that people from upper social standing are in condition to hire specialized cooks.

The crossing of the average duration of employment and schooling time does not allow any interpretation. There seems to be some correlation between this variable and the age of the interviewees, which makes sense. A statistic pattern common to Brazil, India, and Portugal shows that people employed in houses of upper social standing do more frequently report intermediate employment durations (see tables 0.2 [BR][IN], row [17], columns [P][Q]; as well as in Guibentif (2011), table 0.1 [P].row [15], column [P]). Since we find a similar pattern in the three countries, it is worth trying an interpretation. It could be that, on the one hand, these employers are in condition to offer good conditions and to keep good employees over longer periods of time in their house. For the same reasons, they also are in condition to replace them easily from time to time, in order to avoid narrow personal relationships, or to employ younger people.

B. The reality of domestic work (dependent variables)

Tables 1.1 – 3.1 analyse a broad set of questions, crossing the relevant answers with the variables introduced in the former section. The topics are introduced in the tables and discussed here in the order that seems the most appropriate from the point of view of a socio-legal research, that is: first, the experiences of concerned people are discussed, as far as possible, with no reference to legal categories, in order to avoid biases that the legal approach to the facts could induce. The legal aspects of the reality under analysis are approached in the last point⁵.

⁵ For additional references on this methodological option, see Guibentif (2011), introduction to section B.

a) *Experiences of discomfort (Tables 1.1)*

Table 1.1 [All] compares the average level of satisfaction observed in the different countries in relation to several specific aspects of domestic work (salary, amount of work, nature of the tasks, work environment). The level of satisfaction varies according to the considered aspects, according to a pattern that remains stable across the countries. The highest proportion of people “not satisfied” concerns the salary; followed by “amount of work”, “nature of the tasks”, and “work environment”. The only exception is to be found in India, where people are less satisfied with the relationship to their colleagues than with the nature of their tasks. The levels of dissatisfaction vary significantly across the countries. At the extremes, we have, on the one hand, the United Kingdom, with low proportions of people answering that they are “not satisfied” (20% not satisfied with their salary; all other scores clearly below the levels attained in other countries); on the other hand, Mozambique, with a very high proportion of “not satisfied” (74% not satisfied with their salary). We find intermediate levels in Brazil and India (actually precisely the same proportion of “not satisfied” answers on the issue of salaries: 43,1%).

If we analyse the national tables, we find a quite clear relationship between the proportions of people “not satisfied” with their salary and the age: the younger the interviewees, the higher the proportion of “not satisfied” answers. One exception is Mozambique, where we find the reverse picture: the older the person, the higher the probability of dissatisfaction. Let us remember, however, that interviewees in Mozambique are on average younger than in other countries, and that the general level of dissatisfaction is much higher. These are signs of a very different social situation. It would be important better to grasp this difference in the next steps of our comparative work.

An almost linear relationship also exists between satisfaction with the salary and duration of schooling: the longer the period of schooling, the higher the proportion of “not satisfied” answers. Regarding the other items concerned – amount of work, nature of the tasks, work environment –, the highest levels of dissatisfaction, in Brazil and India, are attained by the second age category (31-40).

In general, the satisfaction with the salary is more probable when the person is employed in a house of a higher social standing, which seems plausible (India, United Kingdom, as well as Portugal). This is not so clearly the case in Brazil, where we find, in these circumstances, high proportions of people “not satisfied” in relation to all items. We shall soon come back to this point (see point c below).

As far as the impact of variables characterizing the activity is concerned, people employed in only one house answer “not satisfied” on all questions in a relatively high number of cases. The lower levels of dissatisfaction relate to the categories “employed in two houses” or “employed in three houses”. There are however some exceptions: in India, as well as actually in Portugal, the highest proportion of people “not satisfied” with their salary is to be found in the category “employed in two houses”.

Levels of satisfaction according to the type of activity often vary across the countries and do not allow cross-cutting interpretations. Some similarities are to be found in

relation to the following two profiles: lower proportions of “not satisfied” answers on several topics in the case of people having to care for dependent persons; higher proportions in the case of people hired mainly for cleaning tasks.

In general, people with the shortest average duration of employment relationship also more frequently report to be “not satisfied”. One intriguing exception: Mozambique where people with an average duration of contract of 3-5 years seem to be even less satisfied with their salary and the amount of work, than people with shorter average duration of employment. This result relates probably to the fact these people also are, as we saw in the section before, older on the average, and that, as we saw at the beginning of the present section, older domestic workers in Mozambique tend to be less satisfied with their salary.

In general terms, the level of satisfaction concerning the salary seems by far the easier to interpret on the basis of the personal variables here considered, than the other levels of satisfaction under analysis. Indeed, these other levels probably depend more on other variables (physical resources, cultural dispositions, etc.) that could not be included in this general analysis.

b) Specific situations encountered (Tables 1.2)

The frequency of the situations encountered⁶ mirrors somehow the frequency of “not satisfied” answers discussed in the section before. Very low frequencies are to be found in the United Kingdom; the highest in Mozambique. The difference between this country and the others is less dramatic than in the case for other types of variables, however. The average frequency of issues relating to money is 46%, which can be compared with Brazil: 44%. In all countries we find the same order of frequencies: issues of money are the most frequent, followed by excessive work demands. Forms of violence are less frequent, actually with comparable scores in Brazil, India and Mozambique: around 11%. No cases of violations of rights were detected by the survey carried out in India. An intriguing figure in India, however, is the frequency of situations qualified as “lack of food”. Concerning precisely this variable in India, there is a linear relationship to the age: the younger, the higher the risk of suffering this situation⁷.

As far as the relationship to the age of the interviewees is concerned, the categories (up to 30) and (31 to 40) appear to be more exposed to the situations listed in the questionnaire. Between the two categories concerned, we find two patterns: in India and Portugal, issues of money seem to be more frequently encountered by domestic workers between 31 and 40, while workers until 30 have more frequently to face excessive demands. In Brazil, we find just the opposite distribution: issues of money are more frequently encountered by domestic workers until 30 years old; excessive demands by workers between 31 and 40.

⁶ On the typology of the situations, see Guibentif (2011), point B-b.

⁷ Table 1-2-A [IN], column [T], rows [8]-[10]; the next figure in the column is less significant due to the small number of individuals in the category.

The level of schooling does not have an impact comparable across the different countries. There is no obvious linear relationship between the duration of the schooling period and the probability of meeting a specific situation. Indeed, a better education may give, to some extent, means to the person both to better handle specific situations, but also, at the same time, to identify them and to report them to the interviewer.

Issues of money are less frequent when people are employed in houses of upper social standing. On the other hand, the probability of discrimination cases is higher in that category of houses.

There seems not to be a simple relationship between frequency of situation encountered and number of employers. As we saw in Portugal, some relationship exists in the case of money issues: if the person works in many houses, the probability of meeting problematic situations is higher. We have similar figures in Brazil, where people employed in three houses do more frequently report problems of money. In India, on the contrary, people working only in one house do more frequently report such problems. One question worth being asked here is: could there be a link between these answers and the fact that people employed in only one house are proportionally less numerous in India than in Brazil or Portugal?

There are no general trends in the relationship between type of activity and the frequency of situations encountered. One just could note that the category of those who have, apart from cleaning duties, to take care of animals and plants, do report, on several items, in different countries, more frequently problematic situations than the average. A category where we meet, on several items, frequencies below the average is the one of domestic workers hired mainly for cleaning tasks.

c) Global level of satisfaction (Tables 1.3)

The countries can be classified in three categories. The highest proportion of “not satisfied” is reached by Mozambique (52%); on an intermediate level we find Brazil and India, with an identical score: 13.8%; and finally the United Kingdom and Portugal (8% / 9%).

In Mozambique, we have the possibility to compare levels of satisfaction between men and women. Female domestic workers do answer, in a much higher proportion than men, to be globally “not satisfied” with their job (78%, compared with 48% of male domestic workers). Women do not seem to meet more frequently problematic situations than men, but, as a matter of fact, those situations more frequently encountered by women are possibly more likely to condition negatively their global level of satisfaction (wage arrears, sexual harassment, psychological violence, etc.).

On several variables indicating the general level of satisfaction, there is a clear relationship with the age: the younger, the less satisfied. But this does not apply to all variables. So the “not satisfied” answers on the general question on their experience as domestic workers, in Brazil and India, are the most frequent in the second age category (31-40). The fact that the younger domestic workers are again more satisfied

with their job could, perhaps, be related to the recent economic evolution of these two countries, likely to give to younger people the notion of more encouraging perspectives in terms of professional future⁸. Another pattern of answers in these tables is a kind of “U”, where the youngest and the oldest interviewees give the more negative answers, interviewees of intermediate age categories the less negative (see the cases of India and United Kingdom, on the question: “Is domestic work well regarded?”).

In India, as well as in Portugal, domestic workers employed in houses of upper social standing are more satisfied. This applies to all items in India; in Portugal, the exception is the answer on the question “Is domestic work well regarded?”: the higher the social standing of the employer, the more probable a negative answer. In Brazil, in almost all questions indicating the general level of satisfaction, people employed in houses of higher social standing give more frequently negative answers (one exception: the desire to work for cleaning companies decreases as higher is the status of the employer). If we add these answers to those about satisfaction concerning specific aspects (above, point a), we are led to the hypothesis that the differences between social categories seem to generate more severe tensions in Brazil than in the other countries here compared.

The global level of satisfaction seems to be in general lower when people are employed in only one house.

There is no obvious relationship between profiles of activity and general level of satisfaction. One only possible comment: people having to take care of children do give, on average, slightly less negative answers.

d) *Practices against the law (Tables 2.1)*

We have here to compare quite heterogeneous data that allow, in some cases, unexpected groupings. So the answers on the payment of social security may be grouped in two categories: Portugal and Brazil, on the one hand (44% and 38% of non payment), and India, Mozambique and United Kingdom, on the other hand (around 60%). Comparable frequencies of accidents at work – which we consider here as an indication of unsafe working conditions – are to be found in Brazil and United Kingdom (7% and 4%), on the one hand, and in India, Mozambique and Portugal, on the other hand (19%, 16%, 13%).

Three variables have a similar behaviour: insufficient salary, excessive working time, and age below the legal minimum level: highest scores in Mozambique, followed by Brazil and India; significantly lower scores in Portugal and United Kingdom. These figures suggest a strong impact of the general level of development of the countries compared. Figures concerning Portugal and United Kingdom could be interpreted as revealing the fact that domestic workers do take advantage, at least in some measure,

⁸ In this sense, concerning Brazil, see Castro, Lúcia Rabello de, Mattos, Amana Rocha, “O que é que a política tem a ver com a transformação de si? Considerações sobre a acção política a partir da juventude”, *Análise Social* XLV, núm. 193, pp. 793-823.

of the “European Social Model”, even if this model targets more directly the regular labour market.

One variable shows precisely the reverse pattern: workload seems to be much heavier in United Kingdom than in the other countries compared. Portugal comes next, followed by India and Brazil. Productivity of domestic work would be higher in the European countries than in others. This could be related also to the material tools available to the workers.

Let us now consider the national tables and the impact of the different independent variables on the variables here discussed. In general terms, the impact of the age seems to be weak. For some variables, people more exposed to the problems belong to the younger and to the older categories. Two more linear relationships might be emphasized. Excessive working time in India: the older the domestic worker, the more probable it is for such a situation to happen. Low salary in Brazil: the younger the worker, the more exposed to this situation.

The relationship between suffered illegal practices and the level of education is not easy to interpret. One relationship worth a special mention: in Brazil, the longer the period of schooling, the lower the probability of the employer to refuse to sign an employment contract (table 2.1-A [BR], column [E], rows [3] to [6]). This could indicate that a higher level of education gives more chances to the interested person to efficiently argue in favour of the contract. In Mozambique, the level of schooling seems to have a positive impact on the salary: the higher this level, the lower the proportion of insufficient salaries.

In Portugal and Brazil, the higher the social status of employers, the higher the proportion of workers facing excessive working times, and the lower the probability of unpaid bonus or social security contributions.

The relationship between the probability of suffering the situations here discussed and the number of employers is not easy to interpret. In Brazil, people employed in only one house are clearly less exposed than others. One general, and quite obvious, trend: those who work in many houses have to cope with a heavier workload.

The relationship to the different types of activities is also hard to decipher. Some types of activities seem to be more likely to expose domestic workers to illegal practices, but there are differences between the countries. So people hired only for cleaning tasks are more exposed to several kind of practices against the law in Brazil, Portugal and United Kingdom. In India and Mozambique, the same category of workers seem to be less exposed to such practices.

A longer average duration of employment does not seem to protect workers against the practices here considered.

e) Relationship to the law (Tables 3.1.)

When it comes to the relevance given to the law, the country most similar to Portugal is the United Kingdom. Given the low number of questionnaires completed there, the

comparison between these two countries does not allow very solid conclusions. One difference is worth being noted however: the higher frequency of answers indicating a positive valuation of contracts in United Kingdom. In the three other countries, the answers' frequencies on this point do vary considerably. In Brazil, answers indicating a positive relationship to contracts, work inspection and courts, are more frequent than in the two European countries; in India, far less frequent. India is also the only country among the five here analysed where neither employment contracts nor cases in court are reported. Mozambique offers a mixed picture. On the one hand, answers valuating positively the intervention of public authorities are frequent, even more than in Brazil, and there is one case in court mentioned, among 50 questionnaires completed; on the other hand, positive opinions on contracts are less frequent, and only in one case an employment contract is reported as having been signed.

Here we have signs of two legalities coexisting, more or less loosely connected: the legality of the state, corresponding to the notion that there is an authority in position to act where there are abuses; and the legality of formal interpersonal relationship, corresponding to the notion that agreements have to be honoured, and that the non compliance of commitments agreed is likely to be sanctioned.

The link between age and relationship to the law varies from country to country. In United Kingdom, the youngest interviewees seem to be less inclined to value positively contracts or the intervention of the authorities. In India and Brazil, intermediate age categories depart from the younger and older; in India people between 31 and 40 give more positive answers to the questions; in Brazil, people 31 and 50 are less positive on contracts, those between 41 and 60 less positive on work inspection and courts. Even if these figures are far from allowing reliable conclusions, one could here suggest that the experience of the states' recent history could help to interpret the behaviour of these variables. At least in Brazil, the experience of authoritarian regimes in the 1970' could have had some impact on the trust toward public authorities. Conversely, the democratization of the country in recent decades could motivate a more positive attitude towards the law. In the United Kingdom, the youngest are those who give less frequently positive answers on contracts and courts. This could be a result of the political turn in the 1980s that could have led to an attitude based more on self help than on the intervention of State agencies. But the low number of questionnaire in this country does not allow us to confirm such hypothesis.

The level of education relates positively to favourable attitudes towards contracts, and to the readiness to go to court, at least in Brazil and India.

The social standing of employers, again, has a completely different impact in the different countries compared. In India, just as in Portugal, people employed in houses of upper social standing give more positive answers in legal matters (contract useful, would go to court, etc.). There is no such a clear relationship in Brazil, which brings us back to the idea of a particularly deep gap between social classes. People employed in middle class houses without office give less frequently positive answers in Brazil, India, and Portugal. Unexpectedly, people employed precisely in this category of houses give the most positive answers in the United Kingdom.

In India, just as in Portugal, people employed in only one house do give more legalistic answers than people employed in more than one house. In Brazil and the

United Kingdom, the relationship is less significant. Positive answers are more frequent when a person is employed in more than one house; but contracts are more frequently signed when she is employed only in one house. In Mozambique, domestic workers are in most cases employed in only one house. However, the only case in which a contract has been signed is one of the two cases in which a person is employed in two houses.

As far as the activity profiles are concerned, one common feature across the countries here compared is the fact that people hired almost exclusively for cleaning activities seem to be less interested in the intervention of work inspection; people hired to take care of people – children or dependents – among other tasks, do more frequently have a signed contract.

People with a short average duration of employment relationship give the more legalistic answers.

Concluding remarks – A first attempt

Our data suggest the three following general statements concerning domestic work.

– Domestic work is obviously conditioned by its societal environment. This means that, from country to country, it may show features likely to be related to national or regional characteristics. In particular, characteristics relating to recent historical processes, such as the recent economic take off of Brazil and India, the end of civil war in Mozambique, or, as some answers could indicate, the implementation of liberal policies in the United Kingdom over the last decades. Or structural societal characteristics: signs of more severe tensions between social classes in Brazil than in the other countries here compared; or of a somehow less favourable treatment of younger people in India.

– More specifically, there seems to exist differences in the nature of domestic work, possibly related to certain more general notions of what is privacy, what are possible relations between peoples, who is supposed to take on what kind of task. See in particular the differences between countries where domestic workers usually work only in one house (Mozambique), and others where work in several houses is frequent; or the differences in terms of activity's content (for instance India, where tasks other than cleaning seem to be far less frequent than in other countries). There are also intriguing differences in the amount of work, as far as it could be measured here.

– Domestic work seems to be a sphere where problems suffered by societies are experienced in a particularly acute measure. The treatment of certain problems is committed to the families; and the families commit them to domestic workers. This is what seems to happen in the case of care for dependent persons. This could also explain the extremely high levels of dissatisfaction in Mozambique.

Domestic work depends on what happens within the houses. But it also depends on the way workers are led to establish and end employment relationships. Differences in

the average duration of the contracts, frequencies of the termination of the contracts for certain reasons, and, again, the number of houses where domestic workers are employed, are some of the variables that should be analysed in order to better identify the differences between the countries in this aspect.

As far as the relation to the law is concerned, there is, in any event, no direct relationship between legal responses (cases in court, or just the fact that a person consults some entity likely to help her) and the seriousness of the problems encountered. So there must exist very influential intermediate variables.

One important factor here is probably the relationship to the state. Some data suggest that periods of authoritarian political regimes reduce the probability for people to submit their problems to state agencies (people from Eastern Europe in Portugal; some answers collected in Brazil).

Another issue is the readiness in considering that social relationships can be framed by legal arrangements. It seems to be comparatively low in India and in Mozambique. In order to interpret this data, we should better know how inter-personal commitments are strengthened in these countries. There may be – there definitely are, but to what extent available to people belonging to lower social strata? – means alternative to legal contracts.

The two previous points have to be linked to the following broader socio-legal question. How do these two aspects of legal experience – in the relationship to authorities, in the relationship to other people, in particular in the private sphere – relate to each other?

The scarcity of cases in court, and of cases in which the interested domestic worker submits the problems she encountered to an external entity might be related to difficulties in the access to courts or to such external entities, or to insufficient levels of trust toward state agencies or relevant private entities. However, another explanation has also to be taken into account: the relationship to the employers is, on the average, qualified as fairly good. This could prevent a worker from acting, since this could deteriorate that good relationship. In more general terms, there seems to be some contradiction between the fact that situations in principle not acceptable do occur quite frequently, and the fact that the domestic sphere is a rather peaceful one. Or is this just appearance?

Let us try to derive from these still very provisional and incomplete conclusions some thoughts on policies aiming at improving the social situation of domestic workers. Firstly, we have to recognize that their situation heavily depends on the macro-societal and economic framework. As long as a society in general suffers severe economic and societal troubles, domestic workers will be among those most exposed to these problems. In the face of this fact, priority has to be given to the means improving the room for manoeuvre of domestic workers to be able to seek places of employment where they can expect to be less exposed. This means in particular to help them to terminate under fair conditions unfavourable employment relationships.

As far as the treatment of domestic workers at their workplace is concerned, it could be worth developing a precise public image of – making visible again – who domestic workers are, how they are supposed to work, and how they should be treated. This image cannot be usefully developed without a clear notion of privacy. And it probably deserves to be designed carefully taking into account national or regional peculiarities. This has to be done not only by legal means, and should involve as far as possible existing associations.

One way of developing this “public image” of domestic work could be, taking apart more practical and legal considerations, the generalization of written contracts. Indeed, the negotiation of a contract is an opportunity to discuss a concrete situation from a more general viewpoint, which could favour the shaping of this image, on the ground of concrete notions such as rights of the persons and respect of privacy.

References

- BLÉTIÈRE, Vanessa (2008a), *Por uma Sociologia do Trabalho Doméstico: Contribuição para um Projecto Interdisciplinar*, Lisbon, Dinâmia-CET – ISCTE-IUL, Working paper 2008/62
- BLÉTIÈRE, Vanessa (2008b), *Reconhecer o trabalho doméstico: desafios de uma análise sociológica*, Lisbon, Dinâmia-CET – ISCTE-IUL, Working paper 2008/71
- GUIBENTIF, Pierre (2011), *Rights perceived and practiced. Results of a survey carried out in Portugal as part of the project “Domestic Work and Domestic Workers – Interdisciplinary and Comparative Perspectives”*, Lisbon, Dinâmia-CET – ISCTE-IUL, Working Paper n° 2011/01

Annex 1: Typology of activities (Quick Cluster)

```

QUICK CLUSTER a12.1_exec_rc2 a12.2_exec_rc2 a12.3_exec_rc2 a12.4_exec_rc2
a12.5_exec_rc2 a12.6_exec_rc2 a12.7_exec_rc2 a12.8_exec_rc2 a12.9_exec_rc2
a12.10_exec_rc2 a12.11_exec_rc2 a12.12_exec_rc2 a12.13_exec_rc2
a12.14_exec_rc2 a12.15_exec_rc2
a12.16_exec_rc2 a12.17_exec_rc2 a12.18_exec_rc2 a12.19_exec_rc2
/MISSING=LISTWISE
/CRITERIA=CLUSTER(6) MXITER(10) CONVERGE(0)
/METHOD=KMEANS(NOUPDATE)
/SAVE CLUSTER
/PRINT INITIAL ANOVA.
    
```

Notes

Output Created		13-Mar-2011 16:58:16
Comments		
Input	Data	C:_0_User\pg_sd\div\DomWork\Inquerit o_Port\BaseEnviada_110127\BD_DW_2 0110310_2.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	940
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any clustering variable used.
Syntax		QUICK CLUSTER a12.1_exec_rc2 a12.2_exec_rc2 a12.3_exec_rc2 a12.4_exec_rc2 a12.5_exec_rc2 a12.6_exec_rc2 a12.7_exec_rc2 a12.8_exec_rc2 a12.9_exec_rc2 a12.10_exec_rc2 a12.11_exec_rc2 a12.12_exec_rc2 a12.13_exec_rc2 a12.14_exec_rc2 a12.15_exec_rc2 a12.16_exec_rc2 a12.17_exec_rc2 a12.18_exec_rc2 a12.19_exec_rc2 /MISSING=LISTWISE /CRITERIA=CLUSTER(6) MXITER(10) CONVERGE(0) /METHOD=KMEANS(NOUPDATE) /SAVE CLUSTER /PRINT INITIAL ANOVA.
Resources	Processor Time	0:00:00.688
	Elapsed Time	0:00:00.752
	Workspace Required	5888 bytes
Variables Created or Modified	QCL_1	Cluster Number of Case

[DataSet1]

C:_0_User\pg_sd\div\DomWork\Inquerito_Port\BaseEnviada_110127\BD_DW_20110310_2.sav

Initial Cluster Centers

	Cluster					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
a12.1_rc2 To clean the house (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	,00	1,00
a12.2_rc2 To tidy rooms (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	,00	,00	1,00	,00	1,00
a12.3_rc To do the laundry (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	,00	1,00	,00	,00	1,00
a12.4_rc To iron clothing (Y1/ N+M0)	,00	,00	1,00	1,00	,00	1,00
a12.5_rc To prepare the meals (S 1/ N+M 0)	1,00	,00	,00	,00	1,00	1,00
a12.6_rc To decide the meals (Y1/ N+M0)	,00	1,00	,00	1,00	1,00	1,00
a12.7_rc To wash the dishes (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	,00	,00	1,00	1,00	1,00
a12.8_rc To keep eye on children (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	,00	,00	1,00	1,00	,00
a12.9_rc To bring/take children from/to school (Y1/ N+M0)	,00	1,00	,00	,00	1,00	,00
a12.10_rc Meals for the children (Y1/ N+M0)	,00	,00	,00	1,00	1,00	,00
a12.11_rc Meals for dependent persons (Y1/ N+M0)	,00	,00	1,00	1,00	,00	,00
a12.12_rc Medication for dependent persons (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	,00
a12.13_rc To keep company (Y1/ N+M0)	,00	,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	,00
a12.14_rc To take care of animals/plants (Y1/ N+M0)	,00	,00	1,00	,00	,00	1,00
a12.15_rc To make shopping lists (Y1/ N+M0)	,00	,00	,00	1,00	1,00	1,00
a12.16_rc To go shopping (Y1/ N+M0)	,00	,00	1,00	,00	1,00	1,00
a12.17_rc To prepare receptions for people (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	,00	,00	,00	1,00	,00
a12.18_rc To help at celebrations/parties (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	,00	,00	,00	1,00	1,00
a12.19_rc To answer the phone / the door (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	,00

Iteration History^a

Iteratio n	Change in Cluster Centers					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1,758	1,711	1,726	1,588	2,332	1,407
2	,227	,092	,349	,439	,095	,278
3	,110	,064	,317	,411	,069	,169
4	,159	,055	,175	,136	,057	,162
5	,092	,025	,063	,055	,000	,097
6	,067	,026	,040	,025	,010	,072
7	,053	,058	,042	,049	,000	,058
8	,041	,000	,025	,047	,000	,038
9	,064	,010	,030	,018	,000	,028
10	,015	,000	,008	,000	,000	,010

a. Iterations stopped because the maximum number of iterations was performed.

Iterations failed to converge. The maximum absolute coordinate change for any center is ,010. The current iteration is 10. The minimum distance between initial centers is 3,000.

Final Cluster Centers

	Cluster					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
a12.1_rc2 To clean the house (Y1/ N+M0)	,99	,87	,98	,99	,99	,99
a12.2_rc2 To tidy rooms (Y1/ N+M0)	,97	,67	,96	,97	,99	,97
a12.3_rc To do the laundry (Y1/ N+M0)	,92	,30	,88	,82	,99	,90
a12.4_rc To iron clothing (Y1/ N+M0)	,94	,48	,94	,87	,99	,95
a12.5_rc To prepare the meals (S 1/ N+M 0)	,92	,10	,35	,95	,99	,98
a12.6_rc To decide the meals (Y1/ N+M0)	,27	,09	,12	,60	,96	,62
a12.7_rc To wash the dishes (Y1/ N+M0)	,84	,61	,85	,91	1,00	,93
a12.8_rc To keep eye on children (Y1/ N+M0)	,36	,09	,12	,06	,99	,68
a12.9_rc To bring/take children from/to school (Y1/ N+M0)	,18	,05	,04	,01	,98	,33
a12.10_rc Meals for the children (Y1/ N+M0)	,14	,05	,08	,07	,97	,64
a12.11_rc Meals for dependent persons (Y1/ N+M0)	,03	,05	,01	,80	,98	,04
a12.12_rc Medication for dependent persons (Y1/ N+M0)	,05	,05	,01	,77	,98	,04
a12.13_rc To keep company (Y1/ N+M0)	,21	,10	,08	,93	,98	,31
a12.14_rc To take care of animals/plants (Y1/ N+M0)	,02	,07	,82	,54	,95	,74
a12.15_rc To make shopping lists (Y1/ N+M0)	,14	,03	,13	,59	,98	,50
a12.16_rc To go shopping (Y1/ N+M0)	,29	,10	,23	,62	,98	,72
a12.17_rc To prepare receptions for people (Y1/ N+M0)	,08	,03	,04	,31	,94	,46
a12.18_rc To help at celebrations/parties (Y1/ N+M0)	,17	,07	,15	,31	,98	,64
a12.19_rc To answer the phone / the door (Y1/ N+M0)	,79	,24	,88	,87	,98	,94

ANOVA

	Cluster		Error		F	Sig.
	Mean Square	df	Mean Square	df		
a12.1_rc2 To clean the house (Y1/ N+M0)	,414	5	,029	934	14,335	,000
a12.2_rc2 To tidy rooms (Y1/ N+M0)	2,443	5	,062	934	39,582	,000
a12.3_rc To do the laundry (Y1/ N+M0)	10,398	5	,103	934	100,531	,000
a12.4_rc To iron clothing (Y1/ N+M0)	6,051	5	,088	934	69,125	,000
a12.5_rc To prepare the meals (S 1/ N+M 0)	24,347	5	,086	934	283,158	,000
a12.6_rc To decide the meals (Y1/ N+M0)	19,364	5	,142	934	136,173	,000
a12.7_rc To wash the dishes (Y1/ N+M0)	2,986	5	,112	934	26,764	,000
a12.8_rc To keep eye on children (Y1/ N+M0)	22,816	5	,120	934	190,077	,000
a12.9_rc To bring/take children from/to school (Y1/ N+M0)	21,801	5	,086	934	253,226	,000
a12.10_rc Meals for the children (Y1/ N+M0)	24,317	5	,096	934	253,821	,000
a12.11_rc Meals for dependent persons (Y1/ N+M0)	29,731	5	,043	934	688,728	,000
a12.12_rc Medication for dependent persons (Y1/ N+M0)	28,927	5	,047	934	615,511	,000
a12.13_rc To keep company (Y1/ N+M0)	24,753	5	,108	934	229,820	,000
a12.14_rc To take care of animals/plants (Y1/ N+M0)	25,521	5	,114	934	224,375	,000
a12.15_rc To make shopping lists (Y1/ N+M0)	21,461	5	,122	934	176,039	,000
a12.16_rc To go shopping (Y1/ N+M0)	18,846	5	,150	934	125,540	,000
a12.17_rc To prepare receptions for people (Y1/ N+M0)	21,040	5	,101	934	207,820	,000
a12.18_rc To help at celebrations/parties (Y1/ N+M0)	21,101	5	,126	934	167,033	,000
a12.19_rc To answer the phone / the door (Y1/ N+M0)	12,488	5	,107	934	117,183	,000

The F tests should be used only for descriptive purposes because the clusters have been chosen to maximize the differences among cases in different clusters. The observed significance levels are not corrected for this and thus cannot be interpreted as tests of the hypothesis that the cluster means are equal.

Number of Cases in each Cluster

Cluster	1	154,000
	2	165,000
	3	190,000
	4	97,000
	5	166,000
	6	168,000
Valid		940,000
Missing		,000

Cluster	Nr. of persons	Activity profile according to above table “Final Cluster Centres”
1	154	All tasks apart from caring for dependent people, i.e. including caring of children
2	165	Almost exclusively cleaning, i.e. all tasks relating to cleaning; no care of people, no shopping, no meals
3	190	Cleaning as well as caring of animal or plants; no caring of people, no meals, no shopping
4	97	All tasks apart from caring for children, i.e. including caring of elderly, sick, or dependent people
5	166	All tasks, without significant exception (“all-rounders”)
6	168	All tasks, except caring for people – children or dependent – i.e. cleaning, but also shopping, and preparing of meals
Valid	940	
Missing	,000	

Tables

Notes to the tables

1. *Social status of employers*: hypothetically reconstructed on the basis of answers on the nature of the interviewees' work. "Upper": three or more bathrooms, two or more employees, bedroom rate of occupation of one person or less per room. "Lower": up to two bathrooms, bedroom rate of occupation above 1,25. "Middle (with office)": all others, while one or more rooms in the house are qualified as "office". "Middle (without office)": all others, while none of the rooms is qualified as office. (More on this variable under point A (b) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

2. *Activity profile*: The questionnaire includes a list of nineteen performed tasks. The answers given on the basis of this list (questions A12.1 to A12.19) were analysed per cluster analysis (see Annex 1, to be compared with annex 1 of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011), which led to the definition of six categories:

- category 1: All tasks apart from caring for elderly, sick, or dependent people, i.e. including caring of children;
- category 2: Almost exclusively cleaning, i.e. all tasks relating to cleaning; no care of people, no shopping, no meals;
- category 3: Cleaning as well as caring of animal or plants; no caring of people, no meals, no shopping;
- category 4: All tasks apart from caring for children, i.e. including caring of elderly, sick or dependent people;
- category 5: All tasks, without significant exception ("all-rounders");
- category 6: All tasks, except caring for people – children or dependent – i.e. cleaning, but also shopping and preparing of meals.

(More on this variable under point A (c) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

3. *Average duration relationship of employment*: Estimated on the basis of three answers to the questionnaire: how long do the interviewee work in this type of activity (A; question A5)? In how many houses has she/he worked since the beginning of her/his career (B; question A7)? In how many houses does she/he work for the moment (C; question A10)? The estimated average duration was calculated on the basis of the following formula: [Estimated average duration of employment relationship = $A/B * C$].

(More on this variable under point A (c) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

4. Total number per category : In principle, the total number of cases per variable, summing up the number of cases par category, should equal the total number of people interviewed generally considered in the table (for Portugal: 684). However, this total number may be lower. This is the case every time that answers are missing in some of the completed questionnaires. Example: three questionnaires completed in Portugal do not indicate the nationality of the interviewee; total of valid answers on this point: 681; see Table 0.1 (P), row [1], column [F].

5. With employer a relationship of conflict: Based on question C3, asking for a qualification of the relationship with the employer, and submitting successively the following qualifications: “Relationship of friendship”, “Relationship of trust”, “Relationship of conflict”; possible answers on the three qualifications are: “Yes”, “No”, “Don’t know”.

6. *Troubles with colleagues (hypothetical)*: When questioned on the quality of their relationship with colleagues, nobody among the interviewees chooses the answers “bad” or “very bad”. However, several people who reported to work in a house together with other employees did not answer at all this question. We considered such cases as an indicator of an uncomfortable relationship.

(More on this hypothesis under point B (a) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

7. *General level of satisfaction*: The interviewees had to indicate their general level of satisfaction with their job on the following scale: “Very pleased” / “Satisfied” / “Not very satisfied” / “Not satisfied at all” (D6). The number of very negative answers is extremely low (5 answers; less than 1%). This is why we merged them with the answers “Not very satisfied” (8%; 55; both categories merged: 8,8%).

(More on the answers to this question under point B (c) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

8. *Reports three or more specific motives of dissatisfaction*: variable calculated on the basis of the answers to the different specific motives of (dis-)satisfaction (question D5, partly analysed in tables 1.1: Tasks executed, work schedule, amount of work, salary, work environment, autonomy / decision making.

(More on this variable under point B (c) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

9. *Would you prefer to work through a cleaning company ?* Here we considered only the “No” answers to this question given by domestic workers hired directly by the people they work for.

(More on the interpretation of this answer under point B (c) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011; more on people employed by companies under point A (b))

10. *Low salary indicating abuse*: In Portugal, the current minimum wage, applicable to domestic workers, is defined by the law as a monthly wage of 485 euros. On this basis, a minimum hourly wage would be about 2.40 euros (485 euros / [4.5 weeks * 44 hours]). The variable registers all cases in which the hourly salary, directly indicated or estimated on the basis of other answers, is below this threshold. This proportion has to be interpreted taking into account that in a significant proportion of cases, the relevant information was not available. The real proportion of cases of salaries below the threshold is presumably higher than the one we were in condition to calculate. In the case of the other countries analysed, we consider as relevant levels, on the basis of the information supplied by the members of our network based in these countries, the following amounts: Brazil – 1.16 euros, India – 0.20 euros, Mozambique – 0.17, United Kingdom – 2,84 euros.

(More on this variable under point B (e) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

11 *Working time excessive*: Taking into account current Portuguese legislation, the three following situations were included in this category: more than six days a week, more than 26 days a month, more than 8.5 hours a day. Cases in which at least one of these conditions is fulfilled were considered as cases of excessive working schedule.

Same comment as in the previous note: this proportion has to be interpreted taking into account that in a significant proportion of cases, the relevant information was not available. The real proportion of cases of excessive working schedule is presumably higher than the one we were in condition to calculate.

The same criterion was used to analyse the answers collected in Brazil, India and the United Kingdom. In the case of Mozambique, we were obliged to apply a more tolerant criteria: 12 instead of 8,5 hours a day as third possible level indicating abuse. Applying the same criterion as in the other countries leads to 100% of probably excessive time schedule, thus making any comparison impossible.

(More on this variable under point B (e) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

12 *Less than 1.5 hour per room a week (indice of workload)*: Knowing the number of rooms of the house where the person works (or of the house where she spends the major part of her working time); and, in a majority of cases, how many hours she works in that house per week, and admitting that all rooms have to be cleaned up at least once a week, we calculated the following indice: number of rooms divided by the number of weekly hours = number of rooms, or else, in most cases, the fraction of room a worker has to clean up in one hour. The more important this fraction, the heavier the workload. We considered 0.66 (the worker has less than 1.5 hours available per week for the cleaning of one room) as a significant threshold, since it differentiates in Portugal a group of 9.7%.

Same comment as in the previous note: this proportion has to be interpreted taking into account that in a significant proportion of cases, the relevant information was not available. The real proportion of cases of excessive workload is presumably higher than the one we were in condition to calculate.

Just as in the case of the excessive working time, we had here to create a separate variable for Mozambique, in order to make differences visible. The relevant threshold had to be less than 15 hours a room-week (situation faced by 12% of the interviewees).

(More on this variable under point B (e) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

13 *Maternity leave denied*: Question E10.1 asks: “Did you get the maternity leave?” “No” answers were considered as due to a refusal from the part of the employer.

14 *Hired under 16 within the last ten years*: This minimum age in Portugal is nowadays 16. Age when the person started to work as domestic worker was calculated according to the formula: current age [H1] minus years working as domestic worker [A5]. We restricted the analysis to the cases that occurred during the last ten years before the application of the questionnaire (since 1998). In the other countries compared, we considered the following minimum ages, on the basis of the information supplied by the members of our network based in these countries: Brazil and United Kingdom – 16, India – 14, Mozambique – 15.

(More on this variable under point B (e) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

15 *Employment contract in principle useful*: Interviewees had the opportunity to accept the following statement “Written contracts are worthless within employers’ homes”. We considered that interviewees reacting with a “No” to this statement do consider a contract as in principle useful.

(More on this variable under point B (f) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

16 *Employment contract positively valued*: Interviewees had to indicate if they agree, or not, with several statements about contracts, such as: “Serve to guarantee your rights”, “Serve to resolve conflicts between employers and employees” and “Serve to protect you as a worker”. We considered the proportion of people who agreed with these three statements as an indication of positive valuation of contracts.

(More on this variable under point B (e) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

17 *Asked for a written employment contract*: There is no direct question in this sense in the questionnaire. This variable was constructed adding those people who answered “Yes” to the question “Do you currently have a written employment contract?”, and those who answered “The employer didn’t want one” or “Waiting for the employer to do it” to the question: “Why don’t you have a written contract?” The calculated figures only offer an estimate, and the proportion of cases in which the interviewee really did ask for a contract is certainly lower than the one displayed: the existing contract might be a result of the employer’s initiative; and interviewees might answer they are waiting for a contract, while they did not explicitly asked for it.

(More on this variable under point B (e) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

18 *Left house*: People who answered “Yes” at least to one of the following points: “Left house because the salary was insufficient”, “Left house because I disliked the tasks I was obliged to perform”, “Left house because of heavy work schedule”.

(More on this variable under point B (e) of Dinâmia-CET Working Paper 1/2011)

Tables summarizing the data on domestic work, from a socio-legal point of view

(2nd version, issued 20 April 2011)

**Table 0.1 General characterization of the people interviewed
Main general and personal variables - Comparative Tables**

[%] in rows (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	Nationality (Portugal only)					Age						Social status of employers (hypoth.) ¹					Gender		
	Categories		[B] Brazil	[C] Eastern Europe	[D] Africa (PALOP)	[E] Portugal	[F]	[G] until 30	[H] 31-40	[I] 41-50	[J] 51-60	[K] 61 and more	[L]	[M] lower	[N] middle (without office)	[O] middle (with office)	[P] upper	[Q]	[R] female	[S] male	[T]
Brazil	[1]	116	-	-	-	-	-	16.5	26.1	35.7	16.5	5.2	100	8.8	54.0	27.4	9.7	99.9	97.4	2.6	100
India	[2]	65	-	-	-	-	-	33.8	35.4	23.1	6.2	1.5	100	3.1	64.1	7.8	25.0	100	100	0	100
Mozambique	[3]	50	-	-	-	-	-	81.6	10.2	6.1	2.0	0.0	100	2.3	93	4.7	0	100	18.4	81.6	100
Portugal	[4]	684	12,2	8,4	12,5	67,0	100	17,7	23,4	30,8	21,1	7,1	100	13,5	33,4	48,2	4,9	100	99,7	0,3	100
United Kingdom	[5]	25	-	-	-	-	-	24.0	24.0	28.0	16.0	8.0	100	20.0	24.0	52.0	4.0	100	92.0	8.0	100

Table 0.1 (Compl.)

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	[B] Illiterate	[C] Elem. literacy, no schooling	[D] 4 years	[E] 5-6 years	[F] 7-9 years	[G] 10-12 years	[H] More than 12 years	[I]	Average nr. of years [J]
	Categories										
Brazil	[1]	102	0	0	26.5	16.7	27.5	26.5	2.9	100	7.4
India	[2]	38	0	0	36.8	34.2	15.8	13.2	0	100	5.6
Mozambique	[3]	45	24.4	13.3	28.9	8.9	20.0	4.4	0	100	4.0
Portugal	[4]	612	1.6	5.2	33.4	16.1	19.3	17.8	6.4	100	7.2
United Kingdom	[5]	25	0	0	16.0	4.0	16.0	32.0	32.0	100	11.0
General	[6]										7.1

Age (average)
42,2
36,1
24,7
43,2
41,2
41,5

Table 0.2 Characteristics of activity according to main general and personal variables - Comparative Tables

[%] in rows (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, issued 20 April 2011)

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	In how many houses working at present?					Activity profile ²							Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³					
	Categories		[B] 1	[C] 2	[D] 3	[E] 4 or more	[F]	[G] Care of children included	[H] Cleaning, almost excl.	[I] Care of animals or plants included	[J] Care of adults included	[K] All-rounders	[L] Cleaning and meals	[M]	[N] less than one year	[O] 1-3 years	[P] 3-5 years	[Q] 5-10 years	[R] More than 10 years	[S]
Brazil	[1]	116	64.6	15.0	8.0	12.4	100	16.4	8.6	12.9	9.5	27.6	25.0	100	10.1	27.5	18.3	28.4	15.6	100
India	[2]	65	32.3	16.9	21.5	29.2	100	9.2	63.1	6.2	12.3	1.5	7.7	100	10.8	24.6	18.5	30.8	15.4	100
Mozambique	[3]	50	95.3	4.7	0	0	100	10.0	22.0	22.0	0	6.0	40.0	100	38.5	35.9	17.9	5.1	2.6	100
Portugal	[4]	684	43,6	24,7	14,9	16,7	100	16,6	19,4	21,9	10,3	18,9	12,9	100	11,1	25,0	20,9	24,3	18,7	100
United Kingdom	[5]	25	58.3	12.5	8.3	20.8	100	28.0	28.0	24.0	8.0	4.0	8.0	100	10.0	30.0	25.0	25.0	10.0	100

		How many houses? (average)	Average Duration of employment per employer (average)
Brazil		1,95	6,60
India		2,78	6,24
Mozambique		1,05	2,58
Portugal		2,25	6,88
United Kingdom		2,29	4,60

Table 1.1

Experiences of discomfort - Comparative Tables

Proportion [%] of people "not satisfied" for specific reasons

Their relationship with personal and general variables (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, issued 20 April 2011)

	Reasons for being not satisfied		Salary		Amount of work		Nature of tasks		Work environment				
	Indicators		[B] Not satisfied	[C] Left house(s) for this reason	[D] Not satisfied	[E] Left house(s) for this reason	[F] Not satisfied	[G] Left house(s) for this reason	[H] Work environment in gen.	[I] With employer a relationship of conflict ⁵	[J] Troubles with colleagues (hypoth.) ⁶	[K] Left house(s) because of relationship difficulties	
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people giving these answers										[L] Average [B][D][F][H]
Brazil	[1]	116	43.1	45.7	24.1	19.8	6.0	10.3	3.4	2.6	6.0	25.9	19.2
India	[2]	65	43.1	33.8	13.8	29.2	10.8	12.3	3.1	3.1	16.9	33.8	17.7
Mozambique	[3]	50	74.0	68.0	40.0	26.0	18.0	20.0	10.0	14.0	2.0	32.0	35.5
Portugal	[4]	684	29,2	29,1	17,5	15,5	4,7	6,9	2,2	1,3	3,2	14,3	13,4
United Kingdom	[5]	25	20.0	40.0	8.0	12.0	4.0	8.0	4.0	0	4.0	16.0	9

Table 1.2 Situations encountered, in detail - Comparative Tables
 Proportion [%] of people who encountered the referred situation

Their relationship with personal and general variables (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, issued 20 April 2011)

Types of situation		Situations encountered	Issues of money					Excessive demands					Forms of Violence					Violation of rights			
			[B] Benefits unpaid	[C] social security unpaid	[D] Un paid over overtime	[E] Wage arrears	[F] Average	[G] Denial of rest times	[H] Tasks not originally agreed	[I] Obligated to perform a task against will	[J] Denial of vacations	[K] Average	[L] Physical violence	[M] Sexual harassment	[N] Psychological violence	[O] Discrimination	[P] Average	[Q] Personal documents taken away	[R] Prevented from joining social org.	[S] Average	[T] Lack of food
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people to whom it happened																		
Brazil	[1]	116	42.2	53.4	33.6	47.4	44.2	19.8	46.6	26.7	16.4	27.4	0.9	15.5	16.4	13.8	11.7	5.2	1.7	3.5	11.2
India	[2]	65	13.8	24.6	7.7	41.5	21.9	10.8	43.1	21.5	23.1	24.6	6.2	7.7	15.4	13.8	10.8	0	0	0	16.9
Mozambique	[3]	50	38.0	42.0	38.0	64.0	45.5	30.0	66.0	28.0	46.0	42.5	4.0	4.0	28.0	8.0	11.0	0	4.0	2.0	6.0
Portugal	[4]	684	40,1	34,1	46,2	33,6	38,5	13,2	35,4	15,4	14,5	19,6	1,3	5,4	9,9	13,2	7,5	1,0	,9	1,0	5,8
United Kingdom	[5]	25	4.0	0	8.0	8.0	5	0	4.0	4.0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.0	2	4.0

Table 1.3 Signs of general dissatisfaction - Comparative Tables

Proportion [%] of people to the following questions an answer revealing dissatisfaction

Their relationship with personal and general variables (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, issued 20 April 2011)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? ⁹
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all ⁷	Yes ⁸	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people giving these answers								
Brazil	[1]	116	13.8	14.7	69.0	54.3	60.3	36.2	35.3	43.9	21.6
India	[2]	65	13.8	6.2	44.6	67.7	61.5	20.0	15.4	32.3	26.2
Mozambique	[3]	50	52.0	50.0	96.0	62.0	50.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	44.0
Portugal	[4]	684	8,8	5,8	62,1	55,1	58,9	51,8	36,1	46,2	9,8
United Kingdom	[5]	25	8.0	4.0	84.0	32.0	36.0	52.0	4.0	30.7	4.0

Table 2.1 Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - Comparative Tables

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

Their relationship with personal and general variables (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, issued 20 April 2011)

	Types of irregularities		Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations						Child Labour
	Situations considered		(B) Social security not paid	(C) Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	(D) Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	(E) Employer refuses to sign contract	(F) Salary below official minimum wage ¹⁰	(G) Working time excessive ¹¹	(H) Less than 1,5 hour per room-week ¹²	(I) Accident at work	(J) Worker had to pay health costs	(K) Irreg. answers % of (I)	(L) Maternity	(M) Maternity leave denied ¹³	(N) Irreg. answers % of (L)	(O) Hired under official minimum age within the last 10 years ¹⁴
		(A) Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people to which it applies													
Brazil	[1]	116	37.9	35.1	6.9	12.1	33.6	41.4	1.7	6.9	2.6	37.7	17.2	0.9	5.2	4.3
India	[2]	65	58.5	41.7	0	0	46.2	75.4	6.2	18.5	12.3	66.5	13.8	15.4	111.6	3.1
Mozambique	[3]	50	56.0	85.7	2.0	2.0	78.0	100.0	0.0	16.0	4.0	25.0	4.0	0	0	24.0
Portugal	[4]	684	44,0	32,9	3,2	6,6	9,1	10,8	11,4	12,6	1,9	15,1	16,5	4,7	28,5	0,9
United Kingdom	[5]	25	64.0	8.0	0	4.0	0.0	4.0	28.0	4.0	16.0	400	8.0	12.0	150	0

10. Relevant levels, on the basis of the information supplied by the members of our network based in these countries, the following amounts: Brazil – 1.16 euros, India – 0.20 euros, Mozambique – 0.17, United Kingdom – 2,84 euros.

11. The general criterion was: one of three conditions fulfilled (more than six days a week, more than 26 days a month, more than 8.5 hours a day). In the Tables on Mozambique, in order to reveal differences made invisible by the figure calculated on this basis (100%), we applied a slightly different criterion (more than six days a week, more than 26 days a month, more than 12 hours a day). The average frequency of excessive working time calculated on the basis of this different criterion is 86%.

12. The general criterion was: less than 1,5 hour available a week to clean up room. In the national tables for Mozambique, it had to be less than 15 hours, a threshold that allows us to differentiate a proportion of 12% of the interviewees.

14. Minimum ages, on the basis of the information supplied by the members of our network based in these countries: Brazil and United Kingdom – 16, India – 14, Mozambique – 15.

(Other notes and more on notes 10, 11, 12, 14, see the section opening these tables).

Table 3.1 Relationship to the law – Status, attitudes, actions - Comparative Tables

Proportion [%] of people answering “yes” to the following questions

Their relationship with personal and general variables (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, issued 20 April 2011)

		Attitudes						Status		Actions			
		[B] Employment contract in principle useful ¹⁵	[C] Employment contract positively valued ¹⁶	[D] Would go to court to defend rights	[E] Thinks Work inspection would help (where she has worked).	[F] Thinks Work inspection would help (in general)	[G] Employment contract signed	[H] Member of a union	[I] Asked for an written employment contract ¹⁷	[J] Searched for association or union	[K] Left house ¹⁸	[L] Went to court	
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people to which it applies										
Brazil	[1]	116	70.7	51.7	76.7	50.0	63.8	33.9	2.6	49.1	7.8	56.9	8.6
India	[2]	65	29.2	29.2	16.9	24.6	29.2	0	4.6	0	6.2	50.8	0
Mozambique	[3]	50	8.0	42.0	84.0	80.0	88.0	2.0	0	4.0	0	70.0	2.0
Portugal	[4]	684	51,0	46,3	64,3	25,7	41,7	28,9	6,4	40,5	5,7	38,5	2,9
United Kingdom	[5]	25	48.0	76.0	60.0	36.0	44.0	28.0	8.0	32.0	0	44.0	4.0

Tables summarizing the data on domestic work, from a socio-legal point of view

(2nd version, 24 March 2011)

Table 0.1 (BR) General characterization of the people interviewed

Main general and personal variables - Brazil

[%] in rows (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Variables	[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	Schooling							Age						Social status of employers (hypoht.) ¹					Gender		
			[B] No schooling	[C] 4 years	[D] 5-6 years	[E] 7-9 years	[F] 10-12 years	[G] More than 12 years	[H]	[I] until 30	[J] 31-40	[K] 41-50	[L] 51-60	[M] 61 and more	[N]	[O] lower	[P] middle (without office)	[Q] middle (with office)	[R] upper	[S]	[T] female	[U] male	[V]
Interviewees (Nr.)	[1]	116	0	27	17	28	27	3	102	19	30	41	19	6	115	10	61	31	11	113	113	3	116
Interviewees %	[2]		0	26.5	16.7	27.5	26.5	2.9	100	16.5	26.1	35.7	16.5	5.2	100	8.8	54.0	27.4	9.7	99.9	97.4	2.6	100
Place of interview	[3]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[4]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[5]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[6]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Schooling	[7] No schooling	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[8] 4 years	27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.1	25.9	33.3	18.5	11.1	100	19.2	42.3	26.9	11.5	100	100	0	100
	[9] 5-6 years	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.9	35.3	41.2	17.6	0	100	0	64.7	29.4	5.9	100	94.1	5.9	100
	[10] 7-9 years	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.8	25.9	40.7	18.5	0	100	3.6	57.1	25.0	14.3	100	96.4	3.6	100
	[11] 10-12 years	27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37.0	29.6	25.9	7.4	0	100	7.4	63.0	22.2	7.4	100	100	0	100
	[12] More than 12 years	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33.3	0	66.7	0	0	100	0	33.3	33.3	33.3	100	100	0	100
Age	[13] until 30	19	-	15.8	5.3	21.1	52.6	5.3	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	72.2	16.7	11.1	100	100	0	100
	[14] 31-40	30	-	25.0	21.4	25.0	28.6	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.0	53.3	23.3	13.3	100	100	0	100
	[15] 41-50	41	-	25.0	19.4	30.6	19.4	5.6	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	60.0	22.5	12.5	100	100	0	100
	[16] 51-60	19	-	33.3	20.0	33.3	13.3	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.5	31.6	57.9		100	84.2	15.8	100
	[17] 61 and more	6	-	100	0	0	0	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	20.0	20.0		100	100	0	100
Social status of employers (hypoht.)	[18] lower	10	-	62.5	0	12.5	25.0	0	100	0	30.0	20.0	20.0	30.0	100	-	-	-	-	-	100	0	100
	[19] middle (without office)	61	-	19.6	19.6	28.6	30.4	1.8	100	21.7	26.7	40.0	10.0	1.7	100	-	-	-	-	-	96.7	3.3	100
	[20] middle (with office)	31	-	26.9	19.2	26.9	23.1	3.8	100	9.7	22.6	29.0	35.5	3.2	100	-	-	-	-	-	96.8	3.2	100
	[21] upper	11	-	27.3	9.1	36.4	18.2	9.1	100	18.2	36.4	45.5	0	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	100	0	100

Table 1.1-B (BR) Experiences of discomfort - Brazil

Proportion [%] of people “not satisfied” for specific reasons

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, 24 March 2011)

	Reasons for being not satisfied		Salary		Amount of work		Nature of tasks		Work environment				
	Indicators		[B] Not satisfied	[C] Left house(s) for this reason	[D] Not satisfied	[E] Left house(s) for this reason	[F] Not satisfied	[G] Left house(s) for this reason	[H] Work environment in gen.	[I] With employer a relationship of conflict ⁵	[J] Troubles with colleagues (hypoth.) ⁶	[K] Left house(s) because of relationship difficulties	[L] Average [B][D][F][H]
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people giving these answers										
All interviewees	[1]	116	43.1	45.7	24.1	19.8	6.0	10.3	3.4	2.6	6.0	25.9	19.2
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	73	46.6	39.7	26.0	19.2	5.5	6.8	4.1	2.7	5.5	23.3	20.6
	[3] 2	17	35.3	41.2	17.6	29.4	5.9	17.6	0	0	17.6	35.3	14.7
	[4] 3	9	55.6	77.8	22.2	0	0	22.2	11.1	0	0	33.3	22.2
	[5] 4 or more	14	14.3	57.1	21.4	28.6	7.1	7.1	0	7.1	0	21.4	10.7
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	19	52.6	36.8	26.3	31.6	10.5	10.5	0	0	0	15.8	22.4
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	10	10.0	40.0	0	10.0	0	20.0	0	0	10.0	10.0	2.5
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	15	53.3	66.7	26.7	13.3	0	13.3	6.7	6.7	0	33.3	21.7
	[9] Care of adults included	11	45.5	27.3	27.3	9.1	9.1	9.1	0	0	45.5	36.4	20.5
	[10] All-rounders	32	43.8	43.8	34.4	21.9	9.4	6.3	6.3	0	3.1	18.8	23.5
	[11] Cleaning and meals	29	41.4	51.7	17.2	20.7	3.4	10.3	3.4	6.9	0	37.9	16.4
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	11	63.6	18.2	45.5	18.2	18.2	0	9.1	0	9.1	0	34.1
	[13] 1-3 years	30	50.0	56.7	40.0	30.0	6.7	6.7	0	6.7	10.0	43.3	24.2
	[14] 3-5 years	20	30.0	35.0	20.0	10.0	0	10.0	5.0	0	10.0	25.0	13.8
	[15] 5-10 years	31	32.3	38.7	12.9	22.6	6.5	16.1	3.2	0	3.2	19.4	13.7
	[16] More than 10 years	17	47.1	58.8	5.9	11.8	0	11.8	0	0	0	23.5	13.3

Table 1.2-B (BR) Situations encountered, in detail - Brazil

Proportion [%] of people who encountered the referred situation

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, 24 March 2011)

Types of situation		Issues of money						Excessive demands					Forms of Violence				Violation of rights				
	Situations encountered	[B] Benefits unpaid	[C] social security unpaid	[D] Un paid over overtime	[E] Wage arrears	[F] Average	[G] Denial of rest times	[H] Tasks not originally agreed	[I] Obligated to perform a task against will	[J] Denial of vacations	[K] Average	[L] Physical violence	[M] Sexual harassment	[N] Psychological violence	[O] Discrimination	[P] Average	[Q] Personal documents taken away	[R] Prevented from joining social org.	[S] Average	[T] Lack of food	
	Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people to whom it happened				Average proportion					Average proportion				Average proportion			Average proportion			
All interviewees	[1]	116	42.2	53.4	33.6	47.4	44.2	19.8	46.6	26.7	16.4	27.4	0.9	15.5	16.4	13.8	11.7	5.2	1.7	3.5	11.2
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	73	37.0	52.1	34.2	49.3	43.2	23.3	47.9	24.7	16.4	28.1	1.4	9.6	19.2	9.6	10.0	2.7	1.4	2.1	12.3
	[3] 2	17	41.2	47.1	29.4	29.4	36.8	17.6	29.4	29.4		19.1	0	23.5	5.9	11.8	10.3	11.8	0	5.9	17.6
	[4] 3	9	55.6	66.7	55.6	66.7	61.2	11.1	66.7	22.2	33.3	33.3	0	22.2	33.3	44.4	25.0	0	0	0.0	0
	[5] 4 or more	14	50.0	57.1	21.4	42.9	42.9	7.1	35.7	42.9	21.4	26.8	0	28.6	7.1	21.4	14.3	14.3	7.1	10.7	7.1
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	19	36.8	52.6	31.6	63.2	46.1	10.5	52.6	31.6	21.1	29.0	0	5.3	10.5	10.5	6.6	0	5.3	2.7	5.3
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	10	30.0	30.0	30.0	10.0	25.0	20.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	20.0	0	20.0	10.0	30.0	15.0	10.0	0	5.0	10.0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	15	66.7	53.3	40.0	73.3	58.3	33.3	66.7	40.0	33.3	43.3	0	20.0	26.7	0	11.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7
	[9] Care of adults included	11	54.5	54.5	18.2	18.2	36.4	27.3	45.5	27.3	9.1	27.3	9.1	9.1	18.2	9.1	11.4	18.2	0	9.1	18.2
	[10] All-rounders	32	40.6	53.1	40.6	56.3	47.7	25.0	31.3	25.0	9.4	22.7	0	18.8	15.6	18.8	13.3	3.1	0	1.6	6.3
	[11] Cleaning and meals	29	34.5	62.1	31.0	37.9	41.4	10.3	55.2	20.7	17.2	25.9	0	17.2	17.2	13.8	12.1	3.4	0	1.7	20.7
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	11	36.4	54.5	36.4	45.5	43.2	36.4	27.3	0	9.1	18.2	9.1	9.1	9.1	27.3	13.7	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1
	[13] 1-3 years	30	60.0	60.0	40.0	53.3	53.3	30.0	66.7	36.4	23.3	39.1	0	23.3	26.7	3.3	13.3	6.7	0	3.4	23.3
	[14] 3-5 years	20	40.0	60.0	45.0	60.0	51.3	10.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	27.5	0	0	20.0	20.0	10.0	0	0	0.0	5.0
	[15] 5-10 years	31	32.3	38.7	22.6	41.9	33.9	16.1	29.0	15.0	9.7	17.5	0	16.1	16.1	22.6	13.7	6.5	0	3.3	12.9
	[16] More than 10	17	35.3	52.9	17.6	29.4	33.8	11.8	41.2	29.0	29.4	27.9	0	17.6	5.9	5.9	7.4	5.9	5.9	5.9	0

Table 1.3-B (BR) Signs of general dissatisfaction - Brazil

Proportion [%] of people to the following questions an answer revealing dissatisfaction

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, 24 March 2011)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? ⁹
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all ⁷	Yes ⁸	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people giving these answers								
All interviewees	[1]	116	13.8	14.7	69.0	54.3	60.3	36.2	35.3	43.9	21.6
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	73	16.4	17.8	74.0	56.2	58.9	24.7	30.1	37.9	24.7
	[3] 2	17	5.9	5.9	47.1	35.3	58.8	41.2	35.3	45.1	0
	[4] 3	9	11.1	11.1	66.7	66.7	66.7	44.4	44.4	51.8	11.1
	[5] 4 or more	14	14.3	7.1	64.3	50.0	64.3	92.9	50.0	69.1	28.6
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	19	15.8	15.8	73.7	47.4	42.1	31.6	36.8	36.8	36.8
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	10	0	0	60.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	30.0	43.3	10.0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	15	13.3	20.0	86.7	60.0	73.3	33.3	26.7	44.4	13.3
	[9] Care of adults included	11	18.2	18.2	81.8	63.6	72.7	18.2	45.5	45.5	27.3
	[10] All-rounders	32	25.0	21.9	68.8	50.0	59.4	40.6	37.5	45.8	21.9
	[11] Cleaning and meals	29	3.4	6.9	55.2	58.6	65.5	37.9	34.5	46.0	17.2
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	11	27.3	27.3	90.9	36.4	45.5	27.3	18.2	30.3	54.5
	[13] 1-3 years	30	10.0	20.0	73.3	60.0	70.0	30.0	33.3	44.4	20.0
	[14] 3-5 years	20	15.0	15.0	55.0	45.0	55.0	40.0	45.0	46.7	15.0
	[15] 5-10 years	31	19.4	9.7	64.5	51.6	58.1	38.7	32.3	43.0	12.9
	[16] More than 10 years	17	5.9	0	70.6	70.6	58.8	52.9	47.1	52.9	23.5

Table 2.1-B (BR) Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - Brazil

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, 24 March 2011)

	Types of irregularities		Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations						Child Labour
	Situations considered		[B] Social security not paid	[C] Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	[D] Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	[E] Employer refuses to sign contract	[F] Salary below 1.16 euros ¹⁰	[G] Working time excessive ¹¹	[H] Less than 1,5 hour per room-week ¹²	[I] Accident at work	[J] Worker had to pay health costs	[K] Irreg. answers % of [I]	[L] Maternity	[M] Maternity leave denied ¹³	[N] Irreg. answers % of [L]	[O] Hired under 16 within the last 10 years ¹⁴
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people to which it applies													
All interviewees	[1]	116	37.9	35.1	6.9	12.1	33.6	41.4	1.7	6.9	2.6	37.7	17.2	0.9	5.2	4.3
In how many h. working at present?	[2] 1	73	31.5	31.0	6.8	9.6	42.5	39.7	0	6.8	4.1	60.3	15.1	0	0	5.5
	[3] 2	17	35.3	17.6	5.9	23.5	11.8	41.2	0	17.6	0	0	23.5	0	0	5.9
	[4] 3	9	44.4	55.6	22.2	22.2	0	66.7	11.1	0	0	0	22.2	11.1	50	0
	[5] 4 or more	14	64.3	50.0	0	7.1	35.7	42.9	7.1	0	0	0	21.4	0	0	0
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	19	31.6	31.6	10.5	10.5	52.6	47.4	0	10.5	0	0	26.3	0	0	5.3
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	10	40.0	11.1	0	20.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	0	0	0	10.0	10.0	100	0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	15	46.7	66.7	0	13.3	46.7	40.0	6.7	0	0	0	6.7	0	0	6.7
	[9] Care of adults included	11	45.5	9.1	18.2	27.3	18.2	36.4	0	0	0	0	18.2	0	0	0
	[10] All-rounders	32	40.6	38.7	9.4	3.1	21.9	40.6	0	15.6	9.4	0	18.8	0	0	0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	29	31.0	34.5	3.4	13.8	37.9	31.0	0	3.4	0	0	17.2	0	0	10.3
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	11	54.5	30.0	0	18.2	45.5	36.4	0	18.2	9.1	50	9.1	0	0	9.1
	[13] 1-3 years	30	40.0	46.7	10.0	10.0	53.3	30.0	0	3.3	3.3	100	16.7	0	0	13.3
	[14] 3-5 years	20	25.0	40.0	15.0	0	20.0	40.0	0	5.0	5.0	100	15.0	0	0	0
	[15] 5-10 years	31	48.4	30.0	6.5	12.9	29.0	54.8	3.2	6.5	0	0	19.4	0	0	0
	[16] More than 10	17	17.6	17.6	0	17.6	17.6	0	5.9	11.8	0	0	29.4	5.9	20.1	0

Table 3.1-B (BR) Relationship to the law – Status, attitudes, actions - Brazil

Proportion [%] of people answering “yes” to the following questions

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, 24 March 2011)

		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	Attitudes				Status		Actions				
			[B] Employment contract in principle useful ¹⁵	[C] Employment contract positively valued ¹⁶	[D] Would go to court to defend rights	[E] Thinks Work inspection would help (where she has worked).	[F] Thinks Work inspection would help (in general)	[G] Employment contract signed	[H] Member of a union	[I] Asked for a written employment contract ¹⁷	[J] Searched for association or union	[K] Left house ¹⁸	[L] Went to court
All interviewees	[1]	116	70.7	51.7	76.7	50.0	63.8	33.9	2.6	49.1	7.8	56.9	8.6
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	73	68.5	49.3	79.5	46.6	64.4	45.2	4.1	63.0	9.6	50.7	9.6
	[3] 2	17	76.5	70.6	70.6	58.8	76.5	23.5	0	35.3	0	52.9	0
	[4] 3	9	66.7	44.4	44.4	66.7	77.8	22.2	0	44.4	0	88.9	0
	[5] 4 or more	14	71.4	42.9	85.7	50.0	42.9	0	0	7.1	14.3	64.3	21.4
	Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	19	63.2	42.1	73.7	52.6	63.2	36.8	0	78.9	10.5	57.9
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	10	70.0	40.0	60.0	30.0	70.0	20.0	0	40.0	10.0	50.0	10.0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	15	53.3	53.3	86.7	60.0	60.0	13.3	0	26.7	6.7	80.0	13.3
	[9] Care of adults included	11	90.9	63.6	72.7	63.6	72.7	45.5	0	72.7	9.1	45.5	9.1
	[10] All-rounders	32	78.1	71.9	87.5	53.1	59.4	38.7	6.3	37.5	6.3	53.1	3.1
	[11] Cleaning and meals	29	69.0	34.5	69.0	41.4	65.5	37.9	3.4	48.3	6.9	55.2	17.2
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	11	81.8	63.6	100.0	45.5	36.4	18.2	9.1	45.5	9.1	36.4	9.1
	[13] 1-3 years	30	66.7	53.3	80.0	56.7	66.7	36.7	3.3	53.3	6.7	66.7	10.0
	[14] 3-5 years	20	50.0	45.0	70.0	50.0	65.0	40.0	0	45.0	5.0	40.0	10.0
	[15] 5-10 years	31	77.4	51.6	80.6	51.6	74.2	32.3	0	51.6	6.5	51.6	9.7
	[16] More than 10 years	17	76.5	47.1	52.9	41.2	58.8	35.3	5.9	47.1	5.9	64.7	5.9

Tables summarizing the data on domestic work, from a socio-legal point of view

(2nd version, 24 March 2011)

Table 0.1 (IN) General characterization of the people interviewed
Main general and personal variables according to place of interview - India

[%] in rows (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	Schooling							Age							Social status of employers (hypoth.) ¹					Gender		
Categories			[B] No schooling	[C] 4 years	[D] 5-6 years	[E] 7-9 years	[F] 10-12 years	[G] More than 12 years	[H]	[I] until 30	[J] 31-40	[K] 41-50	[L] 51-60	[M] 61 and more	[N]	[O] lower	[P] middle (without office)	[Q] middle (with office)	[R] upper	[S]	[T] female	[U] male	[V]	
Interviewees (Nr.)	[1]	65	0	14	13	6	5	0	38	22	23	15	4	1	65	2	41	5	16	64	65	0	65	
Interviewees %	[2]		0	36.8	34.2	15.8	13.2	0	100	33.8	35.4	23.1	6.2	1.5	100	3.1	64.1	7.8	25.0	100	100	0	100	
Place of interview	[3]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	[4]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	[5]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	[6]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Schooling	[7] No schooling	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	[8] 4 years	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57.1	28.6	14.3	0	0	100	7.1	64.3	7.1	21.4	100	100	0	100	
	[9] 5-6 years	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46.2	30.8	23.1	0	0	100	0	84.6	7.7	7.7	100	100	0	100	
	[10] 7-9 years	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0	50.0	0	0	0	100	0	66.7	16.7	16.7	100	100	0	100	
	[11] 10-12 years	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40.0	40.0	20.0	0	0	100	0	80.0	0	20.0	100	100	0	100	
	[12] More than 12 years	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Age	[13] until 30	22	-	42.1	31.6	15.8	10.5	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	68.2	9.1	22.7	100	100	0	100	
	[14] 31-40	23	-	30.8	30.8	23.1	15.4	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.3	65.2	4.3	26.1	95.6	100	0	100	
	[15] 41-50	15	-	33.3	50.0	0	16.7	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.1	57.1	14.3	21.4	92.8	100	0	100	
	[16] 51-60	4	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	50.0	0	50.0	100	100	0	100	
	[17] 61 and more	1	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	100	0	0	100	100	0	100	
Social status of employers (hypoth.)	[18] lower	2	-	100	0	0	0	-	100	0	50.0	50.0	0	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	100	0	100	
	[19] middle (without office)	41	-	32.1	39.3	14.3	14.3	-	100	36.6	36.6	19.5	4.9	2.4	100	-	-	-	-	-	100	0	100	
	[20] middle (with office)	5	-	33.3	33.3	33.3	0	-	100	40.0	20.0	40.0	0	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	100	0	100	
	[21] upper	16	-	50.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	-	-	31.3	37.5	18.8	12.5	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	100	0	100	

Table 1.1-B (IN) Experiences of discomfort - India

Proportion [%] of people "not satisfied" for specific reasons

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, 24 March 2011)

	Reasons for being not satisfied		Salary		Amount of work		Nature of tasks		Work environment				
	Indicators		[B] Not satisfied	[C] Left house(s) for this reason	[D] Not satisfied	[E] Left house(s) for this reason	[F] Not satisfied	[G] Left house(s) for this reason	[H] Work environment in gen.	[I] With employer a relationship of conflict ⁵	[J] Troubles with colleagues (hypoth.) ⁶	[K] Left house(s) because of relationship difficulties	[L] Average [B][D][F][H]
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people giving these answers										
All interviewees	[1]	65	43.1	33.8	13.8	29.2	10.8	12.3	3.1	3.1	16.9	33.8	17.7
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	21	42.9	38.1	28.6	38.1	23.8	19.0	9.5	4.8	14.3	33.3	26.2
	[3] 2	11	72.7	9.1	0	0	0	9.1	0	0	18.2	18.2	18.2
	[4] 3	14	50.0	42.9	21.4	28.6	14.3	7.1	0	0	21.4	35.7	21.4
	[5] 4 or more	19	21.1	36.8	0	36.8	0	10.5	0	5.3	15.8	42.1	5.3
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	6	16.7	16.7	16.7	0	16.7	33.3	0	0	33.3	33.3	12.5
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	41	51.2	36.6	14.6	36.6	7.3	9.8	2.4	0	19.5	36.6	18.9
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	4	50.0	25.0	0	25.0	25.0	0	0	0	0	25.0	18.8
	[9] Care of adults included	8	12.5	25.0	12.5	0	0	0	0	12.5	0	12.5	6.3
	[10] All-rounders	1	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	0	0	0	0	0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	5	60.0	60.0	20.0	60.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	35
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	7	57.1%	57.1	42.9	28.6	28.6	42.9	14.3	0	0	42.9	21.6
	[13] 1-3 years	16	43.8	62.5	12.5	50.0	18.8	18.8	6.3	6.3	12.5	43.8	20.4
	[14] 3-5 years	12	41.7	16.7	8.3	16.7	16.7	8.3	0	0	25.0	25.0	16.7
	[15] 5-10 years	20	40.0	0	10.0	20.0	0	0	0	5.0	20.0	30.0	12.5
	[16] More than 10 years	10	40.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	0	10.0	0	0	20.0	30.0	12.5

Table 1.2-B (IN) Situations encountered, in detail - India

Proportion [%] of people who encountered the referred situation

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, 24 March 2011)

	Types of situation	Situations encountered	Issues of money					Excessive demands					Forms of Violence				Violation of rights				
			[B] Benefits unpaid	[C] social security unpaid	[D] Un paid over overtime	[E] Wage arrears	[F] Average	[G] Denial of rest times	[H] Tasks not originally agreed	[I] Obligated to perform a task against will	[J] Denial of vacations	[K] Average	[L] Physical violence	[M] Sexual harassment	[N] Psychological violence	[O] Discrimination	[P] Average	[Q] Personal documents taken away	[R] Prevented from joining social org.	[S] Average	[T] Lack of food
		Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people to whom it happened				Average proportion					Average proportion				Average proportion			Average proportion		
All interviewees	[1]	65	13.8	24.6	7.7	41.5	21.9	10.8	43.1	21.5	23.1	24.6	6.2	7.7	15.4	13.8	10.8	0	0	0	16.9
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	21	23.8	47.6	14.3	42.9	32.2	19.0	52.4	23.8	23.8	29.8	4.8	9.5	28.6	28.6	17.9	0	0	0	23.8
	[3] 2	11	0	9.1	0	9.1	4.6	9.1	36.4	18.2	18.2	20.5	0	9.1	9.1	0	4.6	0	0	0	18.2
	[4] 3	14	14.3	14.3	7.1	35.7	17.9	0	50.0	21.4	14.3	21.4	7.1	7.1	14.3	21.4	12.5	0	0	0	7.1
	[5] 4 or more	19	10.5	15.8	5.3	63.2	23.7	10.5	31.6	21.1	31.6	23.7	10.5	5.3	5.3	0	5.3	0	0	0	15.8
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	6	16.7	16.7	0	16.7	12.5	0	33.3	33.3	16.7	20.8	0	0	33.3	0	8.3	0	0	0	33.3
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	41	7.3	17.1	4.9	39.0	17.1	12.2	34.1	19.5	24.4	22.6	4.9	9.8	9.8	12.2	9.2	0	0	0	12.2
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	4	0	50.0	0	50.0	25.0	25.0	75.0	25.0	25.0	37.5	0	0	0	25.0	6.3	0	0	0	25.0
	[9] Care of adults included	8	25.0	50.0	12.5	50.0	34.4	0	50.0	12.5	12.5	18.8	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0
	[10] All-rounders	1	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	100	0	0	25.0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	5	60.0	40.0	40.0	80.0	55.0	20.0	80.0	40.0	40.0	45.0	40.0	20.0	80.0	60.0	50.0	0	0	0	60.0
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	7	14.3	28.6	0	14.3	14.3	14.3	57.1	14.3	28.6	28.6	14.3	14.3	28.6	28.6	21.5	0	0	0	28.6
	[13] 1-3 years	16	25.0	25.0	18.8	56.3	31.3	25.0	56.3	31.3	18.8	32.9	6.3	6.3	25.0	31.3	17.2	0	0	0	18.8
	[14] 3-5 years	12	16.7	25.0	8.3	33.3	20.8	0	41.7	0	16.7	14.6	0	0	8.3	16.7	6.3	0	0	0	8.3
	[15] 5-10 years	20	5.0	30.0	5.0	45.0	21.3	5.0	40.0	30.0	35.0	27.5	5.0	15.0	15.0	0	8.8	0	0	0	20.0
	[16] More than 10	10	10.0	10.0	0	40.0	15.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	15.0	10.0	0	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	10.0

Table 1.3-B (IN) Signs of general dissatisfaction - India

Proportion [%] of people to the following questions an answer revealing dissatisfaction

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, 24 March 2011)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? ⁹
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all ⁷	Yes ⁸	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people giving these answers								
All interviewees	[1]	65	13.8	6.2	44.6	67.7	61.5	20.0	15.4	32.3	26.2
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	21	23.8	14.3	57.1	66.7	61.9	23.8	19.0	34.9	47.6
	[3] 2	11	9.1	0	45.5	72.7	72.7	36.4	0	36.4	0
	[4] 3	14	7.1	7.1	42.9	71.4	71.4	14.3	14.3	33.3	21.4
	[5] 4 or more	19	10.5	0	31.6	63.2	47.4	10.5	21.1	26.3	21.1
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	6	0	16.7	50.0	66.7	33.3	16.7	0	16.7	16.7
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	41	14.6	4.9	43.9	73.2	61.0	14.6	17.1	30.9	22.0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	4	0	0	75.0	50.0	50.0	75.0	0	41.7	25.0
	[9] Care of adults included	8	12.5	0	25.0	50.0	75.0	25.0	25.0	41.7	37.5
	[10] All-rounders	1	0	0	0	0	100.0	0	0	33.3	0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	5	40.0	20.0	60.0	80.0	80.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	60.0
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	7	28.6	28.6	71.4	71.4	71.4	28.6	14.3	38.1	42.9
	[13] 1-3 years	16	18.8	6.3	62.5	68.8	56.3	18.8	12.5	29.2	50.0
	[14] 3-5 years	12	16.7	8.3	33.3	66.7	75.0	25.0	8.3	36.1	25.0
	[15] 5-10 years	20	5.0	0	35.0	75.0	50.0	20.0	25.0	31.7	10.0
	[16] More than 10 years	10	10.0	0	30.0	50.0	70.0	10.0	10.0	30.0	10.0

Table 2.1-B (IN) Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - India

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, 24 March 2011)

	Types of irregularities		Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations						Child Labour
	Situations considered		[B] Social security not paid	[C] Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	[D] Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	[E] Employer refuses to sign contract	[F] Salary below 0.20 euros ¹⁰	[G] Working time excessive ¹¹	[H] Less than 1,5 hour per room-week ¹²	[I] Accident at work	[J] Worker had to pay health costs	[K] Irreg. answers % of [I]	[L] Maternity	[M] Maternity leave denied ¹³	[N] Irreg. answers % of [L]	[O] Hired under 14 within the last 10 years ¹⁴
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people to which it applies													
All interviewees	[1]	65	58.5	41.7	0	0	46.2	75.4	6.2	18.5	12.3	66.5	13.8	15.4	111.6	3.1
In how many h. working at present?	[2] 1	21	61.9	40.0	0	0	38.1	85.7	0	23.8	4.8	20.2	14.3	14.3	100.0	0
	[3] 2	11	72.7	54.5	0	0	54.5	63.6	9.1	9.1	9.1	100.0	0	27.3	0.0	9.1
	[4] 3	14	42.9	50.0	0	0	57.1	57.1	7.1	28.6	28.6	100.0	28.6	0	0.0	7.1
	[5] 4 or more	19	57.9	29.4	0	0	42.1	84.2	10.5	10.5	10.5	100.0	10.5	21.1	201.0	0
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	6	33.3	16.7	0	0	50.0	66.7	16.7	33.3	0	0.0	33.3	0	0.0	0
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	41	65.9	50.0	0	0	41.5	70.7	4.9	14.6	14.6	100.0	9.8	22.0	224.5	4.9
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	4	50.0	50.0	0	0	75.0	100	25.0	25.0		0.0	25.0	0	0.0	0
	[9] Care of adults included	8	25.0	12.5	0	0	37.5	100	0	25.0	12.5	50.0	12.5	0	0.0	0
	[10] All-rounders	1	100	0	0	0	100	0	0		0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	5	80.0	66.7	0	0	60.0	80.0	0	20.0	20.0	100.0	20.0	20.0	100.0	0
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	7	85.7	33.3	0	0	71.4	85.7	0	14.3	0	0.0	0	14.3	0.0	0
	[13] 1-3 years	16	68.8	40.0	0	0	56.3	81.3	12.5	25.0	12.5	50.0	18.8	18.8	100.0	
	[14] 3-5 years	12	50.0	63.6	0	0	41.7	58.3	8.3	16.7	16.7	100.0	0	16.7	0.0	8.3
	[15] 5-10 years	20	50.0	50.0	0	0	35.0	75.0	5.0	10.0	15.0	150.0	10.0	10.0	100.0	5.0
	[16] More than 10	10	50.0	10.0	0	0	40.0	80.0	0	30.0	10.0	33.3	40.0	20.0	50.0	0

Table 3.1-B (IN) Relationship to the law – Status, attitudes, actions - India

Proportion [%] of people answering “yes” to the following questions

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 2nd version, 24 March 2011)

		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	Attitudes				Status		Actions				
			[B] Employment contract in principle useful ¹⁵	[C] Employment contract positively valued ¹⁶	[D] Would go to court to defend rights	[E] Thinks Work inspection would help (where she has worked).	[F] Thinks Work inspection would help (in general)	[G] Employment contract signed	[H] Member of a union	[I] Asked for a written employment contract ¹⁷	[J] Searched for association or union	[K] Left house ¹⁸	[L] Went to court
All interviewees	[1]	65	29.2	29.2	16.9	24.6	29.2	0	4.6	0	6.2	50.8	0
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	21	47.6	61.9	33.3	38.1	52.4	0	14.3	0	9.5	57.1	0
	[3] 2	11	18.2	18.2	9.1	9.1	18.2	0	0	0	9.1	18.2	0
	[4] 3	14	21.4	21.4	14.3	28.6	28.6	0	0	0	0	57.1	0
	[5] 4 or more	19	21.1	5.3	5.3	15.8	10.5	0	0	0	5.3	57.9	0
	Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	6	16.7	33.3	50.0	0	16.7	0	0	0	0	33.3
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	41	26.8	24.4	7.3	19.5	19.5	0	7.3	0	2.4	56.1	0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	4	25.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0	0	0	0	25.0	0
	[9] Care of adults included	8	25.0	25.0	12.5	25.0	62.5	0	0	0	25.0	25.0	0
	[10] All-rounders	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	5	16.7	60.0	40.0	80.0	60.0	0	0	0	20.0	80.0	0
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	7	14.3	57.1	28.6	42.9	14.3	0	14.3	0	0	71.4	0
	[13] 1-3 years	16	62.5	50.0	25.0	31.3	37.5	0	12.5	0	12.5	81.3	0
	[14] 3-5 years	12	16.7	16.7	25.0	25.0	25.0	0	0	0	8.3	41.7	0
	[15] 5-10 years	20	30.0	25.0	5.0	15.0	30.0	0	0	0	5.0	20.0	0
	[16] More than 10 years	10	0	0	10.0	20.0	30.0	0	0	0	0	60.0	0

Tables summarizing the data on domestic work, from a socio-legal point of view

(3rd version, issued 20 April 2011)

**Table 0.1 (MZ) General characterization of the people interviewed
Main general and personal variables - Mozambique**

[%] in rows (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Categories	[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	Age						Schooling						Social status of employers (hypoth.)					Gender		
			[B]until 20	[C]21-30	[D]31-40	[E]41-50	[F]51 and more	[G]	[H] illiterate	[I] Elem. literacy, no schooling	[J] 4 years	[K] Up to 9 years	[L] More than 9 years	[M]	[N]lower	[O]middle (without office)	[P]middle (with office)	[Q]upper	[R]	[S]female	[T]male	[U]
Interviewees (Nr.)	[1]	50	26	14	5	3	1	49	11	6	13	13	2	45	1	40	2	0	43	9	40	49
Interviewees %	[2]		53.1	28.6	10.2	6.1	2.0	100	24.4	13.3	28.9	28.9	4.4	100	2.3	93	4.7	0	100	18.4	81.6	100
Gender	[3] Female	9	33.3	22.2	22.2	22.2	0	100	37.5	12.5	25.0	25.0	0	100	0	100	0	0	100	-	-	-
	[4] Male	40	57.5	30.0	7.5	2.5	2.5	100	22.2	13.9	27.8	30.6	5.6	100	2.8	91.7	5.6	0	100	-	-	-
Age	[5] until 20	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.4	13.0	26.1	39.1	4.3	100	4.5	95.5	0	0	100	11.5	88.5	100
	[6] 21-30	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	30.8	7.7	38.5	23.1	0	100	0	91.7	8.3	0	100	14.3	85.7	100
	[7] 31-40	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0	100	0	100	0	0	100	40.0	60.0	100
	[8] 41-50	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0	0	0	0	50.0	100	0	50	50	0	100	66.7	33.3	100
	[9] 51 and more	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	100	0	100	100
Schooling	[10] Illiterate	11	36.4	36.4	9.1	9.1	9.1	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	100	0	0	100	27.3	72.7	100
	[11] Elem. literacy, no schooling	6	50.0	16.7	33.3	0	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.7	83.3	0	0	100	16.7	83.3	100
	[12] 4 years	13	50.0	41.7	8.3	0	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	90.9	9.1	0	100	16.7	83.3	100
	[13] Up to 9 years	13	69.2	23.1	7.7	0	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	100	0	0	100	15.4	84.6	100
	[14] More than 9 years	2	50.0	0	0	50.0	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	50	50	0	100	0	100	100
Social status of employers (hypoth.)	[15] lower	1	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	0	100	100
	[16] middle (without office)	40	53.8	28.2	12.8	2.6	2.6	100	27.8	13.9	27.8	27.8	2.8	100	-	-	-	-	-	15.4	84.6	100
	[17] middle (with office)	2	0	50.0	0	50.0	0	100	0	0	50.0	0	50.0	100	-	-	-	-	-	0	100	100
	[18] upper	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0

Table 1.2-A (MZ) Situations encountered, in detail - Mozambique

Proportion [%] of people who encountered the referred situation

A - Their relationship with personal and general variables (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 3rd vers., issued 20 April 2011)

Types of situation		Situations encountered	Issues of money					Excessive demands					Forms of Violence					Violation of rights			
			[B] Benefits unpaid	[C] social security unpaid	[D] Un paid over overtime	[E] Wage arrears	[F] Average	[G] Denial of rest times	[H] Tasks not originally agreed	[I] Obligated to perform a task against will	[J] Denial of vacations	[K] Average	[L] Physical violence	[M] Sexual harassment	[N] Psychological violence	[O] Discrimination	[P] Average	[Q] Personal documents taken away	[R] Prevented from joining social org.	[S] Average	[T] Lack of food
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people to whom it happened																		
All interviewees	[1]	50	38.0	42.0	38.0	64.0	45.5	30.0	66.0	28.0	46.0	42.5	4.0	4.0	28.0	8.0	11.0	0	4.0	2.0	6.0
Gender	[2] Female	9	33.3	22.2	22.2	100	44.4	22.2	55.6	44.4	44.4	24.4	0	11.1	33.3	0	11.1	0	0	0	22.2
	[3] Male	40	40.0	47.5	42.5	57.5	46.9	32.5	70.0	25.0	47.5	25.5	5.0	2.5	27.5	10.0	11.3	0	5.0	1.3	2.5
Age	[4] until 20	26	46.2	50.0	46.2	65.4	52.0	30.8	57.7	26.9	46.2	23.1	3.8	3.8	26.9	7.7	10.6	0	0	0	7.7
	[5] 21-30	14	28.6	28.6	21.4	57.1	33.9	21.4	85.7	28.6	50.0	27.1	7.1	0	28.6	14.3	12.5	0	7.1	1.8	0
	[6] 31-40	5	40.0	40.0	40.0	80.0	50.0	60.0	80.0	60.0	40.0	40.0	0	20.0	60.0	0	20.0	0	20.0	5.0	0
	[7] 41-50	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	100	50.0	0	33.3	0	66.7	6.7	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	33.3
	[8] 51 and more	1	0	100	100	0	50.0	100	100	0	0	40.0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0
Schooling	[9] Illiterate	11	27.3	36.4	36.4	72.7	43.2	36.4	72.7	45.5	54.5	30.9	18.2	9.1	45.5	18.2	22.8	0	0	0	9.1
	[10] Elem. literacy, no schooling	6	33.3	33.3	33.3	83.3	45.8	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7	13.3	0	0	50.0	0	12.5	0	16.7	4.2	0
	[11] 4 years	13	23.1	30.8	23.1	69.2	36.6	30.8	76.9	53.8	30.8	32.3	0	7.7	30.8	7.7	11.6	0	7.7	1.9	0
	[12] Up to 9 years	13	61.5	53.8	46.2	46.2	51.9	30.8	69.2	0	53.8	20.0	0	0	7.7	0	1.9	0	0	0	7.7
	[13] More than 9 years	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0	50.0	0	100	10.0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0
Social status of employers (hypoth.)	[14] lower	1	0	100	0	0	25.0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0
	[15] middle (without office)	40	40.0	45.0	42.5	60.0	46.9	30.0	67.5	32.5	45.0	26.0	5.0	5.0	35.0	7.5	13.1	0	2.5	0.6	2.5
	[16] middle (with office)	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	100	62.5	0	100	0	50.0	20.0	0	0	0	50.0	12.5	0	0	0	0
	[17] upper	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0

Table 1.3-B (MZ) Signs of general dissatisfaction - Mozambique

Proportion [%] of people to the following questions an answer revealing dissatisfaction

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 3rd version, 20 April 2011)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? ⁹
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all ⁷	Yes ⁸	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people giving these answers								
All interviewees	[1]	50	52.0	50.0	96.0	62.0	50.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	44.0
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	41	58.5	48.8	95.1	65.9	51.2	22.0	53.7	25.4	43.9
	[3] 2	2	50.0	50.0	100	50.0	100	0	100	66.7	0
	[4] 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	[5] 4 or more	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	5	40.0	80.0	100	20.0	40.0	60.0	60.0	53.3	0
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	11	54.5	45.5	100	36.4	54.5	9.1	27.3	30.3	45.5
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	11	27.3	54.5	100	63.6	18.2	9.1	45.5	24.3	81.8
	[9] Care of adults included	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	[10] All-rounders	3	66.7	66.7	100	66.7	100	0	100	66.7	0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	20	65.0	40.0	90.0	85.0	60.0	25.0	55.0	46.7	40.0
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	15	66.7	53.3	93.3	66.7	53.3	13.3	40.0	35.5	26.7
	[13] 1-3 years	14	57.1	50.0	92.9	71.4	57.1	7.1	57.1	40.4	42.9
	[14] 3-5 years	7	57.1	42.9	100	57.1	42.9	42.9	71.4	52.4	57.1
	[15] 5-10 years	2	100	100	100	100	100	50.0	100	83.3	50.0
	[16] More than 10 years	1	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	100

Table 2.1-A (MZ) Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - Mozambique

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

A - Their relationship with personal and general variables (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 3rd vers., issued 20 April 2011)

	Types of irregularities		Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations						Child Labour
	Situations considered		[B] Social security not paid	[C] Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	[D] Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	[E] Employer refuses to sign contract	[F] Salary below 0.17 euros ¹⁰	[G] Working time excessive ¹¹	[H] Less than 15 hour per room-week ¹²	[I] Accident at work	[J] Worker had to pay health costs	[K] Irreg. answers % of [I]	[L] Maternity	[M] Maternity leave denied ¹³	[N] Irreg. answers % of [L]	[O] Hired under 15 within the last 10 years ¹⁴
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people to which it applies													
All interviewees	[1]	50	56.0	85.7	2.0	2.0	78.0	86.0	12.0	16.0	4.0	25.0	4.0	0	0	24.0
Gender	[2] Female	9	55.6	77.8	0	0	66.7	77.8	33.3	22.2	0	0	22.2	0	0	11.1
	[3] Male	40	57.5	87.5	2.5	2.5	80.0	90.0	5.0	15.0	5.0	33.3	0	0	0	25.0
Age	[4] until 20	26	69.2	76.9	3.8	0	76.9	96.2	11.5	15.4	3.8	24.7	0	0	0	34.6
	[5] 21-30	14	50.0	100	0	0	78.6	92.9	7.1	14.3	0	0.0	7.1	0	0	14.3
	[6] 31-40	5	20.0	80.0	0	0	80.0	60.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	20.0	0	0	0
	[7] 41-50	3	66.7	100	0	33.3	66.7	33.3	.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	[8] 51 and more	1	0	100	0	0	100	100.0	.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schooling	[9] Illiterate	11	45.5	100	0	0	90.9	90.9	9.1	27.3	18.2	66.7	0	0	0	9.1
	[10] Elem. literacy, no schooling	6	50.0	83.3	0	0	83.3	83.3	.0	16.7	0	0.0	0	0	0	16.7
	[11] 4 years	13	38.5	75.0	0	0	84.6	84.6	15.4	7.7	0	0.0	7.7	0	0	23.1
	[12] Up to 9 years	13	69.2	76.9	7.7	0	69.2	92.3	15.4	15.4	0	0.0	7.7	0	0	38.5
	[13] More than 9 years	2	50.0	100	0	50.0	100	50.0	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social status of employers (hypoth.)	[14] lower	1	100	100	0	0	100	100.0	.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	[15] middle (without office)	40	50.0	84.6	0	0	75.0	85.0	12.5	17.5	5.0	28.6	2.5	0	0	22.5
	[16] middle (with office)	2	50.0	100	0	50.0	100	50.0	.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	[17] upper	0	0	0	0	0	0	.0	.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3.1-B (MZ) Relationship to the law – Status, attitudes, actions - Mozambique

Proportion [%] of people answering “yes” to the following questions

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 3rd vers., issued 20 April 2011)

		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	Attitudes				Status			Actions			
			[B] Employment contract in principle useful ¹⁵	[C] Employment contract positively valued ¹⁶	[D] Would go to court to defend rights	[E] Thinks Work inspection would help (where she has worked).	[F] Thinks Work inspection would help (in general)	[G] Employment contract signed	[H] Member of a union	[I] Asked for a written employment contract ¹⁷	[J] Searched for association or union	[K] Left house ¹⁸	[L] Went to court
All interviewees	[1]	50	8.0	42.0	84.0	80.0	88.0	2.0	0	4.0	0	70.0	2.0
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	41	9.8	43.9	82.9	82.9	87.8	0	0	0	0	75.6	2.4
	[3] 2	2	0	50.0	100	100	100	50.0	0	0	0	50.0	0
	[4] 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	[5] 4 or more	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	5	0	80.0	100	100	100	0	0	0	0	60.0	0
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	11	9.1	54.5	90.9	81.8	90.9	0	0	9.1	0	54.5	0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	11	18.2	27.3	100	72.7	100	0	0	0	0	90.9	0
	[9] Care of adults included	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	[10] All-rounders	3	0	66.7	100	100	100	33.3	0	33.3	0	66.7	0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	20	5.0	30.0	65.0	75.0	75.0	0	0	0	0	70.0	5.0
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	15	6.7	53.3	86.7	80.0	86.7	0	0	0	0	73.3	0
	[13] 1-3 years	14	14.3	28.6	71.4	85.7	85.7	0	0	0	0	71.4	0
	[14] 3-5 years	7	14.3	28.6	85.7	100	100	14.3	0	0	0	100	14.3
	[15] 5-10 years	2	0	100	100	100	100	0	0	0	0	50.0	0
	[16] More than 10 years	1	0	100	100	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Tables summarizing the data on domestic work, from a socio-legal point of view

(3rd version, 17 April 2011)

Table 0.1 (UK) General characterization of the people interviewed
Main general and personal variables according to place of interview – United Kingdom

[%] in rows (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 3rd version, 17 April 2011)

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	Schooling							Age							Social status of employers (hypoth.) ¹					Gender		
Categories			[B] No schooling	[C] 4 years	[D] 5-6 years	[E] 7-9 years	[F] 10-12 years	[G] More than 12 years	[H]	[I] until 30	[J] 31-40	[K] 41-50	[L] 51-60	[M] 61 and more	[N]	[O] lower	[P] middle (without office)	[Q] middle (with office)	[R] upper	[S]	[T] female	[U] male	[V]	
Interviewees (Nr.)	[1]	25	-	4	1	4	8	8	25	6	6	7	4	2	25	5	6	13	1	25	23	2	25	
Interviewees %	[2]		-	16.0	4.0	16.0	32.0	32.0	100	24.0	24.0	28.0	16.0	8.0	100	20.0	24.0	52.0	4.0	100	92.0	8.0	100	
Place of interview	[3]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	[4]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	[5]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	[6]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	[6]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Schooling	[7] No schooling	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	[8] 4 years	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	25.0	50.0	25.0	100	0	25.0	75.0	0	100	100	0	100	
	[9] 5-6 years	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	100	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	100	100	0	100	
	[10] 7-9 years	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25.0	50.0	0	0	25.0	100	25.0	25.0	50.0	0	100	75.0	25.0	100	
	[11] 10-12 years	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37.5	12.5	37.5	12.5	0	100	12.5	37.5	50.0	0	100	87.5	12.5	100	
	[12] More than 12 years	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25.0	25.0	37.5	12.5	0	100	25.0	12.5	50.0	12.5	100	100	0	100	
Age	[13] until 30	6	-	0	0	16.7	50.0	33.3	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	33.3	16.7	50.0	0	100	66.7	33.3	100	
	[14] 31-40	6	-	0	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.7	33.3	50.0	0	100	100	0	100	
	[15] 41-50	7	-	14.3	0	0	42.9	42.9	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	28.6	14.3	42.9	14.3	100	100	0	100	
	[16] 51-60	4	-	50.0	0	0	25.0	25.0	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	25.0	75.0	0	100	100	0	100	
	[17] 61 and more	2	-	50.0	0	50.0	0	0	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	50.0	50.0	0	100	100	0	100	
Social status of employers (hypoth.)	[18] lower	5	-	0	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	100	40.0	20.0	40.0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	80.0	20.0	100	
	[19] middle (without office)	6	-	16.7	0	16.7	50.0	16.7	100	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	100	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	100	
	[20] middle (with office)	13	-	23.1	0	15.4	30.8	30.8	100	23.1	23.1	23.1	23.1	7.7	100	0	0	0	0	0	92.3	7.7	100	
	[21] upper	1	-	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	100	

Table 1.3-B (UK) Signs of general dissatisfaction - United Kingdom

Proportion [%] of people to the following questions an answer revealing dissatisfaction

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 3rd version, 17 April 2011)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? ⁹
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all ⁷	Yes ⁸	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people giving these answers								
All interviewees	[1]	25	8.0	4.0	84.0	32.0	36.0	52.0	4.0	30.7	4.0
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	14	7.1	7.1	78.6	42.9	14.3	50.0	7.1	23.8	7.1
	[3] 2	3	0	0	100	33.3	66.7	33.3	0	33.3	0
	[4] 3	2	0	0	50.0	0	50.0	50.0	0	33.3	0
	[5] 4 or more	5	0	0	100	20.0	60.0	80.0	0	46.7	0
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	7	0	0	57.1	28.6	14.3	42.9	14.3	23.8	14.3
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	7	14.3	0	85.7	14.3	85.7	42.9	0	42.9	0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	6	0	0	100	50.0	33.3	66.7	0	33.3	0
	[9] Care of adults included	2	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	33.3	0
	[10] All-rounders	1	100	100	100	100	0	100	0	33.3	0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	2	0	0	100	50.0	0	0	0	0.0	0
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	2	0	0	100	50.0	50.0	100	50.0	66.7	0
	[13] 1-3 years	6	16.7	16.7	83.3	33.3	16.7	50.0	16.7	27.8	0
	[14] 3-5 years	5	0	0	80.0	20.0	40.0	80.0	0	40.0	0
	[15] 5-10 years	5	0	0	60.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	26.7	0
	[16] More than 10 years	2	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	33.3	0

Table 2.1-B (UK) Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - United Kingdom

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006; 3rd version, 17 April 2011)

	Types of irregularities		Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations						Child Labour
	Situations considered		[B] Social security not paid	[C] Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	[D] Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	[E] Employer refuses to sign contract	[F] Salary below 6.73 euros ¹⁰	[G] Working time excessive ¹¹	[H] Less than 1,5 hour per room-week ¹²	[I] Accident at work	[J] Worker had to pay health costs	[K] Irreg. answers % of [I]	[L] Maternity	[M] Maternity leave denied ¹³	[N] Irreg. answers % of [L]	[O] Hired under 16 within the last 10 years ¹⁴
		[A] Total nr. of people per category ⁴	% of people to which it applies													
All interviewees	[1]	25	64.0	8.0	0	4.0	1	4.0	28.0	4.0	16.0	400.0	8.0	12.0	150.0	0
In how many h. working at present?	[2] 1	14	57.1	7.1	0	7.1	7.1	7.1	14.3	7.1	21.4	301.4	14.3	28.6	200.0	0
	[3] 2	3	66.7	0	0	0	0	0	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	[4] 3	2	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50.0	0	0
	[5] 4 or more	5	100	20.0	0	0	0	0	60.0	0	20.0	0	0	20.0	0	0
Activity profile ²	[6] Care of children included	7	28.6	0	0	0	14.3	14.3	14.3	0	14.3	0	0	14.3	0	0
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	7	57.1	14.3	0	0	0	0	57.1	0	14.3	0	0	28.6	0	0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	6	100	16.7	0	16.7	0	0	16.7	16.7	16.7	100.0	16.7	33.3	199.4	0
	[9] Care of adults included	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0
	[10] All-rounders	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	50.0	0	50.0	0	50.0	0	0	0
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) ³	[12] less than one year	2	100	0	0	50.0	0	0	50.0	0	50.0	0	0	50.0	0	0
	[13] 1-3 years	6	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	16.7	0	0	0	0	16.7	0	0
	[14] 3-5 years	5	80.0	20.0	0	0	0	0	40.0	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	100.0	0
	[15] 5-10 years	5	60.0	0	0	0	0	0	20.0	0	20.0	0	20.0	20.0	100.0	0
	[16] More than 10	2	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50.0	0	0

