Belgian labour career determinants in European perspective.

Jonathan Debeer

Dimitri Mortelmans

Inhoudsopgave

1 Introduction

Life- and career-histories can be seen as an ordered sequence of employment states. Daily, monthly or yearly observations form a string of employment states, portraying one's career. Many scholars have argued that recently, we have moved from "traditional" and rather rigid careers, to more "transitional" (Schmid, 1998, p. 33), "protean" (Baruch, 2006; Hall, 1996; Segers, Inceoglu, Vloeberghs, Bartram, & Henderickx, 2008) or "boundaryless careers" (Defillippi & Arthur, 1994; Segers, et al., 2008), trading a lifelong employment and psychological contract for employability and the exploration of new ventures.

Though these changes are widely documented, European labour markets are repeatedly said to obstruct the coming of age of these transitional careers. Often diagnosed as suffering from Eurosclerosis (Salvanes, 1997), European labour markets, to varying degrees, have been faced with high unemployment, and inactivity, late entry and early retirement. Though recently, some authors have seen improvement (Vail, 2008), high degrees of job security, collective bargaining and labour regulation (DiPrete, de Graaf, Luikx, Tahlin, & Blossfeld, 1997; Salvanes, 1997) are said to shape the European employment careers and bring necessary change and flexibility to a grinding halt. While transitional careers were found to exist on the Belgian labour market (Debeer, 2010; Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007; Soens, et al., 2005) traditional careers continue to be the norm. Personal characteristics such as education, gender, age and migration status were found to be decisive factors in career outlook.

Most studies of European careers have confined their scope to the comparison of careers in one or a few countries at a time. Often, one exemplary country out of each welfare state type of the canonical Esping-Andersen typology is used (Dingeldey, 2007; DiPrete, et al., 1997; Kim, 2009; Stier & Lewin-Epstein, 2001; Vail, 2008; Versantvoort, 2008). Because of data limits, little attempts have been made to compare employment histories on a broader scale. The impact of highly divergent social, eco-

nomical and institutional backgrounds on employment careers is yet to be fully explored.

The aim of this article is threefold. First, we want to us the European Household Panel to construct a career typology which spans 14 European countries. The ECHP data provides us with longitudinal and internationally comparable data needed in order to create such a typology. The focus lies on the international comparability. Like previous research (Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007), we will use optimal matching techniques to cluster careers into types. A second focus of the article is to assess the distribution of these career patterns across Europe. We are interested in both the global distribution and the specific distributions of male and female careers. Finally, we test the reliability of our typology by testing a limited number of career determinants on our European career patterns. Special attention is paid to Belgian careers in a comparative European frame and additional models were estimated to test the effects of person and country level variables on the Belgian career distribution.

2 New careers in time and space?

Many authors have constructed career typologies. Berger et al. (Berger, Steimuller, & Sopp, 1993) studied male and female labour careers to assess the amount of destandardization on the German labour market. Jacobs (Jacobs, 1999) used a typology of variability and discontinuity in female careers in Britain. Scherer (Scherer, 2001) and McVicar and Anyadike-Danes (Duncan McVicar & Anyadike-Danes, 2002) searched for career patterns in the transition from education to work, the former for Great Britain and West Germany, the latter for Ireland. Kogan (Kogan, 2007) compared immigrants' and native West-Germans' employment careers and found significant differences between both. Kuppens and Mortelmans (Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007; Kuppens & Mortelmans, 2004; Soens, et al., 2005) created a typology of transitional career patterns and studied the effects of a number of determinants on their occurence.

Existing typologies can be situated on a double male versus female and "traditional career" versus "transitional career" divide. In traditional careers, workers follow a linear path of financial and functional promotion within a limited number of firms. The

psychological contract is based on the promise of sustained employment, during which the worker acquires firm-specific skills and knowledge. Work is a non-interrupted phase between education and retirement, little to no additional transitions are made (Baruch, 2006; Brückner & Mayer, 2005; Soens, et al., 2005; Sullivan, 1999). Traditional female careers are mainly made up of spells of housework. The employment specialization usually resulted in men taking up the role of breadwinner (Stier & Lewin-Epstein, 2001). Typical traditional careers involve continuous fulltime employment, housewife careers and fulltime self-employment.

Economic globalization, social and demographic change, rising female labour participation, organizational flexibilisation and an increased focus on employability transformed professional careers (Baruch, 2006; Reci & de Bruijn, 2006; Soens, et al., 2005; Sullivan, 1999; van Hoof & van der Lippe, 2007). First, employees are now less bound to a certain firm or employer. Careers have grown "boundaryless" as skills are less specific, training happens on the job and people seek an intrinsic motivation within their job content (Baruch, 2006; Defillippi & Arthur, 1994; Segers, et al., 2008; Sullivan, 1999). In these "boundaryless careers", people are invited to take matters into their own hands and construct their own careers in an "intelligent" or "protean" fashion. The opportunity and responsibility is theirs to make career choices, act on what they value most and find self-fulfilment in their employment (Baruch, 2006; de Gier, 2008; Segers, et al., 2008). This is not to say that transitions are always made willingly. The decline of the old psychological contract entails a great deal of job insecurity, unemployment and involuntary change (Sullivan, 1999). In the wake of the 1980s, huge numbers of redundancies transformed the system in favour of more dynamic careers (Baruch, 2006).

Non-traditional careers will be characterized by high differentiation and destandardization compared to their traditional counterparts. Differentiation is "the process where the number of distinct states or stages across the life time increases" (Brückner & Mayer, 2005, p. 33) while destandardization means that "life states (…) and their sequences can become experiences which either characterize an increasingly smaller part of a population or occur at more dispersed ages and durations" (Brückner & Mayer, 2005, p. 32). Typical for non-traditional or transitional careers are therefore high numbers of transitions and heterogeneity.

Previous research (Debeer, 2010; Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007), has shown that traditional careers persist on the Belgian labour market. Though policy such as career breaks (Soens, et al., 2005) is intended to facilitate transitions within one's career, the traditional continuous career continues to be the norm. Increasing diversity as a result of female labour market participation, migration and prolonged education however, have diversified careers tangibly. Age-, period and cohort effects were responsible for the rise in transitional careers, a detailed study of which can be found in Debeer (2010).

Both traditional and transitional career types can be labelled either "strong" or "weak" from a labour market/economic independence perspective. The weak counterparts of the strong protean careers are those employment histories riddled with unemployment and various types of inactivity between spells of labour market activity. Broadly speaking, strong traditional careers contain continuous fulltime employment and self-employment and stand in contrast to housework and (long-time) unemployment.

In Belgium too, the "transitional career" is a generic term containing both strong (job-hoppers) and weak (regime-hoppers, combination-hoppers, highly transitional hoppers…) employment histories, the latter of which were found to be largely populated by underprivileged groups (Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007; Soens, et al., 2005).

Policy is of significant importance in the formation of careers (DiPrete, et al., 1997; Widmer & Ritschard, 2009). For the European context, policy can be either situated on a European scale, a national scale or both at the same time. A good example is the Lisbon strategy, aimed to make Europe the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world. One of its goals for its member states to accomplish, is to attain 60% labour market activity for women by 2010. The implementation of these guidelines through state policy will have important consequences for the labour market and will be shaped by path dependencies and other state-level contingencies.

In discussing (welfare) state policy, one can not but mention the welfare state typology of Esping-Andersen (Esping-Andersen, 1990) which is often cited as a framework for the interpretation of inter-country differences but has also been criticized (Stier & Lewin-Epstein, 2001; Vail, 2008) adjusted (Castles & Michell, 1993) or sup-

plemented with additional types such as the Mediterranean welfare type (Arts & Gelissen, 2002; Bonoli, 1997; Leibfried, 1993). Yet, little attention was paid to the implication on careers. Blossfeld et al. (2006), argue that the labour market should be an important part of the welfare state perspective. Four dimensions are distinguished: the employment relation system, the occupational system, the employment-sustaining policy and the pension system. Based on these criteria, countries are classified in five different regimes: the conservative, socio-democratic, liberal, Southern-European and post-socialist regime.

The **conservative or corporatist** welfare regime (e.g. Germany, the Netherlands) is strongly oriented toward certain transfers, with decommodifying effects for those who are economically inactive. Due to its commitment to the traditional division of labour in the family it is often referred to as the 'male-breadwinner' or 'one-and-a-half-earner' model (Muffels & Luijkx, 2006). Belgium too is usually situated in the corporatist or conservative European type. Active labour market and taxation policies in **social-democratic regimes** (e.g. Denmark) are aimed at full employment, gender equality and a 'fair' income distribution with a high degree of wage compression (Luijkx, Kalmijn, & Muffels, 2006). The **liberal regime's** (Mills, Blossfeld, & Bernardi, 2006) comparatively high labour market performance is related to the reduction of union power, restrictive labour organisation and more general flexibility on the labour market (e.g. the United Kingdom). Italy and Spain are classified among the more **familistic or 'southern' welfare regimes** (Ferrera, 1996) which accentuate the strong ideological and practical involvement of family and kinship networks in protecting its members against economic and social risks. Finally, there is the **post-socialist regime** (e.g. Hungary, Estonia and the Czech Republic) which share the same origin of a communist regime, but in many ways have evolved in the direction of different welfare regimes (Bukodi & Robert, 2006).

3 Determinants of career trajectories and hypotheses

In addition to the creation and distribution of this European career typology, we want to check its validity. This is achieved through examining the odds of these career patterns. Our goal is not to provide an exhaustive profile of the cluster members. Rather,

face validity is tested. The vast career and labour market literature is filled with a gamut of factors of which we chose a limited number on both person and country level.

As was mentioned before, important differences can be noted between countries. For instance, Stier (Stier & Lewin-Epstein, 2001) found that when policy is geared towards support for working mothers, career continuity is more likely. Likewise, when exit possibilities are provided, women are more likely to exit the labour market. Many other authors have studied the impact of welfare state regimes on unemployment (Gangl, 2004; Taylor & Bradley, 1997), part-time employment (O'Reilly & Bothfeld, 2002), early retirement (Kim, 2009; Schils, 2008) and general occupational mobility (DiPrete, 2002, 2003).

As was mentioned before, Blossfeld et al. (H.-P. Blossfeld, Mills, & Bernardi, 2006) constructed a typology of welfare states in which special attention was paid to the labour market. His typology feeds out first hypothesis. *(1) We expect groups of European countries to appear around similar distributions of career patterns, akin to the five-way typology of Blossfeld et al. (2006).*

We also controlled for Belgian regions. It has been shown that the state of the Flemish labour market is generally more favourable than those in either Wallonia or Brussels (De Klerck & Van Wichelen, 2008; Vroman & Van Wichelen, 2007). We expect therefore that *(2) strong traditional and transitional careers are more likely to be found in Flanders compared to Wallonia and Brussels.*

Person level traits include gender, human capital, familial situation and migration trajectory.

The literature suggests important difference between male and female working patterns on many levels (Cunningham, 2007; Stier & Lewin-Epstein, 2001; 1999; Treas & Widmer, 2000). Consistently, country policy is found to either facilitate or hamper female labour participation. Though the feminization of the labour market has (at least partially) weakened differences between sexes, policy may still be geared towards either gender equality or more male-oriented labour markets (H. P. Blossfeld,

et al., 2006). Both policies entail different career distributions. Therefore, overall we expect *(3a) significant differences between male and female career distributions.*

Furthermore, research, investigating the 'destandardisation thesis' put forth by Shanahan (2000), Brückner and Mayer (Brückner & Mayer, 2005; Mayer, 2004), found significant stronger individualisation (Berger, et al., 1993) and destandardisation processes (Dykstra, 2003; Widmer & Ritschard, 2009) in women. This was confirmed in previous research on the Belgian labour market, where we found that women were overrepresented in (weak) transitional careers (Debeer, 2010; Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007). The master status perspective provides an explication for these findings. It states that institutional and social norms in modern society assign men the central role of the breadwinner while women are mainly responsible for the household and perform paid employment only on subsidiary grounds. Due to this "double allegiance", a thorough investment in employment is more difficult for women, which is why they show more transitional employment. Because of this *(3b) we expect a higher probability of transitional (either protean or weak) careers in women.*

The acquisition of human capital such as education, is argued to be one of the more influential factors of career development (Mincer, 1958; Schomann & Becker, 1995). Low education was found to lead to instable and precarious careers (Soens, et al., 2005) and more and prolonged spells of unemployment (Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007; Soens, et al., 2005). Furthermore, Segers et al. (Segers, et al., 2008) found that highly educated people were driven more strongly by achievement and personal growth, increasing their chances of pursuing protean careers. Previous research confirmed these findings as in Belgium, the lower educated were found significantly more in weak transitional careers (Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007). Also, increasing educational attainment of women has resulted in rising female employment (H.-P. Blossfeld & Jaenichen, 1992; Deleeck, 2003; Soens, et al., 2005). Overall we expect *(4) tertiary graduate's careers to feature more strong traditional and transitional careers then their lower educated peers.*

As was mentioned before however, country and country policy contribute greatly to career distributions. For instance, a gendered labour market will partially negate any educational effects on employment for women (Drobnic, Blossfeld, & Rohwer, 1999).

Therefore, we expect that *(4a) the effect of education will be at least partly dependent on the country of residence.*

Concerning the familial situation, both partner and children play a significant role. On the one hand, singles are expected to experience less stress concerning their work-life balance, and would therefore be more likely to build strong careers. However, the effect goes both ways as the added support of a partner may ease the conflict between the private life and work. The presence of children adds another ingredient to the mix. When one can rely on a partner to provide for the family, the added benefit of (a mothers') employment diminishes (Widmer & Ritschard, 2009). Single parents on the other hand, due to the increased burden of providing for the family, are even more compelled to be active on the labour market. Prone to difficulties, related to the household however, they face increased risk of involuntary transitions (Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007). Overall, we expect that *(5a) single parents will be found more active on the labour market though prone to weak transitional careers.* Futhermore, *(5b) singles and couples without children will be less likely to be economically inactive.*

Similarly to the work of Kogan (Kogan, 2007), we want to investigate how immigrants' employment careers differ from natives'. Kogan found that migrational background had a significant effect on careers. Controlling for education and gender, Turkish guest workers were found more in precarious careers and suffered frequent and long-term unemployment spells. Second generation migrants and EU-citizens on the other hand had employment histories that were far more similar to natives' careers. Overall, *(8) immigrants are expected to show weaker traditional and transitional careers as they are confronted more with unemployment and other inactivity spells*.

4 Data and methodology

The European Community Household Panel (ECHP) was used to conduct our analyses. Set up by Eurostat, the panel contains longitudinal data of 15 Western European countries on personal characteristics, family traits and a limited number of country variables. For most countries, data is available from 1994 till 2001. Even though no

full careers were available, the longitudinal character of the database allows us to construct career fragments of up to 8 years. This way, empirical employment careers were created where cohorts were used as a proxy for age groups[1]. Due to this approach, the results of our study need to be handled with great care. Age group distributions should not be confused for simple age-effects. Different respondents provided data at different times in their lives which leaves open the possibility of cohort effects.

Our statistical method was optimal matching analysis (OMA) for which we used the TDA programme. OMA has its roots in molecular biology and more specifically DNA research. Optimal matching algorithms were used to recognize patterns in the DNA and protein sequences. The technique calculates for each pair of sequences how much one differed from the next. The adaptation for the social sciences was pioneered by Abbott who promoted the use of sequence methods in this discipline (Abbott & Forrest, 1986; Abbott & Hrycak, 1996; Forrest & Abbott, 1990). In our analysis, the sequences are career paths. Each sequence consists of the employment states of a single respondent at various points in time. This is a logical approach to the data because we would like to determine whether there is observable evidence of differences in the distribution of career patterns between countries.

OMA has been used successfully before to compare employment histories. Chan (Chan, 1995) used OMA to map opportunity structures in Hong Kong labour markets. Han and Moens (Han & Moen, 1999) investigated the effects of historical, social and biographical factors on retirement pathways while Halpin and Chan (Halpin & Chan, 1998) mapped out work-life histories. Kogan (Kogan, 2007) focused on the difference between West-Germans' and migrants' employment careers. Other authors who used OMA include Stovel et al. (Stovel, Savage, & Bearman, 1996), Mary Blair-Loy (Blair-Loy, 1999), McVicar et al. (D. McVicar & Anyadike-Danes, 2000) and Arosio (Arosio, 2004).

The OMA technique is based on a number of assumptions that are inherent in the structure of the data. A timeline is assumed with multiple points of measurement t1, t2, …, tn. The variable X is measured at every point in time, which results in a range of observations. In this manner, a sequence of observations of variable X at time t is made. This range represents the course or career path for that respondent over the

points of measurement of the variable. The dependent variable labour market state is a nominal variable with twelve categories (table 1).

Table 1: Available employment states that were used in the career section of the ECHP data

	Employment state
1	working with an employer in paid employment (15+ hours / week)
2	working with an employer in paid apprenticeship (15+ hours / week)
3	working with an employer in training under special schemes related to employment (15+ hours / week)
4	self-employment (15+ hours / week)
5	unpaid work in a family enterprise (15+ hours / week)
6	in education or training
7	unemployed
8	retired
9	doing housework, looking after children or other persons
10	in community or military service
11	other economic inactive
12	working less than 15 hours

The distance between sequence one (the first respondent) and sequence two (the second respondent) is calculated using a transformation measure. This shows the 'cost' of transforming sequence 1 into sequence 2. The transformation is made by inserting, deleting, or substituting elements. Deletions and insertions receive an

equal cost of "1" while substitution costs are calculated based on the data. The lower the transformation costs, the more similar sequences are. This results in a distance or dissimilarity matrix. Once the distance matrix is calculated, the sequences are organized into career typologies using cluster analysis, grouping similar cases.

Before the ECHP data could be used, several preparations had to be made. First, Sweden was omitted from our sample. This was necessary as no true panel data was available: instead, data was constructed as pooled cross-sections. Secondly, only respondents, older than 18, were retained in the final sample. Because the TDA procedure could not run the full sample due to its huge dimensions, the sample was divided by cohort. These were created based on respondents' decade of birth, which was used as a proxy for age groups. This resulted in five different cohorts ranging from being born before 1940 to being born after the 1960s. The clustering of the cohorts in the ECHP can be viewed in table 2. As a consequence, it is worth mentioning that ages of cohorts do overlap some. This is inevitable as respondents grow eight years older over the duration of the survey. Third, each respondent was assigned one observation in which his or her consecutive spells in any of the previously mentioned employment types was recorded. Finally, as the optimal matching procedure handles gaps in sequences poorly, all respondents with missing states during their recorded period were omitted[2].

Table 2: Cohort; frequency, distribution and age range (ECHP data)

	% of total	minimal age	maximal age	N
Born from 1970 onwards	18.96	18	31	21,580
1960-1969	24.94	25	41	28,396
1950-1959	22.66	35	51	25,798
1940-1949	19.58	45	61	22,292
Born before 1940	13.86	55	92	15,773

N: 113,839

In our final step, we made use of time-independent variables that were available in the ECHP data to do a multinomial regression on our career patterns. Human capital was measured through "highest attained level of general or higher education completed". Career sequences were considered as a whole and only the highest attained level of education over the sequence recorded. There were three possibilities, each corresponding to a certain ISCED level: (1) "less than second stage of secondary education" (ISCED 0-2), (2) "second stage of secondary level education" (ISCED 3) and (3) "recognised third level education" (ISCED 5-7). The latter was used as a reference category.

Familial situation was probed by investigating the sociological composition of the family. Three distinct groups were distinguished: (1) "singles or couples with no children", (2) "single parents" and (3) "couples with children". Each related to a demographic group which the literature suggested showed distinct employment patterns. "Couples with children" were chosen as a reference category.

"Migration trajectory", which originally contained various categories, was collapsed into a simple dummy, asking whether the person was (1) born in the country of residence or (2) not (the latter was used as a reference category). This simplification was necessary due to our small sample size.

In comparing Belgian "regions", we chose to compare (1) Flanders to (2) Wallonia and Brussels combined. Again this choice was made on pragmatic grounds as our sample size did not allow us to explore the Belgian situation in more detail.

5 Results

In this section, the results for the three aims of our study are shown successively, starting off with an in-depth study of the typology that was the result of our optimal matching analysis.

5.1 A European career typology

We used squared Euclidian distances as a proximity coefficient and increase in the sum of squares for a clustering method. Bootstrap validation in the Clustan Graphics programma found multiple viable combinations of clusters for each cohort. Our choice of model was made on both inter-cohort comparability and distinct patterns within each cohort. This resulted in a total of 7 recurring career types and 6 cohort-specific types, two of which ("continuous education" and "continuous retirement") were discarded as they did not represent active careers and were thus beyond the scope of this study (table 3).

Table 3: Career typology; frequency and distribution over cohorts/age-groups (Europe) (ECHP data)

		N	%	18 - 31 (Cohort after 1970)	25 - 41 (Cohort 1960-69)	35 - 51 (Cohort 1950-59)	45 - 61 (Cohort 1940-49)	55+ (Cohort before 1940)
1	continuous paid employment	32,283	28.36	.	47.43	45.58	31.65	.
2	limited transitional paid employment	11,825	10.39	26.08	11.29	8.02	4.14	.
3	highly transitional paid employment	15,967	14.03	27.44	11.91	11.24	16.88	.
4	continuous fulltime housework, childrearing and care giving	11,747	10.32	.	0.95	9.67	16.80	33.19
5	housework and other economic inactivity	8,856	7.78	.	14.19	1.88	3.14	23.09
6	fulltime continuous self-employment	7,223	6.34	.	6.48	10.66	11.81	.
7	unemployment and other inactivity	14,273	12.54	12.48	7.75	12.95	15.57	16.28
8	starting careers/school leavers	4,242	3.73	19.66	.	.	.	.
9	highly transitional career start	3,095	2.72	14.34	.	.	.	.
10	labour market leaver	2,622	2.3	.	.	.	.	16.62
11	old age activity	1,706	1.5	.	.	.	.	10.82

N= 113,839

There were three clusters in which "working for an employer in paid employment (15+ hours)" was most dominant. The first type is made up of careers of (1) **continuous paid employment (15+ hours)**. Spells of other employment states are rare; unemployment, experienced at least once by merely 8% of cluster members, being the most frequent.

Related but different is the (2) **limited transitional paid employment (15+ hours)** type. Transitions are slightly more frequent but the dominance of paid employment remains obvious. Other states that occur are unemployment and education.

A third distinct type is the (3) **highly transitional paid employment (15+ hours)** career. These can no longer be called continuous as transitions into and out of unemployment, housework and other inactivity states are even more rampant than they were in type 2. Nonetheless, paid employment remains the most prevalent state, in which way, it remains different from other inactivity careers that feature in our typology.

(4) Almost exclusively made up of female members, **continuous fulltime housework, childrearing and care giving** is the economic inactive counterpart of our first, traditional career type. Transitions are not common though other inactivity spells occur occasionally. In the oldest cohort, some respondents move over the duration of the sequence. Housework made for the second most frequent career type for women.

Just like fulltime employment, housework careers can be tainted by a number of transitions which gives rise to the (5) **transitional housework/housework and other economic inactivity** career. Again, housework remains the single most dominant employment state but respondents experience more transitions both to activity and inactivity states and sometimes even show almost full sequences in "other inactivity", or unemployment. Both types feature limited amounts of years in paid employment.

Another career type involves self-employment. There are those whose employment history was characterized by (6) **fulltime** and **continuous self-employment**. Though this type does not feature in the youngest and oldest cohorts, we do notice some of

these careers in the unemployment (7), highly transitional career starters (9) and old age activity (11) types in these age groups.

The (7) **unemployment and other inactivity** type differs from other inactivity sequences (4,5) in that it is unemployment that dominates the employment histories.

As was mentioned earlier, both the youngest and oldest cohorts sport some unique career types. For the former, there are two, centred round education. The latter's are based on the occurrence of retirement spells.

The (8) **starting careers/school leavers** begin their run in education, only to move over to either fulltime employment or unemployment with which one third of all members are stricken for at least one year. As was mentioned before, those who spend their whole sequence in education were left out of the sample.

Similarly, (10) **labour market leavers** forms the missing link to retirement. The latter follows fulltime employment, housework, other inactivity or self-employment. Labour market re-entry, at 7% of respondents, is rather the exception than the norm.

A small portion of the youngest cohort experiences a (9) **highly transitional career start**. These hold the middle ground between the (3) highly transitional paid employment and (7) unemployment careers and are assigned a distinct cluster by OMA. Given the often tumultuous start of careers it's not unlikely however that, over time, these careers will evolve into either (2) limited or (3) highly transitional careers.

Finally, (11) **old age activity** gathers all non-retired respondents in the oldest age group. Though there are some pockets of inactivity, this cluster mainly holds respondents of the continuous fulltime employment (1,2) and self-employment (6) types, the occurrence of which were too small to result in distinct clusters in the oldest age group.

A few remarks, regarding the constructed typology should be made. First, the data was divided into cohorts for the TDA program to run which resulted in exclusive career types for both the youngest and oldest cohort (namely, clusters 8 through 11). As education and retirement are highly important in their respective cohorts, while nearly non-existent in others, they leave a firm print on career patterns within these

cohorts. Certain continuity can be seen however, which we touched upon in the above (table 3). Secondly, the career types should be considered ideal types of points within a continuum around which variations and aberrations occur.

5.2 European careers

In the second part of this section, we present both the global distribution of career patterns over age-groups within Europe and compare the distributions of career types between European countries. Table 3 shows the global European division of labour market states for each age group/cohort and demonstrates the important differences between the oldest, youngest and three middle age groups concerning career pattern distribution.

The youngest age group experiences by far the most transitional careers. These are situated both in the paid employment and age-specific clusters. As was mentioned before, the continuous education cluster has been left out. When this career type would have been left in, it would account for almost 30% of all respondents in this age group.

The three middle age groups are divided into seven distinct clusters, the division of which changes rather dramatically over cohorts. While for those born in the 1960s, continuous employment amounts to almost 50%, this figure falls to ca. 30% for those born in the 1940s. At the same time, transitional types of paid employment rise in relative importance until they make up 40% of all paid employment careers.

The fall in paid employment is due to an increase of both the continuous housework cluster and unemployment careers. Only 4% in the 1960s cohort, housework makes up for 17% in the one but oldest age group. Though the rise of unemployment based careers is not nearly as dramatic, their numbers double as respondents grow older.

Finally, the "other inactivity" cluster and self-employment careers show opposite trends. Where the former decreases in frequency over cohorts, the latter increases.

Nearly 60% of the oldest age group is fully retired. The result of leaving out the "continuous retired" is that more than half of the oldest respondents reside in either of the housework types. One third of the remaining respondents is in the process of leaving

the labour market while another third is in a rather precarious labour situation, faced with highly transitional careers, predominantly in inactivity and unemployment. Old age activity is, at 10%, only a marginal career type.

Our typology provides us with a clear and comprehensive overview of the European career distribution. By examining the distributions by age-group, we get a feel for the way in which age impacts careers in the European context. The oldest and youngest of these age-groups show specific career types, portraying the importance of these periods of transition in life histories. At the same time however, we notice certain commonalities with common types which allows us to show continuity between age-groups.

At best, however, this figure represents the mean European career. In what follows, we will describe the general tendencies and diversity in career distributions in 14 European labour markets. We will consider both the general distribution and the differentiated careers of men and women. In heeding our first comment, we chose to compare countries in their overall distribution instead of age-groups (table 4).

Table 4: Career types; general and gendered frequency and distribution of 14 European countries (ECHP data)

MEN AND WOMEN	AU	BE	DK	EL	ES	F	FIN	GE	I	IE	L	NL	P	UK
continuous paid employment	28.93	40.09	44.12	16.76	19.51	36.82	27.28	38.22	23.54	18.73	31.15	31.67	24.92	34.59
limited transitional paid employment	13.51	8.89	12.40	6.48	8.82	10.72	16.56	10.62	7.72	11.15	15.47	9.94	11.18	11.13
highly transitional paid employment	15.89	11.45	15.64	10.16	13.04	15.07	20.38	16.91	12.36	13.82	14.11	11.37	13.68	16.82
continuous fulltime housework, childrearing and care giving	12.04	7.14	0.75	13.72	16.10	7.55	0.50	4.82	13.64	17.06	14.53	14.83	7.77	3.55
housework and other economic inactivity	6.88	6.58	3.77	10.38	11.23	6.03	3.61	5.27	8.88	9.26	7.83	11.17	5.64	5.91
fulltime continuous self-employment	6.62	5.99	3.24	13.13	5.90	4.22	9.21	3.46	8.85	6.22	2.18	2.15	8.46	5.37
unemployment and other inactivity	9.40	11.08	8.87	17.23	13.71	8.91	13.61	9.90	15.49	13.31	9.54	11.56	14.17	11.79
starting careers/school leavers	3.40	3.59	4.33	3.04	4.22	4.17	4.27	3.46	3.31	4.35	2.53	3.03	4.51	3.88
highly transitional career start	1.59	1.82	2.49	3.92	3.32	3.47	2.71	3.39	3.15	2.75	1.22	1.21	2.38	2.20
labour market leaver	1.38	2.51	2.93	3.71	2.72	2.52	1.20	2.52	1.75	1.36	0.84	1.31	3.51	2.74
old age activity	0.36	0.87	1.45	1.46	1.44	0.52	0.68	1.45	1.31	1.99	0.61	1.75	3.77	2.01

(Table 4 cont.)

WOMEN	AU	BE	DK	EL	ES	F	FIN	GE	I	IE	L	NL	P	UK
continuous paid employment	20.00	33.32	42.15	10.65	11.35	30.82	27.81	31.62	17.19	13.58	17.75	21.49	20.36	31.62
limited transitional paid employment	11.52	7.53	12.41	4.86	5.93	9.04	16.81	9.47	6.19	8.97	12.54	8.57	9.24	9.91
highly transitional paid employment	14.41	11.38	16.89	8.79	9.22	14.26	20.71	17.82	9.89	12.68	11.30	11.07	12.18	17.61
continuous fulltime housework, childrearing and care giving	22.00	13.43	1.38	25.27	29.64	13.25	0.88	9.51	26.16	32.01	27.37	24.93	14.97	6.42
housework and other economic inactivity	11.17	10.27	4.53	16.56	17.22	9.39	3.97	8.26	13.77	13.90	13.29	14.27	8.65	8.85
fulltime continuous self-employment	5.38	4.13	2.31	5.34	2.76	2.35	6.68	1.99	4.22	1.55	1.28	1.30	6.14	2.78
unemployment and other inactivity	10.10	11.38	9.16	17.87	14.22	10.38	13.92	11.58	14.81	10.63	11.66	12.28	15.42	12.37
starting careers/school leavers	2.83	3.56	5.02	2.82	3.95	3.98	4.15	3.50	2.93	3.65	2.38	3.20	4.18	3.59
highly transitional career start	1.21	2.09	2.56	3.79	3.05	3.50	3.20	2.76	3.00	2.10	1.50	1.48	2.71	2.34
labour market leaver	1.31	2.46	2.22	3.47	1.83	2.70	1.05	2.48	1.39	0.38	0.57	0.34	3.59	3.12
old age activity	0.07	0.45	1.38	0.58	0.83	0.33	0.81	1.01	0.46	0.55	0.35	1.05	2.55	1.40

(Table 4 cont.)

MEN	AU	BE	DK	EL	ES	F	FIN	GE	I	IE	L	NL	P	UK
continuous paid employment	39.51	47.68	46.03	23.97	29.17	43.29	26.76	44.69	30.41	24.50	46.30	42.44	29.77	37.83
limited transitional paid employment	15.88	10.42	12.40	8.38	12.24	12.52	16.32	11.74	9.39	13.59	18.78	11.39	13.24	12.45
highly transitional paid employment	17.63	11.52	14.44	11.78	17.56	15.94	20.05	16.02	15.04	15.10	17.28	11.69	15.27	15.96
continuous fulltime housework, childrearing and care giving	0.24	0.09	0.14	0.12	0.08	1.42	0.14	0.21	0.07	0.29		4.14	0.13	0.43
housework and other economic inactivity	1.80	2.43	3.04	3.11	4.13	2.40	3.25	2.34	3.58	4.06	1.65	7.90	2.45	2.70
fulltime continuous self-employment	8.08	8.08	4.13	22.30	9.61	6.24	11.67	4.90	13.86	11.46	3.20	3.05	10.92	8.19
unemployment and other inactivity	8.57	10.74	8.60	16.48	13.09	7.33	13.31	8.25	16.22	16.31	7.14	10.79	12.85	11.16
starting careers/school leavers	4.08	3.63	3.66	3.30	4.54	4.37	4.38	3.43	3.72	5.14	2.70	2.85	4.85	4.20
highly transitional career start	2.04	1.51	2.42	4.06	3.64	3.44	2.22	4.01	3.32	3.47	0.90	0.92	2.04	2.06
labour market leaver	1.47	2.57	3.61	3.99	3.77	2.33	1.33	2.55	2.14	2.46	1.15	2.34	3.42	2.33
old age activity	0.69	1.33	1.52	2.49	2.15	0.73	0.55	1.87	2.24	3.60	0.90	2.49	5.07	2.68

First we will look at the general distribution of careers on the European labour markets. The Southern European countries (Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece) and Ireland exhibit a similar distribution of career patterns in which low continuous paid employment is combined with high percentages of self-employment (up to 13.1% in Greece), high unemployment rates and continuous housework (though the latter with the exception of Portugal). Some of these traits are shared with other countries. Finland for instance, has high rates of self-employment too and Luxembourg and the Netherlands are marked by high continuous housework rates.

At the same time, Luxembourg and the Netherlands resemble Austria, the United Kingdom and to a lesser extend France and Germany, in showing higher continuous paid employment (ca. 30%) and lower unemployment rates than the above mentioned countries. Denmark (44.1%) and Belgium (40.1%) take the lead in continuous paid employment. The latter scores only moderately concerning the amount of housework however, in which it resembles Portugal and its neighbouring countries: Germany, France and the United Kingdom. Denmark and Finland on the other hand, are almost completely void of housework careers.

Spells of transitional housework (type 6) are found mainly in countries that already have high numbers of continuous housework. At 6.6%, Belgian figures are neither very high nor very low on the European scale. In almost all countries (with the exception of the Netherlands), there's a higher tendency towards highly transitional paid employment compared to limited transitionality. The combined total of both types is highest in Finland (36.9%) and lowest in Belgium (20.3%), the Netherlands (23.3%), Italy (20.1%) and Greece (16.6%).

When considering cohort-specific career patterns, labour market exit and entry are less relevant in our analysis. Three patterns in highly transitional career starters can be distinguished. First, there's Austria, the Netherlands and Luxembourg where at less than 1.5%, these are rather seldom. At over 3% of all respondents, highly transitional career starts are found more than twice as much in Greece, Spain, France, Germany and Italy. Other countries are found in between both groups. At 1.8%, Bel-

gium tends towards the lower side of the spectrum. Old age activity is highest in Portugal, the United Kingdom and Ireland but remains rare overall.

Considering women's careers, Finland and Denmark immediately pop out. Both countries boast exceedingly low percentages of continuous or transitional housework careers. Housework is nonetheless an almost exclusively female career pattern in other countries. As their percentages where highest in the global distribution, it is not surprising then that the Southern countries and Ireland are found to have the highest female housework rates.

n regard to other career patterns, differences between Finland and Denmark are notable. Belgium (33.3%) joins Denmark (42.1%) in having the highest number of continuous paid female employment while Finland's rates are only moderate (27.8%). Low percentages are found for the Netherlands, Portugal, Austria, Luxembourg and especially Greece (10.6%) and Spain (11.3%). On the other hand, Finland has both the highest percentage of female transitional paid employment and self-employment. It's worth noticing that, while their overall percentages were the highest in all of Europe, Southern European countries' self-employment rates for women are moderate to low (with the exception of Portugal), suggesting that self-employment is predominately male in these countries. Belgian female self-employment rates at 4.1% are moderate. Female unemployment careers are high and hold up to 17.8% (Greece) of all respondents while elsewhere, female unemployment spells hover between 9 and 12% of the total sample (11.4% in Belgium).

Some shifts can be noted in cohort-specific career types compared to the overall distribution. While highly transitional career starts remain most frequent in Greece, Spain and Italy, Finland and France join in. Finally, old age activity for women is low to very low overall.

Differences between male and female career pattern distributions were smallest for Finland and Denmark closely followed by Belgium, Germany and the United Kingdom. For Finland and Denmark, housework is almost non-existent. When substituting female housework careers for continuous paid employment, differences in the latter group dissolve.

In Austria, Greece, France, Italy, Spain, Ireland and the Netherlands, men are twice as likely to be in continuous paid employment. Transitional paid employment distributions are largely similar to the female distribution. Nonetheless, percentages lie higher and inter-country differences are smaller.

Men consistently demonstrate a higher probability of self-employment, especially in the Mediterranean countries. Belgian male percentages were twice as high as women's. Unemployment rates are rather similar for both sexes though tend to be slightly lower for men with the exception of Ireland. The contrast in unemployment figures between sexes is highest in France, Germany, Ireland and Luxembourg and rather low elsewhere (less then 1% in Belgium).

Finally, cohort-specific career patterns are generally more frequent among men. Highly transitional career starters are most common in Greece, Spain, Italy, Luxembourg and Germany. Old age activity too is far more frequent for men though, three patterns can be distinguished: most old age activity can be found in Portugal (5%), the United Kingdom, Ireland, the Netherlands, Italy, Greece and Spain. Belgium (1.33%), Denmark and Germany score moderately with up to 1.9% (Germany). Figures for Austria, France, Luxembourg and Finland are downright low.

5.3 Reliability of career types

The last phase of our analysis consisted of the multinomial regression of a number of time-independent variables on our European career typology which served as a test of their reliability. We controlled for gender, educational level and country and added an effect which measured the interaction between country and education. First, four global European models were estimated. The first two contained only the general effects for each gender. The third and fourth model added the interaction between country and education.

Additional models were created to provide an in-depth view of the Belgian and Flemish distributions. First, the effects of education on the Belgian distribution of career

patterns was compared to the European mean. In two consecutive steps, we added familial situation and migration trajectory and region.

Table 5 *Model 1 and 2: The effects of country and educational level on the distribution of career types for men and women (ECHP data)*

Career type (ref. continuous paid employment)	limited transitional paid employment		highly transitional paid employment		continuous fulltime housework, childrearing and care giving		housework and other economic inactivity		fulltime continuous self-employment	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country (ref. Germany)										
Denmark	0.83**	0.77***	0.81**	0.75***	0.69	0.09***	1.03	0.33***	0.46***	0.48***
The Netherlands	0.77***	0.96	0.65***	0.88*	16.78***	2.07***	2.38***	1.43***	0.34***	0.45***
Belgium	0.66***	0.58***	0.6***	0.63***	0.43	1.11	0.71*	0.96	0.85*	0.98
France	0.74***	0.64***	0.77***	0.7***	5.19***	0.68***	0.62***	0.59***	0.67***	0.54***
Luxembourg	1.06	1.51***	0.81***	0.95	0.17	2.22***	0.39***	1.33***	0.31***	0.47***
United Kingdom	1.08	0.85**	1.18**	1.10	2.91***	0.51***	1.02	0.82**	1.10	0.78*
Ireland	1.48***	1.51***	1.33***	1.45***	1.82	4.21***	1.88***	2.23***	2.08***	0.85
Italy	0.82***	0.82***	1.08*	0.88**	0.32**	1.73***	1.09	1.21***	1.86***	1.54***
Greece	1.00	1.09	1.13*	1.41***	0.78	4.00***	1.51***	3.26***	4.17***	3.69***
Spain	1.23***	1.32***	1.42***	1.39***	0.4*	3.68***	1.45***	2.79***	1.39***	1.69***
Portugal	1.14**	1.09	1.02	0.87**	0.4*	0.59***	0.57***	0.47***	1.24***	1.59***
Austria	1.11	1.31***	1.06	1.15*	1.07	1.81***	0.66**	1.07	1.00	1.88***
Finland	1.87***	1.58***	1.91***	1.42***	1.04	0.09***	1.78***	0.44***	2.16***	2.08***
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary	1.07***	1.09***	1.02	1.04	1.12	0.94*	0.79***	0.95*	0.89***	0.93
Less than second stage of secondary	1.23***	1.12***	1.34***	1.37***	2.7***	4.57***	2.3***	3.21***	1.52***	1.77***

(Table 5 Cont.)

	unemployment and other inactivity		starting careers/school leavers		highly transitional career start		labour market leaver		old age activity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country (ref. Germany)										
Denmark	0.73***	0.51***	0.81	0.77*	0.92	0.7*	1.5***	1.14	0.84	1.47*
The Netherlands	0.85**	1.02	0.76**	1.07	0.35***	0.66***	0.89	0.24***	1.33**	1.73***
Belgium	0.83**	0.78***	0.33***	0.42***	0.33***	0.48***	1.01	1.7***	0.72	0.66
France	0.49***	0.53***	0.48***	0.38***	0.78*	0.64***	0.81*	1.10	0.37***	0.35***
Luxembourg	0.45***	0.97	0.5***	0.81	0.29***	0.68*	0.36***	0.38***	0.37***	0.61
United Kingdom	1.18**	0.93	1.43***	0.92	1.3*	0.98	1.05	1.83***	1.56***	1.82***
Ireland	2.02***	1.38***	1.31*	1.18	1.97***	1.26	1.39**	0.41***	2.98***	1.44
Italy	1.46***	1.17***	1.32***	1.24**	1.59***	1.44***	0.79**	0.73**	1.26*	0.61*
Greece	2.15***	2.93***	1.42***	1.87***	2.75***	3.53***	2.33***	4.35***	2.1***	1.82**
Spain	1.32***	2.04***	1.87***	2.82***	2.13***	2.92***	1.56***	1.76***	1.3***	2.08***
Portugal	0.92	0.8***	1.97***	1.86***	0.89	1.18	0.94***	1.08	2.17	2.27***
Austria	0.76***	0.82**	1.04	0.94	0.78	0.43***	0.67*	0.92	0.48**	0.12**
Finland	1.86***	1.19**	1.87***	1.13	1.64***	1.39**	0.90	0.85	0.5**	1.34
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary level education (ISCED 3)	0.91***	0.98	1.18***	1.23***	1.17***	1.25***	0.69***	0.73***	0.66***	0.71***
Less than second stage of secondary education (ISCED 0-2)	1.88***	2.5***	0.95	0.82***	1.61***	1.41***	2.43***	4.58***	2.07***	2.81***

***p<0,001 **p<0,01, *p<0,05

N (model 1)= 52,473; N (model 2)= 57,100 -

Model 1 and 2 tested only the general effects. We will not discuss the results for the country predictor. In the previous section we already spent ample time comparing country and gender differences in career distributions. It suffices to say here that differences in the odds-ratios between countries appear to be largely significant.

Examining the education estimates, we notice that, though the strength of the effects may vary, significant odds-ratios for both sexes consistently point in the same direction. Overall, the higher one's education, the lower the odds to highly and limited transitional employment and highly transitional career starts. Continuous housework and other types of inactivity, self-employment, unemployment and both old age career patterns follow a U-shaped education effect where the secondary educated boast the lowest chance of being in either of these types. For school leavers, the ranking is reversed as it is the secondary educated who have the highest odds.

Table 6 Model 3 and 4: The effects of country and educational level and the interaction between both on the distribution of career types for men and women (ECHP data)

Career type (ref. continuous paid employment)	limited transitional paid employment		highly transitional paid employment		continuous fulltime housework, childrearing and care giving		housework and other economic inactivity		fulltime continuous self-employment	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country (ref. Germany)										
Denmark	0.88	0.09***	0.83*	0.07**	0.72	0.01*	1.04	9209.58	0.45***	#######
The Netherlands	0.86**	1.29**	0.72***	1.09	11.35***	3.29***	2.45***	0.72	0.33***	0.08
Belgium	0.69***	2.04***	0.62***	1.93***	0.47	2.74***	0.67*	0.71	0.79*	0.42
France	0.76***	2.34***	0.78***	1.79***	3.09***	2.98***	0.6***	0.55	0.67***	0.17
Luxembourg	1.03	1.25*	0.81**	0.88	0.46	2.53***	0.42***	0.59	0.31***	0.07
United Kingdom	0.95	0.63***	1.09	0.77**	1.78	0.62**	1.07	0.34	1.29**	0.09
Ireland	1.47***	1.2*	1.31***	1.82***	1.48	2.5***	1.59***	0.58	2.05***	0.07
Italy	0.83**	0.59***	1.08	0.8*	0.38*	0.79	1.41***	0.56	2.05***	0.26
Greece	1.00	0.74**	1.13*	1.28*	0.86	3.76***	1.52***	1.20	4.12***	0.71
Spain	1.26***	0.93	1.42***	1.23*	0.39*	2.64***	1.51***	0.83	1.46***	0.23
Portugal	1.2*	1.51***	1.07	1.18	0.77	0.27**	0.48**	0.14	1.32*	0.18**
Austria	1.00	1.26*	0.95	1.04	1.25	1.86***	0.71	0.46	1.00	0.16
Finland	1.8***	1.24*	1.87***	1.12	0.93***	0.11***	1.55***	0.17	2.28***	0.39
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary	1.1***	0.99	1.05*	0.91	0.77	1.09	0.79***	0.39	1.00	0.16
Less than second stage of secondary	1.24***	0.79***	1.32***	1.29***	2.23***	2.79***	2.4***	0.98	1.22***	0.19

Table 6 (cont.)

	unemployment and other inactivity		starting careers/school leavers		highly transitional career start		labour market leaver		old age activity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country (ref. Germany)										
Denmark	0.74***	0.06**	0.81	0.13	0.95	1.44	1.53***	805601692	0.82	14517.35
The Netherlands	0.85**	1.22*	0.93	1.7**	0.34***	0.71	0.96	0.10	1.32*	0.62
Belgium	0.8**	2.21***	0.31***	0.54	0.33***	0.43	1.06	0.26	0.73	0.38
France	0.49***	1.95***	0.55***	0.74	0.89	1.01	0.82	0.18	0.39***	0.21
Luxembourg	0.45***	0.81	0.39***	0.58	0.22***	0.69	0.29***	0.11	0.3***	0.39
United Kingdom	1.26**	0.75**	0.72	0.59	1.09	0.65	1.33*	0.43	2.07***	0.52
Ireland	1.69***	1.48***	1.34*	0.77	1.96***	0.71	1.38*	0.08	2.9***	0.37
Italy	1.57***	1.00	1.25*	1.02	1.45**	0.95	1.06	0.17	1.38**	0.30
Greece	2.15***	2.27***	1.45***	1.99***	2.6***	3.39	1.84***	0.71	1.81***	1.00
Spain	1.37***	1.46***	2.01***	2.33***	2.35***	2.46	1.42***	0.37	1.3*	0.85
Portugal	0.96	0.7***	2.68***	4.52	1.29	2.02	0.78	0.17	1.8***	0.86
Austria	0.75*	0.78*	1.30	1.09	1.05	0.39	0.65	0.18	0.56*	0.22
Finland	1.81***	1.00	1.65***	1.30	1.34	1.32	0.95	0.19	0.49**	0.60
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary level education (ISCED 3)	0.94*	0,83*	1.11	1.36	1.10	1.34	0.73***	0.21	0.7***	0.53
Less than second stage of secondary education (ISCED 0-2)	1.9***	1,95***	1.08	0.74	1.9***	1.13	2.33***	0.56	1.66***	0.77

Country*education   1355.16***   3515.95***

***p<0,001 **p<0,01, *p<0,05   N=

N (model 1)= 52,473; N (model 2)= 57,100

Model 3 and 4 add an effect that estimates the interaction between country and educational level. For women, the drop in significance of both country and education effects are remarkable. This, coupled with the high significance of the interaction effect

as a whole suggests that the link between female cluster membership and education differs greatly between countries, especially concerning housework and other economic inactivity, self-employment and the cohort-specific clusters.

The drop in significance levels is far less pronounced in men: both country and education continue to have an important effect on male career type membership while controlling for the interaction effect. Furthermore, the direction of the education effect remains unaltered. For women, the only significant difference between both models is that the lowly educated appear to have lower odds to highly transitional paid employment compared to continuous employment.

Table 7 Model 5 and 6: The effects of educational level on the distribution of career types for men and women (Europe) (ECHP data)

Career type (ref. continuous paid employment)	limited transitional paid employment		highly transitional paid employment		continuous fulltime housework, child-rearing and care giving		housework and other economic inactivity		fulltime continuous self-employment	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary	1.04	1.07**	0.98	1.02	1.28**	0.97	0.8***	0.93**	0.84***	0.88***
Less than second stage of secondary	1.26***	1.15***	1.37***	1.35***	2.23***	4.85***	2.2***	3.3***	1.69***	1.96***
	unemployment and other inactivity		starting careers/school leavers		highly transitional career start		labour market leaver		old age activity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary level education (ISCED 3)	0.87***	0.94**	1.04	1.09*	1.11**	1.13**	0.65***	0.67***	0.59***	0.62***
Less than second stage of secondary education (ISCED 0-2)	1.97***	2.57***	1.1**	0.97	1.67***	1.55***	2.44***	4.49***	2.38***	3.06***

***p<0,001 **p<0,01, *p<0,05
   N (model 1)= 52,473; N (model 2)= 57,100

Table 8 Model 7 and 8: The effects of educational level on the distribution of career types for men and women (Belgium) (ECHP data)

Career type (ref. continuous paid employment)	limited transitional paid employment		highly transitional paid employment		continuous fulltime housework, childrearing and care giving		housework and other economic inactivity		fulltime continuous self-employment	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary	0.90	1.00	0.94	1.12	0.00	1.14	0.79	1.21	0.94	1.13
Less than second stage of secondary	1.43**	1.32	1.72***	1.46**	25.86***	4.55***	3***	3.77***	1.01	0.96

	unemployment and other inactivity		starting careers/school leavers		highly transitional career start		labour market leaver		old age activity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary level education (ISCED 3)	1.00	1.14	1.20	2.34*	1.28	2.07*	0.6*	0.84	0.59	0.90
Less than second stage of secondary education (ISCED 0-2)	1.79***	2.68***	0.64	0.37	1.83	3.79***	2.43***	4.39***	1.9*	2.97*

***p<0,001 **p<0,01, *p<0,05
N (model 1)= 1,915; N (model 2)= 2,181

Models 5 and 6 portray the effects of education on the European distribution while models 7 and 8 do the same for Belgium. Mainly due to the reduced sample size, education effects for Belgium were less significant which was especially clear for secondary education. Overall, effects seem to point in the same direction as the global European effects which we already discussed. Nevertheless, the positive effect of being lowly educated on highly transitional paid employment and career starts and continuous housework were found to be far stronger.

Table 9 Model 9 and 10: The effects of educational level and familial situation on the distribution of career types for men and women (Belgium) (ECHP data)

Career type (ref. continuous paid employment)	limited transitional paid employment		highly transitional paid employment		continuous fulltime housework, childrearing and care giving		housework and other economic inactivity		fulltime continuous self-employment	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary	0.80	2.16*	0.88	1.04	8.77	1.71*	0.80	1.34	0.91	0.93
Less than second stage of secondary	1.42*	0.62	1.75***	1.82**	34.16	3.48***	3.04***	3.76***	1.08	1.50
Family situation (ref. couple with children)										
No children	1.07	1.40	1.19	1.22	266.51	2.14**	2.17*	1.35	1.37	1.19
Single parent	1.69	0.44**	1.13	0.95	0.34	0.72	1.57	0.78	0.77	0.78

	unemployment and other inactivity		starting careers/school leavers		highly transitional career start		labour market leaver		old age activity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary level education (ISCED 3)	0.99	1.56*	1.06	24.41	0.84	1.05	0.61*	0.73	0.55*	0.73
Less than second stage of secondary education (ISCED 0-2)	1.69***	2.03**	0.55	0.01	2.02	5.58***	2.52***	3.87***	2.01*	4.17*
Family situation (ref. couple with children)										
No children	1.65*	1.46*	2.16	41.35***	13.77***	1.40	39.31***	78.59	2.77*	37.92
Single parent	1.08	0.99	2.36	0.00	0.04	0.70	0.01	12.96	1.60	9.40

***p<0,001 **p<0,01, *p<0,05
N (model 1)= 1,721; N (model 2)= 642

In model 9 and 10 we added the familial situation as a predictor variable. No changes were found in the education effects. Though the limits of our Belgian sample are almost reached by adding another variable, we do find some additional significant ef-

fects. Surprisingly, women who had no children had far higher odds to pursue a housework career. The same held true for men in housework and other economic inactivity. Having no children further increased the odds of unemployment, labour market leavers (men), career starts (women) and highly transitional career starts (men). Single mothers, finally had higher odds of continuous compared to transitional paid employment.

Table 10 Model 11 and 12: The effects of educational level, familial situation, migration trajectory and region of inhabitancy on the distribution of career types for men and women (Belgium) (ECHP data)

Career type (ref. continuous paid employment)	limited transitional paid employment		highly transitional paid employment		continuous fulltime housework, childrearing and care giving		housework and other economic inactivity		fulltime continuous self-employment	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary	0.83	2.19*	0.90	1.01	8.74	1.76*	0.81	1.38	0.91	0.94
Less than second stage of secondary	1.36*	0.58	1.74***	1.84**	32.28	3.65***	3.03***	3.69***	1.11	1.47
Family situation (ref. couple with children)										
No children	1.07	1.37	1.19	1.20	250.08	2.13**	2.21**	1.30	1.43	1.18
Single parent	1.77	0.46**	1.11	0.93	0.32	0.64	1.53	0.75	0.74	0.78
Migration trajectory (ref. not born in the country)										
Native	0.86	1.09	0.88	0.85	13.46*	0.54	0.72	0.74	0.92	0.83
Region (ref. Other regions)										
Flanders	1.07	1.29	0.89	1.17	0.91	0.74	0.84	0.87	0.85	1.11

(Table 10 Cont.)

	unemployment and other inactivity		starting careers/school leavers		highly transitional career start		labour market leaver		old age activity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary level education (ISCED 3)	1.01	1.58**	1.06	23.51	0.84	1.09	0.63*	0.73	0.61	0.74
Less than second stage of secondary education (ISCED 0-2)	1.69***	2.06**	0.52	0.01	2.06	6.08***	2.53***	4.01***	1.64	4.42*
Family situation (ref. couple with children)										
No children	1.8**	1.48*	2.10	46.23***	14.89***	1.39	40.54***	80.42	2.89**	28.28
Single parent	0.92***	0.94	2.49	0.00	0.04	0.58	0.01	11.97	1.65	5.87**
Migration trajectory (ref. not born in the country)										
Native	0.65	0.66	47.18	20.45	0.76	31.86	1.12	0.60	1.44	0.43
Region (ref. Other regions)										
Flanders	0.85	0.82	1.33	1.41	0.66	0.39	0.95	0.79	0.89	0.78

***p<0,001 **p<0,01, *p<0,05

N (model 1)= 1673; N (model 2)= 630

Finally, adding migration and region to our list of variables produced little to no significant outcome. The effects of education and family situation remain mostly the same, with the exception of old age activity and unemployment. For the latter, odds for single fathers are found to be lower (though only slightly) while single mothers are far more likely to be in old age activity.

The only significant effect of migration appears to be that native men are far more likely to be in a housework career. No significant differences are found between Flanders and the other Belgian regions.

6 Discussion

Our first aim was to construct a career typology based on the combined data of 14 European countries. Many authors have picked on European labour markets and regimes, stating that they are responsible for crippling much needed change and flexibilization. But can Europe be diagnosed as stricken with Eurosclerosis? Our results certainly show that some countries cope with high unemployment and/or high female housework rates. Furthermore, continuous paid employment continues to be the most dominant European employment state. As a side note, we mention that in half of the countries, over 65% of the oldest age group are found in retirement and over 30% of the youngest age group are in fulltime education.

Continuous or traditional employment careers are thus firmly entrenched in European labour markets. Nevertheless, a sizeable part of the sample experiences transitional employment which gives rise to the emergence of specific career types. Our youngest respondents lack nearly all continuous, non-interrupted careers[3]. But, transitional employment is not reserved to the youngest age groups. Interestingly, while percentages of limited transitional paid employment drops at higher ages, highly transitional careers slightly gain in importance. We should be careful to ascribe such changing distribution to ageing effects since age, period and cohort effects often deliver a multi-layered mix. For instance, in previous research on the emergence of a transitional labour market in Belgium (Debeer, 2010), we found that, even though most transitions are made at a young age (age), the peak has shifted slightly over cohorts (cohort) while rising labour mobility from the 1960s on has partially nullified the effect altogether (period). The way in which our data is constructed does not allow us to discern these trends. Subsequent research is needed to disentangle age-, period and cohort effects on a European scale and situate them in a historical context.

Does a rose by any other name smell as sweet – or rather, are these "transitional" careers also "protean" or "boundaryless" careers? These concepts entail a normative content, suggesting that strong, transitional careers would replace the strong fixed careers of yesterday. Our results convince us that our "transitional" career types are often of the weak transitional type. First and foremost, they are riddled with spells of unemployment, housework and other inactivity. Furthermore, as will be shown later,

they are populated with typically disadvantaged groups. As was mentioned above, highly transitional paid employment increases for older age groups, coinciding with rising unemployment. As the literature suggest that older people are less likely to invest in protean careers or exploit the possibilities of boundaryless career (Segers, et al., 2008; Sullivan, 1999; Widmer & Ritschard, 2009), it is not unlikely that transitions in these age groups are at least partially involuntary. We certainly do not disclaim the existence of strong transitional careers. However, they are not found in our data. Subsequent research might include variables such as job security, satisfaction and career outlook to distinguish those who live the dream from those whose dream is being lived.

The second aim consisted of exploring the distribution of career patterns for the different European countries individually. Our results pointed out that the "European career" should not be generalised. Labour markets differ greatly, from paid employment-prone Denmark to housework-ridden Italy. Most countries pop up in the results according to what could be expected from the literature. For instance, while housework was frequent in Mediterranean countries like Italy and Spain (Castles & Michell, 1993; Stier & Lewin-Epstein, 2001; Vlasblom & Schippers, 2004) and intermediate in Western European countries like France, Germany and The Netherlands (Vlasblom & Schippers, 2004), it was virtually non-existent in the United Kingdom and Scandinavian countries like Denmark and Finland, known for their high percentages of female labour participation (Versantvoort, 2008). Though the last two decades have seen extensive labour market reforms in Italy, the country continues to lag behind other European labour markets with high unemployment and low paid employment careers (Schindler, 2009). Self-employment, on the other hand, was found to be high in Mediterranean states, which confirmed the literature (Blanchflower, 2000). Meanwhile, low labour market participation of workers aged 55 and older in Belgium was illustrated by low old age activity, high percentages of unemployment and low percentages of continuous paid employment in the 45-61 year old age group (De Klerck & Van Wichelen, 2008). Falling unemployment rates due to French labour market reforms in the course of the 1990s (Estevao & Nargis, 2005; Vail, 2008) were reflected in unemployment careers which did not exceed 10%.

Overall, it seems that inter-country differences in career distribution are most distinct for women. The presence or absence of housework in female careers thoroughly shapes differences between countries. Again, it was the Southern European countries that showed the lowest percentages of female employment. Scandinavian countries on the other hand had little to no housework careers at all. In all countries men were more likely to be in self-employment or any of the cohort-specific career types. Gender equality on the labour market appears not to have arrived yet.

At the same time, intra-country disparity between male and female careers, which can be situated in all career types, range from very high (Southern European countries, Ireland, France, Austria and the Netherlands) too nearly non-existent (Denmark and Finland). We did not test in which way the distribution of career types within countries was prone to change over cohorts. Further research should focus on a cohort-analysis of career distribution.

Many authors have turned to the available Esping-Andersen classification of welfare states. This has the advantage of entering a comprehensive and widely acknowledged frame of reference. However, it should not be an excuse to negate the complex reality of labour markets (Stier & Lewin-Epstein, 2001) nor let us fail to look beyond forks in path dependencies (Vail, 2008). The typology of Blossfeld et al. (2006), which proved more useful to us, is based on the classification by Esping-Andersen. Labour markets are taken up and form an important part of the classification. All in all, most confirmation was found for the existence of a Southern and a social-democratic regime, the former characterised by high unemployment, self-employment and housework, the latter by high paid employment and similarity between male and female careers.

Belgium can be positioned in between the corporatist and social-democratic type. For most career patterns, its percentages fell neatly in between the highest and lowest scores, with the exception of continuous paid employment. The latter reflects the enduring dominance of (fulltime) continuous employment in the Belgian labour market (Debeer, 2010; Soens, et al., 2005). Intra-country differences between men and women remained relatively low with the exception of housework and self-employment. 23.7% of the female sample is still found in either of the housework types, suggesting the remaining importance of housewives for the Belgian labour

market. Nevertheless, previous research (Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007) has shown that housewives were mainly found in the older age groups. Younger women were more likely to be in transitional employment.

Our third aim was to test face validity of our typology. No attempt was made to create an exhaustive profile of career patterns. Rather, multinomial regression was used to confirm their validity.

First, we examined the general effects of country and educational level on cluster membership. Seeing the way in which both inter- and intra-country differences shape the distribution of career patterns for men and women, it is not surprising then that country effects appeared so significant in our multinomial regression. For both men and women, the effect of country on cluster membership was usually found to be either significant or very significant.

As expected, male and female career distributions differed significantly. First, housework remains a virtually exclusive female employment "career". Significance levels of country effects on housework for men were relatively low. Men on the other hand had, globally, about 33% more chance to be in continuous paid employment and were three times as likely to be in self-employment. Furthermore, though lower in absolute numbers, transitional paid employment careers made up a larger share of paid employment for women who were more prone to highly transitional career starts particularly. As such, there is proof for the master status perspective (Widmer & Ritschard, 2009).

Again it is unsure whether these transitional careers should be classified as "protean". The literature suggests that female transitional careers are usually the result of accommodation to circumstances (Widmer & Ritschard, 2009). On the other hand, women were found to be more value-driven in giving direction in their careers (Segers, et al., 2008). Country policy is vital in the facilitation of female labour participation. Further research should focus on the legislative context and its effects on female/male transitional labour careers.

Human capital pays out in career type odds. For both sexes, the effects of education largely pointed in the same direction, though were different in intensity and displayed a U-shaped pattern for continuous housework and other types of inactivity, self-

employment, unemployment and both old age career patterns (e.g. while unemployment was highest for the lowest educated, it was slightly lower for the secondary educated compared to the tertiary educated). In line with our expectations, those who had received the lowest educational attainment were usually found in the least favourable careers. In contrast with the literature (Segers, et al., 2008), transitional paid employment types were found to be more frequently in the second and lower educated groups, once again strengthening our conviction that these are not strong transitional or "protean" careers.

When an interaction effect between country and education was included, significance levels of both country and education fell significantly for women suggesting that the link between female cluster membership and education differs greatly over countries. This confirms our conviction that country policy has a large influence on female activity through education. An in-depth examination of education policy will be left to further research.

Additional models were plotted in which we tested our typology for the Belgian and Flemish labour market. Educational effects were found to be similar to the global European effects. This confirmed previous findings (Debeer, 2010; Heylen & Mortelmans, 2007) as it was shown that the lowly educated were far more prone to weak (transitional) careers such as unemployment, housework, transitional paid employment and highly transitional career starts.

Differing results for gender were less clear-cut. Secondary educated women were more likely to be in highly transitional careers while the lowly educated women had higher odds of highly transitional career starts. These results prove that women were most likely to be found in the weakest, transitional careers. On the other hand, lowly educated men had higher odds of limited transitional paid employment while no significant effect was found for women.

Contrary to our expectations, single mothers showed higher odds of continuous employment compared to transitional paid employment. This probably reflects the need of these women to provide for the household. This belief is strengthened as these women were at the same time more likely to be in old age activity and less so in unemployment. Again contrary to expectations, singles and couples without children

had far higher odds of multiple types of inactivity (unemployment, housework…). However, as singles and couples without children made up the bulk of both the oldest (75.7%) and the youngest cohorts (69.9%) it is obvious that these household types are largely specific to a certain life phase which may distort our results. Subsequent research should approach the career typologies from a life course perspective and go beyond these confounding variables.

Results for the effect of migration trajectory were too limited to draw conclusions. Nonetheless, migrant men were far less likely to have a household career which flies in the face of our expectations. Some may be explained through the composition of the group, however. Non-natives comprised both EU citizens and non-EU citizens. OECD studies have proven that, while on the one hand, similar to Kogan (Kogan, 2007), non-EU citizen migrants had a higher probability of unfavourable careers, on the other hand, careers of EU-citizens differed only slightly from natives'. Further research should delve more meticulously into an investigation of European migrants' careers and explore differences in career outlook by country of emigration.

Due to the limited size of our sample, no significant results for region of inhabitance could be found. This need not mean that effects are not significant, simply the limits of our sample were reached.

7 Conclusion

In this report, we examined first the existence of European career types. We used optimal matching techniques to cluster the sequences, derived from the ECHP survey. In total, 13 clusters were distinguished two of which were discarded as they were not situated in activity. The distribution of these career types over the youngest, oldest and middle age groups, provided us with insight in the global distribution of careers in the European context. Though (strong) traditional careers remain a reality in the European countries, transitional career types pop up and are not restricted to certain age groups.

Continuous, fixed employment careers remain important in the European labour markets. Though transitional careers were found, a close examination of our typology re-

vealed that they did not fit the "protean" or "boundaryless" career types as unemployment, inactivity and housework ran rampant.

Secondly, we explored how these careers were distributed over the European countries. In comparing the gendered distribution of these career histories, we found strong inter-country differences suggesting significant variety in European labour markets. In addition, intra-country differences with regard to the distribution of career types between genders varied greatly. In some countries, male and female careers were virtually identical while in other countries, differences stacked up to the point of showing segregated careers. Belgium was found somewhere in between the conservative and social-democratic types with limited differences in career distribution between gender and high continuous employment.

Finally, our career typology was put to the test. Reliability was probed through the multinomial regression of a limited number of variables on our patterns, which overall confirmed the validity of our typology. Additional parameters were examined for Belgium. It was found that familial situation has an important impact on career distributions. Region and migration results could not be interpreted due to the limited sample size. Further research should use this to explore the domestic situation comprehensively or focus on an international comparison of any of the topics we briefly touched upon.

The longitudinal data and great diversity of variables in the European Community Household Panel proved invaluable for the construction of a career typology for the European context. Though these traits make the ECHP the data bank of choice for comparative European longitudinal analysis, it is not without flaws.

First, only 8 waves were present, spanning from 1994 till 2001. We circumvented this by creating empirical careers using career fragments and cohorts as a proxy for age groups. Furthermore, once divided by country and especially by region, the limits of the sample size are quickly reached. Systematically missing data for countries finally limits its use as a comparative data bank. Nevertheless, we were able to study the distribution of a valid and reliable typology for Europe as a whole and within European countries.

8 Bibliography

Abbott, A., & Forrest, J. (1986). Optimal Matching Methods for Historical Sequences. Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 16(3), 471-494.

Abbott, A., & Hrycak, A. (1996). Measuring Resemblance in Sequence Data: An Optimal Matching Analysis of Musicians' Careers. *American Journal of Sociology, 96*(1), 144-185.

Arosio, L. (2004). Occupational Careers and Longitudinal Data: Tools and Perspectives of Research. *Quality and Quantity, 38*, 435-456.

Arts, W., & Gelissen, J. (2002). Three worlds of welfare capitalism or more? A state-of-the-art report. *Journal of European Social Policy, 12*(2), 137-158.

Baruch, Y. (2006). Career development in organizations and beyond: Balancing traditional and contemporary viewpoints. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*(2), 125-138.

Berger, P. A., Steimuller, P., & Sopp, P. (1993). Differentiation of Life-Courses? Changing Patterns of Labour-Market Sequences in West Germany. *European Sociological Review, 9*(1), 43-65.

Blair-Loy, M. (1999). Career Patterns of Executive Women in Finance: An Optimal Matching Analysis. *The American Journal of Sociology, 104*(5), 1346-1397.

Blanchflower, D. G. (2000). Self-employment in OECD countries. *Labour Economics, 7*(5), 471-505.

Blossfeld, H.-P., & Jaenichen, U. (1992). Educational Expansion and Changes in women's Entry into Marriage and Motherhood in the Federal Republic of Germany. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54*(2), 302-315.

Blossfeld, H.-P., Mills, M., & Bernardi, F. (Eds.). (2006). *Globalization, Uncertainty and Men's Careers*. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing Inc.

Blossfeld, H. P., Buchholz, S., & Hofacker, D. (2006). *Globalization, Uncertainty and Late careers in society*. London: Routledge.

Bonoli, G. (1997). Classifying Welfare States: a Two-dimension Approach. *Journal of Social Policy, 26*(3), 351-372.

Brückner, H., & Mayer, K. U. (2005). De-standardization of the Life Course: What it Might Mean? And if it Means Anything, Whether it Actually Took Place. *Advances in Life Course Research, 9*, 27-53.

Bukodi, E., & Robert, P. (2006). Men's career mobility in Hungary during the 1990s. In H. P. Blossfeld, S. Buchholz & D. Hofacker (Eds.), *Globalization, Uncertainty and Men's careers*. London: Routledge.

Castles, F. G., & Michell, D. (Eds.). (1993). *Worlds of welfare and families of nations*. Aldershot: Darmouth.

Chan, T. W. (1995). Optimal Matching Analysis: A Methodological Note on Studying Career Mobility. *Work and Occupations, 22*(4), 467-490.

Cunningham, M. (2007). Influences of Women's Employment on the Gendered Division of Household Labor Over the Life Course: Evidence From & 31-Year Panel Study. *Journal of Family Issues, 28*, 422-444.

de Gier, E. (2008). De 'Nieuwe werknemer': oude wijn in nieuwe zakken of toch niet? *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken, 24*(1), 16-18.

De Klerck, W., & Van Wichelen, L. (2008). Hoe actief is het arbeidsmarktbeleid in Vlaanderen, België en Europa? *Over.werk Tijdschrift van het Steunpunt WSE*(3-4), 10-24.

Debeer, J. (2010). Traditie of transitie? Een empirische toets van de destandardiseringshypothese op de Belgische arbeidsmarkt (1931 - 2002). *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken*(1).

Defillippi, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1994). The Boundaryless career: a compentecy-based perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 15*, 307-324.

Deleeck, H. (2003). *De architectuur van de welvaartsstaat opnieuw bekeken*. Leuven: Acco.

Dingeldey, I. (2007). Between workfare and enablement - The different paths to transformation of the welfare state: A comparative analysis of activating labour market policies. *European Journal of Political Research, 46*(6), 823-851.

DiPrete, T. A. (2002). Life Course Risks, Mobility regimes and Mobility Consequences: A Comparison of Sweden, Germany and the United States. *The American Journal of Sociology, 108*(2), 267-309.

DiPrete, T. A. (2003). Do Cross-National Differences in Household Standard of Living Mobility Parallel Cross-National Differences in Occupational Mobility? A Comparison of Germany, Sweden and the USA. *Current Sociology, 51*, 483-498.

DiPrete, T. A., de Graaf, P. M., Luikx, R., Tahlin, M., & Blossfeld, H.-P. (1997). Collectivist Versus Individualist Mobility Regimes? Structural Change and Job Mobility in Four Countries. *The American Journal of Sociology, 103*(2), 318-158.

Drobnic, S., Blossfeld, H.-P., & Rohwer, G. (1999). Dynamics of Women's Employment Patterns over the Family Life Course: A Comparison of The United States and Germany. *Journal of Marriage and the family, 61*(1), 133-146.

Dykstra, P. A. (2003). Levenslooppatronen: Toenemende varatie? *Bevolking en Gezin, 32*(2), 21-34.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Estevao, M., & Nargis, N. (2005). *Structural Labor Market Changes in France*. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.

Ferrera, M. (1996). The "Southern" model of welfare in social Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy, 6*(1), 17-37.

Forrest, J., & Abbott, A. (1990). The Optimal Matching Method for Studyin Anthropological Sequence Data: An Introduction and Reliability Analysis. *Journal of Quantitative Anthropology, 1*(2), 151-170.

Gangl, M. (2004). Labor Market Structure and Re-Employment Rates: Unemployment Dynamics in West Germany and the United States. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, 20*, 185-224.

Hall, D. T. (1996). Protean Careers of the 21st Century. *The Academy of Management Executive (1993), 10*(4), 8-16.

Halpin, B., & Chan, T. W. (1998). class Careers as Sequences: An Optimal Matching Analysis of Work-Life Histories. *European Sociological Review, 14*(2), 111-130.

Han, S.-K., & Moen, P. (1999). Clocking out: Temporal Patterning of Retirement. *American Journal of Sociology, 105*(1), 191-236.

Heylen, L., & Mortelmans, D. (2007). Determinanten van loopbaanpatronen. *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken, 23*(1), 8-19.

Jacobs, S. (1999). Trends in Women's Career Patterns and in Gender Occupational Mobility in Britain. *Gender, Work and Organization, 6*(1), 32-46.

Kim, J. (2009). Early Retirement in the Three Types of Welfare States. *Research on Aging, 31*(5), 520-548.

Kogan, I. (2007). A study of immigrants' employment careers in West Germany using the sequence analysis technique. [Article]. *Social Science Research, 36*, 491-511.

Kuppens, A., & Mortelmans, D. (2004). Longitudinale loopbaananalyse met sequentieanalyse. In D. Mortelmans, M. T. Casman & R. Doutrelepont (Eds.), *Elf jaar uit het leven in België* (pp. 377-401). Gent: Academia Press.

Leibfried, S. (1993). Towards a European Welfare State. In C. Jones (Ed.), *New Perspectives on the Welfare State in Europe* (pp. 133-156). New York: Routledge.

Luijkx, R., Kalmijn, M., & Muffels, J. A. (2006). The impact of globalization on job and career mobility of Dutch men: life history data from the mid-1905s to the year 2000. In H. P. Blossfeld, S. Buchholz & D. Hofacker (Eds.), *Globalization, Uncertainty and Men's Careers*. London: Routledge.

Mayer, K. U. (2004). Whose Lives? How History, Societies, and Institutions Define and Shape Life Courses. *Research in Human Development, 1*(3), 161-187.

McVicar, D., & Anyadike-Danes, M. (2000). *Predicting Successful and Unsuccessful Transitions from School to Work Using Sequence Methods*: Economic Research Institute of Northern Ireland.

McVicar, D., & Anyadike-Danes, M. (2002). Predicting succesful and unsuccesful transitions from school to work by using sequence methods.

Mills, M., Blossfeld, H. P., & Bernardi, F. (2006). Globalization, uncertainty and men's employment careers: a theoretical framework. In H. P. Blossfeld, S. Buchholz & D. Hofacker (Eds.), *Globalization, Uncertainty and Men's Careers*. London: Routledge.

Mincer, J. (1958). Investment in Human Capital and Personal Income Distribution. *The Journal of Political Economy, 66*(4), 281-302.

Muffels, J. A., & Luijkx, R. (2006). Globalization and male job mobility in European welfare states. In H. P. Blossfeld, S. Buchholz & D. Hofacker (Eds.), *Globalization, Uncertainty and Men's Careers*. London: Routledge.

O'Reilly, J., & Bothfeld, S. (2002). What happens after working part time? Integration, maintenance or exclusionary transitions in Britain and Western Germany. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 26*(4), 409-439.

Reci, I., & de Bruijn, J. (2006). *Transitional Labour Markets: Past, Present and Future Applications*. Amsterdam: SISWO/Social Policy Research.

Salvanes, K. G. (1997). Market Rigidities and Labour Market Flexibility: An International Comparison. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 99*(2), 315-333.

Scherer, S. (2001). Early Career Patterns: A Comparison of Great Britain and West Germany. *Eur Sociol Rev, 17*(2), 119-144.

Schils, T. (2008). Early Retirement in Germany, The Netherlands, and the United Kingdom: A Longitudinal Analysis of Individual Factors and Institutional Regimes. *European Sociological Review, 24*(3), 315-329.

Schindler, M. (2009). *The Italian Labor Market: Recent Trends, Institutions, and Reform Options*: International Monetary Fund.

Schmid, G. (1998). *Transitional labour markets: a new European employment strategy*. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.

Schomann, K., & Becker, R. (1995). Participation in Further education over the Life Course: A Longitudinal Study of Three Birth Cohorts in the Federal Republic of Germany. *European Sociological Review, 11*(2), 187-208.

Segers, J., Inceoglu, I., Vloeberghs, D., Bartram, D., & Henderickx, E. (2008). Protean and boundaryless careers: A study on potential motivators. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*(2), 212-230.

Shanahan, M. J. (2000). Pathways to Adulthood in Changing Societies: Variability and Mechanisms in Life Course Perspective. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 667-692.

Soens, N., De Vos, A., Buyens, D., Heylen, L., Kuppens, A., Van Puyvelde, I., et al. (2005). *Belgische loopbanen in kaart: traditioneel of transitioneel; Eindraport van het onderzoek naar "het begrip loopbaan"*. Gent: Academia Press.

Stier, H., & Lewin-Epstein, N. (2001). Welfare Regimes, Family-Supportive Policies, and Women's Employment along the Life-Course. *American Journal of Sociology, 106*(6), 1731-1760.

Stovel, K., Savage, M., & Bearman, P. (1996). Ascription into Achievement: Models of Career Systems at Lloyds Bank, 1890-1970. *American Journal of Sociology, 102*(2), 358.

Sullivan, S. E. (1999). The Changing Nature of Careers: A Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management, 25*(3), 457-484.

Taylor, J., & Bradley, S. (1997). Unemployment in Europe: A comparative analysis of regional disparities in Germany, Italy and the UK. *Kyklos, 50*(2), 221.

Treas, J., & Widmer, E. D. (2000). Married Women's Employment over the Life Course: Attitudes in Cross-National Perspective. *Social Forces, 78*(4), 1409-1436.

Vail, M. I. (2008). From 'welfare without work' to 'buttressed liberalization': the shifting dynamics of labor market adjustment in France and Germany. *European Journal of Political Research, 47*(3), 1-25.

van Hoof, J., & van der Lippe, T. (2007). Combineren en balanceren; Arbeid, zorg en tijd in een veranderende samenleving. *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken, 23*(Spec.), 97-101.

Versantvoort, M. (2008). Streven naar het Scandinavisch mode? Effecten van oudershapsverlof op de arbeidsmarktpositie van vrouwen. *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken, 24*(2), 189-207.

Vlasblom, J. D., & Schippers, J. J. (2004). Increases in Female Labour Force Participation in Europe: Similarities and Differences. *European Journal of Population/Revue européenne de Démographie, 20*(4), 375-392.

Vroman, P., & Van Wichelen, L. (2007). Het Vlaams en Belgisch arbeidsmarktbeleid door een Europese bril. *Over.werk Tijdschrift van het Steunpunt WSE*(1), 94-100.

Widmer, E. D., & Ritschard, G. (2009). The de-standardization of the life course: Are men and women equal? *Advances in Life Course Research*(14), 28-39.

9 Appendices

Career type (ref. continuous paid employment)	limited transitional paid employment		highly transitional paid employment		continuous fulltime housework, child-rearing and care giving		housework and other economic inactivity		fulltime continuous self-employment	
	Men (Model 1, N=)	Women (Model 2, N=)	Men (Model 1, N=)	Women (Model 2, N=)	Men (Model 1, N=)	Women (Model 2, N=)	Men (Model 1, N=)	Women (Model 2, N=)	Men (Model 1, N=)	Women (Model 2, N=)
Country (ref. Germany)										
Denmark	0.83**	0.77***	0.81**	0.75***	0.69	0.09***	1.03	0.33***	0.46***	0.48***
The Netherlands	0.77***	0.96	0.65***	0.88*	16.78***	2.07***	2.38***	1.43***	0.34***	0.45***
Belgium	0.66***	0.58***	0.6***	0.63***	0.43	1.11	0.71*	0.96	0.85*	0.98
France	0.74***	0.64***	0.77***	0.7***	5.19***	0.68***	0.62***	0.59***	0.67***	0.54***
Luxembourg	1.06	1.51***	0.81***	0.95	0.17	2.22***	0.39***	1.33***	0.31***	0.47***
United Kingdom	1.08	0.85**	1.18**	1.10	2.91***	0.51***	1.02	0.82**	1.10	0.78*
Ireland	1.48***	1.51***	1.33***	1.45***	1.82	4.21***	1.88***	2.23***	2.08***	0.85
Italy	0.82***	0.82***	1.08*	0.88**	0.32**	1.73***	1.09	1.21***	1.86***	1.54***
Greece	1.00	1.09	1.13*	1.41***	0.78	4.00***	1.51***	3.26***	4.17***	3.69***
Spain	1.23***	1.32***	1.42***	1.39***	0.4*	3.68***	1.45***	2.79***	1.39***	1.69***
Portugal	1.14**	1.09	1.02	0.87**	0.4*	0.59***	0.57***	0.47***	1.24***	1.59***
Austria	1.11	1.31***	1.06	1.15*	1.07	1.81***	0.66**	1.07	1.00	1.88***
Finland	1.87***	1.58***	1.91***	1.42***	1.04	0.09***	1.78***	0.44***	2.16***	2.08***

Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary	1.07***	1.09***	1.02	1.04	1.12	0.94*	0.79***	0.95*	0.89***	0.93
Less than second stage of secondary	1.23***	1.12***	1.34***	1.37***	2.7***	4.57***	2.3***	3.21***	1.52***	1.77***

	unemployment and other inactivity		starting careers/school leavers		highly transitional career start		labour market leaver		old age activity	
	Men (Model 1, N=)	Women (Model 2, N=)	Men (Model 1, N=)	Women (Model 2, N=)	Men (Model 1, N=)	Women (Model 2, N=)	Men (Model 1, N=)	Women (Model 2, N=)	Men (Model 1, N=)	Women (Model 2, N=)
Country (ref. Germany)										
Denmark	0.73***	0.51***	0.81	0.77*	0.92	0.7*	1.5***	1.14	0.84	1.47*
The Netherlands	0.85**	1.02	0.76**	1.07	0.35***	0.66***	0.89	0.24***	1.33**	1.73***
Belgium	0.83**	0.78***	0.33***	0.42***	0.33***	0.48***	1.01	1.7***	0.72	0.66
France	0.49***	0.53***	0.48***	0.38***	0.78*	0.64***	0.81*	1.10	0.37***	0.35***
Luxembourg	0.45***	0.97	0.5***	0.81	0.29***	0.68*	0.36***	0.38***	0.37***	0.61
United Kingdom	1.18**	0.93	1.43***	0.92	1.3*	0.98	1.05	1.83***	1.56***	1.82***
Ireland	2.02***	1.38***	1.31*	1.18	1.97***	1.26	1.39**	0.41***	2.98***	1.44
Italy	1.46***	1.17***	1.32***	1.24**	1.59***	1.44***	0.79**	0.73**	1.26*	0.61*
Greece	2.15***	2.93***	1.42***	1.87***	2.75***	3.53***	2.33***	4.35***	2.1***	1.82**
Spain	1.32***	2.04***	1.87***	2.82***	2.13***	2.92***	1.56***	1.76***	1.3***	2.08***
Portugal	0.92	0.8***	1.97***	1.86***	0.89	1.18	0.94***	1.08	2.17	2.27***
Austria	0.76***	0.82**	1.04	0.94	0.78	0.43***	0.67*	0.92	0.48**	0.12**
Finland	1.86***	1.19**	1.87***	1.13	1.64***	1.39**	0.90	0.85	0.5**	1.34
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary level education (ISCED 3)	0.91***	0.98	1.18***	1.23***	1.17***	1.25***	0.69***	0.73***	0.66***	0.71***
Less than second stage of secondary education (ISCED 0-2)	1.88***	2.5***	0.95	0.82***	1.61***	1.41***	2.43***	4.58***	2.07***	2.81***

***p<0,001 **p<0,01, *p<0,05

Career type (ref. continuous paid employment)	limited transitional paid employment		highly transitional paid employment		continuous full-time housework, childrearing and care giving		housework and other economic inactivity		fulltime continuous self-employment	
	Men (Model 3, N=)	Women (Model 4, N=)	Men (Model 3, N=)	Women (Model 4, N=)	Men (Model 3, N=)	Women (Model 4, N=)	Men (Model 3, N=)	Women (Model 4, N=)	Men (Model 3, N=)	Women (Model 4, N=)
Country (ref. Germany)										
Denmark	0.88	0.09***	0.83*	0.07**	0.72	0.01*	1.04	9209.58	0.45***	#######
The Netherlands	0.86**	1.29**	0.72***	1.09	11.35***	3.29***	2.45***	0.72	0.33***	0.08
Belgium	0.69***	2.04***	0.62***	1.93***	0.47	2.74***	0.67*	0.71	0.79*	0.42
France	0.76***	2.34***	0.78***	1.79***	3.09***	2.98***	0.6***	0.55	0.67***	0.17
Luxembourg	1.03	1.25*	0.81**	0.88	0.46	2.53***	0.42***	0.59	0.31***	0.07
United Kingdom	0.95	0.63***	1.09	0.77**	1.78	0.62**	1.07	0.34	1.29**	0.09
Ireland	1.47***	1.2*	1.31***	1.82***	1.48	2.5***	1.59***	0.58	2.05***	0.07
Italy	0.83**	0.59***	1.08	0.8*	0.38*	0.79	1.41***	0.56	2.05***	0.26
Greece	1.00	0.74**	1.13*	1.28*	0.86	3.76***	1.52***	1.20	4.12***	0.71
Spain	1.26***	0.93	1.42***	1.23*	0.39*	2.64***	1.51***	0.83	1.46***	0.23
Portugal	1.2*	1.51***	1.07	1.18	0.77	0.27**	0.48**	0.14	1.32*	0.18**
Austria	1.00	1.26*	0.95	1.04	1.25	1.86***	0.71	0.46	1.00	0.16
Finland	1.8***	1.24*	1.87***	1.12	0.93***	0.11***	1.55***	0.17	2.28***	0.39
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary	1.1***	0.99	1.05*	0.91	0.77	1.09	0.79***	0.39	1.00	0.16
Less than second stage of secondary	1.24***	0.79***	1.32***	1.29***	2.23***	2.79***	2.4***	0.98	1.22***	0.19

	unemployment and other inactivity		starting careers/school leavers		highly transitional career start		labour market leaver		old age activity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	(Model 3, N=)	(Model 4, N=)	(Model 3, N=)	(Model 4, N=)	(Model 3, N=)	(Model 4, N=)	(Model 3, N=)	(Model 4, N=)	(Model 3, N=)	(Model 4, N=)
Country (ref. Germany)										
Denmark	0.74***	0.06**	0.81	0.13	0.95	1.44	1.53***	805601692	0.82	14517.35
The Netherlands	0.85**	1.22*	0.93	1.7**	0.34***	0.71	0.96	0.10	1.32*	0.62
Belgium	0.8**	2.21**	0.31***	0.54	0.33***	0.43	1.06	0.26	0.73	0.38
France	0.49***	1.95***	0.55***	0.74	0.89	1.01	0.82	0.18	0.39***	0.21
Luxembourg	0.45***	0.81	0.39***	0.58	0.22***	0.69	0.29***	0.11	0.3***	0.39
United Kingdom	1.26**	0.75**	0.72	0.59	1.09	0.65	1.33*	0.43	2.07***	0.52
Ireland	1.69***	1.48***	1.34*	0.77	1.96***	0.71	1.38*	0.08	2.9***	0.37
Italy	1.57***	1.00	1.25*	1.02	1.45**	0.95	1.06	0.17	1.38**	0.30
Greece	2.15***	2.27***	1.45***	1.99***	2.6***	3.39	1.84***	0.71	1.81***	1.00
Spain	1.37***	1.46***	2.01***	2.33***	2.35***	2.46	1.42***	0.37	1.3*	0.85
Portugal	0.96	0.7***	2.68***	4.52	1.29	2.02	0.78	0.17	1.8***	0.86
Austria	0.75*	0.78*	1.30	1.09	1.05	0.39	0.65	0.18	0.56*	0.22
Finland	1.81***	1.00	1.65***	1.30	1.34	1.32	0.95	0.19	0.49**	0.60
Education level (ref. tertiary)										
Second stage of secondary level education (ISCED 3)	0.94*	0,83*	1.11	1.36	1.10	1.34	0.73***	0.21	0.7***	0.53
Less than second stage of secondary education (ISCED 0-2)	1.9***	1,95***	1.08	0.74	1.9***	1.13	2.33***	0.56	1.66***	0.77

Country*education   1355.16***   3515.95***

***p<0,001 **p<0,01, *p<0,05

10 Notes

1   Therefore, for the remainder of the article, both terms will be used as synonyms.

2   As this resulted in the deletion of only 1.5% of all cases, this proved no significant problem.

3   The exception being fulltime education, though these were left out of our typology.