

## ***Rights perceived and practiced***

***Results of a survey carried out in Portugal as part of the project  
“Domestic Work and Domestic Workers  
Interdisciplinary and Comparative Perspectives”***

### **Working Paper**

[ISCTE-IUL – Dinâmia-CET]

Pierre Guibentif

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



## Contents:

Introduction.....	3
Structure of the tables .....	3
A. Characteristics of the interviewees and of the context and nature of their activity (independent variables: Tables 0.1 and 0.2) .....	6
a) One general variable: the place where the interview was conducted .....	6
b) Main personal variables .....	7
c) Main variables characterizing the activity .....	9
B. The reality of domestic work (dependent variables).....	12
a) Experiences of discomfort (Table 1.1).....	13
b) Specific situations encountered (Table 1.2).....	16
c) Global level of satisfaction (Table 1.3).....	19
d) Work experiences of the interviewees – A general assessment.....	23
e) Practices against the law (Table 2.1) .....	25
f) Relationship to the law (Table 3.1.).....	30
C. Some tentative interpretations.....	34
D. Relevance of the survey’s results for legal empowerment strategies .....	37
References.....	40
Annex 1: Typology of activities (Quick Cluster) .....	41
Annex 2: Principal component analysis of the situations encountered.....	47
Tables .....	55
Notes to the tables .....	57



## Introduction

The following tables are designed to offer an overview on the data concerning Portugal gathered within the framework of a survey part of the *Domestic Work and Domestic Workers* research project<sup>1</sup>. The analysis of these data should allow us to develop interpretive hypotheses that could help us in reading another set of tables, based on a more limited number of questionnaires, concerning the other countries included in our research<sup>2</sup>.

The tables offer a view on the reality of domestic work, crossing data characterizing its main aspects – dependent variables – with data characterising its context, supposed though to have some impact on it – independent variables.

Tables 0.1 and 0.2 present the independent variables. In other words, they offer a more accurate notion of who interviewed people are, and for whom and in which general conditions they work (A). Tables 1.1 until 3.1 describe the behaviour of several dependent variables in relation to the independent variables previously introduced (B). The paper is concluded with a general assessment of our findings (C) and some thoughts on their relevance for empowerment policies addressing domestic workers, and in particular for the design of legal information that should be made available to them (D).

### *Structure of the tables*

All tables are constructed according to the following rule: independent variables and their concrete values are always listed in *rows*. Dependent variables appear in *columns*. The interpretation of the tables is than a result of the comparison between the figures appearing in one same column, i.e.: a comparison between the impact, on a certain dependent variable, caused by the different possible values of an independent variable.

---

<sup>1</sup> Project financed by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia – FCT, reference PTDC/JUR/65622/2006. For more details on the topic of this project, see in particular Blétière (2008a), and Blétière (2008b). I thank António Velez for his support in the processing of data and production of tables, and Valdemar Ferreira for his support in the edition of this working paper. Detailed information on the contents of the database containing the results of the survey, as well as on the variables used for the production of the table is to be found in the document *Research Project Domestic Work – Guide to the SPSS Database / Projecto de investigação Trabalho Doméstico – Guia da Base de Dados em SPSS* (Lisbon, Dinâmia-CET, 2011), available at Dinâmia-CET.

<sup>2</sup> Brazil, India, Mozambique, United Kingdom. To be published in another Dinâmia Working Paper. Together with this one, it will offer a first version of a socio-legal analysis of our research results to be included, in a more compact formulation, in Guibentif *et al.* (forthcoming).

In order to facilitate the comparison, the tables only show percentages in almost all cases. The main numerical figures, concerning the independent variables, appear at the borders of tables 0.1 and 0.2 (column [A]; row [1]), as well as in the columns [A] of the following tables.

A total of 684 questionnaires were analysed. In principle, the sum of the figures corresponding to the possible values of each variable should equal this number. In fact, occasionally the completed questionnaires do not include the relevant answers; this obliges us to work with lower figures (for example: one questionnaire completed in Portugal does not include any answer on the question of the gender). In tables 1.1 until 3.1, percentages are in principle always calculated on the basis of all the 684 questionnaires.

There is an important difference between the construction procedure of tables 0.1. and 0.2 (introduction to the independent variables), and the one of tables 1.1 until 3.1 (analysis of the behaviour of dependent variables). The first two tables consist of a composition of complete sub-tables crossing all values of two of the variables under discussion. It means that all individual answers appear in the table. So it is always possible to sum the percentages in the rows of the sub-tables up to 100. The following tables 1.1 until 3.1 only show, in each of their columns, one column issued from the original tables: the one containing the most relevant answer, and from which the opposed answer(s) can in most cases be deduced. In these tables, obviously, the percentages reported cannot be summed. On the other hand, they may be compared across one same row, if it is the case (example: in table 1.2 a higher proportion of wage arrears [column E] than of discrimination case [column O], whatever the characteristics of the concerned person [in all rows]).

The following two fragments of tables 0.1 and 1.3-A illustrate these two construction procedures, as well as, actually, one of the many problems we encountered in the interpretation of our data. Table 0.1 shows that the younger our interviewees are, the more probable it is that they are immigrants. Table 1.3 – derived from, among others, the tables shown as examples 2-A and 2-B – reveals that the younger our interviewees are, the more probable it is for them to answer “not” or “not at all satisfied” when questioned on their general level of satisfaction, and “Yes” to the question “Would you change for another job?”. Not surprisingly, these two variables, general level of satisfaction and will to change for another job, have a similar behaviour.

The question raised by these two examples is to what extent the relationship between age and level of satisfaction is a consequence of the link between young age and status of immigrant. Indeed, nationality of interviewees proved to have a strong impact on many answers. This is why we include here a second complete set of tables, presenting only the answers of the Portuguese interviewees (456). As far as the impact of age on the level of global satisfaction is concerned, it is clearly confirmed by table 1.3-A (PP).

**Example 1: Fragment of Table 0.1.**

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per category	Nationality				
	Categories		[B] Brazil	[C] Eastern Europe	[D] Africa (PALOP)	[E] Portugal	[F]
Interviewees (Nr.) [1]		684	83	57	85	456	681
Interviewees (%) [2]			12,2	8,4	12,5	67,0	100
Age	[13] until 30	120	21,0	13,4	19,3	46,2	100
	[14] 31-40	159	18,4	12,7	12,0	57,0	100
	[15] 41-50	209	8,6	6,7	11,0	73,7	100
	[16] 51-60	143	7,0	4,2	9,2	79,6	100
	[17] 61and more	48	2,1	2,1	10,4	85,4	100

**Example 2-A: Fragment of Table 1.3-A**

Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?
Answers considered		Not very satisfied/Not satisfied at all	Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category	% of people giving these answers
All interviewees	[1]	684	8,8
Age	[6] until 30	120	<b>13,3</b>
	[7] 31-40	159	<b>8,8</b>
	[8] 41-50	209	<b>9,6</b>
	[9] 51-60	143	<b>4,9</b>
	[10] 61and more	48	<b>4,2</b>
			<b>64,1</b>
			<b>84,2</b>
			<b>71,7</b>
			<b>59,3</b>
			<b>48,3</b>
			<b>25,0</b>

**Example 2-B: Table from which column [B] of Table 1.3-A (example 2-A) is extracted (in bold)**

		General level of satisfaction (%)			Total	
		No answer	<b>Not satisfied / Not satisfied at all</b>	Satisfied		Very pleased
Age (5 categories)	until 30		<b>13,3</b>	71,7	15,0	100,0
	31-40	,6	<b>8,8</b>	74,2	16,4	100,0
	41-50	,5	<b>9,6</b>	65,1	24,9	100,0
	51-60		<b>4,9</b>	68,5	26,6	100,0
	61 and more		<b>4,2</b>	52,1	43,8	100,0
Total		,3	<b>8,7</b>	68,2	22,8	100,0

**Example 2-C: Table from which column [D] of Table 1.3-A (example 2-A) is extracted (in bold)**

		Would you change for another job? (%)			Total
		No answer	<b>Yes</b>	No	
Age (5 categories)	until 30	,8	<b>84,2</b>	15,0	100,0
	31-40	,6	<b>71,7</b>	27,7	100,0
	41-50	1,0	<b>59,3</b>	39,7	100,0
	51-60		<b>48,3</b>	51,7	100,0
	61 and more	2,1	<b>25,0</b>	72,9	100,0
Total		,7	<b>61,9</b>	37,4	100,0

### A. Characteristics of the interviewees and of the context and nature of their activity (independent variables: Tables 0.1 and 0.2)

#### a) *One general variable: the place where the interview was conducted*

Table 0.1 shows in the first place the characteristics of the interviewees according to the *place where the interview was conducted*, which we are in condition to presume to be – considering the geographical distances – the region where they work. The aim of this first analysis is not so much to draw conclusions about regional characteristics of domestic work in Portugal, but mainly to evaluate the quality of the collected data. Indeed, given the “snowball” technique used in the composition of the sample, we will possibly meet in each region groups of people with similar characteristics, not only because these characteristics would be an effect of regional features, but because the people who answered first the questionnaire indicated other people to interview with a similar personal profile. Therefore it was important to check if such regional effects of the survey procedure exist, and how strong they are. And if, at the same time, the data gathered in the different regions show, as a whole, sufficient variety, and if the differences between regions are likely, at least to some extent, to be linked



to general characteristics of them. An impact of the research procedure is more likely to occur where a lower number of questionnaires was applied, which is the case in Algarve (28), Alentejo (31) and Coimbra (44).

Differences in the proportions of immigrants are likely to be explained by the existence of numerous immigrant communities in the corresponding regions: comparatively high proportions of people from Africa in Lisbon, from Eastern Europe in the Algarve and, with lower figures, in Oporto, and from Brazil in Braga, Alentejo, and Oporto.

Differences in the representations of age categories may be more difficult to be explained by regional characteristics (comparatively, a very high proportion of older people in Algarve and Coimbra; high proportion of younger persons in Alentejo and Braga).

Level of schooling is clearly below the average in Alentejo, and comparatively high in Braga and Algarve.

#### b) *Main personal variables*

In the following rows, tables 0.1 and 0.2 present the population surveyed according to what may be named the main personal variables. Four of them are personal characteristics: *nationality*, *age*, *gender* and *schooling*.

*Gender* will only be taken into consideration in this first table. Indeed, in Portugal, 681 from 684 (99.7%) interviewees are women. Two men answered, one coming from Lisbon, the other from Oporto, the two main cities in the country. These figures allow us to consider the surveyed population as essentially female and not to insert in the following tables rows specially devoted to the variable *gender*.

Another variable is not taken into consideration in the table: the fact of being directly employed by private houselords, or by a company. Only six people belong to the second category. This very low proportion certainly corresponds to a currently low involvement of companies in this sector – but it will probably increase in the future – even if it is probably also an effect of other factors. People who work for companies may not belong to the same informal groups to which workers of private house lord belong. They also may be subject to a tighter organizational control by their employer, feeling less free to answer the questionnaire.

As far as their *nationality* is concerned, we were able to create four main categories: Brazil, Africa (PALOP – Portuguese-speaking African countries), Eastern Europe, and Portugal. Two thirds of the interviewees are Portuguese (456 / 67%); Africa and Brazil are represented by similar figures (85 and 83 / about 12% in both cases); Eastern Europe forms a slightly smaller group (57 / 8%).

Five *age* categories were differentiated (up to 30 / 31-40 / 41-50 / 51-60 / 61 and more), forming groups of comparable volume (between 120 and 209 / 18-23%), with

the exception of the smaller group of older workers (48 / 7%). The small number of workers below 20 (less than 30) and above 70 (about 10) did not justify the creation of separate categories.

Interviewees were distributed in six categories according the duration of their *schooling*. A considerable proportion did spend only four years in school. But many interviewees had a longer schooling time, even beyond 12 years.

A crucial variable is, for obvious sociological reasons, the socio-economic status of the employers of domestic workers. Their conception of home and intimacy will orient their choice at the moment of hiring the workers; their lifestyle will shape the working conditions of them, and so on. So it seems of utmost relevance to have data about them. However, the questionnaire is addressed to the domestic workers themselves. For ethical reasons, we did not ask them any questions about other people (apart from a few questions on their relationship to other people). On the other hand, answers given on questions about their work enable us to reconstruct, hypothetically at least, the social status of their employers. In a first step, an upper and a lower social level were differentiated from a presumable middle class, on the basis of three variables: number of bathrooms, number of domestic workers employed, and occupation rate of bedrooms. We considered as an indication of a socio-economic privileged position the combination of the three following criteria: three or more bathrooms, two or more employees, and a bedroom rate of occupation of one person or less per room. – At the other end of the social spectrum, we considered as an indicator of a modest socio-economic position the combination of two criteria: up to two bathrooms, and a bedroom rate of occupation above 1.25. In order to introduce some differentiation in the numerically important remaining middle class, we opted for one criterion that separates two quantitatively comparable sets, corresponding, at least as the analysis of the Portuguese data reveals, to quite different behaviours: the fact that the house does include, or does not include an office. This may be considered as an indication of a higher education level, and more professional autonomy. The use of these criteria leads us, in Portugal, to four categories which figures correspond to what might be expected in terms of demographic distribution according to the social stratification of Portuguese society. The number of domestic workers employed by people belonging to the upper level is comparatively small (32 / 5%), which corresponds to the general distribution of the population. The number of workers employed by people likely to be qualified as belonging to a lower socio-economic status is relatively small too (89 / 14%), a low figure that might be interpreted as due to the fact that people living under these socio-economic conditions hardly can afford to pay a domestic worker. The main part of the interviewees belong to what we might name the middle class (537 / 82%), with a majority of people – almost half of our sample – working in houses with office (317 / 48%), a smaller proportion (220 / 33%) in houses without office.

Crossing the four main personal variables now introduced (see tables 0.1 and 0.1-2 rows [9] to [21]) allows the following statements:

- Immigrants are comparatively younger than Portuguese workers. This can easily be explained, in the case of Brazil and Eastern Europe, by the fact that the immigration took place, in many cases, in recent years. People from African countries are slightly more numerous in older categories than the other two

categories of foreigners. Indeed, the migration flows from Africa started long before those from Brazil and Eastern Europe.

- People of upper social status employ comparatively more Portuguese domestic workers. As far as immigrants are concerned, we observe two quite different behaviours. On the one hand, Brazilians and people from African countries are more frequently employed by people belonging to a lower social level (modest homes, houses without office; about 14% in each of the four cases considered), less by people belonging to a higher level (well off; houses with office; about 10% in each of the four cases considered). On the other hand, people from Eastern Europe are more frequently employed by the upper categories (about 10%), less by the lower (about 6%). This difference could be due to the level of wages, or to the differences in the ability to deal with people speaking foreign languages.
- People of upper socio-economic status seem to hire rather younger people; people living in modest socio-economic conditions, older people.
- Level of schooling varies strongly according to the nationality. People from Eastern Europe are far above the average, which confirms the picture of the comparatively high level of education of the immigrants coming from these countries. Brazilians have also a rather high level of education. The level is lower among people from African countries, on the other hand. The distribution among the six categories here differentiated suggests that the average level is slightly higher than the one of Portuguese interviewees. The calculation of the corresponding means confirms this state of affairs: Eastern Europe: 13.7 years; Brazil: 9.5 years; African Countries: 6.5 years; Portugal: 6.1 years.
- There is a clear relationship between age and level of schooling. Younger people tend to have spent a significantly longer period of time at school, which is certainly is result of education policies implemented over the last decades.

c) *Main variables characterizing the activity*

In a first approach, three variables were considered: *number of houses* where people work at the same time; *nature of their tasks*; *average duration of the employment relationship*. These three variables will be discussed here separately, as well as in their relation to the above introduced personal variables. The general hypothesis is that personal characteristics of employees are likely to condition the way they organize their work, as far as they are in condition to do it; and that the social status of their employers is likely to influence the kind of work the employees have to perform, and under what conditions they work.

The relationship between the characteristics of the activities and the place of employment will not be discussed here. Some specific points shall be picked up later on in the present document.

A brief analysis of the *number of houses* where the interviewees currently work at the same time shows that about half of them only work in one house (291 / 44%); a large

majority works in two or more houses. The maximum number quoted by a domestic worker questioned in Portugal is actually 10.

Among the four groups of nationalities, workers from Eastern Europe seem to be far more likely to work in several houses at the same time (36% in 4 or more houses, up against an average of 17%); on the other hand, people from Africa, far more likely to work in only one house (58% against an average of 44%). Workers above 60 are more often employed in only one house (61% against an average of 44%); workers between 30 and 50 in several houses. People of upper socio-economic level tend to employ people that work exclusively for them (60% against an average of 44%). People with a higher level of schooling tend to work more frequently in several houses at the same time.

The most interesting data concerning the activity is its *content*. Our questionnaire includes a list of nineteen performed tasks. The answers given on the basis of this list (questions A12.1 to A12.19) were analysed per cluster analysis (see Annex 1), which led to the definition of six categories – six *profiles of domestic workers*:

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

These six categories correspond to six groups of interviewees of comparable dimension. The largest group is the one of those having, among other tasks, to take care of animals or plants (150 / 22%); two other groups are smaller than the average: the people who, among other tasks, have to take care of dependent people (70 / 10%), and those who, apart from cleaning, while not having to care for people, have to prepare meals (88 / 13%).

As far as the relationship between these types of performed tasks and the nationalities is concerned, two maxima and three minima are worth to be mentioned. People from Eastern Europe seem to be hired for a job including caring of animals or plants (35%; average: 22%) more frequently than other nationalities. There also seems to be a relationship, even if less strong, between African nationalities and jobs including only cleaning activities (24%; average: 19%). On the other side, people from Eastern Europe seem to be far less frequently hired to take care of children (5%; average 17%; a sharp difference that could be explained by the employers’ desire of hiring in such cases a native Portuguese-speaking person). Portuguese people report less frequently

that they have to take care of dependent people (8%; compared with values above 14% for other nationalities). People from Eastern Europe seem not to have an appropriate profile for being hired as all-rounders (11%; average 19%), perhaps, again, because tasks of the all-rounders often include care of people, which requires good language skills.

Some relations seem also to exist between the nature of the tasks and the age. Two relations are quite easy to interpret: to take care of children, the preference seems to be given to workers between 30 and 40 (20%; average 17%); to take care of dependent persons, to workers between 50 and 60 (14%; average 10). Children are handed over to people who are about as old as their parents; older people are preferred to take care of dependents, even if in an age warranting sufficient physical fitness. Two relations are not so easy to interpret, even if they are worth a mention: people which activity includes the preparation of meals, not having to care for people, are more numerous among the oldest interviewees (21%; average 13%); all-rounders are preferably hired among the younger people (23%; average 19%).

Analysing the relationship between social status of employers and the nature of the tasks reveals three almost linear correlations. The higher the social status of employers, the more probable it is for the employee to have to take care of children (the proportion goes from 6 to 31%). Conversely, the lower the status, the more probable it is to find workers with dependent people in charge (0 to 26%). Admittedly, where kindergarten and schools exist, employers will require their employee to devote time to children only if there is a comparatively high income available to pay this additional working time. On the other hand, financial resources may allow families with a higher social standing to place dependent relatives in institutions, which is in Portugal a costly option. For less wealthy families, the contracting of a – preferably non Portuguese – carer is one of the few affordable options (as we saw, among the interviewees, immigrants are overrepresented in the category of the carers). There is no obvious explanation, however, for a third, statistically quite obvious, relation: the higher the social status, the higher the probability of hiring an “all-rounder”. One interpretation could be that families with sufficient financial resources try to hire a person they trust, under financially favourable conditions, to take over a particularly heavy and diverse workload.

Workers who have to care for dependent people have a slightly higher level of schooling. An important proportion of workers having among their tasks to take of animals and plants went to school for more than 12 years. This figure is due to the overrepresentation of people from Eastern Europe among workers with this activity profile.

A third variable characterizing the work is the *average duration of the employment relationship* they had over their career. This duration was estimated on the basis of three answers to the questionnaire: how long do they work in this type of activity (A; question A5); in how many houses have they worked since the beginning of their career (B; question A7); in how many houses do they work for the moment (C; question A10). The estimated average duration was calculated on the basis of the following formula: [Estimated average duration of employment relationship =  $A/B * C$ ]. For the construction of the following tables (in other analytical operations we shall calculate means), five categories were distinguished: less than one year (72 /

11%), 1-3 years (160 / 25%), 3-5 years (133 / 21%), 5-10 years (155 / 24%), and more than 10 years (119 / 19%).

Logically, shorter durations are to be found among younger and immigrant people. As far as the socio-economic status of the employers is concerned, the most significant data is the shorter average duration in the case of people employed in middle class houses without office (clearly above the average in the 1-3 years category; clearly below the average in the *More than 10 years* category). Longer durations are to be observed in houses of lower socio-economic conditions, and in middle-class houses with office. Statistically noteworthy is the fact that houses of lower social category are clearly underrepresented, houses of the higher category overrepresented precisely in the category of medium duration (3-5 years; 15% and 27%, for an average of 21%). There seems to be a quite strong negative correlation between the average duration of employment relationship and the duration of schooling. The higher the level of schooling, the shorter the average duration of employment.

## **B. The reality of domestic work (dependent variables)**

Tables 1.1 until 3.1 present the answers of the interviewees to the questions addressing their work experience, the problems they encountered, and the way they reacted to these problems. We start with those answers more immediately related to their life experience and less conditioned by official criteria of appreciation (Tables 1.1-1.3); in a second step, we analyse answers that allow us to detect signs of violations of the applicable official rules (Table 2.1), independently from the personal appreciation of the interviewees. Finally, we analyse the way they relate to the law and to official policies and measures, and what legal steps they have undertaken when it was the case (3.3). By adopting this order of discussion, we try to follow, as far as possible, a basic rule of socio-legal research that has been formulated in particular in the context of researches based on direct observation: not to let legal concepts shape / bias the perception of the researcher at the moment she/he gathers data on the field (Hawkins, 1984). The underlying hypothesis is that most of the time our visions of social reality are not shaped by legal categories, and that the use of such categories makes the researcher running the risk of developing a legalistic account of social reality, not paying adequate attention to the way the lay people construct the social world in which they participate.

Indeed, we are here working on answers given to a pre-formulated questionnaire. But this questionnaire was not formulated by jurists; and it places questions of legality after having tackled most of the relevant questions regarding the nature of the work, and the people's appreciation towards this work. Several questions open up a rather broad scope of answers, and many open ended questions allowed the interviewees to give voice to their own perception of things.

In the last section of this document (D), after having tackled the more narrowly speaking legal aspect of domestic work, we shall proceed the other way round and, starting then with the law, ask how the law, and more precisely the law as concretely

practiced in context, is likely to be used – or better used – as a means of protection of domestic workers.

a) *Experiences of discomfort (Table 1.1)*

The questionnaire includes a set of questions inquiring the interviewees' level of regarding several specific aspects of their work (D5). Part of these questions may be related to another set of questions, placed at the beginning, about the motives of leaving a house where they worked for some time. It makes sense to join the answers to these two questions: a motive for leaving a house may be presumed to be a motive of dissatisfaction. On a first level of analysis, the comparison between the two types of answers (dissatisfaction toward some aspect / motive of leaving a house) allows us to appreciate the consistency of our data. Indeed, the two types of variable behave in a similar way; and where we find differences, there also are plausible explanations for them. But the comparison also informs us about the attitude of people towards troublesome situations. One may leave, or tolerate. This second level of analysis will be discussed later on, in the context of the interviewees' reactions towards the situations they face.

Four motives of dissatisfaction are considered. In decreasing order of the number of “not satisfied” answers, these motives are – insufficient salary (29% not satisfied), – amount of work (18%), – nature of the tasks (5%), – difficulties in the relations with other people in the house where they work. On this last point, we take advantage of the answers to three questions: quality of the relationship with employers (C4), quality of the relationship with colleagues (C8), and satisfaction with work environment. There were no answers “not satisfied” on the questions concerning the two concrete relationships; the proportion of people dissatisfied with the work environment is low (average of 2.2%). The proportions of answers “left house for this reason” are: – insufficient salary (29%), amount of work (16%), difficulties in the relations with other people (14%), nature of the task (7%).

The two main problems faced are, not surprisingly, low salaries and a heavy workload. The nature of the tasks is considered as a problem in a much more limited number of cases. This corresponds to information collected in the course of in-depth interviews carried out within the framework of this project: at several occasions, interviewees reported the pleasure they had in the nature of their work; in the pleasure they could have in looking at rooms or things they had neatly cleaned up.

More intriguing are the answers concerning relational problems. There are troubles of this nature, which is revealed by the proportion of cases in which they led people to leave their employers. However, when questioned about their level of satisfaction in the relationship with employers or with colleagues, interviewees never answer they are “not satisfied”. Signs of relational troubles, however, can be detected through the analysis of other answers. One question invites interviewees to apply different qualifications to the relationship to their employers (C3). One of these qualifications is “A relationship of conflict”. A very small number of interviewees accept it as appropriate (1.3%). As far as the relations with the colleagues are concerned, one data seems to be worth being considered: several people, who reported to work in a house

together with other employees, did not answer the question about the quality of the relationship with their colleagues (on a scale from “very good” to “very bad”). While this can be in some cases a simple failure in the completion of the questionnaire, it also could correspond to situations in which the interviewee refused to qualify this relationship, which may be considered as a sign of an uncomfortable relationship. The difference between the answers on motives for leaving a house, and the answers on the relationship’s quality, reveals most probably a strong norm of discretion toward what goes on in the house of employment, and of loyalty toward people in that house. An alternative explanation – people interviewed currently feel comfortable with other people in the house where they work, and former troubles were solved by leaving the houses where troubles were experienced – could explain a low number of “not satisfied” answers on these items, but not the complete absence of such answers.

Both scales proposed in the questionnaire for the assessment of the relationship with employers and colleagues include a level “Reasonable”. This answer could obviously be used by a person wishing to avoid a negative answer, but in reality experiencing troubles. However, this is certainly not always the case. There are also people who use this level just to indicate a really “reasonable” quality of relationship, for example simply because the relationship is not too “personal”.

Considering from now on only the answers about the level of satisfaction, let us comment the possible impact of the nationality. The answers of Brazilians and people from African countries show a higher average level of dissatisfaction, those of people from Eastern Europe the lowest. The proportion of people from Eastern Europe “not satisfied” is the lowest on all items. The most notable difference concerns the amount of work (9%; average 18%). The proportion of “not satisfied” Portuguese workers is generally low too, with the exception of precisely this item, the amount of work, where they reach the highest score (19%). Brazilians are, more frequently than others, not satisfied with the salary (41%; average 30%); workers from African countries with the nature of the task (9%; average 5%).

Interviewees until 30 show the highest proportion of “not satisfied” answers on all items; interviewees above 60, the lowest. The scores of the three intermediate age categories somehow contradict this order. The younger (30-40) seem to be globally more satisfied than the older (50-60). A possible explanation of this behaviour could be the fact that, after a first period of deception, expectations are adapted to the job, while there still remain some perspectives of social mobility. Later on, while such perspectives were frustrated, or seem to become less probable, the level of dissatisfaction increases again. In later years, however, people become more tolerant again. Or their employers become less demanding, because they got old too, or else because they recognize that one should not address too heavy demands to older people.

The data here collected reveal a clear linear relationship between the workers’ level of satisfaction and their employers’ social status. But this relationship has two opposed directions. As far as salary, nature of the tasks, work environment, and quality of the relationship with the employers is concerned, the higher the status of employers, the *lower* the proportion of dissatisfied answers. As far as the amount of work is concerned, we observe a reverse trend: the higher the status, the *higher* this proportion.



There is no obvious relationship between the levels of satisfaction here discussed and the level of schooling.

There are considerable differences between the places of interview as far as the proportion of “not satisfied” answers is concerned. The highest proportion is to be observed in Alentejo; the lowest – only a few “not satisfied” answers – in Algarve. We find comparatively high scores in Braga and Oporto, and low scores in Coimbra and Lisbon.

The level of satisfaction in relation to the topic here considered – salary, amount of work, nature of tasks, relationship with other people – seems also to vary – even if in more modest proportions than in relation to the other independent variables here considered – according to the number of houses where the person works at the same time. Three levels may be distinguished: the highest number of “not satisfied” answers is reached by people working in only one house (except on the question of the salary, where the highest score is reached by those working in two houses); the lowest by those working in three or more houses; intermediate numbers by those working in two houses. A plausible explanation of this behaviour could be the following: if a person works in different houses, negative experiences suffered in one house may be compensated by the more rewarding ones made in other houses. People who work in several houses at the same time may also be in better condition to leave a house where serious problems were encountered, while she continues to work for other houses. Both explanations require some ability of the person to move from one house to another one, and also to combine properly different commitments. A person who works in three or more houses might be presumed to have such competences.

Differences in the nature of the tasks seem to have a rather strong impact on the levels of satisfaction here under analysis. We find important differences between the average proportions: highest score for all-rounders, lowest for those who only work in cleaning activities. All-rounders do give, in a high proportion of cases, “not-satisfied” answers to almost all questions here considered. Higher proportions are attained by other categories in two cases: the nature of the tasks, in the case of those who have to take care of children; the relationship with employers, in the case of those who have to take care of dependent people. At the other end of the scale, let us note a remarkably low proportion of interviewees “not satisfied” with the nature of the tasks among those hired for cleaning and preparing meals, with no care of people; and the absence of answers “relationship of conflict with employers” in this same category, as well as in the category of people working in cleaning activities only.

The relationship between satisfaction on the items here considered and average duration of the employment relationship could be described in the following way: the highest scores are related to the shortest duration (less than one year). This figure may be interpreted in two distinct ways. On the one hand, there is – as we could see in the analysis of the independent variables – a higher proportion of young people in this category, and we could see that younger people tend to give more frequently “not satisfied” answers. On the other hand, short employment duration may indicate frequent troubles encountered. Even if these problems were somehow solved by leaving the house, they may impact on the job’s evaluation. Medium average durations (3-5 years) seem to correspond to somehow lower proportions of “not satisfied” answers. Perhaps we have here another sign of the positive impact of the

fact that a person is in condition to move from one house to another in order to optimize her working conditions.

*b) Specific situations encountered (Table 1.2)*

Interviewees were confronted with a set of fifteen problematic situations they could have encountered, and had to answer if “yes” or “no” they did experience such situations (question G4). A last question – “Other situations?” received almost no answers (two in Portugal), which indicates that the list of questions can be considered as appropriate.

In a first step, the answers were submitted to a principal component analysis (see Annex 2) in order to detect possible similarities in the behaviour of groups of these variables. This analysis led to the identification of four groups of situations: – (i) related basically to issues of money (benefits not paid; social security contributions not paid; unpaid overtime; wage arrears); – (ii) indicating excessive demands from the employers (denial of rest times; tasks demanded that were not originally agreed; obligation to perform a task against will; denial of vacations); – (iii) forms of violence (physical violence; sexual harassment; psychological violence; discrimination); – (iv) violations of basic legal rules protecting workers (personal documents taken away; prevented from joining social organization). One item proved to be difficult to include in one of these groups in particular: the fact that the domestic workers suffer lack of food. In the table, the situations were grouped according to these four categories, and average levels of responses were calculated in each of the four groups.

The general proportion of people having experienced the situations considered varies from almost 50% (unpaid overtime) to close to 1% (physical violence). The four groups differentiated correspond to four different levels. Issues of money can be considered as frequent (average of 39%). About one sixth of the interviewees have been confronted with excessive demands (around 15%, with the exception of the item “tasks demanded that where not originally agreed”, with a significantly higher proportion, similar to the first group: 35%). The category of the violence is more heterogeneous in terms of frequencies. It ranges from 13% (cases of discrimination) to 1,3% (physical violence). Cases of violations of basic workers’ rights are rare (around 1% of the interviewed population concerned).

Considering the answers received, we could make the following general assessment: domestic workers frequently meet problems related to the lack of payments from the part of their employers; serious excesses in their employers’ demands of are less frequent, even if they are faced by a significant proportion of interviewees. A comparable proportion faces problems of discrimination. Cases of violence and of gross violation of rights are relatively rare.

A crucial question is whether our sample allows us to generalize these proportions to the whole population of domestic workers in Portugal. The diversity of the situation captured by the questionnaire and the plausibility of other answers allows us to admit some correspondence between our figures and reality. However, as far as violence and gross violations of rights are concerned, we are allowed to presume that people who

suffer such situations had less probability to participate in the social networks that permit us to find our interviewees. At least on these questions, the proportion verified in our survey is most probably below the real level of frequency. This brings us to the following global picture: a world where the major problems concern money; where abuses from the part of employers exist but do not correspond to generalized practices; where violence exists, in a limited, but appreciable number of cases.

The frequency of the situations here considered varies strongly according to the nationality. Two groups can be formed: on the one hand, people from Brazil and Eastern Europe, with higher scores in the three main categories of situations; on the other hand, people from Portugal and from African countries, with lower scores. In the first group, the levels are comparable, with the following exceptions: people from Brazil suffer more frequently non payment of social security, denial of vacations, and physical violence; people from Eastern Europe, non payment of benefits, obligation of performing a task against their will, psychological violence. We do note that the two latter situations relate to the experience of psychological constraint. Among Portuguese workers, the proportion of people suffering the situations mentioned is considerably lower than in the other categories, except regarding the “tasks demanded originally not agreed”. The order of the countries in the fourth category – violation of rights – is different: here Brazil has a considerably higher score than all three other nationalities, and workers from African countries are more concerned than those from Eastern Europe. Generally, the proportion of “yes” answers of African workers is remarkably low, compared with the remaining immigrant population. We will have to come back to this difference.

The relationship between the frequency of the situations considered and the employers’ social status is not easy to describe, even if some quite visible relations exist. In general terms, with one only exception, people employed in houses of upper socio-economic conditions seem to be clearly less exposed to these situations than others. The exception is psychological violence, where the highest proportion of situations reported concerns this social category (20%, against about 10% in all other three categories). On the other hand, the lower the social status of employers, the more probable it is for workers to report physical violence and sexual harassment. The distribution of cases in the two first categories – issues of money and excessive demands – varies in a more limited measure according to the social status of employers. However, issues of money are slightly more frequent among people working in middle class houses without office, and excessive demands in middle class houses with or without office.

Rather surprisingly, people with the longest school career (more than 12 years) appear to be clearly more exposed to the situations here discussed than all other categories. This relates to the fact that Brazilians and people from Eastern Europe – also more exposed categories – are overrepresented in this category. But comparable figures are to be found in the table presenting only the scores of Portuguese citizens (1.2-C [PP]). One reason could be that people with this level of schooling are particularly well placed to identify such situations and willing to report them.

Similarly to what could be observed in terms of levels of satisfaction, the situations here considered are much more frequently reported in Alentejo – with the exception of those we named “excessive demands” – than in the other regions, less frequently in Algarve. Another place where the proportion of “yes” responses is particularly low is

Coimbra. Lisbon is clearly above the average in matters of money and of excessive demands. This is worth being noticed, since Lisbon hosts the major part of interviewees. Even a small difference to the mean value of a variable in the case of this city means a considerable difference to the other places.

The impact of the number of houses on the frequency of the reported situations varies considerably according to the groups of situations. In the case of issues of money, there seems to be a linear relationship: the higher the number of houses where someone works, the higher the probability of facing such issues. The relationship is less clear in the cases of excessive demands and violence. In the cases of excessive demands, there is an amazing proximity between the high scores of the two extreme cases – only one house / four or more houses. This could be explained as follows: at one extreme, an employer who knows to be the only employer of a domestic worker may demand more than it is appropriate, on the one hand because he/she assumes that no other commitments limit the worker's availability, on the other hand, because he/she may calculate that the employee will estimate as difficult the search for other employers. At the other extreme, somebody working for many employers runs a higher risk of her different employers not having an overview on her commitments, therefore requiring her to do more than it is feasible, and simply a higher risk of not being able to maintain a sound management of her many commitments. Finally, cases of violence seem to be as probable in all categories. Indeed the causes of such cases seem to have little to do with the number of employers. The two possible factors here compensate each other: somebody working in many houses may run a higher risk of meeting an employer capable of violence toward the employee; on the other hand, he/she is also in better condition to switch to another employer at the first signs of probability of violence from the part of the employer.

Concerning the relationship between the probability of the situations considered and the activity profile of the domestic workers, four relations are worth being emphasized. Firstly, those workers hired for cleaning and taking care of plants and animals seem to be significantly more exposed to issues of money than the other categories (an average level of 50%, to be compared with a general average of 39%). Secondly, according to the figures gathered in the table, workers caring for a dependent person are much more exposed to forms of violence. In the category of excessive demands, there is no such a clear relationship dominating the picture, but – thirdly – all-rounders, and – fourthly – people having to care for dependent persons, attain indeed higher scores than the other categories.

The two latter relations may be explained simply by the nature of the activity. An “all-rounder” is *per definitionem* more exposed to face demands originally not envisaged, or to be obliged to do something she initially would have refused to do. A person who has to care for a dependent person is probably more exposed, given the constant demand of attention from the part of the dependent person, to have to renounce rest times or vacations. As far as the second relation is concerned, there is also an obvious explanation based on the nature of the tasks, which is confirmed by the table: to take care of a dependent person creates a high probability of situations likely to be qualified as “psychological violence” (17%, average: 10%).

Beyond this last point, the two relations mentioned first hardly can be explained by the nature of the work itself. Here other variables have to be considered. And there are indeed variables likely to explain these relations. Workers who have to care for

animals and plants are demanded in particular by middle class houses without office (table 0.1), and this is precisely the social category of employers to whom issues of money seem to be, statistically, stronger related. The relation between “carers” and “forms of violence” is more difficult to explain. But there are two possible “intermediate variables”. On the one hand, “carers” are more frequently demanded by houses of more modest socio-economic conditions, and forms of violence seem to be slightly more associated to this social status of employers than to others. On the other hand, “carers” are more frequently hired among Brazilians (table 0.2: 17% with this activity profile; average 10%). And Brazilians report more cases of violence than workers of other nationalities.

The frequency of the situations here discussed also varies according to the average duration of the employment relationships, even if not in a measure comparable to the impact of other independent variables. Interestingly, almost all situations are more frequently experienced where the duration of employment is between 1 and 3 years. The lowest figures are in many cases related to the longest (more than 10 years), and in some cases to the shortest durations. The only situation that differs from this pattern is the denial of rest times, where the highest figure corresponds to the longest and shortest employment durations. A plausible explanation of the more general behaviour – low figures at the extremes; highest figures related to the duration of 1-3 years – is that workers stay in the same houses for a very long time if they feel at least some comfort there. Conversely, where people stay only for very short periods in the same houses, there is little time left for the situations here considered to happen.

*c) Global level of satisfaction (Table 1.3)*

Several questions allow us to reconstruct the general image domestic workers have about domestic work, as well as their global satisfaction in the job. It seemed advisable to analyse the answers to these questions after those on the satisfaction on specific aspects, and on concrete specific situations encountered. Thus we will be in condition to appreciate, not only the general attitude toward this work, but also the way this attitude is constructed, on the basis of more specific experiences. In the framework of a research aiming at identifying the problems faced by domestic workers, in order to find ways to give them more instrumental means to cope with these problems, our first interest was to locate the cases of general dissatisfaction.

The interviewees had to indicate their general level of satisfaction with their job on the following scale: “Very pleased” / “Satisfied” / “Not very satisfied” / “Not satisfied at all” (D6). The number of very negative answers is extremely low (5 answers; less than 1%). These few answers will not be analysed separately but merged with the answers “Not very satisfied” (8%; 55; both categories merged: 8,8%). This figure is similar to the proportion of cases likely to be qualified as violence (average proportion of 7,5%), discussed in the previous section. A plausible proximity: the number of workers openly reporting to be satisfied with their job corresponds in some extent to the number of people experiencing, or having experienced, very serious troubles with their employers.

In order to appreciate the consistency of the data, we compared the level of general satisfaction with the job with the answers to the different specific motives of (dis-)satisfaction (question D5, already discussed in section a). In this sense, we considered the cases of people declaring to be “not satisfied” with at least three of the six aspects listed in the questionnaire. 6% of the interviewees correspond to this criterion. In other words, the answers do focus, in most of the cases, on only one or two aspects. The behaviour of this recalculated variable is very similar to the one of the answers on the level of general satisfaction.

The level of general satisfaction measured by the question where it is addressed directly is fairly high. However, the answers to the question “Would you change for another job?” oblige us to mitigate the notion of a globally positive attitude of domestic workers towards their job: almost two thirds of the interviewees (62%) would like to change. Even if part of those who give this answer simply are pleased to change from time to time their occupation, whatever it is, there is probably a high proportion of people who want to change because they do not like the job. The proportion here encountered is actually significantly higher than the one of “not satisfied” answers on specific aspects (highest score for “not satisfied with the salary”: 29%), and higher than the proportion of people who saw themselves confronted with what we called in the previous section “issues of money” (39%). A simple interpretation of these figures is that the concrete material aspects of their job do not, as such, offer a sufficient explanation of the desire of domestic workers to change their job. One possible additional reason is the public image of this kind of work. Indeed, 55% of the interviewees answer “No” to the question “Is domestic work well regarded?”.

The questionnaire includes a set of questions aiming at reconstructing the interviewees’ image of domestic work<sup>3</sup>. Interviewees were confronted with a set of statements and had to tell us whether they considered them right or wrong. Three statements could be considered as corresponding to an image of the job linked to some degree of dissatisfaction: “a lonely/solitary work”; “a precarious work”; “A work involving some danger”. The proportion of approvals to the first two statements is comparable to the proportion of “No” answers to the question of the positive image of domestic work (59% and 52%). Not surprisingly, it is lower toward the statement “Domestic work is a dangerous work” (36%).

One more question (F6) deserves to be discussed in this section: “Remaining as a domestic worker, would you prefer (a) to work directly in private households? (b) to work in private households through a domestic cleaning company?” In addition to these alternative answers, they were invited to justify their preference. Interestingly enough, this open-ended question triggered a huge number of substantial responses (and this after about one hour of the questionnaire’s application), revealing a particular interest for this issue from the part of the workers interviewed. As already mentioned, only a very few number of interviewees do work for cleaning companies (6; 1%). Among the others, who currently work directly in private households, an overwhelming majority (89%) prefers to continue working under these conditions. Even so, a significant number would like to switch to a cleaning company (10%). This

---

<sup>3</sup> For a specific analysis of this aspect, see the chapter of the book in preparation drafted by Vanessa Blétière.

answer may have quite different meanings, but it seems legitimate to admit that it indicates a certain level of dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs.

The crossing of the variables now introduced with the interviewees' nationality leads to several interesting findings. There are differences in the general level of satisfaction. The highest proportions of "not satisfied" answers are to be found among workers of Eastern Europe (12,3%), the lowest among Portuguese (7,9%) and Brazilians (8,4%). People from African countries are in between these two levels (10,6%). Workers from Brazil and from Eastern Europe do give the highest number of "Yes" answers when questioned if they would like to change for another job (77 and 75%, average 62%). This confirms what we learned from the study of recent migrations in Europe. Domestic work is an opportunity for migrant women to enter the labour market via one of its least formalized sectors, being the prospect of those migrants who engage in this activity to switch as soon as possible to a more qualified one. At the other end of the scale, the lowest proportion of people interested in changing is to be found among Portuguese workers (57%). People from Eastern Europe are less than others inclined to consider domestic work as dangerous (25%; average 36%), Brazilians are the most inclined to consider it as solitary (63%; average 52%). Among other less noticeable differences, workers from African countries are proportionally more numerous to perceive a negative public image of the profession, than it is the case for other nationalities (59%, average 55%). On the other hand, there is a huge difference between the answers of workers from African countries and those of other interviewees regarding the issue of cleaning companies. African workers are far more numerous to indicate a preference to be employed by a company (22%, average 10%).

There seems to be quite a strong correlation between the general level of satisfaction and the interviewees' age: the younger, the higher the probability of answers indicating dissatisfaction, desire to change for another job, and perception of a negative public image of the profession. Younger persons are also more interested than others to be employed by companies (20%, average 10%). As far as representations of the job are concerned, there is a clear cross-cutting difference between the oldest category (60 and older) and the others in the level of acceptance of the statements proposed. While a majority of interviewees of the other age categories consider as true that domestic work is precarious and lonely (with only one quasi exception: 48% of people between 41 and 50 consider it as a lonely job), only a minority of older people adhere to those statements (38% / 35%).

The impact of the employer's social status appears to be weaker than the one of age or nationality of interviewees. People working in middle class houses without office are slightly more inclined than others to consider themselves as "not satisfied" with their job. A similar difference is to be found in the answers on the questions "Would you change for another job?" and "Domestic work, a precarious work?" On the same variables, the lowest scores are related to people employed in houses of upper social status. A linear relationship exists between the employer's social status and the perceived public image of domestic work. The higher the employer's status, the more probable it is to receive a "No" answer on the question "Is domestic work well regarded?" (63%, average 55%; proportion at the other end of the scale: 49%).

The correlation between the variables here discussed and the level of schooling is strong. People with higher level of schooling report more frequently than others general dissatisfaction, desire to change the job and so on.

The general level of satisfaction varies according to the place of the interview. Highest scores are to be found in Braga; lower ones in Coimbra. Nobody answered “not satisfied” in Algarve. The highest proportion of people who want to change for another work, and who consider that domestic work is not well regarded, concerns Alentejo; the lowest scores on these two questions are to be found, again, in the Algarve and in Coimbra.

There is no clear relationship between the discussed variables and the number of houses where a person works. One remarkable figure, however: a quite low proportion of not satisfied persons among those who work in two houses (4,8%, average 8,8%). The highest proportion is to be found among those who work in only one house (11,7%). This confirms the hypothesis that people who work for different employers have better conditions to take advantage of this kind of professional activity, even if the difference between the categories “working in two houses” – lowest level of global dissatisfaction – and “working in three houses” – lowest level of dissatisfaction with specific aspects – remains to be explained.

The activity profile seems to cause important differences in the general level of satisfaction. Less satisfied are those who have to take care of children (12,3% of “not satisfied [at all]”, average 8,8%); more satisfied those who have to take care of animals or plants (6,7%), and all-rounders (7%). Those who have to take care of dependent persons are less prone to change to another job (54%, average 62%), and have a more positive notion of the public image of domestic work (47%, average 55%). The highest proportion of people considering that domestic work is not well regarded is to be found among domestic workers in charge with animals and plants. In the same category, we also have the lowest responses to the questions “domestic work: a dangerous work?” and “Would you prefer to work for a cleaning company?” The highest proportion of “Yes” answers to this last question is to be found among workers hired only for cleaning. Not surprisingly, a higher proportion of workers hired only for cleaning, and of those hired for cleaning, as well as to take care of animals and plants, accept the statement “domestic work is a solitary work”. All other activity profiles include tasks to be performed in direct personal contact with people.

There is a strong linear correlation between the level of general satisfaction and the will to change for another job, on the one hand, and the average duration of employment, on the other. The shorter this duration, the higher the proportion of people “not satisfied”, and the higher the proportion of people desiring to change. On the long run, so it seems, a relationship of trust with employers is likely to counter-balance the discomfort domestic workers feel toward their occupation. However, we should not forget here the probable impact of nationality. Portuguese workers are far more likely to work since 10 years or more for the same employers. As it appeared here, Portuguese workers tend to give less frequently answers corresponding to feelings of dissatisfaction.



d) *Work experiences of the interviewees – A general assessment*

It is now time to attempt a summary comparison between the three tables analysed up to now: concrete motives of (dis)satisfaction, situations encountered, and general level of (dis)satisfaction. Four variables deserve a special comment.

As far as *age* is concerned, three types of impact may be distinguished. The impact on the variables indicating the general level of satisfaction is strong, and in several cases linear. The impact on the level of satisfaction regarding more concrete aspects is less visible. The impact on the probability of being confronted with certain situations is weaker, clearly visible only in the case of discriminations. A possible interpretation of this general assessment is the following. Age might have an influence on what happens concretely to people, but this influence is weak, and concerns specifically certain types of situations. On the other hand, the general appreciation of our own life or work conditions depends heavily on a set of subjective criteria that are likely to depend on the age (the older the more tolerant towards deceptions) or on the generation to which we belong (the expectations of comfort are presumably higher among people grown up in recent decades than among those who were exposed to the more demanding life conditions in the first years after World War II). Between these two types of impact – low on concrete situations; high on the general feeling of satisfaction – we may expect an intermediate level of impact on the appreciation of concrete aspect of the work situation. The concrete problems (salary, amount of work, type of tasks, and so on) are to a limited extent related to the age, but the relationship is neither necessary nor linear, and the criteria of appreciation, since they address a specific aspect of reality, are less related to general dispositions of the person concerned toward her social environment. This interpretation also could be applied to the impact of the level of schooling.

The impact of *nationality* is much more complex and difficult to interpret. Generally, Portuguese workers seem to meet fewer difficulties, and to be more satisfied, in general as well as in particular terms, with their life conditions. This confirms the notion according to which non nationals are socially more vulnerable than nationals. The other three groups of nationalities here considered show three quite different statistical behaviours. Let us, for the moment, describe them. A tentative interpretation of the differences will be attempted later on in this document.

- Brazilians are *frequently confronted with problematic situations*; they *frequently qualify themselves as “not satisfied”* in relation to specific aspects of their work, and they frequently indicate they would like to change for another job. But their *level of general satisfaction is comparatively high*.
- Workers from Eastern Europe are exposed to *problematic situation in a measure to a large extent comparable to Brazilians*. But, on the one hand, they seem to be *more satisfied with specific aspects* of their job, and, on the other hand, their *level of general satisfaction is comparatively low*.
- Finally, people from African countries seem to find themselves *less frequently confronted with problematic situations*. But they are *less satisfied with specific aspects*, in particular with the nature of tasks and with the relationship with the

employers, and show a fairly *high proportion of persons “not satisfied” in general terms with their work.*

The *employer’s social status* has on many variables a rather unpredictable impact. However, three comments can be formulated. Generally, people working in houses of higher social standing seem to work under better conditions, and to be more satisfied with their job, in general, and as far as particular aspects are concerned. In contrast to this general profile, under some specific aspects, people employed in such houses seem to experience particularly adverse conditions. This is the case in all circumstances where the – hypothetically huge – difference of social status between employee and employer plays a role: rich employers are frequently considered as having a negative image of domestic work, their attitudes are frequently experienced as discrimination; they are in condition to require a heavy amount of work.

One correspondence is worth being emphasized: people working in middle class houses without office report a slightly lower level of general satisfaction, and more frequently the desire to change for another job. It is in the same category that we find more people dissatisfied with their salary, and facing issues of money (unpaid benefits, etc.). Finally, this other correspondence: the comparatively highest proportion of conflicts with employers is to be found in houses of modest social condition. It is also in these houses that, according to our figures, more cases of physical violence are reported. This correspondence cannot be ignored, since the differences, compared with other categories of employers, are in both cases considerable. But it has to be interpreted very carefully. Admittedly, issues of conflict and violence are more likely to be explicitly referred to in certain social *milieux*, while there are elsewhere stronger norms preventing people from speaking about such issues, especially when they concern the house where one lives or works.

Concerning the number of houses where a person works, we have to notice that people working in two houses experience less frequently adverse situations (apart from issues of money), and answer more frequently that they are more satisfied in general terms. However, the proportion of “not satisfied” answers on specific aspects is comparatively high.

A last comment concerns the activity profile. Here we shall limit ourselves to emphasize the important difference in the impact of this variable on the situations encountered, on the one hand, and on the feelings of satisfaction, on the other. The activity profile is a variable of a special kind. Firstly, we may question to what extent it is legitimate to admit sharp differences between categories. Secondly, we have to recognize that it strongly depends on other variables here included in the analysis. First of all, the employer’s status, then the age of the employee; and, beyond these more obvious relationships, prejudice regarding nationalities, consideration of language skills, local cultural norms, etc. If we globally assess this set of variables likely to condition the activity profile, variables related to the person of the worker appear to be less important than variables related to the employers and to the context of the house. This explains the differences between tables 1.1 and 1.3 on the one hand, and table 1.2 on the other. The variables characterizing the context have, through the activities that they condition, a somehow patterned impact on the objective aspects of domestic work, i.e. on the situations encountered. Their impact on the personality of the domestic worker, which conditions the levels of satisfaction, is

far less direct. Therefore, we find less “readable” figures on the tables reporting these levels.

e) *Practices against the law (Table 2.1)*

In the foregoing sections we have considered the reality of domestic work according to the criteria of the interviewees. Objective criteria played a role in the construction of the set of adverse situations submitted to them. But most of these situations correspond to what anyone in our western societies would consider as – more or less – problematic, or even prohibited. On the way to the approach of the law’s relevance in the treatment of the problems encountered by domestic workers, we now have to scrutinize more specifically the situations that clearly contradict the law, thus justifying legal measures. Now we do not anymore consider the criteria the interviewees apply to the evaluation of their situations, but as far as possible objective and legal criteria.

Many responses to question G4 do indicate illegalities, and table 1.2 should be taken into account in a systematic survey of the practices against the law experienced by the interviewees. In the present analysis, however, we shall analyse several more specific facts contrary to the law, revealed by the answers to other questions. Obviously, this step of analysis will have to be adapted to the relevant national legislation in the analysis of each of the four other countries here compared.

The questionnaire includes two questions that can directly reveal possible illegalities : does the employer pay contributions to the national social security system (which is mandatory; E8)?<sup>4</sup> Does the employer pay at least one thirteenth monthly salary (for holiday or for Christmas) according to a binding rule of Portuguese labour law (E9). Moreover, the questionnaire allows to detect if, under given circumstances, the reactions of the employers was in accordance with Portuguese labour law. In the case of an accident at work, did the employer bear the health costs? (E12) If a maternity leave has been asked for, has it been granted? (E10) Table 2.1 registers the cases in which the law, on these four points, according to the answers of the interviewees, was not obeyed. We detect high levels of non compliance with the law: social security contributions not paid according to 44% of the interviewees; neither holiday nor Christmas bonus: 33%; maternity leave not granted while demanded: 29%; health costs after accident at work not supported by the employer: 15%.

One more illegality is explicitly addressed by the questionnaire, even if in abstract terms: non fulfilment of the written contract. Non fulfilment is reported in about 11% of the cases when a contract was signed (compare table 2.1, column [D] and table 3.1, column [G]). Interestingly, and not surprisingly, signed contracts seem, if we consider this figure, to have a more stringent impact on the practices of employers than the law. An open-ended question gives us some views on the cases of non fulfilment. A summary assessment of these cases reveals proportions similar to those we encountered at several moments of the present analysis: more frequent are issues of

---

<sup>4</sup> On the sociological relevance of the payment of social security contributions by employers, see Suleman (forthcoming).

work schedule (amount of work; 10 cases from 23 answers) and of salary (8 cases); also mentioned, but less frequent: tasks demanded not included in the contract (5 cases).

Another formal illegality can be reconstructed on the basis of the data collected by the questionnaire: the hiring of people below the legal minimum age (current age [H1] minus years working as domestic worker [A5]). This minimum age in Portugal is nowadays 16; over years it was 14. As a matter of fact, among people interviewed in Portugal, 31 were hired before 14, but in all cases a long time ago. It makes sense here to only take recent practices into consideration. We restricted the analysis to the cases that occurred during the last ten years before the application of the questionnaire (since 1998). During this period, only six people were hired while they were less than 16 years old. This indicates a rather low rate of violation of the Portuguese legislation against child work. However, we also have to take into account the fact that typically such situations are more likely not to be included in our pool of interviewees, remaining young people presumably under narrower control of their employer, and less involved in the informal networks upon which our “snowball” strategy of identification of domestic workers had to be based.

Beyond these formal illegalities, the questionnaire allows us to detect other signs of possible abuses. One is the refusal of signing a written contract. Indeed, there is no obligation of the parts to sign a written contract. However, the refusal of such an arrangement, from the part of the employer, who presumably holds the stronger position in the relationship, allows us to admit that he/she tries to save room for manoeuvre with a view to future work demands, and/or to create conditions less favourable for the worker in case of conflict. Such a refusal is reported in 6,6% of the cases. This comparatively low figure is not easy to interpret. It should be confronted with the number of cases in which the worker actually asked for such a contract. The interesting data here are the differences between the interviewed categories of workers.

The questionnaire is likely to reveal three types of material abuses, presumably violating the labour legislation.

*Insufficient wages:* In a majority of cases, the data collected allow us to calculate the hourly wage of the workers, at least as an estimate. In Portugal, the current minimum wage, applicable to domestic workers, is defined by the law as a monthly wage of 485 euros. On this basis, a minimum hourly wage would be about 2,40 euros (485 euros / [4,5 weeks \* 44 hours]). The proportion of workers earning a wage below this threshold is about 5,7%.

*Excessive working schedule:* Even if this calculation could not be carried out in all cases, in a majority of them it was possible to check whether one of the following situations was fulfilled: more than six days a week, more than 26 days a month, more than 8.5 hours a day. Cases in which at least one of these conditions is fulfilled were considered as cases of excessive working schedule in the face of Portuguese legislation. A proportion of 8.2% of the interviewees corresponds to this situation.

*Excessive workload:* Here we do not base our calculation on a legal threshold, that actually does not exist, but on the comparison between the cases observed. An indice of the workload was constructed. We know the number of rooms of the house where

the person works (or of the house where she spends the major part of her working time); and we know in a majority of cases how many hours she works in that house per week. We admit that all rooms have to be cleaned up at least once a week. Dividing the number of rooms by the number of weekly hours (total time available to perform the job) we obtain the number of rooms, or else, in most cases, the fraction of room a worker has to clean up in one hour. The more important this fraction, the heavier the workload. We considered 0.66 (the worker has less than 1.5 hours available per week for the cleaning of one room) as a significant threshold, since it differentiates in Portugal a group of 9.7%. Here, again, the relevant figure is not this general proportion, arbitrarily chosen by the research team, but its variation across the categories of interviewees.

The proportion of practices against the law varies significantly across nationalities. Worth a special notice is the fact that workers from African countries are the least exposed category (social security contribution not paid: 32%; average 44%; wage bonus not granted: 24%; average 33%). Strangely, it is amongst Portuguese workers that we find the highest proportion of people whose social security contributions are not paid by their employers. A possible explanation is that the situation of foreign workers is somehow controlled by the authorities in charge with foreigners, which creates a stronger pressure toward a regular treatment of them from the part of employers. The distribution of irregular reactions toward accidents at work and maternity is not easy to interpret. The most impressive figure is the following: all Brazilian women who report they asked for a maternal leave, had their demand refused. People from Eastern Europe seem to be more exposed to the non payment of health costs after accidents at work, followed by people from African countries (34%, 26%; average 15%). Brazilians seem to be less exposed (13%), even less than Portuguese workers (14%), a fact that remains to be explained. Accidents at work are much more frequently reported by Portuguese workers than by the workers of other nationalities (14.7%, average 12.6%). A probable reason for this figure is that immigrants tend not to declare accidents at work, to avoid the risk of having the contract terminated, while this contract is a condition for obtaining their residence permit. The highest proportion of refusals of signing a contract is reported by workers from Eastern Europe. This proportion, however, might be to some extent influenced by the attitude of these workers toward the law and contracts, as we shall see in the next section. More important is to note that there are two main categories: people from Portugal and from African countries with a lower proportion of refusals (5.9%), and people from Brazil and Eastern Europe, with a higher proportion (8.4% and 10.5%). Cases of low salaries and of child work are more frequent among workers from African countries (10.6%, average 5.7%); excessive working time: Brazil and Eastern Europe (19% and 20%, average 11%); excessive workload: people from Eastern Europe and from Portugal (15.8% and 12.1%, average 11.4%).

In relation to the age, the highest figures are to be found at both ends of the scale, concerning the youngest and the oldest categories. The intermediate category of the 41-50 is the least exposed to non payment of social security contributions and wage bonus; it is also less exposed to a refusal from the part of the employer to sign a contract. Accidents at work are particularly frequent in the category of the 51-60, which is partly due to the fact that there is a majority of Portuguese workers in this category, being, as has been mentioned before the Portuguese more inclined to declare such accidents. The category most exposed to have to pay the following health costs

is 31-40 years. As far as cases of maternity are concerned, we find, logically, an even distribution of this eventuality among all age categories. On the other hand, the younger the interviewees, the higher the proportion of cases in which the maternity leave was refused. It is difficult to appreciate to what extent employers have become less compliant over the years, or if older interviewed people do not remember, or do not want to remember, the trouble they had in obtaining the leave. Signs of abuses in terms of work schedule and workload clearly affect more the oldest category. This could be a late effect of domestic work practices that were generally accepted decades ago, and that would not anymore be accepted nowadays.

The social status of the employer seems, here again, to have a quite clear impact. The lowest proportions of non payment of social security contributions and wage bonus are to be found among workers in houses of upper social standing. There is a huge difference between these workers and the average as far as wage bonus is concerned (9% against an average of 33%). Accidents at work seem to be less frequent among workers in middle class houses without office, but the proportion of workers who had to pay the following health costs is the highest in exactly this same category. Cases of maternity, as well as refusals of maternity leaves, seem to be more probable in houses of upper social standing or middle class houses with office. The almost parallel behaviour of these two variables could have the following explanation. Domestic workers employed by people living in more modest conditions do not even ask for a maternal leave; when the employers are better off, the tendency to ask for a leave increases, which gives to these categories of employers more occasions to refuse. However, the considerable difference between the two categories of middle class house demands at least an additional explanation, which is still to be found.

The level of schooling does not seem to have a clear impact on the probability of suffering the practices here discussed. There are two exceptions: people with higher level of schooling seem to be less exposed to excessively low salaries and to excessive work schedules. This relationship appears even more clearly when we only consider the situation of Portuguese workers (table 2.1-C [PP]). Figures concerning the employer's refusal of signing an employment contract are intriguing. People with a higher level of schooling do more frequently report such refusals, while we could expect them to be in a better position to negotiate such a contract. One simple interpretation is that these people do also probably more frequently ask their employer for a contract (which is somehow confirmed by table 3.1-C [PP]<sup>5</sup>), thus being more exposed to a refusal. They also are in a better position to appreciate such a refusal as challenging their rights and to report it as such to the interviewer. People with a lower level of schooling might more easily accept the motives invoked by employers for their attitude, which could lead them to prefer not to speak about a refusal.

Non payment of wage bonus seems to be more frequent in Alentejo, non payment of social security contributions in Oporto. Signs of very frequent cases of workload excesses are visible in Alentejo (32%, average 11%); high proportions of such cases are also to be found in Braga and Coimbra (27% at both places). Excesses of work schedule seem to be more frequent in Oporto (17%, average 11%). The most

---

<sup>5</sup> The relationship between level of schooling and readiness for asking the employer for a contract does not appear on table 3.1-C (P) (all nationalities). This is due to the fact that foreigners have specific reasons to insist to have a contract signed, not depending on their level of schooling but on their legal status as immigrants.

intriguing figure is the following, which suggests that there is a bias in our sample: there is a huge concentration of case of non paid health cost after accidents at work in Braga (67%, average 15%).

The number of houses where a person works does not seem to have a strong impact on the frequency of illegalities. Non payment of social security contributions and of wage bonus seems to be slightly more probable when there are several employers. Perhaps because such situations raise doubts about who is responsible for the payment. This could also be a reason why people working in different houses seem to run a higher risk of having to pay the health costs after an accident at work. The other way round, it seems somehow easier to obtain a maternal leave when working in different houses. Perhaps because there is some probability of one employer granting the leave, thus creating a “precedent” that can be put forward in the negotiation with other employers. What can be interpreted as signs of abuses according in the light of other variables appears here, at least to some extent, as the material consequence of the work situation. Who works in one house has to accept a heavier work schedule than who works in different houses (these people did answer the questionnaire on the basis of the arrangements valid in the house where they work the longest). It is impressive to see that even among people employed in several houses, there is a significant proportion (around 5%) with an excessive work schedule in the only house where they work the longest (perhaps in some cases there was a misunderstanding of the rules of the questionnaire’s completion, but not in all such cases). People who work in many houses are more exposed to a heavy workload (18%, average 11%). This seems plausible: employers may accept such arrangement once provided the necessary work is performed, event if there is less time available for it.

Some significant relations between types of illegalities and activity profiles have to be emphasized. Non compliance of the law in matters of social security contributions and of wage bonus seem to be particularly frequent where workers were hired exclusively for cleaning, or for cleaning and care of animals and plants. Cases of non fulfilment of the contract are extremely frequent where workers have to care for dependent people. Signs of excessive workload are particularly frequent in the case of workers hired only for cleaning (23%, average 11%). This figure has to be interpreted carefully. Indeed, the index of workload was calculated only on the basis of the cleaning of rooms. Logically, workers who do only cleaning will have to face more demanding expectations in terms of room cleaning, than people who are also supposed to care for children or dependent people, or to prepare meals. All-rounders and people whose tasks include the preparing of meals seem to face more frequently refusals of signing a work contract from the part of their employer. The proportion of workers who have to pay their health costs after an accident at work is the highest among workers employed also to prepare meals, the proportion of refusals of maternity leaves is the highest among all-rounders.

In general terms, a shorter average duration of the employment relationship is linked to higher proportions of illegalities. See the figures concerning the non payment of wage bonus, aspects of the contract not fulfilled, signs of excessive time schedule, non payment of health costs after an accident at work. In some cases, the category most exposed is the one including workers with an average duration of one to three years. The simple explanation of this fact is probably that it may take some time until

a non legal practice become apparent (payment of social security contributions; signs of heavy workload).

f) *Relationship to the law (Table 3.1.)*

Now that we have identified where and in what proportion cases of non compliance of the law occur, it is time to examine what legal measures are effectively taken in the same contexts. A previous question, however, in order to appreciate the motives of the measures taken, is to analyse in more general terms the relationship between the workers and the law. This relationship may be analysed on two levels. There may be a formal link between the person and the law or legalized institutions (in this case, unions or other stakeholders' groupings): the person may have signed a contract or be member of such a grouping. And the person may have notions about the law that makes her more or less interested in using it in dealing with the problems she faces.

Some questions included in the questionnaire inform us about the attitudes of the workers toward the law and legal institutions. The most direct question in this sense concerns the readiness of the interviewee to go to court to defend her rights. About two thirds answered "yes" to this question (64%). Other questions concern the relevance of having a contract signed. Interviewees had to indicate if they agree, or not, with several statements about contracts, such as: "Serve to guarantee your rights", "Serve to resolve conflicts between employers and employees" and "Serve to protect you as a worker". We considered the proportion of people who agreed with these three statements as an indication of the level of confidence, in a given group, in the tools supplied by the law. The proportion of people corresponding to this criterion is 46%. Conversely, people had the opportunity to accept the following statement "Written contracts are worthless within employers' homes". We considered that interviewees reacting with a "No" to this statement do consider a contract as in principle useful. 51% answered that way. Two questions address the issue of visits of work inspectors in the houses where domestic workers are employed. Firstly if such a measure is seen as appropriate for the house where the interviewed person works; secondly, if such a measure is positively valued in general terms. The "yes" answers to the second question are more frequent than to the first. 49% agree with the principle of visits of work inspections in private houses; 26% with such visits in the house where they are employed. The two questions about the concrete actual relationship of the interviewees to the law are: if a written employment contract has been signed, and if the interviewee is member of a trade union. There is a written contract in 29% of the cases; 6.4% of the interviewees are members of a union.

Eventually, we have to know what measures the persons have taken to face problems they encountered. Two questions address this point directly: if the person has searched for a union or association, and if she has gone to court to defend her rights. On these questions, "yes" answers are far less frequent than on those introduced up to now. 5.7% have searched for the help of an association; 2.9% went to court.

The questionnaire informs us about another concrete measure likely to be taken. If a worker meets serious problems in a house, she simply may leave it and search for another employer. There is a question on the motives why the interviewed person has



left in the past some of the houses where she worked (A8). Several answers proposed to this question correspond to such situations (“insufficient salary”, “I disliked the tasks”, “heavy work schedule”, and so on). Some of the answers to these questions were already been discussed here, in section (a), as revealing experiences of discomfort. Now we have to come back to them, from the point of view of the capacity of action they reveal. This means that we do not to consider here the concrete motives, but the fact that the worker left a house because of a disagreement on some aspects of her working conditions. The answers registered by the questionnaire on this point have to be interpreted carefully. We did not insist on the precise decision making process that led to the termination of the employment relationship and only invited interviewees to indicate the material reasons of their leaving. In some cases, the decision might have been facilitated or even taken by the employers. But it is legitimate to assume that in an important proportion of cases in which salary, nature of the tasks, and work schedule are referred to, the decision was taken by the worker (in particular, we did not consider the answers “for difficulties in relationships with employers [...]”, an answer that could easily correspond to situations in which the final decision had been in fact taken by the employer). 39% report such a termination of the relationship.

A first general appreciation of these figures could be: firstly, there is a decreasing impact of the law, from the attitudes to the concrete measures. About half part of the interviewees give answers that suggest readiness in using legal tools. Concrete measures in the sense of facilitating future legal steps were taken only in part of these cases (contracts in less than a third of them; only a small proportion of interviewees are members of unions), in part, obviously because such steps also depend on other people (the employer has to accept to sign a contract; the unions have to be accessible). Concrete legal measures to deal with problems are even less frequent. However, and this is the second conclusion, an alternative measure to the call for the public authority’s intervention, the leaving of the place where troubles did arise, is rather frequently used.

The relationship to the law, as we are here in condition to analyse it, changes a lot according to the nationality of the interviewees. There are in particular two very different cases: workers from Eastern Europe are in all items here discussed less inclined than others to give an answer indicating an actual relationship to the law: positive appreciation of the contract: 26% (average 46%); would go to court to defend her rights: 40% (average 64%), members of union: 2% (average 6%), and so on. And, even if figures on this point are scarce and do not allow any generalization, let us notice that in this population we meet the lowest proportion of people who went to court: 1,8%, average 2,9%. In contrast to this profile, we have workers from African countries, with exactly the opposed characteristics: higher proportions of people with a positive opinion about the law and legal institutions: contract in principle useful: 68% (average 51%); contract positively valued: 48% (average 46%); work inspection in the houses: 55% (average 42%); would go to court: 75% (average 64%). Higher proportion of concrete relationship to the law: members of a union 12% (average 6%). And higher proportion of people who went to court: 5.9% (average 2.9%). When compared with other nationalities, however, this category of workers seems less inclined to terminate the contract: 31% (average 39%). What characterizes Brazilians is a particularly high proportion in favour of work inspection where they work: 39% (average 26%), and of cases in which they left a house for not being satisfied with

work conditions: 45% (average 39%). Among Portuguese workers we find the lowest proportion of employment contracts signed: 22%, average 29%. This is certainly due to the fact that immigrant workers need a contract as a condition for having their residence permit granted, which leads them to insist more than others to have such a contract signed. On the other hand, a high proportion of Portuguese workers have a positive image of employment contracts: 49% (average 46%), but a slightly lower proportion of them consider the contract as useful: 48% (average 51%).

The younger the interviewee, the more probable it is to receive a positive answer to the question “Would you go to the court to defend your rights”. This could be related to a general trend of legalization of social relations over the last decades. This hypothesis is somehow confirmed by the answers of the oldest age category to the question of the intervention of work inspectors (29%, average 42%). The lower proportion of older people working under a written employment contract could also be explained this way. But we also have to take into account here that there are more immigrants among younger people, and we saw that immigrants do more frequently sign a contract with their employer.

There is a clear relationship between houses of upper social standing and attitudes of employees more favourable to the law, as well as a higher proportion of employment contracts signed. On this point, differences according to the social status of the house are more accentuated than those related to nationality. The relationship is linear as far as questions of legal status are concerned: from lower to higher social status of the house, the proportion of contracts signed ranges from 20% to 59% (average 29%), the proportion of members of unions, from 4.5% to 12.5% (average 6.4%). Employees of houses of upper social status give more positive answers on the role of contracts and of work inspection, and are more inclined to go to court to defend their rights. Other figures do not fit in such a linear relationship. Notably, both the proportion of people who would go to court to defend their rights, and who actually went to court is the lowest in the case of employers of middle class houses without office: 61% (average 64%); 1.8% (average 2.9%). The highest proportion of concrete legal steps is to be found among workers employed in house of modest social condition: 13.5% (average 5.7%) searched for the support of an association; 4.5% (average 2.9%) went to court. One last difference is worth a mention: workers left houses more frequently in middle class houses with office and houses of upper social standing (43% and 41%; average 39%), less frequently in middle class houses without office and houses of lower social standing (33% and 34%).

Table 3.1-C (P) shows no clear impact of the level of schooling on the relationship to the law. This can easily be explained by the fact that both aspects – level of schooling and relationship to the law – are directly related to the nationality. So we have to control this third variable. Indeed, figures concerning only Portuguese citizens (table 3.1-C [PP]), however, do indicate some impact, at least as far as the attitudes are concerned. In general terms, Portuguese domestic workers with a higher level of schooling do more frequently give answers indicating a positive attitude toward the law. However, the proportion decreases again, on several variables, in the categories with the highest level of schooling. One possible reason could be that those people expect to be in condition to solve certain problems by themselves. As far as status and actions are concerned, the impact of this variable seems to be weak. People with a

lower level of schooling do more frequently report they left a house because they did not like the work conditions.

As far as places of interview are concerned, we just mention the most visible differences. There are important differences between Lisbon and Oporto, with higher proportions of positive attitudes towards the law, and of cases in court, in Lisbon, and lower figures on the same points in Oporto. The highest proportions of contracts signed and of union memberships are to be found in Algarve. People in this region also seem to be more inclined to go to court to defend their rights. On the other hand, we have there low proportions of positive answers on the role of work inspection. In Braga, intervention of work inspection in the house where the interviewee works is comparatively frequently approved (33%, average 26%); but contracts are less frequent (19%, average 29%) and less frequently positively valued (43%; average 46%).

The number of houses in which people work seems to have some impact on their relationship to the law too, even if to a lower degree. People working in only one house give more frequently answers indicating a positive relationship to the law, and the proportion of contracts signed is higher in this category. A reverse relationship exists when it comes to the cases in which people went to court. The more houses a person works for, the higher the probability of her having went to court. Interestingly, we find in the same category the lowest proportion of “yes” responses to the question “Would you go to court to defend your rights?” (52%, average 64%). One probable reason for this figure is that workers of Eastern Europe are overrepresented in this category, and that people of these nationalities are less inclined, as mentioned before, to give a positive answer to this question.

There are quite different types of links between activity profiles and the relationship to the law. A fairly legalistic profile is the one of the all-rounders: a very high proportion of them belong to a union (21%, average 6%); they do more frequently answer that they are ready to go to court to defend their rights. It is among these people that we find the highest proportion of people supporting interventions of work inspection in general, and even in the house where they are actually working. However, the proportion of people who went to court is close to the average. A very different case is the one of people in charge with animals and plants: low proportion of people giving a positive value to contracts, defending the intervention of work inspection, and ready to go to court to defend their rights. The proportion of people who actually went to court is slightly above the average. We find comparable answers among persons who prepare meals, but in this category nobody went to court. The highest proportion of contracts signed is to be found in the cases of workers who take care of children, and of those caring for dependent persons; we also have a similar proportion of cases in court, on the average or slightly below. On other dimensions however, there are important differences between these two categories. People who care for dependent persons do more frequently defend the intervention of work inspection, and search for the support of an association. People who have to care for children more frequently left a house for not being satisfied with the work conditions (47%; average 39%). Different statistic behaviour is the one of people employed exclusively for cleaning: comparatively high proportion of union membership, employment contract frequently positively valued – but the lowest proportion of

contracts signed – high proportion of approval of work inspection in principle; the highest proportion of cases in court (4.5%, average 2.9%).

The relationship between average duration of the employment relationship and relationship to the law is more difficult to interpret. Three facts are worth being mentioned. There seems to be a correlation between duration of employment relationship and union membership: the longer the duration, the higher is the proportion of workers belonging to a union. A statistically similar relation exists between duration and the proportion of cases in court. On the other hand, answers indicating a positive relationship to the law are in general far more frequent in the cases of short duration of employment (less than one year).

### **C. Some tentative interpretations**

We observe quite different ways of people relating to the law. Two factors are in particular likely to shape this relationship, as our data suggest. One important factor is certainly the cultural background. Older people seem to be less interested in having their problems “legalized”, probably in part because they were socialized at a time when law was less present in everyday life than it is nowadays. This cultural factor could play a role in the case of workers from Eastern Europe. The low proportion of responses giving value to the law and to official authorities could be related to the recent history of their country, where, in many cases, the whole institutional apparatus was completely transformed over the last twenty years, after a long time of a probable gap between reality and official image of the relationship of citizens to the state. Another factor is the current societal context, where a person may have chances, or not, to acquire some training in the use of legal categories. Here again, our findings suggest two situations where such a training may have taken place. The one is the case of workers from African countries. They seem to be more frequently members of unions, and are those who give the more convinced answers on the role of law and authorities. Such an attitude toward the law could have been favoured by the involvement in unions. The other situation is that of workers in houses of upper social standing. Employers in these social situations have presumably a more frequent relationship to legal issues, be it for professional or for personal reasons. In the relationship with employers used to the legal handling of issues, there is also a probability for workers to learn, in some measure, the use of this sort of tool. This could be the explanation of the answers given by “all-rounders”. This activity profile is far more demanded by people of upper social standing. This explanation could also help to understand the answers of people in charge with the care of animals and plants. This is a profile more demanded in middle class houses without office, where employers might belong to social categories that do not have such an intense relationship to the law, or even consider that the law is made for “others” and not for them<sup>6</sup>. A similar attitude might, under these conditions, be developed by their domestic workers.

---

<sup>6</sup> For an empirical analysis of the relationship to the law according to the social position, likely to back this interpretation, see Guibentif *et al.* (2001), and Guibentif (2002).

Our data also allow some hypotheses on the causes of the problems encountered by domestic workers, and some reflection on the possible reactions to these problems. Obviously, financial resources of employers are an important factor for the work conditions of their employees. The category of employers where we find more financial problems are middle class houses without office. Here we find high levels of dissatisfaction. Indeed, it seems that people employed by this category of employers are also, at least in some proportion, those who are less able to adequately react to problems. They are less inclined to go to court and less inclined to leave the house; what remains is the feeling of dissatisfaction. The most favourable situation from this point of view is the one of people working in houses of upper social standing. Material conditions are presumably good. The problems encountered are those related to excessive workload. A possible solution is to switch to another employer. Workers in such houses seem to be fairly well equipped to deal with such transitions. In houses of modest social condition, workers seem to meet more problems of non financial kind. One category of these workers deserves particular attention. It seems that it is in such houses that there is a strong demand for people who will have to care for dependent persons – probably in part because financial resources do not allow an institutional alternative – and such persons are preferably hired among immigrants, namely Brazilians. Here we have the conjunction of several factors generating problems for the worker: immigrant status, unfavourable economic status of the employer, tasks that include a strong relational component likely to generate psychological pressures. This case confirms what the sociology of domestic work already has stated: many problems experienced by domestic workers are problems that society has externalized to the intimate / domestic sphere, where people try to find somebody else to cope with them.

In the face of problems that regard society in general, or the more specific private domain in general, we also find different strategies, that is, ways of actively react toward the problems encountered, according to quite different attitudes toward the law. The data here collected allow us to reconstruct, at least hypothetically, in particular two strategies, related to two groups defined by their nationalities.

People from Eastern Europe, as we saw, seem to be less inclined than others to use the law in the handling of their difficulties. This relates to a higher proportion of workers of this category who solved problems by the way of leaving a house where they worked. While legal remedy seems to be a less attractive alternative, efforts are made in the sense of avoiding troubles in the future. This requires a more proactive behaviour in the establishment of employment relationships. Indeed, people from Eastern Europe are working, in a much higher proportion than others, for three or more houses. One remarkable figure must here be taken into consideration too: look at the distribution between the different social categories of employers according to the nationality of the employee (table 0.1, columns [M] ff., rows [9] ff.). What do these figures indicate? To what extent the nationality of employees may have, as such, an impact on the social status of people that will employ them. How could there be an impact? On the one hand, as an effect of the attitudes of potential employers toward the different immigrant communities. But this is not a direct effect of the nationality of the employees; it is an effect of the social position of the potential employers. Such an effect is revealed elsewhere in the same table, at the crossing of column [C], and rows [18] and [19]. There, low figures indicate the probable tendency of employers in lower social position to prefer not to hire employees from Eastern Europe. A direct

impact of the employees' nationality could be due to the fact that these people make efforts in the sense of being hired by people of a certain social standing. People who already work for several houses, as it is the case for workers from Eastern Europe, are probably in condition to adopt such a selective strategy. And, indeed, the distribution of them according to the social standing of their employers shows a strong focus on employers in middle-class houses with office (64%, while this proportion is 48% for the whole population interviewed). Here we have at least some statistical signs of strategies aiming at avoiding future troubles in maintaining several parallel employment relationships, and in trying to be hired by people belonging to a social category where the level of practices against the law is comparatively low (table 2.1-A), as well as the frequency of unpleasant situations (table 1.2-A), even if the difference in this latter table is less important. One more sign of this strategy could be the fact that this population has the highest proportion of people with intermediate duration of contracts (highest scores for 1-5 years; lowest for 5 and more years: table 0-2, [4], [O]-[R]). This strategy has probably to be viewed in the broader context of a strategy aiming at other professional occupations: in this population, we also find a very high proportion of people who want to change for another job.

We find another way of meeting the difficulties of the profession in the case of workers from African countries. There, as we saw, legal instruments seem to be more positively valued, and relationship to unions is comparatively more frequent. And it is also in this population that we find the highest proportion of interviewees that would like to work for a company, a work environment likely to be much more legalized than the domestic sphere. These figures deserve to be linked with the following findings. Workers from African countries seem to be less exposed than other immigrants in particular to problems of payment, or to excessive demands (table 1.2-A). And they also are less exposed than others to the non payment of social security contributions by their employers (see table 2.1-A; far more exposed, however, to low salaries). One possible – optimistic – interpretation of this picture is the following: these people, probably in connection with associations representing people from African countries – networks with a history of several decades in Portugal – are ready to use legal instruments to defend themselves, and this fact has led to a situation in which their employers are slightly less inclined to abuses. This is an interpretation the available figures suggests, but that will have to be confirmed by other means. The differences, on table 1.2-A, between the rows [4] on the one hand, [2] and [3] on the other, is striking, as well as the difference between these rows on table 3.1-A. This interpretation could also be related to another fact: the same population shows a comparatively high level of dissatisfaction in relation to several specific aspects. Comparatively strong normative expectations may generate frustration, at the same time as availability for reaction<sup>7</sup>. Here too, there is a possible relationship to a broader professional strategy: people from African countries are in a particularly important proportion employed for cleaning tasks exclusively; they are the more interested in working for companies, which usually focus on the cleaning aspect of domestic work. In work contexts where cleaning is the main task to perform, troublesome situations seem to be comparatively less probable, and the level of satisfaction is comparatively high. Moreover, these are contexts where sensitive

---

<sup>7</sup> For a more detailed sociological discussion of the construction of legal expectations and their effects, see Guibentif (forthcoming), a paper prepared on the basis of research experience gathered in the present project.

personal issues are less probable and the handling of conflicts on the basis of legal categories comparatively easier. While people from Eastern Europe seem to aim being hired by people they expect to treat them comparatively well, people from African countries would seek to be employed in a kind of activity more predictable in its content and less likely to generate personal conflicts.

The impact of the level of schooling appeared to be strongly conditioned by the nationality of interviewees, but as could be expected, seem to favour the use of legal tools. Globally, however, this impact is weak and rather unpredictable. One reason for this could be that there is no direct relationship, nor for the domestic workers themselves, neither for their employers, between domestic work and scholarly education. This could be one more aspect of the gap between public and private sphere discussed by the sociology of domestic work. Perhaps it would be worth better to analyse to what extent scholarly education actually is likely to contribute to a better performance of the tasks usually committed to domestic work, thus emphasizing the skills required for this better performance, and improving the image of this occupation<sup>8</sup>. But the same exercise also could lead to a reassessment of educational programmes and their practical relevance, not only for conventional professional occupations, but also in terms of relational skills and ability to work in socially sensitive contexts.

#### **D. Relevance of the survey's results for legal empowerment strategies**

The above summarized findings are not easy to translate in terms of practical guidelines for those who work on material aiming at empowering domestic workers<sup>9</sup>.

The most important conclusion we had to draw from our data is that the situation of domestic workers depends not only on the specific conditions characterizing this occupation, but on more general social problems. If people working for employers of higher social standing work generally in better conditions, it is because their employers too do live in better conditions. If persons employed to take care for dependent people experience particularly hard work conditions, it is because it is difficult for the whole society to deal with dependency. Under these conditions, a first message to be addressed to those who try to improve the status of domestic workers is the following: broader societal problems always will limit the possible impact of measures aiming at helping domestic workers in particular.

So there are, for example, clear signs of a particular vulnerability of persons employed for taking care for dependents persons (see in particular table 1.2-B, row [9], columns [G]-[S]). These persons are, actually, among those who more frequently consider that a work inspection would help, also in the house where they actually work (see table 3.1-B). This could lead to the policy recommendation of setting up a

---

<sup>8</sup> On the issue of skills, see Suleman (forthcoming).

<sup>9</sup> This section takes advantage of the author's participation in the process of elaboration of an informative booklet on the rights and duties of people involved in domestic work (Fernandes, 2011).

mechanism monitoring in particular this kind of domestic work. Such a mechanism, however, should include means of protective interventions not only in favour of the workers, but also of the persons receiving the care. It is highly questionable whether the means currently available to the State agencies in charge with these issues do suffice for the setting up of such a mechanism<sup>10</sup>.

The fact that, in many cases, domestic workers do work where important social problems have to be dealt with, could be emphasized when it comes to enhance the social recognition of this profession. Perhaps it would be worth to make more visible their crucial contribution to the treatment of major societal issues: dependency of very old people, balance between work and family at a time of increasing pressure from the part of companies on their employees, and so on.

One of the few advices to be addressed to the interested people taking this general situation into account is for them to maintain, as far as possible, some room for manoeuvre, and to be in condition to eschew the most dangerous or troublesome situations. This means in particular, to be in condition to leave a house when it seems advisable. Good information on the possibilities, implications, and appropriate procedures of terminating an employment relationship could be, from this point of view, an important help.

In a similar sense, it would be worth explaining under which conditions one person can work for different employers, and what measures have to be adopted in order to best take advantage of multiple employment relationships. As we saw, one factor of better work conditions seems to be the fact that the domestic worker is employed in two or three houses. Even if one cannot derive from this finding a general recommendation for domestic workers to work in many houses at the same time, it shows that it is worth drawing their attention on possible benefits of such situations, to be carefully taken into account when it comes to decide on new employment relationships.

Our findings confirm that there are quite different activity profiles, and that these profiles may be related to different problems, or even that some of these profiles do expose the workers to a particularly high probability of encountering troublesome situations (“all-rounders”, people having to care for dependent persons). This leads to the obvious conclusion that the scope of activity has to be well discussed with the potential employers before entering into the employment relationship.

These three points – need to clarify the conditions of termination of the employment contract, clear definition of different employment relationships and of the time schedule of each of them, identification of the tasks to be performed – all relate to the issue of the written contract. Technically, such a contract seems very useful in the heterogeneous context in which domestic workers are nowadays employed. On the other hand, our data also confirm that a relationship of confidence between employees and employers often exists, and that is probably one of the more rewarding aspects of this profession. Therefore, it is important to find ways to explain to workers, as well as to their employers, that a written contract does not question or depreciate such a

---

<sup>10</sup> For a recent global appreciation of Portuguese public policies in this domain, and their limitations, see Ribeiro (2009).



relationship, but, on the contrary, that it might provide better conditions for its development.

The reluctance of employers as well as employees toward legal instruments and legal institutions should not be ignored. A possible way of handling this structural characteristic of domestic work is to draw the attention of the interested persons on the potentialities of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. Associations and other organized players in this field seem to be nowadays well aware of this perspective. It should be duly mentioned in the information supplied to the domestic workers. It may be an appropriate solution in particular for issues of money. Where more serious violations of rights are at stake, however, the interested people should receive clear information on what defines more precisely such violations, and what are the legal sanctions. And they should know that they are entitled to defend their rights, when necessary in court. To develop the competence of appreciating when the defence of rights has to prevail, and when mediation has to be preferred, could be part of the education to citizenship schools could contribute to develop. But this opens a debate that goes far beyond the issue of domestic work.

Another possible measure, facing problems in the relationship between domestic workers and the law, is to include in the information circulated among interested persons technically accurate legal references, duly introduced as such. The aim of such mentions should be to help them to present their problems to professional jurists and trained officials, and to show that there is no radical divide between the world of the specialists who know the law, and other people who are not even aware of the existence of laws, but that there are different levels of familiarity in the relationship to the law. It should be actually a basic ethic rule for jurists to reduce the differences between these levels.

The data collected also suggest that unions and associations play an important role in the acquiring of legal competences<sup>11</sup>. Their role is certainly crucial in this field, by the way they open a space where domestic workers may experience, better perhaps than in the houses where they work, their capacity of defining their expectations, and of deciding on their personal and professional projects. The experience of these associations could actually be invoked in the justification of the usefulness of contracts. Just as a relationship based on a contract, associations do have written statutes, not because a relationship of solidarity would not exist between their members, but to create better conditions for such a relationship.

---

<sup>11</sup> On the role of associations in this domain, see Velez (forthcoming).

## References

- BLÉTIÈRE, Vanessa (2008a), *Por uma Sociologia do Trabalho Doméstico: Contribuição para um Projecto Interdisciplinar*, Lisbon, Dinâmia-CET – ISCTE-IUL, Working paper 2008/62
- BLÉTIÈRE, Vanessa (2008b), *Reconhecer o trabalho doméstico: desafios de uma análise sociológica*, Lisbon, Dinâmia-CET – ISCTE-IUL, Working paper 2008/71
- FERNANDES, António Monteiro (2011), *Trabalho doméstico – Direitos e deveres das pessoas envolvidas*, Draft for an informative booklet produced in partnership with the *Grupo de Apoio à Mulher Imigrante (GAMI)*, Lisbon, Dinâmia-CET
- GUIBENTIF, Pierre (2001), “A comunicação jurídica no quotidiano lisboeta. Proposta de abordagem empírica à diferenciação funcional”, *Forum Sociológico* nº 5/6 (II série), 2001, pp. 129-161
- GUIBENTIF, Pierre (2002), com Vanda GORJÃO e Rita CHETA, *Comunicação Social e Representações do Crime*, Lisboa, CEJ, 2002
- GUIBENTIF, Pierre (forthcoming), “Os direitos subjectivos na teoria dos sistemas de Niklas Luhmann”, in: Germano Schwartz, Leonel Severo da Rocha (eds), *Luhmann e os direitos fundamentais*, Porto Alegre
- GUIBENTIF, Pierre et al. (forthcoming), *Domestic Work and Domestic Workers - Interdisciplinary and Comparative Perspectives*, Oñati, International Institute for the Sociology of Law (“Oñati Socio-Legal Series”)
- HAWKINS, Keith (1984), *Environment and Enforcement. Regulation and the Social Definition of Pollution*, Oxford, Clarendon Press
- RIBEIRO, Maria Amélia (2009), *Pessoas Idosas e Dependentes: contributo para o Estudo das Respostas do Regime Jurídico dos Cuidados Domiciliários*, Lisbon, ISCTE-IUL (Mestrado Dissertation) 2009
- SULEMAN, Fátima (forthcoming), “The relevance of skills and abilities in shaping the employment contract”, in GUIBENTIF, Pierre *et al.* (forthcoming)
- VELEZ, António (forthcoming), “Civil society organizations”, in GUIBENTIF, Pierre *et al.* (forthcoming)

## Annex 1: Typology of activities (Quick Cluster)

```

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

### Notes

Output Created	11-Mar-2011 15:47:23	
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\_0_User\pg_sd\div\DomWork\Inquerito_Port\BaseEnviada_110127\BD_DW_20110310_2.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	Portugal
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	684
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any clustering variable used.
Syntax	QUICK CLUSTER a12.1_exec_rc2 a12.2_exec_rc2 a12.3_exec_rc2 a12.4_exec_rc2 a12.5_exec_rc2 a12.6_exec_rc2 a12.7_exec_rc2 a12.8_exec_rc2 a12.9_exec_rc2 a12.10_exec_rc2 a12.11_exec_rc2 a12.12_exec_rc2 a12.13_exec_rc2 a12.14_exec_rc2 a12.15_exec_rc2 a12.16_exec_rc2 a12.17_exec_rc2 a12.18_exec_rc2 a12.19_exec_rc2 /MISSING=LISTWISE /CRITERIA=CLUSTER(6) MXITER(10) CONVERGE(0) /METHOD=KMEANS(NOUPDATE) /PRINT INITIAL ANOVA.	
Resources	Processor Time	0:00:00.782
	Elapsed Time	0:00:00.781
	Workspace Required	5888 bytes

[DataSet1]

C:\\_0\_User\pg\_sd\div\DomWork\Inquerito\_Port\BaseEnviada\_110127\BD\_DW\_20110310\_2.sav

## Initial Cluster Centers

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

**Iteration History<sup>a</sup>**

Iteration	Change in Cluster Centers					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1,456	1,844	1,716	1,609	2,400	1,383
2	,245	,254	,407	,565	,137	,195
3	,207	,051	,305	,264	,013	,099
4	,169	,084	,148	,189	,073	,138
5	,105	,039	,050	,041	,013	,105
6	,077	,022	,033	,000	,039	,036
7	,025	,100	,092	,000	,000	,019
8	,000	,032	,027	,032	,000	,000
9	,018	,020	,011	,024	,000	,019
10	,000	,012	,011	,000	,000	,000

a. Iterations stopped because the maximum number of iterations was performed. Iterations failed to converge. The maximum absolute coordinate change for any center is ,007. The current iteration is 10. The minimum distance between initial centers is 3,000.

**Final Cluster Centers**

	Cluster					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
a12.1_rc2 To clean the house (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	,93	,99	1,00	,99	1,00
a12.2_rc2 To tidy rooms (Y1/ N+M0)	1,00	,86	,99	,96	,98	,97
a12.3_rc To do the laundry (Y1/ N+M0)	,96	,39	,91	,86	,98	,92
a12.4_rc To iron clothing (Y1/ N+M0)	,99	,74	,96	,94	,99	1,00
a12.5_rc To prepare the meals (S 1/ N+M 0)	,98	,23	,36	,93	,99	,97
a12.6_rc To decide the meals (Y1/ N+M0)	,47	,07	,03	,53	,95	,69
a12.7_rc To wash the dishes (Y1/ N+M0)	,96	,44	,93	,90	1,00	,86
a12.8_rc To keep eye on children (Y1/ N+M0)	,95	,11	,15	,06	,99	,07
a12.9_rc To bring/take children from/to school (Y1/ N+M0)	,45	,03	,04	,00	,98	,02
a12.10_rc Meals for the children (Y1/ N+M0)	,82	,05	,09	,07	,97	,15
a12.11_rc Meals for dependent persons (Y1/ N+M0)	,04	,06	,01	,90	,98	,03
a12.12_rc Medication for dependent persons (Y1/ N+M0)	,03	,06	,02	,87	,98	,03
a12.13_rc To keep company (Y1/ N+M0)	,40	,11	,14	,91	,99	,18
a12.14_rc To take care of animals/plants (Y1/ N+M0)	,51	,08	,67	,53	,95	,68
a12.15_rc To make shopping lists (Y1/ N+M0)	,35	,03	,11	,53	,98	,53
a12.16_rc To go shopping (Y1/ N+M0)	,68	,09	,20	,61	,99	,57
a12.17_rc To prepare receptions for people (Y1/ N+M0)	,30	,02	,03	,30	,96	,42
a12.18_rc To help at celebrations/parties (Y1/ N+M0)	,48	,05	,12	,31	,99	,50
a12.19_rc To answer the phone / the door (Y1/ N+M0)	,96	,43	,91	,84	,99	,93

**ANOVA**

	Cluster		Error		F	Sig.
	Mean Square	df	Mean Square	df		
a12.1_rc2 To clean the house (Y1/ N+M0)	,087	5	,017	678	5,169	,000
a12.2_rc2 To tidy rooms (Y1/ N+M0)	,316	5	,037	678	8,468	,000
a12.3_rc To do the laundry (Y1/ N+M0)	6,434	5	,098	678	65,968	,000
a12.4_rc To iron clothing (Y1/ N+M0)	1,217	5	,054	678	22,401	,000
a12.5_rc To prepare the meals (S 1/ N+M 0)	15,261	5	,102	678	150,325	,000
a12.6_rc To decide the meals (Y1/ N+M0)	16,830	5	,122	678	138,172	,000
a12.7_rc To wash the dishes (Y1/ N+M0)	5,516	5	,092	678	59,658	,000
a12.8_rc To keep eye on children (Y1/ N+M0)	23,574	5	,071	678	332,723	,000
a12.9_rc To bring/take children from/to school (Y1/ N+M0)	18,814	5	,063	678	298,665	,000
a12.10_rc Meals for the children (Y1/ N+M0)	20,990	5	,081	678	257,655	,000
a12.11_rc Meals for dependent persons (Y1/ N+M0)	23,696	5	,038	678	630,532	,000
a12.12_rc Medication for dependent persons (Y1/ N+M0)	23,494	5	,038	678	610,554	,000
a12.13_rc To keep company (Y1/ N+M0)	17,734	5	,116	678	153,412	,000
a12.14_rc To take care of animals/plants (Y1/ N+M0)	10,957	5	,167	678	65,747	,000
a12.15_rc To make shopping lists (Y1/ N+M0)	15,637	5	,126	678	124,071	,000
a12.16_rc To go shopping (Y1/ N+M0)	14,383	5	,146	678	98,427	,000
a12.17_rc To prepare receptions for people (Y1/ N+M0)	15,737	5	,106	678	148,991	,000
a12.18_rc To help at celebrations/parties (Y1/ N+M0)	15,185	5	,130	678	116,848	,000
a12.19_rc To answer the phone / the door (Y1/ N+M0)	5,686	5	,097	678	58,503	,000

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

**Number of Cases in each Cluster**

Cluster	1	114,000
	2	133,000
	3	150,000
	4	70,000
	5	129,000
	6	88,000
Valid		684,000
Missing		,000

Cluster	Nr. of persons	Activity profile according to above table “Final Cluster Centres”
1	114	All tasks apart from caring for dependent people, i.e. including caring of children
2	133	Almost exclusively cleaning, i.e. all tasks relating to cleaning; no care of people, no shopping, no meals
3	150	Cleaning as well as caring of animal or plants; no caring of people, no meals, no shopping
4	70	All tasks apart from caring for children, i.e. including caring of elderly, sick, or dependent people
5	129	All tasks, without significant exception (“all-rounders”)
6	88	All tasks, except caring for people – children or dependent – i.e. cleaning, but also shopping, and preparing of meals
Valid	684	
Missing	,000	



## Annex 2: Principal component analysis of the situations encountered

### Preliminary note:

This type of analysis is designed to process scaled variables. The variables here under analysis register the answers on questions about situations encountered or not by interviewees. The possible values are: 0= “No, it never happened to me.”; 1= “Yes, it happened to me.” Even if there are only two possible values, which makes the variables likely to be considered as nominal (No/Yes), we admitted that these two possible values also can be treated as two levels of a “short scale”, going from “Never happened” to “Happened at least one time”, while we could have inserted more levels such as, for instance: “Never”, “One time”, “Sometimes”, “Frequently” and so on. The logical possibility of such an extension justifies the scale status of the variables at stake, and thereby their submission to principal component analysis.

```
FACTOR
/VARIABLES g4.1_rc g4.2_rc g4.3_rc g4.4_rc g4.5_rc g4.6_rc g4.7_rc g4.8_rc g4.9_rc g4.10_rc g4.11_rc g4.12_rc
g4.13_rc g4.14_rc g4.15_rc
/MISSING LISTWISE
/ANALYSIS g4.1_rc g4.2_rc g4.3_rc g4.4_rc g4.5_rc g4.6_rc g4.7_rc g4.8_rc g4.9_rc g4.10_rc g4.11_rc g4.12_rc
g4.13_rc g4.14_rc g4.15_rc
/PRINT INITIAL EXTRACTION ROTATION
/FORMAT SORT
/CRITERIA MINEIGEN(1) ITERATE(25)
/EXTRACTION PC
/CRITERIA ITERATE(25)
/ROTATION VARIMAX
/METHOD=CORRELATION.
```

**Notes**

Output Created		11-Mar-2011 15:20:39
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\_0_User\pg_sd\div\DomWork\Inquerito_Port\BaseEnviada_110127\BD_DW_20110310_2.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	Portugal
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	684
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	MISSING=EXCLUDE: User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	LISTWISE: Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any variable used.
Syntax		<pre> FACTOR /VARIABLES g4.1_rc g4.2_rc g4.3_rc g4.4_rc g4.5_rc g4.6_rc g4.7_rc g4.8_rc g4.9_rc g4.10_rc g4.11_rc g4.12_rc g4.13_rc g4.14_rc g4.15_rc /MISSING LISTWISE /ANALYSIS g4.1_rc g4.2_rc g4.3_rc g4.4_rc g4.5_rc g4.6_rc g4.7_rc g4.8_rc g4.9_rc g4.10_rc g4.11_rc g4.12_rc g4.13_rc g4.14_rc g4.15_rc /PRINT INITIAL EXTRACTION ROTATION /FORMAT SORT /CRITERIA MINEIGEN(1) ITERATE(25) /EXTRACTION PC /CRITERIA ITERATE(25) /ROTATION VARIMAX /METHOD=CORRELATION.                     </pre>
Resources	Processor Time	0:00:00.156
	Elapsed Time	0:00:00.186

**Notes**

Output Created		11-Mar-2011 15:20:39
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\_0_User\pg_sd\div\DomWork\Inquerito_Port\BaseEnviada_110127\BD_DW_20110310_2.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	Portugal
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	684
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	MISSING=EXCLUDE: User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	LISTWISE: Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any variable used.
Syntax		<pre> FACTOR /VARIABLES g4.1_rc g4.2_rc g4.3_rc g4.4_rc g4.5_rc g4.6_rc g4.7_rc g4.8_rc g4.9_rc g4.10_rc g4.11_rc g4.12_rc g4.13_rc g4.14_rc g4.15_rc /MISSING LISTWISE /ANALYSIS g4.1_rc g4.2_rc g4.3_rc g4.4_rc g4.5_rc g4.6_rc g4.7_rc g4.8_rc g4.9_rc g4.10_rc g4.11_rc g4.12_rc g4.13_rc g4.14_rc g4.15_rc /PRINT INITIAL EXTRACTION ROTATION /FORMAT SORT /CRITERIA MINEIGEN(1) ITERATE(25) /EXTRACTION PC /CRITERIA ITERATE(25) /ROTATION VARIMAX /METHOD=CORRELATION.                     </pre>
	Processor Time	0:00:00.156
	Elapsed Time	0:00:00.186
	Maximum Memory Required	28260 (27,598K) bytes

[DataSet1] C:\\_0\_User\pg\_sd\div\DomWork\Inquerito\_Port\BaseEnviada\_110127\BD\_DW\_20110310\_2.sav

**Communalities**

	Initial	Extraction
g4.1_rc Wage arrears (y1/n0)	1,000	,396
g4.2_rc Benefits unpaid (y1/n0)	1,000	,702
g4.3_rc Unpaid overtime (y1/n0)	1,000	,383
g4.4_rc Social security unpaid (y1/n0)	1,000	,583
g4.5_rc Tasks originally not agreed (y1/n0)	1,000	,582
g4.6_rc Denial of rest time (y1/n0)	1,000	,607
g4.7_rc Lack of food (y1/n0)	1,000	,278
g4.8_rc Denial of Vacations (y1/n0)	1,000	,397
g4.9_rc Sexual harassment (y1/n0)	1,000	,490
g4.10_rc Physical violence (y1/n0)	1,000	,579
g4.11_rc Psychological violence (y1/n0)	1,000	,450
g4.12_rc Discrimination (y1/n0)	1,000	,407
g4.13_rc Obligated to perform task against will (y1/n0)	1,000	,480
g4.14_rc Prevented from joining union (y1/n0)	1,000	,596
g4.15_rc Personal documents taken away (y1/n0)	1,000	,634

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

**Total Variance Explained**

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3,589	23,925	23,925	3,589	23,925	23,925	2,189	14,595	14,595
2	1,553	10,351	34,277	1,553	10,351	34,277	2,171	14,471	29,067
3	1,221	8,137	42,414	1,221	8,137	42,414	1,860	12,402	41,469
4	1,202	8,012	50,426	1,202	8,012	50,426	1,344	8,957	50,426
5	,962	6,410	56,836						
6	,858	5,721	62,557						
7	,850	5,665	68,223						
8	,726	4,843	73,066						
9	,696	4,641	77,707						
10	,662	4,412	82,119						
11	,636	4,241	86,360						
12	,608	4,051	90,411						
13	,564	3,759	94,170						
14	,466	3,109	97,279						
15	,408	2,721	100,000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix<sup>a</sup>

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
g4.5_rc Tasks originally not agreed (y1/n0)	,639	-,046	,013	-,414
g4.11_rc Psychological violence (y1/n0)	,580	,224	-,174	,180
g4.13_rc Obligated to perform task against will (y1/n0)	,558	,198	-,099	-,346
g4.8_rc Denial of Vacations (y1/n0)	,536	-,085	,164	-,275
g4.6_rc Denial of rest time (y1/n0)	,528	,336	,035	-,462
g4.4_rc Social security unpaid (y1/n0)	,520	-,508	,196	,128
g4.12_rc Discrimination (y1/n0)	,515	,275	-,250	,068
g4.1_rc Wage arrears (y1/n0)	,482	-,367	-,153	,070
g4.7_rc Lack of food (y1/n0)	,481	,217	,006	,002
g4.3_rc Unpaid overtime (y1/n0)	,470	-,395	-,027	,075
g4.9_rc Sexual harassment (y1/n0)	,394	,246	-,380	,359
g4.2_rc Benefits unpaid (y1/n0)	,544	-,600	,071	,203
g4.15_rc Personal documents taken away (y1/n0)	,226	,220	,672	,288
g4.14_rc Prevented from joining union (y1/n0)	,279	,317	,633	,133
g4.10_rc Physical violence (y1/n0)	,406	,317	-,162	,536

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 4 components extracted.

**Rotated Component Matrix<sup>a</sup>**

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
g4.2_rc Benefits unpaid (y1/n0)	<b>,832</b>	,035	,083	,052
g4.4_rc Social security unpaid (y1/n0)	<b>,739</b>	,102	,011	,163
g4.3_rc Unpaid overtime (y1/n0)	<b>,593</b>	,135	,109	-,026
g4.1_rc Wage arrears (y1/n0)	<b>,568</b>	,152	,183	-,128
g4.6_rc Denial of rest time (y1/n0)	-,058	<b>,760</b>	,129	,100
g4.5_rc Tasks originally not agreed (y1/n0)	,317	<b>,692</b>	,048	,003
g4.13_rc Obligated to perform task against will (y1/n0)	,082	<b>,655</b>	,210	-,020
g4.8_rc Denial of Vacations (y1/n0)	,329	<b>,517</b>	-,009	,145
g4.7_rc Lack of food (y1/n0)	,101	,359	,334	,167
g4.10_rc Physical violence (y1/n0)	,071	-,054	<b>,730</b>	,193
g4.9_rc Sexual harassment (y1/n0)	,070	,046	<b>,691</b>	-,076
g4.11_rc Psychological violence (y1/n0)	,173	,290	<b>,573</b>	,083
g4.12_rc Discrimination (y1/n0)	,068	,344	<b>,533</b>	-,015
g4.15_rc Personal documents taken away (y1/n0)	,060	,000	,069	<b>,791</b>
g4.14_rc Prevented from joining union (y1/n0)	-,021	,171	,067	<b>,750</b>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.  
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

**Component Transformation Matrix**

Component	1	2	3	4
1	,566	,629	,494	,200
2	-,797	,266	,453	,299
3	,074	,014	-,462	,884
4	,199	-,731	,581	,298

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.



## *Tables*



## Notes to the tables

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

2. *Activity profile*: The questionnaire includes a list of nineteen performed tasks. The answers given on the basis of this list (questions A12.1 to A12.19) were analysed per cluster analysis (see Annex 1), which led to the definition of six categories:

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

(More on this variable under point A (c) of this working paper)

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

(More on this variable under point A (c) of this working paper)

4. Total number per category : In principle, the total number of cases per variable, summing up the number of cases par category, should equal the total number of

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

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

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

(More on this hypothesis under point B (a) of this working paper)

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

(More on the answers to this question under point B (c) of this working paper)

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

(More on this variable under point B (c) of this working paper)

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

(More on the interpretation of this answer under point B (c) of this working paper; more on people employed by companies under point A (b))

10. *Salary below 2.40 euros per hour as indicating abuse*: In Portugal, the current minimum wage, applicable to domestic workers, is defined by the law as a monthly wage of 485 euros. On this basis, a minimum hourly wage would be about 2.40 euros (485 euros / [4.5 weeks \* 44 hours]). The variable registers all cases in which the

hourly salary, directly indicated or estimated on the basis of other answers, is below this threshold. This proportion has to be interpreted taking into account that in a significant proportion of cases, the relevant information was not available. The real proportion of cases of salaries below the threshold is presumably higher than the one we were in condition to calculate.

(More on this variable under point B (e) of this working paper)

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

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

(More on this variable under point B (e) of this working paper)

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

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

(More on this variable under point B (e) of this working paper)

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

14 *Hired under 16 within the last ten years*: This minimum age in Portugal is nowadays 16. Age when the person started to work as domestic worker was calculated according to the formula: current age [H1] minus years working as domestic worker [A5]. We restricted the analysis to the cases that occurred during the last ten years before the application of the questionnaire (since 1998).

(More on this variable under point B (e) of this working paper)

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

(More on this variable under point B (f) of this working paper)

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

(More on this variable under point B (e) of this working paper)

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

(More on this variable under point B (e) of this working paper)

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

(More on this variable under point B (e) of this working paper)

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

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

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

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	Nationality					Age						Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>					Gender			
Categories			[B] Brazil	[C] Eastern Europe	[D] Africa (PALOP)	[E] Portugal	[F]	[G] until 30	[H] 31-40	[I] 41-50	[J] 51-60	[K] 61 and more	[L]	[M] lower	[N] middle (without office)	[O] middle (with office)	[P] upper	[Q]	[R] female	[S] male	[T]	
Interviewees (Nr.)	[1]	684	83	57	85	456	681	120	159	209	143	48	679	89	220	317	32	658	681	2	683	
Interviewees %	[2]		12.2	8.4	12.5	67.0	100	17.7	23.4	30.8	21.1	7.1	100	13.5	33.4	48.2	4.9	100	99.7	0.3	100	
Place of interview	[3] Alentejo	31	19.4	3.2	12.9	64.5	100	25.8	19.4	29.0	16.1	9.7	100	13.3	53.3	30.0	3.3	100	100	0	100	
	[4] Algarve	28	7.1	21.4	7.1	64.3	100	17.9	14.3	21.4	21.4	25.0	100	19.2	23.1	42.3	15.4	100	100	0	100	
	[5] Braga	73	20.5	5.5	2.7	71.2	100	23.6	26.4	27.8	13.9	8.3	100	13.0	33.3	47.8	5.8	100	100	0	100	
	[6] Coimbra	44	15.9	6.8	4.5	72.7	100	6.8	20.5	25.0	29.5	18.2	100	27.3	31.8	34.1	6.8	100	100	0	100	
	[7] Lisboa	364	8.3	6.9	17.7	67.1	100	18.3	25.8	33.2	19.7	3.0	100	14.0	34.1	47.6	4.3	100	99.7	0.3	100	
	[8] Porto	144	16.1	12.6	7.7	63.6	100	14.7	19.6	30.1	26.6	9.1	100	7.1	30.0	59.3	3.6	100	99.3	0.7	100	
	Nationality	[9] Brazil	83	-	-	-	-	-	30.1	34.9	21.7	12.0	1.2	100	16.3	37.5	42.5	3.8	100	100	0	100
		[10] Eastern Europe	57	-	-	-	-	-	28.1	35.1	24.6	10.5	1.8	100	8.9	21.4	64.3	5.4	100	100	0	100
[11] Africa (PALOP)		85	-	-	-	-	-	27.7	22.9	27.7	15.7	6.0	100	14.8	39.5	42.0	3.7	100	100	0	100	
[12] Portugal		456	-	-	-	-	-	12.1	19.9	34.0	24.9	9.1	100	13.5	33.1	48.2	5.3	100	99.6	0.4	100	
Age	[13] until 30	120	21.0	13.4	19.3	46.2	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.2	35.7	45.2	7.0	100	100	0	100	
	[14] 31-40	159	18.4	12.7	12.0	57.0	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.7	30.5	52.6	5.2	100	100	0	100	
	[15] 41-50	209	8.6	6.7	11.0	73.7	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.3	34.5	50.2	3.9	100	99.0	1.0	100	
	[16] 51-60	143	7.0	4.2	9.2	79.6	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.1	32.8	47.4	3.6	100	100	0	100	
	[17] 61 and more	48	2.1	2.1	10.4	85.4	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	27.3	31.8	34.1	6.8	100	100	0	100	
Social status of employers (hypoth.)	[18] lower	89	14.6	5.6	13.5	66.3	100	15.7	20.2	25.8	24.7	13.5	100	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	0	100	
	[19] middle (without office)	220	13.7	5.5	14.6	66.2	100	18.9	21.7	32.3	20.7	6.5	100	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	0	100	
	[20] middle (with office)	317	10.8	11.4	10.8	67.0	100	16.5	25.7	32.4	20.6	4.8	100	-	-	-	-	-	99.4	0.6	100	
	[21] upper	32	9.4	9.4	9.4	71.9	100	25.0	25.0	25.0	15.6	9.4	100	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	0	100	

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

(5th version)

**Table 0.1-2 (P) General characterization of the people interviewed**

**Main general and personal variables (cont.) - Portugal**

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

	Variables	[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	Schooling						[H]
	Categories		[B] No schooling	[C] 4 years	[D] 5-6 years	[E] 7-9 years	[F] 10-12 years	[G] More than 12 years	
Interviewees (Nr.)	[1]	684	42	206	98	117	110	39	612
Interviewees %	[2]		6.9	33.4	16.1	19.3	17.8	6.4	100
Place of interview	[3] Alentejo	31	16.7	23.3	13.3	16.7	30.0		100
	[4] Algarve	28	3.8	23.1	11.5	30.8	26.9	3.8	100
	[5] Braga	73	4.5	31.3	7.5	22.4	26.9	7.5	100
	[6] Coimbra	44	3.2	38.7	19.4	16.1	16.1	6.5	100
	[7] Lisboa	364	7.0	35.3	19.1	18.8	13.4	6.4	100
	[8] Porto	144	7.0	34.1	13.2	17.1	20.9	7.8	100
Nationality	[9] Brazil	83	2.8	9.9	14.1	25.4	38.0	9.9	100
	[10] Eastern Europe	57	2.1			8.5	40.4	48.9	100
	[11] Africa (PALOP)	85	17.3	23.5	16.0	21.0	18.5	3.7	100
	[12] Portugal	456	6.1	43.9	18.0	18.5	12.0	1.5	100
Age	[13] until 30	120	0	4.8	16.2	29.5	36.2	13.3	100
	[14] 31-40	159	2.1	16.2	20.4	26.1	28.2	7.0	100
	[15] 41-50	209	5.3	39.9	19.1	20.2	10.6	4.8	100
	[16] 51-60	143	15.9	58.7	10.3	5.6	5.6	4.0	100
	[17] 61 and more	48	19.6	56.5	6.5	8.7	6.5	2.2	100
Social status of employers (hypoth.)	[18] lower	89	6.5	35.1	15.6	14.3	22.1	6.5	100
	[19] middle (without office)	220	8.0	29.5	16.5	22.5	18.5	5.0	100
	[20] middle (with office)	317	5.7	35.6	16.7	18.5	16.7	6.8	100
	[21] upper	32	13.3	30.0	6.7	23.3	10.0	16.7	100



**Table 0.2 (P) Characteristics of activity according to main general and personal variables - Portugal**

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

Variables		Categories	[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	In how many houses working at present?					Activity profile <sup>2</sup>							Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>					
				[B] 1	[C] 2	[D] 3	[E] 4 or more	[F]	[G] Care of children included	[H] Cleaning, almost excl.	[I] Care of animals or plants included	[J] Care of adults included	[K] All-rounders	[L] Cleaning and meals	[M]	[N] less than one year	[O] 1-3 years	[P] 3-5 years	[Q] 5-10 years	[R] More than 10 years	[S]
[1] Total nr. of people per category			684	291	165	99	111	666	114	133	150	70	129	88	684	72	160	133	155	119	639
[2] Proportion of people per category (%)				43.6	24.7	14.9	16.7	100	16.6	19.4	21.9	10.3	18.9	12.9	100	11.1	25.0	20.9	24.3	18.7	100
Nationality	[3] Brazil		83	43.2	25.9	16.0	14.8	100	12.0	16.9	22.9	16.9	21.7	9.6	100	20.5	34.6	16.7	19.2	9.0	100
	[4] Eastern Europe		57	25.0	16.1	23.2	35.7	100	5.3	19.3	35.1	14.0	10.5	15.8	100	16.4	36.4	34.5	10.9	1.8	100
	[5] Africa (PALOP)		85	58.2	19.0	13.9	8.9	100	17.6	23.5	15.3	15.3	18.8	9.4	100	18.7	25.3	20.0	24.0	12.0	100
	[6] Portugal		456	43.4	26.6	13.9	16.1	100	18.6	19.1	21.3	7.7	19.5	13.8	100	7.5	21.7	20.0	27.0	23.8	100
Age	[7] until 30		120	49.1	26.7	12.9	11.2	100	14.2	22.5	22.5	10.0	23.3	7.5	100	28.1	46.5	14.9	9.6	0.9	100
	[8] 31-40		159	37.4	26.5	18.7	17.4	100	20.1	23.3	23.9	6.9	17.0	8.8	100	11.5	25.0	30.4	25.0	8.1	100
	[9] 41-50		209	40.7	24.0	16.2	19.1	100	16.7	17.2	23.0	10.0	18.2	14.8	100	6.6	17.3	22.4	32.1	21.4	100
	[10] 51-60		143	43.9	24.5	12.2	19.4	100	15.4	15.4	19.6	14.0	19.6	16.1	100	4.6	20.6	16.8	22.9	35.1	100
	[11] 61 and more		48	61.7	17.0	10.6	10.6	100	16.7	20.8	16.7	10.4	14.6	20.8	100	6.7	15.6	11.1	26.7	40.0	100
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[12] lower		89	45.8	21.7	16.9	15.7	100	5.6	21.3	19.1	25.8	13.5	14.6	100	9.0	25.6	15.4	29.5	20.5	100
	[13] middle (without office)		220	37.8	28.1	17.1	17.1	100	14.5	23.2	25.5	9.1	15.9	11.8	100	11.4	31.0	21.9	20.0	15.7	100
	[14] middle (with office)		317	44.5	23.9	14.2	17.4	100	20.2	16.4	21.1	8.2	22.1	12.0	100	11.8	20.3	20.9	27.7	19.3	100
	[15] upper		32	60.0	30.0	3.3	6.7	100	31.3	6.3	15.6	0	28.1	18.8	100	10.0	23.3	26.7	20.0	20.0	100
Place of interview	[16] Alentejo		31	41.9	29.0	16.1	12.9	100	19.4	12.9	38.7	0	19.4	9.7	100	20.0	36.7	13.3	26.7	3.3	100
	[17] Algarve		28	53.6	14.3	14.3	17.9	100	10.7	17.9	21.4	17.9	14.3	17.9	100	4.0	24.0	20.0	16.0	36.0	100
	[18] Braga		73	33.3	23.6	19.4	23.6	100	12.3	31.5	23.3	4.1	20.5	8.2	100	23.2	24.6	4.3	24.6	23.2	100
	[19] Coimbra		44	23.3	25.6	20.9	30.2	100	11.4	27.3	9.1	9.1	25.0	18.2	100	4.7	32.6	14.0	27.9	20.9	100
	[20] Lisboa		364	43.6	25.4	14.5	16.5	100	17.9	18.7	22.0	12.1	17.6	11.8	100	9.9	21.5	27.2	22.7	18.8	100
	[21] Porto		144	53.9	24.8	11.3	9.9	100	18.1	14.6	21.5	9.7	20.1	16.0	100	10.2	29.2	17.5	27.7	15.3	100

**Table 0.2-2 (P) Characteristics of activity according to main general and personal variables (cont.) - Portugal**

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

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per categor y <sup>4</sup>	In how many houses working at present?					Activity profile <sup>2</sup>							Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>					
	Categories		[B] 1	[C] 2	[D] 3	[E] 4 or more	[F]	[G] Care of children included	[H] Cleaning. almost excl.	[I] Care of animals or plants included	[J] Care of adults included	[K] All-rounders	[L] Cleaning and meals	[M]	[N] less than one year	[O] 1-3 years	[P] 3-5 years	[Q] 5-10 years	[R] More than 10 years	[S]
[1] Total nr. of people per category		684	291	165	99	111	666	114	133	150	70	129	88	684	72	160	133	155	119	639
[2] Proportion of people per category (%)			43.6	24.7	14.9	16.7	100	16.6	19.4	21.9	10.3	18.9	12.9	100	11.1	25.0	20.9	24.3	18.7	100
Schooling	[3] No schooling	42	52.4	26.2	9.5	11.9	100	19.0	7.1	23.8	14.3	16.7	19.0	100	7.7	15.4	12.8	20.5	43.6	100
	[4] 4 years	206	43.8	27.6	11.8	16.7	100	20.4	15.0	23.3	9.2	18.4	13.6	100	3.6	14.4	20.5	32.3	29.2	100
	[5] 5-6 years	98	53.1	20.8	12.5	13.5	100	18.4	12.2	22.4	5.1	25.5	16.3	100	6.5	27.2	18.5	28.3	19.6	100
	[6] 7-9 years	117	39.8	24.8	15.0	20.4	100	23.1	20.5	19.7	10.3	12.8	13.7	100	13.9	31.5	24.1	22.2	8.3	100
	[7] 10-12 years	110	45.7	27.6	14.3	12.4	100	19.1	16.4	22.7	16.4	12.7	12.7	100	23.8	33.7	19.8	16.8	5.9	100
	[8] More than 12 years	39	29.7	10.8	27.0	32.4	100	10.3	5.1	43.6	15.4	17.9	7.7	100	25.0	27.8	38.9	8.3	0	100

**Table 1.1-A (P) Experiences of discomfort - Portugal**

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

**A- Their relationship with personal and general variables** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Reasons for being not satisfied	Indicators	Salary		Amount of work		Nature of tasks		Work environment				[L] Average [B][D][F][H]
			[B] Not satisfied	[C] Left house(s) for this reason	[D] Not satisfied	[E] Left house(s) for this reason	[F] Not satisfied	[G] Left house(s) for this reason	[H] Work environment in gen.	[I] With employer a relationship of conflict <sup>5</sup>	[J] Troubles with colleagues (hypoth.) <sup>6</sup>	[K] Left house(s) because of relationship difficulties	
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people giving these answers										
All interviewees	[1]	684	29.2	29.1	17.5	15.5	4.7	6.9	2.2	1.3	3.2	14.3	13.4
Nationality	[2] Brazil	83	41.0	41.0	16.9	21.7	3.6	7.2	2.4	1.2	7.2	12.0	16.0
	[3] Eastern Europe	57	28.1	28.1	8.8	7.0	3.5	7.0	1.8	0	3.5	15.8	10.6
	[4] Africa (PALOP)	85	30.6	17.6	17.6	17.6	9.4	5.9	3.5	4.7	3.5	11.8	15.3
	[5] Portugal	456	27.2	29.2	18.9	15.1	4.2	7.0	2.0	0.9	2.4	15.1	13.1
Gender not considered:	[6] until 30	120	38.3	20.0	18.3	12.5	7.5	5.8	0.8	2.5	2.5	9.2	16.2
99.7 female	[7] 31-40	159	23.9	26.4	15.7	15.1	3.1	3.1	1.9	0.6	3.8	13.8	11.2
Age	[8] 41-50	209	24.9	38.3	17.2	20.6	4.3	11.0	2.4	1.4	2.9	17.2	12.2
	[9] 51-60	143	32.9	29.4	18.9	13.3	4.2	6.3	3.5	1.4	4.2	17.5	14.9
	[10] 61and more	48	27.1	20.8	14.6	8.3	2.1	6.3	2.1	0	2.1	8.3	11.5
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[11] lower	89	31.5	25.8	14.6	12.4	5.6	6.7	4.5	4.5	6.7	19.1	14.1
	[12] middle (without office)	220	31.8	24.5	15.0	10.0	4.5	5.9	2.7	1.4	1.4	11.4	13.5
	[13] middle (with office)	317	27.8	32.8	18.6	18.9	5.0	7.3	1.6	0.6	1.6	14.8	13.3
	[14] upper	32	18.8	25.0	25.0	18.8	0	3.1	0	0	18.8	9.4	11.0
Place of interview	[15] Alentejo	31	58.1	38.7	32.3	6.5	12.9	6.5	0	0	6.5	9.7	25.8
	[16] Algarve	28	3.6	7.1	0	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	7.1	0.9
	[17] Braga	73	50.7	38.4	11.0	13.7	4.1	2.7	1.4	0	5.5	5.5	16.8
	[18] Coimbra	44	13.6	18.2	15.9	11.4	6.8	2.3	0	0	4.5	15.9	9.1
	[19] Lisboa	364	24.7	29.7	17.3	18.7	4.1	8.5	2.2	2.2	2.7	16.2	12.1
	[20] Porto	144	33.3	28.5	22.2	13.2	4.9	7.6	4.2	0.7	2.8	16.0	16.2

**Table 1.1-B (P) Experiences of discomfort - Portugal**

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

**B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Reasons for being not satisfied	Indicators	Salary		Amount of work		Nature of tasks		Work environment				[L] Average [B][D][F][H]
			[B] Not satisfied	[C] Left house(s) for this reason	[D] Not satisfied	[E] Left house(s) for this reason	[F] Not satisfied	[G] Left house(s) for this reason	[H] Work environment in gen.	[I] With employer a relationship of conflict <sup>5</sup>	[J] Troubles with colleagues (hypoth.) <sup>6</sup>	[K] Left house(s) because of relationship difficulties	
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people giving these answers										
All interviewees	[1]	684	29.2	29.1	4.7	6.9	17.5	15.5	2.2	1.3	3.2	14.3	13.5
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	291	28.2	26.5	19.9	15.1	6.2	4.8	2.4	1.7	3.4	12.4	14.2
	[3] 2	165	32.7	33.9	17.0	19.4	3.0	7.9	1.2	1.2	3.0	13.9	13.5
	[4] 3	99	29.3	29.3	14.1	16.2	4.0	15.2	2.0	0	4.0	17.2	12.4
	[5] 4 or more	111	29.7	28.8	14.4	9.0	4.5	4.5	3.6	0.9	2.7	15.3	13.1
	Activity profile <sup>2</sup>	[6] Care of children included	114	29.8	32.5	20.2	21.9	7.9	7.9	2.6	2.6	1.8	16.7
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	133	23.3	23.3	12.0	13.5	3.0	3.0	0	0	4.5	12.0	9.6
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	150	31.3	26.0	12.0	13.3	3.3	8.7	2.0	1.3	2.7	12.0	12.2
	[9] Care of adults included	70	24.3	32.9	11.4	18.6	5.7	7.1	1.4	4.3	5.7	15.7	10.7
	[10] All-rounders	129	36.4	37.2	27.1	17.8	7.0	10.9	4.7	0.8	2.3	14.0	18.8
	[11] Cleaning and meals	88	27.3	23.9	22.7	8.0	1.1	2.3	2.3	0	3.4	18.2	13.4
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>	[12] less than one year	72	38.9	29.2	20.8	22.2	8.3	6.9	2.8	0	2.8	6.9	17.7
	[13] 1-3 years	160	32.5	26.9	16.9	11.9	6.9	6.9	2.5	2.5	3.1	16.9	14.7
	[14] 3-5 years	133	24.8	29.3	15.8	16.5	1.5	8.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	19.5	11.1
	[15] 5-10 years	155	28.4	27.1	16.1	14.2	3.9	7.7	1.3	0.6	3.9	10.3	12.4
	[16] More than 10 years	119	27.7	30.3	21.0	13.4	5.0	5.9	3.4	0	4.2	10.1	14.3

**Table 1.1-C (P) Experiences of discomfort - Portugal**

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

**C - Their relationship with Schooling** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

Reasons for being not satisfied			Salary		Amount of work		Nature of tasks		Work environment				
Indicators			[B] Not satisfied	[C] Left house(s) for this reason	[D] Not satisfied	[E] Left house(s) for this reason	[F] Not satisfied	[G] Left house(s) for this reason	[H] Work environment in gen.	[I] With employer a relationship of conflict <sup>5</sup>	[J] Troubles with colleagues (hypoth.) <sup>6</sup>	[K] Left house(s) because of relationship difficulties	
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people giving these answers										[L] Average [B][D][F][H]
All interviewees	[1]	684	29.2	29.1	4.7	6.9	17.5	15.5	2.2	1.3	3.2	14.3	13.5
Schooling	[2] No schooling	42	23.8	35.7	9.5	23.8	0	4.8	2.4	0	0	16.7	8.9
	[3] 4 years	206	32.5	30.6	20.4	15.0	5.3	6.8	2.4	1.5	3.9	14.6	15.2
	[4] 5-6 years	98	29.6	34.7	26.5	15.3	7.1	8.2	5.1	2.0	3.1	14.3	17.1
	[5] 7-9 years	117	23.9	29.9	16.2	9.4	4.3	8.5	0.9	.9	1.7	12.0	11.3
	[6] 10-12 years	110	29.1	21.8	11.8	19.1	3.6	2.7	0.9	1.8	2.7	13.6	11.4
	[7] More than 12 years	39	28.2	28.2	10.3	7.7	5.1	5.1	5.1	2.6	10.3	17.9	12.2

**Table 1.2-A (P) Situations encountered, in detail - Portugal**

Proportion [%] of people who encountered the referred situation

**A - Their relationship with personal and general variables** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Types of situation	Situations encountered	Issues of money					Excessive demands					Forms of Violence					Violation of rights			
			[B] Benefits unpaid	[C] social security unpaid	[D] Un paid over overtime	[E] Wage arrears	[F] Average	[G] Denial of rest times	[H] Tasks not originally agreed	[I] Obligated to perform a task against will	[J] Denial of vacations	[K] Average	[L] Physical violence	[M] Sexual harassment	[N] Psychological violence	[O] Discrimination	[P] Average	[Q] Personal documents taken away	[R] Prevented from joining social org.	[S] Average	[T] Lack of food
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to whom it happened																		
All interviewees	[1]	684	40.1	34.1	46.2	33.6	38.5	13.2	35.4	15.4	14.5	19.6	1.3	5.4	9.9	13.2	7.5	1.0	0.9	1.0	5.8
Nationality	[2] Brazil	83	51.8	47.0	50.6	45.8	48.8	20.5	41.0	15.7	24.1	25.3	4.8	12.0	15.7	31.3	16.0	3.6	3.6	3.6	10.8
	[3] Eastern Europe	57	56.1	42.1	52.6	38.6	47.4	19.3	43.9	24.6	19.3	26.8	1.8	10.5	19.3	29.8	15.4	0.0	1.8	0.9	12.3
	[4] Africa (PALOP)	85	37.6	34.1	43.5	27.1	35.6	11.8	21.2	12.9	12.9	14.7	2.4	4.7	8.2	18.8	8.5	2.4	0	1.2	7.1
	[5] Portugal	456	36.4	30.7	45.0	32.2	36.1	11.4	36.2	14.7	12.5	18.7	0.4	3.7	7.9	6.8	4.7	0.4	0.4	0.4	3.9
Age	[6] until 30	120	41.7	37.5	50.0	30.0	39.8	10.0	38.3	17.5	15.0	20.2	0.8	7.5	10.0	19.2	9.4	0.8	0.0	0.4	6.7
	[7] 31-40	159	44.0	40.3	48.4	35.2	42.0	11.9	31.4	15.7	15.7	18.7	0.6	5.7	7.5	13.2	6.8	0.6	0.6	0.6	5.0
	[8] 41-50	209	38.8	28.2	48.8	35.9	37.9	14.4	34.0	16.7	11.5	19.2	2.4	4.3	11.5	12.9	7.8	1.4	1.4	1.4	8.1
	[9] 51-60	143	40.6	37.1	42.7	35.7	39.0	15.4	39.2	14.0	17.5	21.5	1.4	5.6	10.5	11.2	7.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	3.5
	[10] 61 and more	48	27.1	20.8	29.2	20.8	24.5	14.6	35.4	6.3	10.4	16.7	0	4.2	10.4	6.3	5.2	0	0	0	4.2
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[11] lower	89	40.4	37.1	44.9	32.6	38.8	10.1	31.5	13.5	18.0	18.3	3.4	10.1	9.0	13.5	9.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	4.5
	[12] middle (without office)	220	45.0	42.7	47.3	36.4	42.9	12.7	37.3	13.2	16.8	20.0	1.8	4.5	9.5	12.7	7.1	1.4	0.9	1.2	8.6
	[13] middle (with office)	317	37.9	27.8	46.1	33.4	36.3	13.2	36.0	17.7	12.0	19.7	0.6	5.0	10.1	13.9	7.4	0.6	0.9	0.8	5.4
	[14] upper	32	28.1	31.3	40.6	18.8	29.7	9.4	31.3	12.5	12.5	16.4	0	0	21.9	9.4	7.8	0	0	0	0
Place of interview	[15] Alentejo	31	48.4	41.9	87.1	35.5	53.2	3.2	19.4	3.2	6.5	8.1	3.2	9.7	16.1	16.1	11.3	0	0	0	3.2
	[16] Algarve	28	7.1	7.1	42.9	21.4	19.6	0.0	17.9	14.3	0	8.1	0	3.6	3.6	17.9	6.3	0	0	0	0
	[17] Braga	73	39.7	31.5	34.2	28.8	33.6	9.6	45.2	15.1	17.8	21.9	0	5.5	16.4	15.1	9.3	1.4	0	0.7	4.1
	[18] Coimbra	44	13.6	15.9	31.8	13.6	18.7	4.5	18.2	0	2.3	6.3	0	0	2.3	2.3	1.2	0	0	0	6.8
	[19] Lisboa	364	45.3	37.9	45.1	38.5	41.7	14.6	37.9	19.8	15.9	22.1	1.9	6.0	7.7	12.9	7.1	1.4	1.1	1.3	7.4
	[20] Porto	144	39.6	34.7	51.4	31.9	39.4	18.8	36.1	11.8	17.4	21.0	0.7	4.9	14.6	14.6	8.7	0.7	1.4	1.1	4.2

**Table 1.2-B (P) Situations encountered, in detail - Portugal**

Proportion [%] of people who encountered the referred situation

**B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Types of situation	Situations encountered	Issues of money					Excessive demands					Forms of Violence					Violation of rights			
			[B] Benefits unpaid	[C] social security unpaid	[D] Un paid over overtime	[E] Wage arrears	[F] Average	[G] Denial of rest times	[H] Tasks not originally agreed	[I] Obligated to perform a task against will	[J] Denial of vacations	[K] Average	[L] Physical violence	[M] Sexual harassment	[N] Psychological violence	[O] Discrimination	[P] Average	[Q] Personal documents taken away	[R] Prevented from joining social org.	[S] Average	[T] Lack of food
		Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to whom it happened																		
All interviewees	[1]	684	40.1	34.1	46.2	33.6	38.5	13.2	35.4	15.4	14.5	19.6	1.3	5.4	9.9	13.2	7.5	1.0	0.9	1.0	5.8
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	291	34.4	30.2	44.0	26.1	33.7	17.5	35.4	13.7	17.2	21.0	1.7	5.2	11.7	14.4	8.3	1.7	1.4	1.6	7.6
	[3] 2	165	37.0	30.3	47.3	37.0	37.9	9.1	32.1	17.6	11.5	17.6	0.0	4.2	6.7	12.1	5.8	0	0.6	0.3	1.8
	[4] 3	99	52.5	41.4	45.5	40.4	45.0	10.1	37.4	13.1	13.1	18.4	2.0	7.1	11.1	15.2	8.9	0	1.0	0.5	4.0
	[5] 4 or more	111	51.4	45.0	51.4	45.0	48.2	10.8	39.6	18.9	14.4	20.9	1.8	5.4	9.9	11.7	7.2	1.8	0	0.9	9.9
	Activity profile <sup>2</sup>	[6] Care of children included	114	31.6	28.9	46.5	27.2	33.6	16.7	39.5	15.8	11.4	20.9	0.0	2.6	11.4	7.9	5.5	1.8	0	0.9
	[7] Cleaning. almost excl.	133	39.8	33.8	35.3	25.6	33.6	9.0	26.3	12.8	11.3	14.9	1.5	7.5	8.3	14.3	7.9	2.3	0.8	1.6	3.8
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	150	54.0	47.3	55.3	44.0	50.2	6.7	34.7	15.3	14.7	17.9	2.0	3.3	10.0	12.7	7.0	0.7	1.3	1.0	5.3
	[9] Care of adults included	70	45.7	35.7	52.9	28.6	40.7	25.7	37.1	18.6	24.3	26.4	5.7	8.6	17.1	20.0	12.9	1.4	2.9	2.2	12.9
	[10] All-rounders	129	32.6	25.6	45.7	41.9	36.5	18.6	41.1	22.5	17.1	24.8	0	5.4	7.8	17.1	7.6	0	0.8	0.4	9.3
	[11] Cleaning and meals	88	34.1	29.5	42.0	28.4	33.5	8.0	35.2	5.7	11.4	15.1	0	6.8	8.0	8.0	5.7	0	0	0	3.4
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>	[12] less than one year	72	38.9	33.3	51.4	29.2	38.2	18.1	34.7	11.1	9.7	18.4	1.4	4.2	9.7	15.3	7.7	0	1.4	0.7	8.3
	[13] 1-3 years	160	42.5	40.6	50.6	35.6	42.3	12.5	40.0	18.1	21.3	23.0	1.3	6.9	13.1	18.8	10.0	3.8	1.9	2.9	10.0
	[14] 3-5 years	133	48.1	39.8	50.4	33.1	42.9	9.0	33.1	14.3	12.8	17.3	0.8	4.5	7.5	10.5	5.8	0	0	0	1.5
	[15] 5-10 years	155	38.1	31.6	46.5	32.9	37.3	12.3	33.5	13.5	12.3	17.9	1.3	3.9	11.6	11.6	7.1	0.6	0.6	0.6	3.9
	[16] More than 10	119	33.6	22.7	33.6	37.8	31.9	19.3	36.1	15.1	12.6	20.8	0.8	5.9	5.9	10.9	5.9	0	0.8	0.4	5.9

**Table 1.2-C (P) Situations encountered, in detail - Portugal**

Proportion [%] of people who encountered the referred situation

**C - Their relationship with Schooling** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Types of situation	Situations encountered	Issues of money					Excessive demands					Forms of Violence				Violation of rights				
			[B] Benefits unpaid	[C] social security unpaid	[D] Un paid over overtime	[E] Wage arrears	[F] Average	[G] Denial of rest times	[H] Tasks not originally agreed	[I] Obligated to perform a task against will	[J] Denial of vacations	[K] Average	[L] Physical violence	[M] Sexual harassment	[N] Psychological violence	[O] Discrimination	[P] Average	[Q] Personal documents taken away	[R] Prevented from joining social org.	[S] Average	[T] Lack of food
		Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to whom it happened																		
All interviewees	[1]	684	40.1	34.1	46.2	33.6	38.5	13.2	35.4	15.4	14.5	19.6	1.3	5.4	9.9	13.2	7.5	1.0	0.9	1.0	5.8
Schooling	[2] No schooling	42	35.7	21.4	52.4	40.5	37.5	14.3	31.0	11.9	16.7	18.5	0	4.8	11.9	19.0	8.9	0	0	0	0
	[3] 4 years	206	38.8	33.5	41.7	33.5	36.9	14.6	36.9	15.0	13.1	19.9	0.5	3.9	8.7	5.8	4.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	3.4
	[4] 5-6 years	98	36.7	34.7	45.9	39.8	39.3	19.4	49.0	17.3	17.3	25.8	3.1	6.1	13.3	23.5	11.5	3.1	2.0	2.5	10.2
	[5] 7-9 years	117	37.6	35.0	51.3	28.2	38.0	8.5	28.2	12.0	12.0	15.2	1.7	6.0	8.5	12.0	7.1	0.9	0	0	3.4
	[6] 10-12 years	110	35.5	27.3	46.4	25.5	33.7	6.4	27.3	13.6	10.9	14.6	0	5.5	2.7	9.1	4.3	0	0	0	3.6
	[7] More than 12 years	39	74.4	59.0	53.8	51.3	59.6	23.1	53.8	33.3	25.6	34.0	7.7	15.4	30.8	30.8	21.2	0	2.6	0	17.9



**Table 1.3-A (P) Signs of general dissatisfaction - Portugal**

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

**A - Their relationship with personal and general variables** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? <sup>9</sup>
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all <sup>7</sup>	Yes <sup>8</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people giving these answers								
All interviewees	[1]	684	8.8	5.8	62.1	55.1	58.9	51.8	36.1	46.2	9.8
Nationality	[2] Brazil	83	8.4	1.2	77.1	55.4	60.2	62.7	39.8	54.2	13.3
	[3] Eastern Europe	57	12.3	7.0	75.4	52.6	63.2	52.6	24.6	46.8	8.8
	[4] Africa (PALOP)	85	10.6	8.2	68.2	58.8	58.8	58.8	36.5	51.4	22.4
	[5] Portugal	456	7.9	6.1	56.6	54.6	58.6	48.5	37.1	48.1	7.0
Age	[6] until 30	120	13.3	9.2	84.2	60.8	70.0	54.2	33.3	52.5	20.0
	[7] 31-40	159	8.8	3.1	71.7	57.2	61.6	59.7	34.0	51.8	6.3
	[8] 41-50	209	9.6	7.7	59.3	56.0	55.5	47.8	35.4	46.2	8.1
	[9] 51-60	143	4.9	3.5	48.3	49.7	58.0	51.7	44.8	51.5	8.4
	[10] 61 and more	48	4.2	4.2	25.0	41.7	37.5	35.4	25.0	32.6	4.2
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[11] lower	89	7.9	5.6	61.8	49.4	60.7	55.1	40.4	52.1	12.4
	[12] middle (without office)	220	9.5	5.0	64.5	52.7	63.6	49.1	35.5	49.4	10.0
	[13] middle (with office)	317	8.2	6.6	61.8	58.0	54.9	53.3	35.6	47.9	7.3
	[14] upper	32	6.3	3.1	53.1	62.5	56.3	50.0	34.4	46.9	12.5
Place of interview	[15] Alentejo	31	9.7	19.4	80.6	74.2	51.6	58.1	16.1	41.9	12.9
	[16] Algarve	28	0	0	25.0	17.9	53.6	25.0	10.7	29.8	14.3
	[17] Braga	73	12.3	6.8	63.0	61.6	58.9	60.3	27.4	48.9	9.6
	[18] Coimbra	44	6.8	0	40.9	25.0	47.7	52.3	38.6	46.2	2.3
	[19] Lisboa	364	9.1	5.5	65.9	55.2	61.3	54.1	39.0	51.5	10.7
	[20] Porto	144	8.3	6.3	61.8	63.9	59.0	45.1	41.7	48.6	8.3

**Table 1.3-B (P) Signs of general dissatisfaction - Portugal**

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

**B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? <sup>9</sup>
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all <sup>7</sup>	Yes <sup>8</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people giving these answers								
All interviewees	[1]	684	8.8	5.8	62.1	55.1	58.9	51.8	36.1	46.2	9.8
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	291	11.7	6.5	62.9	58.1	56.0	51.5	41.2	49.6	11.0
	[3] 2	165	4.8	5.5	61.8	51.5	61.8	53.3	31.5	48.9	11.5
	[4] 3	99	9.1	7.1	63.6	55.6	59.6	43.4	28.3	43.8	9.1
	[5] 4 or more	111	8.1	4.5	61.3	51.4	64.0	56.8	38.7	53.2	5.4
	Activity profile <sup>2</sup>	[6] Care of children included	114	12.3	8.8	66.7	57.0	51.8	49.1	39.5	46.8
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	133	9.0	3.8	63.9	55.6	68.4	57.1	31.6	52.4	14.3
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	150	6.7	5.3	65.3	60.7	63.3	56.7	28.7	49.6	6.0
	[9] Care of adults included	70	10.0	7.1	54.3	47.1	57.1	45.7	40.0	47.6	12.9
	[10] All-rounders	129	7.0	6.2	58.9	50.4	61.2	49.6	43.4	51.4	7.0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	88	9.1	4.5	59.1	55.7	44.3	46.6	37.5	42.8	11.4
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>	[12] less than one year	72	16.7	12.5	80.6	56.9	68.1	50.0	26.4	48.2	13.9
	[13] 1-3 years	160	13.1	5.6	72.5	60.0	60.6	57.5	39.4	52.5	16.3
	[14] 3-5 years	133	7.5	6.0	69.2	55.6	62.4	56.4	32.3	50.4	9.8
	[15] 5-10 years	155	7.1	4.5	49.7	56.8	56.1	47.1	36.8	46.7	7.1
	[16] More than 10 years	119	3.4	5.0	47.1	43.7	53.8	47.9	42.0	47.9	3.4

**Table 1.3-C (P) Signs of general dissatisfaction - Portugal**

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

**C - Their relationship with Schooling** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? <sup>9</sup>
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all <sup>7</sup>	Yes <sup>8</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people giving these answers								
All interviewees	[1]	684	8.8	5.8	62.1	55.1	58.9	51.8	36.1	46.2	9.8
Schooling	[2] No schooling	42	2.4	0	50.0	50.0	45.2	45.2	40.5	43.6	7.1
	[3] 4 years	206	9.2	8.3	48.1	50.0	59.2	53.4	35.9	49.5	9.7
	[4] 5-6 years	98	13.3	6.1	67.3	63.3	59.2	50.0	51.0	53.4	8.2
	[5] 7-9 years	117	6.8	4.3	71.8	55.6	63.2	55.6	32.5	50.4	15.4
	[6] 10-12 years	110	10.0	4.5	74.5	58.2	61.8	50.0	25.5	45.8	5.5
	[7] More than 12 years	39	12.8	7.7	84.6	74.4	64.1	56.4	35.9	52.1	12.8

**Table 2.1-A (P) Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - Portugal**

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

**A - Their relationship with personal and general variables** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

Types of irregularities			Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations					Child Labour	
Situations considered			[B]Social security not paid	[C]Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	[D]Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	[E]Employer refuses to sign contract	[F]Salary below 2.40 euros <sup>10</sup>	[G]Working time excessive <sup>11</sup>	[H]Less than 1.5 hour per room-week <sup>12</sup>	[I]Accident at work	[J]Worker had to pay health costs	[K]Irreg. answers % of [I]	[L]Maternity	[M]Maternity leave denied <sup>13</sup>	[N]Irreg. answers % of [L]	[O]Hired under 16 within the last 10 years <sup>14</sup>
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies													
All interviewees	[1]	684	44.0	32.9	3.2	6.6	5,7	10.8	11.4	12.6	1.9	15.1	16.5	4.7	28.5	0.9
Nationality	[2] Brazil	83	42.2	32.9	8.4	8.4	7,2	19.3	9.6	9.6	1.2	12.5	8.4	8.4	100	0
	[3] Eastern Europe	57	43.9	40.4	0	10.5	1,8	8.8	15.8	5.3	1.8	34.0	12.3	1.8	14.6	0
	[4] Africa (PALOP)	85	31.8	23.5	4.7	5.9	10,6	20.0	7.1	9.4	2.4	25.5	17.6	5.9	33.5	3.5
	[5] Portugal	456	46.5	33.8	2.4	5.9	5,0	7.9	12.1	14.7	2.0	13.6	18.4	4.2	22.8	.7
Age	[6] until 30	120	51.7	32.8	3.3	8.3	5,8	13.3	12.5	9.2	.8	8.7	15.0	5.8	38.7	1.7
	[7] 31-40	159	40.3	34.6	1.9	6.9	4,4	8.2	11.3	6.9	1.9	27.5	18.9	5.7	30.2	0
	[8] 41-50	209	39.2	26.8	3.3	3.8	6,2	11.5	8.1	13.9	2.4	17.3	16.7	4.3	25.7	0
	[9] 51-60	143	45.5	35.7	4.2	7.7	6,3	7.7	12.6	20.3	2.1	10.3	14.0	2.8	20.0	0
	[10] 61and more	48	54.2	45.8	2.1	6.3	6,3	18.8	20.8	8.3	0	0	16.7	2.1	12.6	0
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[11] lower	89	52.8	36.4	4.5	7.9	2,2	9.0	22.5	13.5	1.1	8.1	11.2	1.1	9.8	1.1
	[12] middle (without office)	220	53.2	42.7	2.3	6.4	4,1	6.8	12.7	9.1	2.7	29.7	15.0	2.7	18.0	1.4
	[13] middle (with office)	317	39.4	27.8	3.5	6.9	6,9	11.7	9.5	14.8	1.3	8.8	17.4	6.0	34.5	0.6
	[14] upper	32	28.1	9.4	3.1	6.3	6,3	28.1	0	15.6	3.1	19.9	34.4	9.4	27.3	0
Place of interview	[15] Alentejo	31	35.5	58.1	0	9.7	,0	6.5	32.3	3.2	0	0	19.4	0	0	3.2
	[16] Algarve	28	46.4	25.0	0	0	3,6	10.7	10.7	10.7	0	0	21.4	0	0.0	0
	[17] Braga	73	50.7	42.5	1.4	5.5	1,4	12.3	27.4	8.2	5.5	67.1	19.2	5.5	28.6	1.4
	[18] Coimbra	44	34.1	31.8	0	4.5	4,5	4.5	27.3	4.5	0	0	6.8	0	0	0
	[19] Lisboa	364	39.8	25.6	3.8	6.6	5,5	9.3	4.9	15.1	1.9	12.6	18.7	7.1	38.0	1.1
	[20] Porto	144	55.6	43.1	4.9	8.3	10,4	16.7	10.4	13.2	1.4	10.6	11.1	1.4	12.6	0

**Table 2.1-B (P) Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - Portugal**

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

**B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

Types of irregularities		Situations considered	Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations						Child Labour
			[B] Social security not paid	[C] Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	[D] Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	[E] Employer refuses to sign contract	[F] Salary below 2.40 euros <sup>10</sup>	[G] Working time excessive <sup>11</sup>	[H] Less than 1.5 hour per room-week <sup>12</sup>	[I] Accident at work	[J] Worker had to pay health costs	[K] Irreg. answers % of [I]	[L] Maternity	[M] Maternity leave denied <sup>13</sup>	[N] Irreg. answers % of [L]	[O] Hired under 16 within the last 10 years <sup>14</sup>
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies													
All interviewees	[1]	684	44.0	32.9	3.2	6.6	5,7	10.8	11.4	12.6	1.9	15.1	16.5	4.7	28.5	0.9
In how many h. working at present?	[2] 1	291	43.0	31.6	3.4	6.5	8,9	17.5	10.3	15.5	2.1	13.5	14.1	5.5	39.0	1.4
	[3] 2	165	46.1	35.2	4.2	7.3	2,4	6.1	7.3	10.9		0.0	22.4	5.5	24.6	1.2
	[4] 3	99	47.5	35.4	2.0	5.1	3,0	4.0	15.2	7.1	3.0	42.3	17.2	3.0	17.4	0
	[5] 4 or more	111	43.2	35.5	2.7	8.1	4,5	5.4	18.0	11.7	3.6	30.8	12.6	2.7	21.4	0
	Activity profile <sup>2</sup>	[6] Care of children included	114	36.0	23.7	2.6	4.4	7,9	14.9	1.8	11.4	0	0	21.9	1.8	8.2
	[7] Cleaning. almost excl.	133	48.9	47.7	1.5	5.3	2,3	7.5	22.6	5.3	1.5	28.3	14.3	3.0	21.0	0.8
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	150	54.7	45.3	1.3	5.3	2,7	5.3	12.7	5.3	1.3	24.5	13.3	3.3	24.8	0.7
	[9] Care of adults included	70	40.0	27.1	15.7	4.3	8,6	17.1	7.1	12.9	0	0	18.6	1.4	7.5	1.4
	[10] All-rounders	129	34.9	17.8		10.1	5,4	8.5	10.1	27.9	3.1	11.1	17.1	12.4	72.5	0.8
	[11] Cleaning and meals	88	45.5	28.4	4.5	10.2	11,4	18.2	10.2	14.8	5.7	38.5	15.9	4.5	28.3	2.3
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>	[12] less than one year	72	48.6	43.1	6.9	8.3	1,4	18.1	15.3	4.2	2.8	66.7	6.9	2.8	40.6	1.4
	[13] 1-3 years	160	51.3	40.6	1.9	9.4	5,0	9.4	18.1	6.3	0	0	13.8	2.5	18.1	1.9
	[14] 3-5 years	133	43.6	30.8	.8	6.8	6,8	6.8	6.0	12.8	1.5	11.7	15.0	3.8	25.3	0.8
	[15] 5-10 years	155	42.6	33.1	5.2	6.5	8,4	11.0	12.3	15.5	2.6	16.8	20.0	5.2	26.0	0.6
	[16] More than 10	119	34.5	20.2	2.5	3.4	5,9	12.6	7.6	22.7	4.2	18.5	22.7	9.2	40.5	0

**Table 2.1-C (P) Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - Portugal**

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

**C - Their relationship with Schooling** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

Types of irregularities			Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations					Child Labour	
Situations considered			[B] Social security not paid	[C] Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	[D] Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	[E] Employer refuses to sign contract	[F] Salary below 2.40 euros <sup>10</sup>	[G] Working time excessive <sup>11</sup>	[H] Less than 1.5 hour per room-week <sup>12</sup>	[I] Accident at work	[J] Worker had to pay health costs	[K] Irreg. answers % of [I]	[L] Maternity	[M] Maternity leave denied <sup>13</sup>	[N] Irreg. answers % of [L]	[O] Hired under 16 within the last 10 years <sup>14</sup>
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies													
All interviewees	[1]	684	44.0	32.9	3.2	6.6	5.7	10.8	11.4	12.6	1.9	15.1	16.5	4.7	28.5	0.9
Schooling	[2] No schooling	42	40.5	35.7	4.8	2.4	16.1	23.8	7.1	16.7	0	0.0	19.0	2.4	12.6	0
	[3] 4 years	206	43.2	31.1	2.4	5.8	9.2	11.2	10.7	17.0	2.4	14.1	23.8	3.4	14.3	1.0
	[4] 5-6 years	98	35.7	32.7	3.1	7.1	7.2	7.1	9.2	21.4	4.1	19.2	15.3	12.2	79.7	1.0
	[5] 7-9 years	117	47.0	34.5	2.6	6.8	2.0	8.5	12.8	6.8	0.9	13.2	17.1	3.4	19.9	0
	[6] 10-12 years	110	46.4	36.4	3.6	6.4	6.5	13.6	15.5	0.9	0.9	100.0	10.9	2.7	24.8	2.7
	[7] More than 12 years	39	48.7	35.9	10.3	10.3	2.9	7.7	10.3	7.7	2.6	33.8	5.1	0	0	0

**Table 3.1-A (P) Relationship to the law – Status, attitudes, actions - Portugal**

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

**A - Their relationship with personal and general variables** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

			Attitudes				Status		Actions				
			[B] Employment contract in principle useful <sup>15</sup>	[C] Employment contract positively valued <sup>16</sup>	[D] Would go to court to defend rights	[E] Thinks Work inspection would help (where she has worked).	[F] Thinks Work inspection would help (in general)	[G] Employment contract signed	[H] Member of a union	[I] Asked for a written employment contract <sup>17</sup>	[J] Searched for association or union	[K] Left house <sup>18</sup>	[L] Went to court
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies										
All interviewees	[1]	684	51.0	46.3	64.3	25.7	41.7	28.9	6.4	40.5	5.7	38.5	2.9
Nationality	[2] Brazil	83	53.0	44.6	68.7	38.6	49.4	43.4	4.8	59.0	7.2	44.6	2.4
	[3] Eastern Europe	57	47.4	26.3	40.4	17.5	22.8	31.6	1.8	49.1	1.8	38.6	1.8
	[4] Africa (PALOP)	85	68.2	48.2	75.3	28.2	55.3	49.4	11.8	64.7	16.5	30.6	5.9
	[5] Portugal	456	47.8	48.7	64.5	24.1	40.1	22.1	6.4	31.6	3.9	38.8	2.6
Age	[6] until 30	120	53.3	51.7	71.7	25.8	41.7	32.5	7.5	46.7	7.5	29.2	0.8
	[7] 31-40	159	53.5	45.3	62.9	22.0	39.0	30.2	3.8	44.0	3.8	34.0	1.9
	[8] 41-50	209	51.2	45.0	68.9	23.4	44.0	28.7	5.3	36.4	4.3	49.8	4.3
	[9] 51-60	143	49.0	44.1	55.9	32.2	44.1	28.0	11.9	40.6	7.7	37.8	4.9
	[10] 61 and more	48	41.7	52.1	54.2	22.9	29.2	18.8	2.1	27.1	8.3	29.2	0
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[11] lower	89	52.8	41.6	65.2	28.1	40.4	20.2	4.5	34.8	13.5	33.7	4.5
	[12] middle (without office)	220	50.5	47.3	60.5	22.7	40.5	24.1	5.5	36.4	7.7	32.7	1.8
	[13] middle (with office)	317	49.8	45.7	64.4	24.6	40.1	31.5	6.6	42.6	2.8	42.6	3.5
	[14] upper	32	56.3	62.5	75.0	37.5	59.4	59.4	12.5	68.8	3.1	40.6	3.1
Place of interview	[15] Alentejo	31	67.7	48.4	77.4	12.9	35.5	38.7	3.2	45.2	0	41.9	0
	[16] Algarve	28	32.1	46.4	71.4	7.1	28.6	42.9	10.7	42.9	0	14.3	0
	[17] Braga	73	43.8	42.5	58.9	32.9	42.5	19.2	0	24.7	0	41.1	4.1
	[18] Coimbra	44	56.8	54.5	70.5	22.7	36.4	15.9	4.5	22.7	4.5	27.3	2.3
	[19] Lisboa	364	54.1	46.7	69.2	27.7	44.5	29.9	10.2	43.7	7.4	41.8	3.8
	[20] Porto	144	45.1	44.4	48.6	24.3	39.6	30.6	0.7	44.4	6.9	36.1	1.4

**Table 3.1-B (P) Relationship to the law – Status, attitudes, actions - Portugal**

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

**B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

			Attitudes				Status		Actions				
			[B] Employment contract in principle useful <sup>15</sup>	[C] Employment contract positively valued <sup>16</sup>	[D] Would go to court to defend rights	[E] Thinks Work inspection would help (where she has worked).	[F] Thinks Work inspection would help (in general)	[G] Employment contract signed	[H] Member of a union	[I] Asked for a written employment contract <sup>17</sup>	[J] Searched for association or union	[K] Left house <sup>18</sup>	[L] Went to court
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies										
All interviewees	[1]	684	51.0	46.3	64.3	25.7	41.7	28.9	6.4	40.5	5.7	38.5	2.9
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	291	52.6	49.1	66.3	29.2	45.7	36.1	6.5	47.8	5.2	35.1	2.1
	[3] 2	165	46.7	47.3	63.6	20.6	37.0	24.8	7.9	39.4	7.3	41.8	3.0
	[4] 3	99	51.5	42.4	69.7	24.2	38.4	23.2	4.0	31.3	4.0	44.4	3.0
	[5] 4 or more	111	50.5	41.4	52.3	26.1	40.5	18.9	5.4	27.9	4.5	37.8	4.5
	Activity profile <sup>2</sup>	[6] Care of children included	114	52.6	45.6	61.4	19.3	36.0	39.5	2.6	50.9	4.4	47.4
	[7] Cleaning. almost excl.	133	59.4	54.9	65.4	25.6	45.9	18.8	6.0	30.1	6.0	29.3	4.5
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	150	43.3	42.7	55.3	22.0	37.3	20.0	1.3	30.0	4.7	38.0	3.3
	[9] Care of adults included	70	62.9	44.3	64.3	25.7	45.7	44.3	2.9	51.4	11.4	42.9	2.9
	[10] All-rounders	129	45.0	51.2	78.3	37.2	45.7	34.1	20.9	49.6	5.4	42.6	3.1
	[11] Cleaning and meals	88	48.9	35.2	61.4	23.9	40.9	26.1	2.3	38.6	4.5	31.8	0
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>	[12] less than one year	72	68.1	54.2	76.4	29.2	52.8	38.9	2.8	51.4	6.9	36.1	1.4
	[13] 1-3 years	160	49.4	45.6	66.9	28.1	41.9	30.6	4.4	45.6	4.4	34.4	0.6
	[14] 3-5 years	133	47.4	42.9	54.1	18.0	36.8	24.1	3.8	36.1	4.5	43.6	1.5
	[15] 5-10 years	155	49.0	41.9	68.4	23.9	39.4	26.5	7.7	37.4	4.5	38.1	3.9
	[16] More than 10 years	119	46.2	48.7	58.0	31.1	42.9	28.6	11.8	35.3	7.6	37.8	4.2



**Table 3.1-C (P) Relationship to the law – Status, attitudes, actions - Portugal**

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

**C - Their relationship with Schooling** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

			Attitudes				Status		Actions				
			[B] Employment contract in principle useful <sup>15</sup>	[C] Employment contract positively valued <sup>16</sup>	[D] Would go to court to defend rights	[E] Thinks Work inspection would help (where she has worked).	[F] Thinks Work inspection would help (in general)	[G] Employment contract signed	[H] Member of a union	[I] Asked for a written employment contract <sup>17</sup>	[J] Searched for association or union	[K] Left house <sup>18</sup>	[L] Went to court
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies										
All interviewees	[1]	684	51.0	46.3	64.3	25.7	41.7	28.9	6.4	40.5	5.7	38.5	2.9
Schooling	[2] No schooling	42	52.4	57.1	61.9	14.3	26.2	33.3	9.5	40.5	4.8	42.9	2.4
	[3] 4 years	206	46.1	49.5	59.7	29.1	41.7	22.8	8.3	33.5	7.3	40.8	3.9
	[4] 5-6 years	98	51.0	45.9	66.3	29.6	45.9	32.7	14.3	44.9	7.1	38.8	5.1
	[5] 7-9 years	117	56.4	50.4	70.1	25.6	49.6	30.8	0.9	43.6	5.1	39.3	0.9
	[6] 10-12 years	110	54.5	40.9	69.1	19.1	41.8	31.8	1.8	43.6	5.5	31.8	0.9
	[7] More than 12 years	39	53.8	28.2	48.7	30.8	35.9	35.9	2.6	48.7	2.6	38.5	5.1

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

**Table 0.1 (PP) General characterization of the people interviewed**  
**Main general and personal variables – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	Nationality					Age					Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>					Gender			
Categories			[B] Brazil	[C] Eastern Europe	[D] Africa (PALOP)	[E] Portugal	[F]	[G] until 30	[H] 31-40	[I] 41-50	[J] 51-60	[K] 61 and more	[L]	[M] lower	[N] middle (without office)	[O] middle (with office)	[P] upper	[Q]	[R] female	[S] male	[T]
Interviewees (Nr.)	[1]	456	-	-	-	-	-	55	90	154	113	41	453	59	145	211	23	438	454	2	456
Interviewees %	[2]		-	-	-	-	-	12.1	19.9	34.0	24.9	9.1	100	13.5	33.1	48.2	5.3	100	99.6	0.4	100
Place of interview	[3] Alentejo	20	-	-	-	-	-	35.0	15.0	25.0	15.0	10.0	100	15.8	52.6	26.3	5.3	100	100	0	100
	[4] Algarve	18	-	-	-	-	-	5.6	0	27.8	33.3	33.3	100	18.8	25.0	43.8	12.5	100	100	0	100
	[5] Braga	52	-	-	-	-	-	17.6	21.6	31.4	17.6	11.8	100	12.2	32.7	49.0	6.1	100	100	0	100
	[6] Coimbra	32	-	-	-	-	-	3.1	18.8	28.1	25.0	25.0	100	28.1	31.3	34.4	6.3	100	100	0	100
	[7] Lisboa	243	-	-	-	-	-	11.6	25.2	36.4	23.6	3.3	100	12.9	33.5	48.1	5.6	100	99.6	0.4	100
	[8] Porto	91	-	-	-	-	-	10.0	10.0	34.4	33.3	12.2	100	9.0	30.3	58.4	2.2	100	98.9	1.1	100
	Nationality	[9] Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[10] Eastern Europe		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[11] Africa (PALOP)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[12] Portugal		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Age	[13] until 30	55	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.2	35.8	45.3	5.7	100	100	0	100
	[14] 31-40	90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.8	32.2	48.3	5.7	100	100	0	100
	[15] 41-50	154	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.7	34.7	51.3	5.3	100	98.7	1.3	100
	[16] 51-60	113	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.0	32.7	48.6	3.7	100	100	0	100
	[17] 61 and more	41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28.9	26.3	36.8	7.9	100	100	0	100
Social status of employers (hypoth.)	[18] lower	59	-	-	-	-	-	11.9	20.3	22.0	27.1	18.6	100	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	0	100
	[19] middle (without office)	145	-	-	-	-	-	13.2	19.4	36.1	24.3	6.9	100	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	0	100
	[20] middle (with office)	211	-	-	-	-	-	11.5	20.1	36.8	24.9	6.7	100	-	-	-	-	-	99.1	0.9	100
	[21] upper	23	-	-	-	-	-	13.0	21.7	34.8	17.4	13.0	100	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	0	100

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

**Table 0.1-2 (PP) General characterization of the people interviewed**  
**Main general and personal variables (cont.) – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**  
 [%] in rows (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Variables	[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	Schooling						[H]
			[B] No schooling	[C] 4 years	[D] 5-6 years	[E] 7-9 years	[F] 10-12 years	[G] More than 12 years	
Interviewees (Nr.)	[1]	456	25	180	74	76	49	6	410
Interviewees %	[2]		6.1	43.9	18.0	18.5	12.0	1.5	100
Place of interview	[3] Alentejo	20	10.5	31.6	21.1	10.5	26.3	0	100
	[4] Algarve	18	5.6	33.3	16.7	27.8	16.7	0	100
	[5] Braga	52	6.1	38.8	8.2	24.5	16.3	6.1	100
	[6] Coimbra	32	5.0	55.0	25.0	15.0	0	0	100
	[7] Lisboa	243	6.3	44.4	21.1	17.5	10.3	0.4	100
	[8] Porto	91	4.9	48.1	13.6	18.5	12.3	2.5	100
Nationality	[9] Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[10] Eastern Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[11] Africa (PALOP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[12] Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Age	[13] until 30	55	0	6.1	20.4	28.6	36.7	8.2	100
	[14] 31-40	90	2.5	19.8	28.4	27.2	22.2	0	100
	[15] 41-50	154	3.6	47.1	21.0	22.5	5.1	.7	100
	[16] 51-60	113	12.0	69.0	9.0	6.0	3.0	1.0	100
	[17] 61 and more	41	15.4	64.1	7.7	7.7	5.1	0	100
Social status of employers (hypoth.)	[18] lower	59	8.0	48.0	16.0	12.0	14.0	2.0	100
	[19] middle (without office)	145	4.6	39.7	16.8	22.9	14.5	1.5	100
	[20] middle (with office)	211	5.8	44.7	20.5	18.4	8.9	1.6	100
	[21] upper	23	18.2	40.9	9.1	22.7	9.1	0	100

**Table 0.2 (PP) Characteristics of activity according to main general and personal variables – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	In how many houses working at present?					Activity profile <sup>2</sup>							Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>					
	Categories		[B] 1	[C] 2	[D] 3	[E] 4 or more	[F]	[G] Care of children included	[H] Cleaning, almost excl.	[I] Care of animals or plants included	[J] Care of adults included	[K] All-rounders	[L] Cleaning and meals	[M]	[N] less than one year	[O] 1-3 years	[P] 3-5 years	[Q] 5-10 years	[R] More than 10 years	[S]
[1] Total nr. of people per category		456	194	119	62	72	447	85	87	97	35	89	63	456	32	93	86	116	102	429
[2] Proportion of people per category (%)			43.4	26.6	13.9	16.1	100	18.6	19.1	21.3	7.7	19.5	13.8	100	7.5	21.7	20.0	27.0	23.8	100
Nationality	[3] Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[4] Eastern Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[5] Africa (PALOP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[6] Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Age	[7] until 30	55	45.5	30.9	14.5	9.1	100	16.4	21.8	29.1	3.6	21.8	7.3	100	27.8	50.0	14.8	7.4	0	100
	[8] 31-40	90	36.8	29.9	14.9	18.4	100	26.7	24.4	18.9	3.3	21.1	5.6	100	6.1	18.3	31.7	34.1	9.8	100
	[9] 41-50	154	39.7	27.2	14.6	18.5	100	16.9	17.5	22.1	8.4	18.8	16.2	100	5.5	15.2	20.7	33.8	24.8	100
	[10] 51-60	113	45.0	25.2	12.6	17.1	100	15.9	14.2	20.4	11.5	20.4	17.7	100	1.9	19.8	17.9	22.6	37.7	100
	[11] 61 and more	41	62.5	15.0	12.5	10.0	100	19.5	24.4	17.1	7.3	12.2	19.5	100	5.1	15.4	7.7	25.6	46.2	100
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[12] lower	59	39.7	27.6	17.2	15.5	100	8.5	22.0	23.7	13.6	18.6	13.6	100	3.5	24.6	17.5	28.1	26.3	100
	[13] middle (without office)	145	36.4	28.0	16.8	18.9	100	15.9	24.1	26.2	6.2	14.5	13.1	100	8.0	26.1	23.2	21.7	21.0	100
	[14] middle (with office)	211	46.1	25.7	12.6	15.5	100	21.3	14.7	18.0	8.5	24.2	13.3	100	7.2	17.5	18.0	33.5	23.7	100
	[15] upper	23	68.2	31.8	0	0	100	39.1	8.7	13.0	0	21.7	17.4	100	13.6	18.2	27.3	13.6	27.3	100
Place of interview	[16] Alentejo	20	40.0	35.0	15.0	10.0	100	25.0	15.0	45.0	0	10.0	5.0	100	26.3	47.4	15.8	5.3	5.3	100
	[17] Algarve	18	55.6	16.7	11.1	16.7	100	5.6	22.2	16.7	22.2	11.1	22.2	100	0	11.8	17.6	23.5	47.1	100
	[18] Braga	52	33.3	27.5	7.8	31.4	100	15.4	30.8	25.0	1.9	17.3	9.6	100	16.7	22.9	4.2	29.2	27.1	100
	[19] Coimbra	32	25.8	25.8	19.4	29.0	100	15.6	31.3	12.5	6.3	21.9	12.5	100	3.2	29.0	12.9	29.0	25.8	100
	[20] Lisboa	243	42.4	28.6	15.5	13.4	100	20.2	17.3	20.2	7.8	21.4	13.2	100	5.7	18.5	26.0	26.0	23.8	100
	[21] Porto	91	56.2	21.3	11.2	11.2	100	18.7	13.2	20.9	9.9	18.7	18.7	100	5.7	23.0	17.2	33.3	20.7	100

**Table 0.2-2 (PP) Characteristics of activity according to main general and personal variables (cont.) – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

Variables		[A] Total nr. of people per categor y <sup>4</sup>	In how many houses working at present?					Activity profile <sup>2</sup>							Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>					
	Categories		[B] 1	[C] 2	[D] 3	[E] 4 or more	[F]	[G] Care of children included	[H] Cleaning, almost excl.	[I] Care of animals or plants included	[J] Care of adults included	[K] All-rounders	[L] Cleaning and meals	[M]	[N] less than one year	[O] 1-3 years	[P] 3-5 years	[Q] 5-10 years	[R] More than 10 years	[S]
[1] Total nr. of people per category		456	194	119	62	72	447	85	87	97	35	89	63	456	32	93	86	116	102	429
[2] Proportion of people per category (%)			43.4	26.6	13.9	16.1	100	18.6	19.1	21.3	7.7	19.5	13.8	100	7.5	21.7	20.0	27.0	23.8	100
Schooling	[3] No schooling	25	52.0	24.0	16.0	8.0	100	20.0	4.0	36.0	12.0	16.0	12.0	100	8.3	16.7	8.3	8.3	58.3	100
	[4] 4 years	180	44.6	28.2	10.2	16.9	100	21.1	16.1	23.3	10.0	18.3	11.1	100	2.4	14.8	20.1	33.1	29.6	100
	[5] 5-6 years	74	50.7	23.3	11.0	15.1	100	21.6	13.5	21.6	1.4	25.7	16.2	100	7.0	23.9	19.7	29.6	19.7	100
	[6] 7-9 years	76	37.8	27.0	14.9	20.3	100	26.3	21.1	18.4	7.9	9.2	17.1	100	8.6	30.0	25.7	24.3	11.4	100
	[7] 10-12 years	49	47.9	29.2	12.5	10.4	100	24.5	18.4	18.4	14.3	14.3	10.2	100	19.1	34.0	25.5	12.8	8.5	100
	[8] More than 12 years	6	50.0	0	16.7	33.3	100	0	16.7	66.7	0	16.7	0	100	66.7	16.7	0	16.7	0	100

**Table 1.1-A (PP) Experiences of discomfort – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

**A- Their relationship with personal and general variables** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Reasons for being not satisfied	Indicators	Salary		Amount of work		Nature of tasks		Work environment				[L] Average [B][D][F][H]
			[B] Not satisfied	[C] Left house(s) for this reason	[D] Not satisfied	[E] Left house(s) for this reason	[F] Not satisfied	[G] Left house(s) for this reason	[H] Work environment in gen.	[I] With employer a relationship of conflict <sup>5</sup>	[J] Troubles with colleagues (hypoth.) <sup>6</sup>	[K] Left house(s) because of relationship difficulties	
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people giving these answers										
All interviewees	[1]	456	27.2	29.2	18.9	15.1	4.2	7.0	2.0	0.9	2.4	15.1	13.1
Nationality	[2] Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[3] Eastern Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[4] Africa (PALOP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[5] Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender not considered:	[6] until 30	55	41.8	20.0	23.6	12.7	5.5	5.5	0	0	0	7.3	17.7
99,6% female	[7] 31-40	90	20.0	26.7	15.6	15.6	2.2	2.2	1.1	0	2.2	14.4	9.7
Age	[8] 41-50	154	22.7	37.0	18.8	20.8	3.2	10.4	2.6	1.9	3.2	20.1	11.8
	[9] 51-60	113	31.0	27.4	19.5	12.4	5.3	8.0	2.7	0.9	2.7	15.0	14.6
	[10] 61and more	41	24.4	22.0	14.6	4.9	2.4	4.9	2.4	0	2.4	9.8	11.0
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[11] lower	59	28.8	25.4	16.9	8.5	6.8	8.5	6.8	3.4	1.7	15.3	14.8
	[12] middle (without office)	145	29.7	25.5	17.2	10.3	3.4	6.9	1.4	0.7	1.4	13.1	12.9
	[13] middle (with office)	211	25.6	33.2	19.0	19.4	4.3	7.1	1.4	0.5	1.4	16.1	12.6
	[14] upper	23	13.0	21.7	26.1	21.7	0	4.3	0	0	13.0	8.7	9.8
Place of interview	[15] Alentejo	20	60.0	30.0	35.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	0	0	5.0	10.0	26.3
	[16] Algarve	18	0	5.6	0	5.6	0	0	0	0	0	5.6	0.0
	[17] Braga	52	50.0	42.3	13.5	11.5	5.8	3.8	0	0	1.9	7.7	17.3
	[18] Coimbra	32	6.3	18.8	15.6	15.6	6.3	3.1	0	0	0	15.6	7.1
	[19] Lisboa	243	23.9	31.3	18.9	18.9	3.3	7.8	2.1	1.2	2.9	16.9	12.1
	[20] Porto	91	28.6	24.2	23.1	11.0	4.4	8.8	4.4	1.1	2.2	17.6	15.1

**Table 1.1-B (PP) Experiences of discomfort - Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

**B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Reasons for being not satisfied	[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	Salary		Amount of work		Nature of tasks		Work environment				[L] Average [B][D][F][H]
	Indicators		[B] Not satisfied	[C] Left house(s) for this reason	[D] Not satisfied	[E] Left house(s) for this reason	[F] Not satisfied	[G] Left house(s) for this reason	[H] Work environment in gen.	[I] With employer a relationship of conflict <sup>5</sup>	[J] Troubles with colleagues (hypoth.) <sup>6</sup>	[K] Left house(s) because of relationship difficulties	
			% of people giving these answers										
All interviewees	[1]	456	27.2	29.2	18.9	15.1	4.2	7.0	2.0	0.9	2.4	15.1	13.1
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	194	22.2	23.7	21.6	13.9	5.7	3.6	2.1	0.5	3.1	11.3	12.9
	[3] 2	119	30.3	37.8	18.5	19.3	3.4	9.2	1.7	1.7	2.5	15.1	13.5
	[4] 3	62	32.3	30.6	16.1	16.1	3.2	19.4	1.6	0	3.2	22.6	13.3
	[5] 4 or more	72	31.9	27.8	13.9	9.7	2.8	2.8	2.8	1.4	0	15.3	12.9
	Activity profile <sup>2</sup>	[6] Care of children included	85	23.5	35.3	20.0	18.8	7.1	9.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	17.6
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	87	24.1	25.3	13.8	12.6	3.4	4.6	0	0	4.6	13.8	10.3
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	97	32.0	24.7	10.3	16.5	2.1	7.2	1.0	1.0	2.1	12.4	11.4
	[9] Care of adults included	35	11.4	25.7	14.3	11.4	5.7	2.9	0	0	0	8.6	7.9
	[10] All-rounders	89	32.6	34.8	29.2	18.0	5.6	11.2	4.5	1.1	2.2	15.7	18.0
	[11] Cleaning and meals	63	30.2	27.0	25.4	9.5	1.6	3.2	3.2	0	1.6	20.6	15.1
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>	[12] less than one year	32	34.4	28.1	25.0	15.6	6.3	9.4	0	0	3.1	3.1	16.4
	[13] 1-3 years	93	26.9	25.8	19.4	9.7	6.5	6.5	2.2	0	3.2	19.4	13.8
	[14] 3-5 years	86	29.1	31.4	18.6	20.9	2.3	5.8	2.3	3.5	1.2	19.8	13.1
	[15] 5-10 years	116	25.0	25.9	16.4	13.8	3.4	9.5	1.7	0.9	1.7	11.2	11.6
	[16] More than 10 years	102	26.5	31.4	19.6	13.7	3.9	5.9	2.9	0	3.9	9.8	13.2





**Table 1.2-A (PP) Situations encountered, in detail - Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

Proportion [%] of people who encountered the referred situation

**A - Their relationship with personal and general variables** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Types of situation	Situations encountered	Issues of money					Excessive demands					Forms of Violence					Violation of rights			
			[B] Benefits unpaid	[C] social security unpaid	[D] Un paid over overtime	[E] Wage arrears	[F] Average	[G] Denial of rest times	[H] Tasks not originally agreed	[I] Obligated to perform a task against will	[J] Denial of vacations	[K] Average	[L] Physical violence	[M] Sexual harassment	[N] Psychological violence	[O] Discrimination	[P] Average	[Q] Personal documents taken away	[R] Prevented from joining social org.	[S] Average	[T] Lack of food
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to whom it happened																		
All interviewees	[1]	456	36.4	30.7	45.0	32.2	36.1	11.4	36.2	14.7	12.5	18.7	0.4	3.7	7.9	6.8	4.7	0.4	0.4	0.4	3.9
Nationality	[2] Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[3] Eastern Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[4] Africa (PALOP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[5] Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender not considered: 99,6% female	[6] until 30	55	38.2	30.9	50.9	27.3	36.8	3.6	36.4	18.2	10.9	17.3	0	5.5	7.3	5.5	4.6	0	0	0	1.8
	[7] 31-40	90	40.0	37.8	50.0	33.3	40.3	8.9	26.7	15.6	13.3	16.1	0	2.2	4.4	6.7	3.3	0	0	0	3.3
	[8] 41-50	154	36.4	26.0	48.1	34.4	36.2	12.3	36.4	14.9	8.4	18.0	0.6	3.2	9.7	6.5	5.0	0.6	1.3	1.0	5.8
	[9] 51-60	113	37.2	34.5	39.8	34.5	36.5	14.2	41.6	14.2	17.7	21.9	0.9	4.4	8.0	8.8	5.5	0.9	0	0.5	3.5
	[10] 61 and more	41	22.0	19.5	26.8	22.0	22.6	17.1	39.0	7.3	9.8	18.3	0	4.9	9.8	4.9	4.9	0	0	0	2.4
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[11] lower	59	35.6	37.3	45.8	33.9	38.2	6.8	27.1	10.2	15.3	14.9	0	6.8	5.1	8.5	5.1	1.7	0	0.9	1.7
	[12] middle (without office)	145	43.4	36.6	45.5	34.5	40.0	10.3	36.6	13.1	11.7	17.9	1.4	4.8	6.2	8.3	5.2	0	0	0	6.9
	[13] middle (with office)	211	34.1	24.6	44.5	31.8	33.8	10.9	38.4	17.1	11.8	19.6	0	2.4	9.5	5.2	4.3	0.5	0.9	0.7	3.3
	[14] upper	23	21.7	26.1	39.1	21.7	27.2	13.0	30.4	8.7	8.7	15.2	0	0	17.4	4.3	5.4	0	0	0	0
Place of interview	[15] Alentejo	20	45.0	40.0	90.0	35.0	52.5	5.0	20.0	0	5.0	7.5	0	0	5.0	0	1.3	0	0	0	0
	[16] Algarve	18	0	5.6	38.9	11.1	13.9	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	11.1	2.8	0	0	0	0
	[17] Braga	52	40.4	30.8	36.5	30.8	34.6	11.5	44.2	13.5	17.3	21.6	0	3.8	13.5	5.8	5.8	0	0	0	1.9
	[18] Coimbra	32	6.3	6.3	31.3	9.4	13.3	3.1	15.6	0	0	4.7	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	6.3
	[19] Lisboa	243	42.0	35.0	42.8	38.3	39.5	11.5	39.1	19.8	14.8	21.3	0.8	4.5	5.8	7.8	4.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	4.5
	[20] Porto	91	35.2	30.8	51.6	28.6	36.6	17.6	41.8	13.2	12.1	21.2	0	4.4	15.4	7.7	6.9	0	0	0	4.4

**Table 1.2-B (PP) Situations encountered, in detail – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

Proportion [%] of people who encountered the referred situation

**B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Types of situation	Situations encountered	Issues of money					Excessive demands					Forms of Violence					Violation of rights				
			[B] Benefits unpaid	[C] social security unpaid	[D] Un paid over overtime	[E] Wage arrears	[F] Average	[G] Denial of rest times	[H] Tasks not originally agreed	[I] Obligated to perform a task against will	[J] Denial of vacations	[K] Average	[L] Physical violence	[M] Sexual harassment	[N] Psychological violence	[O] Discrimination	[P] Average	[Q] Personal documents taken away	[R] Prevented from joining social org.	[S] Average	[T] Lack of food	
		Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to whom it happened																			
All interviewees	[1]	456	36.4	30.7	45.0	32.2	36.1	11.4	36.2	14.7	12.5	18.7	0.4	3.7	7.9	6.8	4.7	0.4	0.4	0.4	3.9	
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	194	31.4	26.8	41.2	25.8	31.3	13.9	37.1	12.9	13.9	19.5	0.5	3.6	9.8	9.3	5.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	4.6	
	[3] 2	119	35.3	25.2	46.2	34.5	35.3	9.2	32.8	21.0	9.2	18.1	0	4.2	5.9	4.2	3.6	0	0.8	0.4	1.7	
	[4] 3	62	46.8	43.5	50.0	38.7	44.8	11.3	41.9	12.9	12.9	19.8	1.6	3.2	6.5	8.1	4.9	0	0	0	1.6	
	[5] 4 or more	72	44.4	43.1	50.0	43.1	45.2	6.9	34.7	11.1	13.9	16.7	0	2.8	6.9	4.2	3.5	1.4	0	0.7	8.3	
	Activity profile <sup>2</sup>	[6] Care of children included	85	25.9	23.5	45.9	23.5	29.7	15.3	41.2	17.6	9.4	20.9	0	1.2	11.8	3.5	4.1	1.2	0	0.6	2.4
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	87	42.5	33.3	35.6	27.6	34.8	8.0	24.1	10.3	11.5	13.5	1.1	3.4	6.9	9.2	5.2	1.1	0	0.6	3.4	
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	97	48.5	43.3	55.7	40.2	46.9	4.1	36.1	14.4	11.3	16.5	0	3.1	7.2	5.2	3.9	0	1.0	0.5	2.1	
	[9] Care of adults included	35	34.3	20.0	42.9	20.0	29.3	17.1	28.6	2.9	17.1	16.4	2.9	0	8.6	5.7	4.3	0	0	0	2.9	
	[10] All-rounders	89	31.5	27.0	43.8	44.9	36.8	18.0	46.1	25.8	16.9	26.7	0	6.7	5.6	11.2	5.9	0	1.1	0.6	9.0	
	[11] Cleaning and meals	63	31.7	28.6	42.9	27.0	32.6	9.5	36.5	7.9	11.1	16.3	0	6.3	7.9	4.8	4.8	0	0	0	3.2	
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>	[12] less than one year	32	34.4	21.9	56.3	25.0	34.4	6.3	25.0	6.3	6.3	11.0	0	0	9.4	3.1	3.1	0	0	0	3.1	
	[13] 1-3 years	93	35.5	34.4	47.3	32.3	37.4	7.5	38.7	12.9	15.1	18.6	0	4.3	7.5	10.8	5.7	1.1	0	0.6	5.4	
	[14] 3-5 years	86	44.2	41.9	54.7	29.1	42.5	8.1	38.4	17.4	12.8	19.2	0	3.5	5.8	2.3	2.9	0	0	0	1.2	
	[15] 5-10 years	116	35.3	30.2	43.1	32.8	35.4	12.9	36.2	14.7	9.5	18.3	0	2.6	10.3	6.0	4.7	0.9	0.9	0.9	3.4	
	[16] More than 10	102	33.3	22.5	35.3	38.2	32.3	18.6	36.3	15.7	13.7	21.1	1.0	5.9	6.9	9.8	5.9	0	1.0	0.5	4.9	

**Table 1.2-C (PP) Situations encountered, in detail – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

Proportion [%] of people who encountered the referred situation

**C - Their relationship with Schooling** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Types of situation	Situations encountered	Issues of money					Excessive demands					Forms of Violence					Violation of rights			
			[B] Benefits unpaid	[C] social security unpaid	[D] Un paid over overtime	[E] Wage arrears	[F] Average	[G] Denial of rest times	[H] Tasks not originally agreed	[I] Obligated to perform a task against will	[J] Denial of vacations	[K] Average	[L] Physical violence	[M] Sexual harassment	[N] Psychological violence	[O] Discrimination	[P] Average	[Q] Personal documents taken away	[R] Prevented from joining social org.	[S] Average	[T] Lack of food
		Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to whom it happened																		
All interviewees	[1]	456	36.4	30.7	45.0	32.2	36.1	11.4	36.2	14.7	12.5	18.7	0.4	3.7	7.9	6.8	4.7	0.4	0.4	0.4	3.9
Schooling	[2] No schooling	25	28.0	16.0	48.0	40.0	33.0	12.0	36.0	16.0	8.0	18.0	0	4.0	4.0	12.0	5.0	0	0	0.0	0
	[3] 4 years	180	38.3	33.3	42.2	33.9	36.9	16.1	38.9	16.7	14.4	21.5	.6	3.9	10.0	5.6	5.0	0.6	0.6	0.6	3.9
	[4] 5-6 years	74	33.8	36.5	47.3	37.8	38.9	12.2	47.3	17.6	13.5	22.7	0	4.1	8.1	16.2	7.1	1.4	1.4	1.4	8.1
	[5] 7-9 years	76	32.9	28.9	44.7	27.6	33.5	6.6	27.6	10.5	11.8	14.1	1.3	3.9	7.9	5.3	4.6	0	0	0.0	2.6
	[6] 10-12 years	49	40.8	24.5	51.0	24.5	35.2	6.1	26.5	10.2	8.2	12.8	0	4.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	0	0	0.0	0
	[7] More than 12 years	6	66.7	50.0	50.0	33.3	50.0	0	66.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	0	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7	0	0	0.0	16.7

**Table 1.3-A (PP) Signs of general dissatisfaction – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

**A - Their relationship with personal and general variables** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? <sup>9</sup>
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all <sup>7</sup>	Yes <sup>8</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people giving these answers								
All interviewees	[1]	456	7.9	6.1	56.6	54.6	58.6	48.5	37.1	48.1	7.0
Nationality	[2] Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[3] Eastern Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[4] Africa (PALOP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[5] Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender not considered:	[6] until 30	55	14.5	10.9	83.6	58.2	70.9	52.7	27.3	50.3	14.5
99,6% female	[7] 31-40	90	7.8	4.4	70.0	61.1	60.0	55.6	34.4	50.0	5.6
Age	[8] 41-50	154	8.4	7.1	53.9	55.2	58.4	46.1	37.0	47.2	6.5
	[9] 51-60	113	4.4	3.5	46.0	49.6	60.2	49.6	47.8	52.5	6.2
	[10] 61and more	41	4.9	4.9	26.8	43.9	34.1	31.7	26.8	30.9	2.4
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[11] lower	59	8.5	8.5	55.9	44.1	64.4	52.5	40.7	52.5	6.8
	[12] middle (without office)	145	7.6	4.1	59.3	49.0	60.0	40.7	33.8	44.8	6.9
	[13] middle (with office)	211	7.6	6.6	56.9	60.7	55.0	53.1	38.4	48.8	5.2
	[14] upper	23	8.7	4.3	47.8	65.2	56.5	52.2	39.1	49.3	13.0
Place of interview	[15] Alentejo	20	5.0	20.0	85.0	65.0	55.0	50.0	10.0	38.3	20.0
	[16] Algarve	18	0	0	11.1	16.7	72.2	11.1	11.1	31.5	11.1
	[17] Braga	52	7.7	7.7	53.8	63.5	55.8	61.5	30.8	49.4	3.8
	[18] Coimbra	32	6.3	0	34.4	28.1	46.9	50.0	46.9	47.9	0
	[19] Lisboa	243	8.6	5.8	62.1	53.9	60.9	47.7	38.7	49.1	7.4
	[20] Porto	91	8.8	6.6	53.8	65.9	56.0	49.5	44.0	49.8	6.6

**Table 1.3-B (PP) Signs of general dissatisfaction – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

**B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? <sup>9</sup>
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all <sup>7</sup>	Yes <sup>8</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people giving these answers								
All interviewees	[1]	456	7.9	6.1	56.6	54.6	58.6	48.5	37.1	48.1	7.0
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	194	10.3	6.7	58.2	58.8	54.1	47.9	39.7	47.2	7.7
	[3] 2	119	5.9	7.6	57.1	50.4	58.0	52.9	31.9	47.6	9.2
	[4] 3	62	4.8	6.5	56.5	51.6	67.7	37.1	32.3	45.7	4.8
	[5] 4 or more	72	8.3	2.8	54.2	51.4	63.9	52.8	43.1	53.3	4.2
	Activity profile <sup>2</sup>	[6] Care of children included	85	11.8	8.2	63.5	58.8	51.8	47.1	36.5	45.1
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	87	9.2	4.6	62.1	52.9	66.7	56.3	33.3	52.1	8.0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	97	4.1	5.2	57.7	57.7	64.9	50.5	27.8	47.7	4.1
	[9] Care of adults included	35	8.6	5.7	37.1	45.7	48.6	25.7	34.3	36.2	5.7
	[10] All-rounders	89	5.6	6.7	51.7	48.3	61.8	51.7	50.6	54.7	3.4
	[11] Cleaning and meals	63	9.5	6.3	55.6	60.3	47.6	44.4	39.7	43.9	12.7
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>	[12] less than one year	32	18.8	18.8	87.5	37.5	62.5	50.0	25.0	45.8	9.4
	[13] 1-3 years	93	8.6	4.3	64.5	38.7	61.3	53.8	36.6	50.6	10.8
	[14] 3-5 years	86	10.5	8.1	65.1	41.9	62.8	54.7	32.6	50.0	10.5
	[15] 5-10 years	116	7.8	5.2	48.3	44.0	56.0	44.8	37.9	46.2	6.0
	[16] More than 10 years	102	2.0	3.9	43.1	55.9	54.9	44.1	44.1	47.7	2.0

**Table 1.3-C (PP) Signs of general dissatisfaction – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

**C - Their relationship with Schooling** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Questions		[B] General level of satisfaction	[C] Reports 3 or more specific motives of dissatisfaction	[D] Would you change for another job?	[E] Domestic work is well regarded?	[F] Domestic work is precarious job?	[G] Domestic work is a solitary job?	[H] Domestic work involves some danger?	[I] Average [F][G][H]	[J] Would you prefer to work through cleaning company? <sup>9</sup>
	Answers considered		Not very satisf/Not satisf at all <sup>7</sup>	Yes <sup>8</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people giving these answers								
All interviewees	[1]	456	7.9	6.1	56.6	54.6	58.6	48.5	37.1	48.1	7.0
Schooling	[2] No schooling	25	0	0	52.0	56.0	40.0	36.0	40.0	38.7	0
	[3] 4 years	180	8.9	8.3	47.8	50.0	60.0	52.8	37.2	50.0	8.3
	[4] 5-6 years	74	10.8	5.4	63.5	62.2	56.8	47.3	52.7	52.3	4.1
	[5] 7-9 years	76	3.9	1.3	67.1	56.6	64.5	53.9	31.6	50.0	14.5
	[6] 10-12 years	49	12.2	10.2	73.5	67.3	69.4	38.8	26.5	44.9	4.1
	[7] More than 12 years	6	16.7	16.7	100	83.3	66.7	50.0	16.7	44.5	16.7

**Table 2.1-A (PP) Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

**A - Their relationship with personal and general variables** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

	Types of irregularities		Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations					Child Labour	
	Situations considered		[B]Social security not paid	[C]Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	[D]Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	[E]Employer refuses to sign contract	[F]Salary below 2.40 euros <sup>10</sup>	[G]Working time excessive <sup>11</sup>	[H]Less than 1,5 hour per room-week <sup>12</sup>	[I]Accident at work	[J]Worker had to pay health costs	[K]Irreg. answers % of [I]	[L]Maternity	[M]Maternity leave denied <sup>13</sup>	[N]Irreg. answers % of [L]	[O]Under 16 within the last 10 years <sup>14</sup>
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies													
All interviewees	[1]	456	46.5	33.8	2.4	5.9	7.7	7.9%	12.1	14.7	2.0	13.6	18.4	4.2	22.8	0,7
Nationality	[2] Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[3] Eastern Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[4] Africa (PALOP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[5] Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender not considered:	[6] until 30	55	50.9	34.5	3.6	12.7	7.3	5.5	16.4	9.1	0	0	14.5	5.5	37.9	1.8
99,6% female	[7] 31-40	90	38.9	33.3	1.1	2.2	4.4	4.4	10.0	10.0	2.2	22.0	23.3	4.4	18.9	0
Age	[8] 41-50	154	44.2	28.6	1.9	3.2	9.7	9.7	9.1	15.6	2.6	16.7	18.8	4.5	23.9	0
	[9] 51-60	113	50.4	35.4	2.7	8.0	8.0	7.1	13.3	21.2	2.7	12.7	15.0	3.5	23.3	0
	[10] 61and more	41	53.7	46.3	2.4	4.9	7.3	14.6	19.5	9.8	0	0	19.5	2.4	12.3	0
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[11] lower	59	61.0	35.6	0	8.5	5.1	3.4	27.1	15.3	1.7	11.1	13.6	1.7	12.5	1.7
	[12] middle (without office)	145	56.6	47.6	2.1	5.5	4.1	3.4	15.2	9.7	2.8	28.9	17.2	2.1	12.2	0.7
	[13] middle (with office)	211	40.8	26.1	3.3	5.7	10.9	9.0	8.1	18.5	0.9	4.9	19.4	5.7	29.4	0.5
	[14] upper	23	30.4	13.0	0	8.7	8.7	26.1	0	17.4	4.3	24.7	34.8	8.7	25.0	0
Place of interview	[15] Alentejo	20	30.0	60.0	0	15.0	0	5.0	25.0	5.0	0	0	25.0	0	0	5.0
	[16] Algarve	18	50.0	16.7	0	0	5.6	5.6	5.6	11.1	0	0	16.7	0	0	0
	[17] Braga	52	50.0	44.2	1.9	7.7	5.8	11.5	32.7	11.5	5.8	50.4	25.0	3.8	15.2	1.9
	[18] Coimbra	32	43.8	31.3	0	3.1	0	3.1	31.3	6.3	0	0	9.4	0	0	0
	[19] Lisboa	243	42.8	28.4	2.5	4.9	7.4	6.2	4.9	17.3	2.1	12.1	21.0	6.6	31.4	0.4
	[20] Porto	91	58.2	40.7	4.4	7.7	14.3	13.2	11.0	15.4	1.1	7.1	9.9	1.1	11.1	0

**Table 2.1-B (PP) Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

**B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

Types of irregularities			Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations					Child Labour	
Situations considered			[B] Social security not paid	[C] Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	[D] Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	[E] Employer refuses to sign contract	[F] Salary below 2.40 euros <sup>10</sup>	[G] Working time excessive <sup>11</sup>	[H] Less than 1,5 hour per room-week <sup>12</sup>	[I] Accident at work	[J] Worker had to pay health costs	[K] Irreg. answers % of [I]	[L] Maternity	[M] Maternity leave denied <sup>13</sup>	[N] Irreg. answers % of [L]	[O] Hired under 16 within the last 10 years <sup>14</sup>
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies													
All interviewees	[1]	456	46.5	33.8	2.4	5.9	7.7	7.9%	12.1	14.7	2.0	13.6	18.4	4.2	22.8	0,7
In how many h. working at present?	[2] 1	194	45.9	29.4	2.1	7.7	10.8	11.3	11.3	17.5	1.5	8.6	14.4	4.1	28.5	1.0
	[3] 2	119	43.7	37.8	2.5	6.7	5.9	4.2	8.4	13.4	0	0	24.4	5.9	24.2	0.8
	[4] 3	62	58.1	40.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	4.8	11.3	11.3	3.2	28.3	21.0	3.2	15.2	0
	[5] 4 or more	72	45.8	37.5	2.8	2.8	6.9	6.9	20.8	11.1	5.6	50.5	13.9	2.8	20.1	0
Activity profile <sup>2</sup>	[6] Care of children included	85	34.1	24.7	2.4	4.7	12.9	11.8	2.4	14.1	0	0	22.4	1.2	5.4	0
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	87	50.6	50.6	1.1	5.7	3.4	5.7	26.4	4.6	2.3	50.0	16.1	1.1	6.8	0
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	97	58.8	49.5	1.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	14.4	5.2	1.0	19.2	12.4	1.0	8.1	0
	[9] Care of adults included	35	48.6	25.7	11.4	0	5.7	5.7	5.7	20.0	0	0	25.7	2.9	11.3	0
	[10] All-rounders	89	39.3	15.7	0	10.1	6.7	5.6	9.0	30.3	3.4	11.2	22.5	12.4	55.1	1.1
	[11] Cleaning and meals	63	47.6	28.6	4.8	9.5	15.9	17.5	9.5	19.0	4.8	25.3	15.9	6.3	39.6	3.2
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>	[12] less than one year	32	46.9	43.8	6.3	9.4	3.1	9.4	21.9	0	0	0	12.5	0	0	0
	[13] 1-3 years	93	53.8	46.2	1.1	11.8	3.2	3.2	23.7	7.5	0	0	11.8	1.1	9.3	3.2
	[14] 3-5 years	86	48.8	36.0	1.2	5.8	7.0	5.8	5.8	16.3	2.3	14.1	15.1	4.7	31.1	0
	[15] 5-10 years	116	48.3	31.9	4.3	4.3	9.5	8.6	9.5	16.4	2.6	15.9	20.7	3.4	16.4	0
	[16] More than 10	102	36.3	20.6	2.0	2.0	13.7	13.7	7.8	22.5	3.9	17.3	23.5	8.8	37.4	0



**Table 2.1-C (PP) Practices against the law (see also Table 1.3) - Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

Proportion [%] of people concerned by such practices

**C - Their relationship with Schooling** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

Types of irregularities		Situations considered	Formal irregularities			Signs of abuse				Reactions in special situations					Child Labour	
			[B] Social security not paid	[C] Neither holiday nor Christmas bonus	[D] Aspects of contract not fulfilled by employers	[E] Employer refuses to sign contract	[F] Salary below 2.40 euros <sup>10</sup>	[G] Working time excessive <sup>11</sup>	[H] Less than 1,5 hour per room-week <sup>12</sup>	[I] Accident at work	[J] Worker had to pay health costs	[K] Irreg. answers % of [I]	[L] Maternity	[M] Maternity leave denied <sup>13</sup>	[N] Irreg. answers % of [L]	[O] Hired under 16 within the last 10 years <sup>14</sup>
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies													
All interviewees	[1]	456	46.5	33.8	2.4	5.9	7.7	7.9	12.1	14.7	2.0	13.6	18.4	4.2	22.8	0,7
Schooling	[2] No schooling	25	52.0	40.0	4.0	4.0	16.0	20.0	4.0	24.0	0	0	16.0	4.0	25.0	0
	[3] 4 years	180	45.0	31.7	2.2	6.1	10.6	10.0	11.1	17.8	2.2	12.4	23.3	3.3	14.2	0.6
	[4] 5-6 years	74	37.8	35.1	1.4	5.4	5.4	4.1	10.8	18.9	4.1	21.7	16.2	10.8	66.7	0
	[5] 7-9 years	76	51.3	38.2	2.6	5.3	5.3	9.2	11.8	7.9	1.3	16.5	21.1	2.6	12.3	0
	[6] 10-12 years	49	44.9	36.7	4.1	12.2	6.1	4.1	16.3	0	0	0	10.2	0	0	4.1
	[7] More than 12 years	6	83.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	0	0	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 3.1-A (PP) Relationship to the law – Status, attitudes, actions - Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

**A - Their relationship with personal and general variables** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

			Attitudes					Status		Actions			
			[B] Employment contract in principle useful <sup>15</sup>	[C] Employment contract positively valued <sup>16</sup>	[D] Would go to court to defend rights	[E] Thinks Work inspection would help (where she has worked).	[F] Thinks Work inspection would help (in general)	[G] Employment contract signed	[H] Member of a union	[I] Asked for a written employment contract <sup>7</sup>	[J] Searched for association or union	[K] Left house <sup>18</sup>	[L] Went to court
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies										
All interviewees	[1]	456	47.8	48.7	64.5	24.1	40.1	22.1	6.4	31.6	3.9	38.8	2.6
Nationality	[2] Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[3] Eastern Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[4] Africa (PALOP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	[5] Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender not considered: 99,6% female	[6] until 30	55	52.7	50.9	70.9	21.8	38.2	25.5	9.1	38.2	3.6	27.3	0
	[7] 31-40	90	52.2	50.0	67.8	18.9	36.7	27.8	3.3	35.6	3.3	33.3	2.2
Age	[8] 41-50	154	47.4	48.7	69.5	24.0	44.2	19.5	4.5	26.0	2.6	50.0	3.2
	[9] 51-60	113	44.2	44.2	54.9	29.2	41.6	21.2	11.5	34.5	5.3	37.2	4.4
	[10] 61 and more	41	41.5	56.1	56.1	22.0	29.3	17.1	2.4	22.0	7.3	29.3	0
Social status of employers (hypoth.) <sup>1</sup>	[11] lower	59	44.1	44.1	59.3	22.0	33.9	6.8	5.1	18.6	11.9	35.6	3.4
	[12] middle (without office)	145	49.0	47.6	58.6	20.0	39.3	17.9	4.1	29.0	4.8	33.1	2.8
	[13] middle (with office)	211	46.4	50.2	67.8	24.6	40.3	26.1	7.1	33.6	1.4	43.1	2.8
	[14] upper	23	56.5	65.2	78.3	39.1	56.5	56.5	17.4	69.6	4.3	39.1	0
Place of interview	[15] Alentejo	20	80.0	55.0	85.0	15.0	40.0	35.0	5.0	45.0	0	35.0	0
	[16] Algarve	18	22.2	50.0	77.8	0	33.3	38.9	16.7	38.9	0	11.1	0
	[17] Braga	52	46.2	46.2	61.5	34.6	48.1	11.5	0	19.2	0	44.2	3.8
	[18] Coimbra	32	56.3	59.4	68.8	21.9	37.5	9.4	3.1	12.5	6.3	31.3	3.1
	[19] Lisboa	243	46.1	46.9	68.3	24.7	39.5	21.0	9.9	32.1	3.7	42.8	3.3
	[20] Porto	91	48.4	49.5	47.3	24.2	39.6	29.7	0	39.6	7.7	34.1	1.1

**Table 3.1-B (PP) Relationship to the law – Status, attitudes, actions – Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

**B - Their relationship with variables characterizing the activity** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	Attitudes				Status		Actions				
			[B] Employment contract in principle useful <sup>15</sup>	[C] Employment contract positively valued <sup>16</sup>	[D] Would go to court to defend rights	[E] Thinks Work inspection would help (where she has worked).	[F] Thinks Work inspection would help (in general)	[G] Employment contract signed	[H] Member of a union	[I] Asked for a written employment contract <sup>17</sup>	[J] Searched for association or union	[K] Left house <sup>18</sup>	[L] Went to court
			% of people to which it applies										
All interviewees	[1]	456	47.8	48.7	64.5	24.1	40.1	22.1	6.4	31.6	3.9	38.8	2.6
In how many houses working at present?	[2] 1	194	48.5	48.5	63.9	24.2	42.3	26.8	6.2	36.6	4.1	32.5	3.1
	[3] 2	119	46.2	52.1	64.7	21.0	36.1	21.0	8.4	34.5	5.9	45.4	2.5
	[4] 3	62	48.4	45.2	72.6	27.4	40.3	16.1	3.2	22.6	3.2	50.0	1.6
	[5] 4 or more	72	45.8	47.2	55.6	26.4	41.7	15.3	5.6	19.4	1.4	34.7	2.8
	Activity profile <sup>2</sup>	[6] Care of children included	85	52.9	47.1	62.4	17.6	35.3	36.5	2.4	46.5	2.4	50.6
	[7] Cleaning, almost excl.	87	58.6	60.9	64.4	26.4	42.5	13.8	3.4	29.0	5.7	31.0	4.6
	[8] Care of animals or plants included	97	41.2	49.5	54.6	20.6	37.1	13.4	1.0	22.2	1.0	37.1	3.1
	[9] Care of adults included	35	40.	34.3	51.4	8.6	34.3	20.0	2.9	20.5	0	37.1	2.9
	[10] All-rounders	89	46.1	51.7	82.0	36.0	44.9	28.1	22.5	41.6	6.7	39.3	2.2
	[11] Cleaning and meals	63	42.9	36.5	65.1	27.0	44.4	20.6	3.2	18.0	6.3	36.5	0
Average duration of employment relationship (estimate) <sup>3</sup>	[12] less than one year	32	75.0	62.5	78.1	12.5	53.1	28.1	6.3	34.4	3.1	31.3	0
	[13] 1-3 years	93	50.5	48.4	71.0	26.9	44.1	20.4	3.2	36.6	1.1	34.4	1.1
	[14] 3-5 years	86	43.0	45.3	59.3	19.8	34.9	18.6	3.5	29.1	5.8	45.3	1.2
	[15] 5-10 years	116	45.7	47.4	67.2	23.3	37.9	21.6	6.9	29.3	3.4	37.1	3.4
	[16] More than 10 years	102	41.2	46.1	54.9	28.4	40.2	26.5	9.8	32.4	5.9	39.2	2.9

**Table 3.1-C (PP) Relationship to the law – Status, attitudes, actions - Portugal (Portuguese citizens only)**

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

**C - Their relationship with Schooling** (Source: survey carried out 2009-10 as part of FCT Project PTDC/JUR/65622/2006)

			Attitudes				Status		Actions				
			[B] Employment contract in principle useful <sup>15</sup>	[C] Employment contract positively valued <sup>16</sup>	[D] Would go to court to defend rights	[E] Thinks Work inspection would help (where she has worked).	[F] Thinks Work inspection would help (in general)	[G] Employment contract signed	[H] Member of a union	[I] Asked for a written employment contract <sup>17</sup>	[J] Searched for association or union	[K] Left house <sup>18</sup>	[L] Went to court
		[A] Total nr. of people per category <sup>4</sup>	% of people to which it applies										
All interviewees	[1]	456	47.8	48.7	64.5	24.1	40.1	22.1	6.4	31.6	3.9	38.8	2.6
Schooling	[2] No schooling	25	56.0	60.0	56.0	12.0	24.0	28.0	4.0	32.0	0	40.0	0
	[3] 4 years	180	44.4	49.4	59.4	28.3	38.9	19.4	7.2	30.0	5.6	42.8	3.3
	[4] 5-6 years	74	48.6	47.3	63.5	25.7	41.9	27.0	13.5	36.5	5.4	35.1	5.4
	[5] 7-9 years	76	53.9	55.3	69.7	30.3	55.3	23.7	0	34.2	2.6	36.8	0
	[6] 10-12 years	49	51.0	44.9	73.5	10.2	36.7	22.4	2.0	36.7	2.0	34.7	0
	[7] More than 12 years	6	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	33.3	16.7	0	33.3	0	33.3	0