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INTRODUCTION

The context in which flexibility of work is to be identified in Bulgaria is the profound social transformation from a centrally planned to a market regulated economy. In a way, the reforms are leading to a flexibilisation of all former social structural patterns and especially those in the field of work. Thus during the one party regime work patterns were highly standardised, strictly regulated, full-time, permanent and secure. Self-employment, free-lancing, home-working, fixed term contracts and other ‘non-standard’ jobs and careers were very limited in number for the four decades of communist rule. There were no real labour markets, as the state allocated school and university graduates to places in the state owned companies where they could stay till retirement. Proclaimed to be The basic human right, the right to work was also an obligation to work and could only be exercised as a full time occupation. Changing jobs between workplaces was strongly discouraged as undesired ‘fluidity’ of the labour force while combining jobs was sanctioned as a lack of full devotion to the goal of ‘work self-realisation’ of the personality.

In the 1990s the social reforms toward liberalisation of the economy and of social life in general resulted in less formal regulation, less control, more insecurity and greater diversity of work. The developing market economy provided a wider scope of opportunities to work in different sectors of the economy: state, privatised, newly founded private, foreign implants, mixed. They offered varying conditions of work with varying arrangements of working time and place. At first seen as a solution to the inefficiency of labour in the centrally planned economy, mass unemployment persisted during the decade of transition, staying at two-digit levels. The sudden collapse of the system of full employment and life-long jobs under the conditions of a fifty-percent drop in economic output for the first five years of reforms created segmented and fractured labour markets. The wide-scale de-structuring of the former regulators in economy, politics, education, health care and other social spheres forced individuals and households to invent flexible strategies to adapt to the new situation.

Flexibility of work, however, is not a hot topic in social sciences’ debate in Bulgaria. Other issues have been extensively studied and widely discussed after the start of the reforms in 1989, such as poverty, unemployment, homelessness, middle class formation, entrepreneurship, gender inequalities, to mention just a few from the topics of the thematic volumes of ‘Sociological Problems’, the only one specialised sociological journal in the country since 1993. Flexibility of labour has not been the focus of any of the scientific conferences in the sociological community in the country, which are rare events anyway in the 1990s. Publications in the field of social policy, industrial relations, human resource management, macro and microeconomics have scarcely touched the topic usually as an illustration of world trends rather than as an examination of the situation in Bulgarian economy. Analysis of work changes in the course of transition has concentrated on privatisation, mass unemployment, active labour market policies, and self-employment.
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Nevertheless, these deliberations have highlighted various aspects of flexibility in terms of work conditions, place and time variations, and adaptability of household strategies. ‘Under-employment’, ‘inferior employment’, ‘part-time work’, ‘temporary work’, ‘informal work regulations’, ‘de-standardisation of work’, ‘atypical employment’, ‘work in the shadow economy’ are all concepts used to study and explain the new processes comprising the growth of flexible labour under post-communism. This diversity of terms in Bulgarian literature is not only a lack of theoretical precision. It reflects the different meanings and political judgements of the authors in the same way as Felstead and Jenson (1999) have discovered in their survey of the debate in Western and (Far) Eastern literature. To now

1. FLEXIBILITY AS A POLICY MODEL

The term flexibility appears in the titles of only three articles in Bulgarian literature, all published in Problems of Labour, the journal of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. Two of them, published in 1996 and 1997, were un-authored compilations, translated from English. Both of them present Western (EU) policies toward greater flexibility in the labour market. The third one (Atanasova, 1998) also discusses foreign models, this time of flexible management strategies inside the company. What all three publications have in common is the perception of flexibility of work as the most advanced mechanism for enhancing employment and improving compatibility under the pressure of globalisation.

1.1. Flexibility as a way for encouraging employment

The 1996 publication (Problems of Labour, 1996) describes the greater flexibility of legal and institutional regulations of the labour market as a response to and a way out of the crisis in employment in Western countries, recommended by G-7, OECD and the European Commission. The article examines the forms of flexibility concerning worker remuneration, working time, and employment protection.

- In the sphere of worker remuneration there are various ways of increasing flexibility. The article claims that the most efficacious policy is the one directed towards reducing the benefits above the salary and increasing the differentiation of salaries and the elasticity of the structure of payments.
- The policy towards flexibilisation of working time should encompass the reduction of working hours and the expansion of part-time jobs. A model example of the latter is the Netherlands where the growth in part-time jobs in the 80s has led to a significant rise in employment.
- The third direction of changes, discussed in the article, is the lowering of job protection providing more freedom for employers in hiring and firing and in choosing among a wider scope of the forms of labour contracts: fixed-term, sub-contracting, franchising and other non-standard forms.
As a synonym to flexibility the article uses the term ‘atypical forms of employment’. It ends up with the conclusion that although flexibility should not be an absolute solution at any price, it is an imperative transformation of the employment system in Bulgaria in view of the rising international competition.

The same positive evaluation to the flexibility of the EU labour market is given in the 1997 article. It starts with the assumption that the need of greater flexibility is not and should not be disputed at all, the real question concerns ‘how it can be achieved and whether it is the sufficient condition for employment growth’ (Problems of Labour, 1997:75).

The article maintains that a major route toward greater flexibility is the investment in training. It requires two essential changes:

- on the part of companies to provide opportunities for life-long learning for the employees, and
- on the part of the workforce to raise their adaptability to changes in working conditions through education and training throughout the life span.

The article determines that flexibility is not incongruous with labour market security and Denmark is cited as a model for matching active labour market policy with high levels of social protection. The anonymous author declares that the concept of work security should be reformulated by laying the stress more upon the security of labour market and less on the security of the individual job. Unlike the first article, this one provides some (limited) statistics on flexibility in EU countries. The data concern only part-time employment and its variations according to gender, age and education of the employees.

1.2. The flexible company as a model for Bulgaria’s new businesses

In the third article Atanasova (1998) analyses flexibility from the perspective of company management. It is discussed within the concept of the internal labour market (Doeringer and Piore, 1971; Atkinson and Meager, 1986). Atanasova underlines several specific features of the internal labour market in a flexible company: flexibility in the number of personnel, functional flexibility, financial flexibility and relocation (distancing) of some of the company’s activities to be performed by outside persons (subcontracting). According to the author, a flexible firm uses various forms of flexible employment in varying degrees of intensity, which are summed up in a table, following Armstrong (1992):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>types of flexibility</th>
<th>conditions of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility based on labour contracts</td>
<td>New forms of work contracts – free lancing, part-time jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility based on working time</td>
<td>Changes in working time, flexible time patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility based on positions</td>
<td>Changes in work assignments and job positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility based on skills</td>
<td>Changes in the scope of knowledge and skills of the employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility based on remuneration</td>
<td>Flexible remuneration systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Atanasova further explores the structure of the flexible firm, asserting that it develops a flexible organisation with a core and periphery internal labour market. The development of the flexible firm has advantages and disadvantages which are taken into consideration in the management’s at-
tempts to motivate the employees in such a firm. She briefly describes Western concepts of work motivation which exist in theories of human resource management and all the examples she provides for successful strategies are from Western (British, German, American) companies.

Various other books and articles also use the term ‘flexible work’ in their discussions of the ways in which labour market policy should develop. The journal Problems of Labour (1999) has published another article in which it presents the Amsterdam Treaty as a strategy for raising the flexibility and adaptability of the labour force and getting it highly qualified and ready for retraining.

Keremidchieva (1998: 21) also studies new directions in labour market policies. She introduces the term ‘flexible workers’, that is workers who are constantly moving between employment and unemployment. She also speaks about a ‘flexible harmonisation of interests’, pointing at the need of public consensus concerning flexibility and the normative basis of the institutionalised labour market. She distinguishes between three approaches in policies, which encourage employment (p.30):

- stimuli for the business for recruiting more employees
- development of new activities meeting new demands (e.g. services)
- changes in the distribution of working time – that is flexible forms of employment.

When analysing the third approach, Keremidchieva (1998) asserts that the reduced working time is a form of solidarity toward the unemployed. Usually the reduction of working time is matched with a reorganisation of the time budget in the companies. On the author’s opinion, this cannot be done by law uniformly for all companies. The reduction of working time should be a result of negotiations. It helps the unemployed but reduces the income and social security benefits. She points at the fact that a third of all employment in the West is in flexible forms and gives the example of the UK, which has adopted a government programme of ‘Labour Redistribuition’. In the judgement of the author, despite some possible negative effects, flexibilisation is a reality and the labour market policy should encourage the adaptability of the companies and of their employees.

Beleva et al (1996: 92-93) insist that the strategy for encouraging employment in Bulgaria should be the use of flexible forms of labour. The latter are defined as part-time work and home working. According to the authors the diversity of forms widens the opportunities for choice and is especially suitable for women – mothers of young children, women who still study.

In a more recent publication Beleva (1999: 42) holds that part-time employment is an indicator for the level of flexibility of the labour market. It creates opportunities for the labour force to find the most suitable forms of labour supply. Additionally, part-time employment is a factor for raising the general level of employment. Kirova (1994) also argues that part-time employment is a form of social protection against unemployment and considers that encouraging this form of work is a form of encouraging women’s employment in particular.

1.3. Flexibility as a New Form of Human Resources Management

Flexibility of labour is heralded as the effective strategy of human resources management particularly under conditions of economic restructuring in Todorova et al (1997). It is seen as a way to raise innovation and labour productivity. The authors associate flexibility with:

- change of occupation
- change of job
- change of the place of living (in search of a job)
- additional employment
- training and re-training
• work under the conditions of a flexible working time

Perhaps because this publication is intended as a

textbook for students in human resource man-

agement, the two pages comprising the chapter
‘Flexibility of Work’ does not contain any empiri-

cal data on the phenomenon either in a Bulgarian

context or on world trends. Nor does it offer any
doubts about the probability of negative effects of
flexibilisation. The authors’ thesis is simple: flexi-
bilisation of work is a global trend, including the

economies in transition. The conclusion is also
plain: the best employment policy is to raise ‘the

work force readiness for change of work as an

answer to changes in economic life’ (Todorova et

al, 1997:26).

Shopov (1997) also approaches the problem

of flexibility of work from the perspective of hu-

man resources management. He argues that the

flexible business organisation, which is brought to

life by the modern technological development,

requires a balanced usage of the opportunities of

the internal and external labour market. In his

calculations (1997:21), a significant proportion of
the labour force in Bulgaria are ‘not fully em-

ployed’. He claims that employed on part-time
contracts (1-39 hours a week) were 7.7% of the
labour force in 1995 while longer than the normal
time work 7.9% of all employees in the country. In
a more recent (and longer) publication named
‘Labour Economics’ (1999) Shopov et al have
dropped out the term ‘flexibility’ and speak about
elasticity of labour. Elasticity is the dynamic bal-
ance between labour demand and remuneration
level.

While Genova (1998) is concerned more with
the flexibility of the motivation strategy of com-
pany’s management, Varbanova (1997:43) men-
tions flexibility in association with organisation of
labour inside the company. She perceives the
flexible working time and the work in the home
as mechanisms to raise the quality of work. These
have advantages both for the company and for
the employees. The non-standard forms of em-
ployment are particularly suited for parents of
small children, disabled, those still in education,
and older people.

A common feature of these publications dis-

cussing flexibility from the perspective of human

resources management is their optimistic vision of
flexibility and lack of supporting empirical data
from the economy or the broader social context in
post-communist Bulgaria. Flexibility is a charac-
teristic of the advanced market societies and the
societies in transition have to quickly follow in
this route. The goal of accession to the European
Union makes flexibilisation of the labour market
and the business management a policy imperative
for Bulgaria. In this discussion there is no mention
of any specifics in the forms of flexible work
when post-communist economic and social reali-
ties are taken into consideration.

2. FLEXIBILITY OF WORK IN THE ECONOMIC RESTRUCTURING IN BULGARIA

The rise in flexible employment in Bulgaria is not
only a policy led trend but has its routes in the
economic restructuring underway in the 1990s.
Empirical research in Bulgaria has studied nu-
merous processes that serve as pressure from the
labour demand side. It reveals various new and
older tendencies of de-standardisation of em-
ployment contracts, working time arrangements,
self-employment, job sharing and job changing.

2.1. Flexibility as Non-Standard Employment in the Post-Communist Labour Market

Unlike the policy oriented papers, greater preci-
sion and more concern for empirical facts are
found in labour market research. The publications
on employment and labour market trends from
the perspectives of sociology and economics are
numerous. They address a great variety of types
of work and employment relations such as ‘underemployment’ (Dimitrova, 1995), ‘new forms of employment contracts’ (Beleva et al., 1997), ‘insecure jobs’ (Vladimirov et al., 1998), ‘job sharing’ or ‘polyvalent employment’ (Yossifov, 1993). These terms are sometimes used interchangeably with ‘flexible employment’. This plethora of terms however not only reflects a kind of uncertainty but also contains a critical (or at least a more balanced) vision of the processes under way in post-communist labour markets. Both the general description and the concrete analyses of labour market trends in the country offer negative interpretations of current situation.

Beleva (1999:44-45) considers inflexibility as the most prominent feature of the employment in the first half of the 1990s. Her publication discusses the following characteristics of the newly formed labour market under post-communism:

- permanent misbalance between labour demand and supply
- high level and duration of unemployment
- underprivileged position of young people in the labour market
- under-development of self-employment and entrepreneurship
- inflexible functioning of the labour market
- bad targeting of employment programmes and measures
- lack of transparency of the processes in the labour market
- high share of informal, unregistered or partly registered employment.

In this publication the author does not provide statistical data for a more detailed analysis. However, her own research contradicts this totally negative vision. A study of 309 companies in Bulgaria (Beleva et al., 1997) reveals a general predisposition among the employers towards a diversification of labour contracts: 72.2% expressing preference toward fixed term contracts, 27.8% - subcontracting, 16.8% - part-time, 15.8% - seasonal employment. The authors define this as a move toward flexible employment relations and a prerequisite of a rational usage of the workforce. However, their data present respondents’ preferences and intentions rather than real practices, so we do not know how many of them are really using these forms of contracts.

Statistical analysis of the distribution of the new forms of employment in Bulgarian economy is to be found in Dimitrova (1995). For the author, the new forms of employment typical for labour markets in an unstable economic situation can be placed under the broad title of ‘inferior employment’ or what in specialised international literature is referred to as ‘underemployment’. She also uses the term ‘flexible forms of employment’ as a synonym but prefers inferior employment as more accurate.

Inferior employment is typical for people who:

- are forced to work less hours or less days than the law for a given occupation in a given country
- are in a forced unpaid leave
- work seasonally
- work on a full-time basis but would like to work additionally
- are highly qualified but hold a low-qualified job
- work on a full-time basis but with long stays (demurrages), low productivity and low pay
- are self-employed but with irregular work loads
- are unpaid family workers.

Following Hussmans et al (1992) Dimitrova distinguishes between manifest and hidden forms of inferior employment and states that it is the manifest forms that are accessible for statistical analysis. Under the Labour Law in Bulgaria the lower limit for full time employment is 40 hours a week. According to this definition underemployed in Bulgaria were 10.3% of all employed in 1994 and the structure of this group was as follows:
Table 2. Employed for Less than 40 hours a week (per cent, June 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Less than 40 hours</th>
<th>1-9 hours</th>
<th>10-19 hours</th>
<th>20-29 hours</th>
<th>30-39 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State sector</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hussmans et al (1992)

Bulgarian women are more often found among the underemployed than men. Women working for less than 40 hours a week were 12.4% of all employed women, while underemployed men constituted 8.5% of all employed men. The underemployed were concentrated in the private sector – their share there was twice higher than in the state sector. It was the private sector as well where the share of those working longer hours was the highest. Among those employed in the private sector 28.9% worked 60 and more hours a week. This research suggests that the newly established private sector allows a greater flexibility of labour.

In the same publication Dimitrova (1995) argues that the development of underemployment in Bulgaria has both economic and social reasons which are embedded in the transition to a market economy. When she considers its consequences, they are all negative: de-qualification of people, disproportions in the labour market, higher competition among the unemployed, impetus for illegal, non-regulated employment.

2.2. Flexibility in Self-Employment and Entrepreneurship

Self-employment is a new, non-standard form of labour for Bulgarian economy. During the previous regime less than one per cent of the work force were involved in activities not associated with the two dominant forms of property – state and co-operative. The large-scale national survey ‘The Town and the Village’ estimated that 0.61% of the economically active population were self-employed and a further 0.34% belonged to the category ‘others’, including free-lancers and missing data (Michailov, 1986). By mid 1990s the self-employed and private employers have overpassed 10% (NSI, 1997).

The non-standard forms of employment under post communism are often seen as negative tendencies leading to high social costs of the transition. Lukanova (1996: 38) argue that part-time employment, together with long-term unemployment, is among the causes for poverty. Underemployment and development of a black labour market come as consequences of the high mass unemployment (Dimitrova, 1994). The end of life-long jobs causes stress not only among the unemployed but also among those still having jobs. Dimitrova’s study (1994) established that a half of those employed feared that they might be dismissed. Four years later, about 60% of the respondents in Vladimirov’s survey (1998) declared that they felt insecurity and fear for their workplace. The concern about the possible job lost was not influenced significantly by the dwelling place, education, age and gender, it was a widely shared attitude.

Flexibility is one of the essential characteristics of Shumpeter’s definition of the entrepreneur, widely accepted by Bulgarian sociologists (Todorova et al, 1997:27; Manolov, 1995:13; Rakadzijiska, 1998:71). Here flexibility is associated with innovation, new combinations of organisational elements, a creative response to market dynamics. Manolov (1995: 26) argues that a risky behaviour and flexibility are the typical features of the entrepreneur. In his study of entrepreneurs in Bul-
garia he found that the leading type of motivation in all groups was economic, followed by the strife for professional development, to get power, etc. His respondents employed three types of strategies: high quality of goods, accessible prices, good organisation of work in the firm. Manolov links flexibility mainly with prices, with their constant ‘actualisation’ (p.56) and does not analyse the organisation of the company, nor the types of working contract used by the employers.

Stoilova (1999) sees the specificity of self-employment in the lack of outside reglementation, a greater degree of autonomy in the work, and direct economic dependence upon the results. She argues that in this field there is a process of formation of a personality type with greater flexibility, adaptability and mobility. The flexible personality type includes a sense for the empty market niches, inclination to risk and readiness to adapt your economic activity to the changing requirements of the clients. Dimitrov (1997: 148) also underlines the role of flexibility in the ‘dynamic motivational structure’ of entrepreneurs in Bulgaria.

Flexibility was also referred to as a personal characteristics of the self-employed in a comparative study of self-employed youth in four East Central European countries, including Bulgaria (Roberts et al, 2000). This research found a much higher readiness to change their field of activities among self-employed youth than that of the unemployed youth and to start business in fields different from their qualifications received at school. Analysing results from the same study Kovacheva (1998:266) defined flexibility as ‘abilities to adapt to the changing economic situation’. The greater success in business was related among other indicators to ‘flexibility as foresight and planning’ (Roberts and Fagan, 1998:134). While the successful businessmen were the most likely to have planned to become self-employed when they were still at school, their career plans have often changed. The parallel samples of young unemployed were more likely than the self-employed to have stuck to their initial career plans despite that it was unlikely for them to be soon realised. This study established that self-employment was associated with longer working hours – three fourths of the respondents worked over 40 hours a week and more than a third – over 60 hours. The share of those over-working was the highest in Bulgaria in comparison with the other three countries. The greatest resource was their industriousness matched with flexibility and workaholism.

Survey data from the first years of market reforms in Bulgaria (Chavdarova, 1993) revealed a high degree of flexibility in the entrepreneur’s activities. A common practice among the self-employed was to register their firms with a very broad scope of activity, which was subsequently limited. The owners frequently changed their main activity or added activities for the time being to react to the economic situation. Often the company was engaged in one type of activity in the informal economy while officially the owner was reporting quite another. All this was possible by the practice of double entry. Chavdarova (p. 166) considers that ‘the most characteristic feature of the independent entrepreneur’s activities in the transition period is that, even if registered, these activities are actually very difficult to control’.

Kostova (1998) also studied this social group, highlighting their ability to change and adapt to the new situation. She examined the work histories of representatives of the economic elite in state and private companies in Bulgaria and found that they tended to be male (in a ratio of 5 to 1), in the age group of 40-60, with higher education and that 80% of them currently were or previously had been members of the Bulgarian Communist (now Socialist) Party (p. 191).

Most of the papers presented by Bulgarian authors at the international conference on the middle class, held in Sofia in 1998 and subsequently published in a volume (See Tilkidziev, 1998) discussed the new role of the entrepreneur in theoretical terms in the concern to judge whether middle class as a category or rather ideology was relevant in Bulgaria. There was very little empirical consideration about the conditions of their work. Not so preoccupied with the theo-
retical classifications were the presentations at the national conference ‘Social Sciences and the Social Change in Bulgaria’, held two years earlier (See Baytchinska, 1998). Here Pavlova (1998) presented results from a study of the types of economic organisation based on different forms of contracts, following Williamson (1991). From this perspective, the hybrid organisation was between the market type and the hierarchical type and was typical for societies in transition. According to the author, these organisational forms were more flexible, informal, open for entrepreneurship and demonstrated better adaptive capabilities. Characteristics of the hybrids in Bulgaria was their mixed type form of ownership, limited autonomy, semi-legal regime of functioning. In Bulgaria they were born by the liberated enterprising spirit and the unstable institutional milieu. In the same volume Manolov (1998) argues on the basis of an empirical research that the principle of innovation is an essential characteristics of the entrepreneurs in Bulgaria with which they increase the adaptability of their companies to the changing market milieu. They compensate the insufficiency of knowledge about the market situation with a growing flexibility in their behaviour.

2.3. Flexibility as Additional Work

Another practice that is associated with flexible labour is holding a second job. Data on this are rarely provided as the large scale labour market studies usually register one dominant employment status. Incidents of working in different companies or combining employment and self-employment, work and study, unemployment and agricultural work creates confusion in otherwise orderly economics statistics (See Lekov, 2000:92). However, the phenomenon has attracted the attention of many sociologists. Tilkidziev (1998a) uses the term ‘additional work’ and stresses that this includes both formal and informal arrangements of work. His study established that a third of the respondents were engaged in such work. An earlier survey conducted by NAPOC (National Public Opinion Centre) in 1991 found that 12% of the sample earned money from a second job. Chavdarova (1993) provides information not only about the incidence of earning money from a second job, but also about the distribution of this practice among various social groups (See Table 3.). The category ‘other’ includes employed women currently on maternity leave, disabled people on invalidity allowances, etc (p. 165).

Table 3. Extra Income Work in Bulgaria (1991, per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social categories</th>
<th>National Distribution</th>
<th>Sample Distribution</th>
<th>Extra income workers within the category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly employed</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chavdarova (1993)
Chavdarova argues that the actual incidence should be higher than the shares reported. She also discusses the distribution according to the economic sector in which the second job is performed. The results are the following (p. 165):

- state sector – 9.2%
- self-employment – 57.8%
- private sector – 18.2%
- co-operative sector – 14.8%

The labour force in extra-income work is predominantly male, having specialised secondary education, in skilled manual occupations as first jobs, and their second jobs are concentrated in the service sector. Most of them declare low level of work efficiency on the main job and frequent incidence of breaks when they are forced to take unpaid leaves or stay formally on work receiving only the minimum wage. Chavdarova considers that a lot of the irregular activity, especially the second jobs in the private sector and on a self-employed basis are done off the record, that is in the hidden economy.

Yossifov (1993: 56) speaks about ‘polyvalent’ employment featuring the practice of holding more than one job: the engineer is driving a taxi in his free evenings, the computer specialist has a small trading company, the politician is a member of the board of a state or private business company. This effort to combine appointments (and incomes) is a reply to the economic pressure and represents a shift from a lifelong binding to an occupation to a ‘dynamic universalism’, according to the author (p. 58). However, he does not provide data about the share of the population involved in this multiple employment and mixes together in one category the flexible work strategies taken by some individuals with political corruption.

2.4. Flexibility as Job Changes in One’s Career

Linked with the practice of holding more than one job simultaneously is another type of flexibility – changing jobs in one’s own career. The individual occupational mobility might be interpreted as an aspect of flexibility. There are not many studies in Bulgaria that have focused on this new tendency supposedly typical for the free market and its wealth of chances.

Dimitrova (1994:67) has established a low degree of occupational mobility – 22.4% of the economically active population have changed their place of work since 1989, 14.4% have changed their occupation and only 6.5% – their living place.

Minev et al (1995: 132) provide similar data from another study – one fourth of their respondents have changed their workplace in the 1990s. However, the authors evaluate this as ‘over-mobility’ among the employed, a lack of professionalism and serious attitude to work. In the same publication (Minev et al, 1995) they argue that there has been a significant decline in the normative regulation of labour relations manifested in the rapid decrease of the share of those employed with a formal contract (particularly without a fixed term) and the rise of the share of those working without a contract.

The changes of the working place as well as of the occupational field, often at the expense of a mismatch between one’s qualifications and the job performed, are a result of the slow and distorted development of the new labour markets under post-communism. The contraction of the formal employment in the state and the co-operative sectors, the failure of the private business to provide a sufficient number of quality jobs have led to a growing informalisation of work arrangements in Bulgaria. The informal employment with its lack of official control and ‘fluid’ set-up of working time, place and conditions has become the most typical form of flexible labour under post-communism in Bulgaria.
3. FLEXIBILITY IN THE INFORMAL (SHADOW) ECONOMY

The informal economy is a widely discussed issue in Bulgarian sociology (See Tilkidziev, 1998a). It is not a completely new phenomenon – during socialism kinship economic exchanges of preserved fruits and vegetables, meat, etc. were a mass practice in the society of permanent deficit (Smollet, 1986, Creed, 1998). While this was expected to subside in the course of the transition to a market economy, the reality proved sociologists wrong. Vladimirov et al (1998) found that preservation of food had widened its scope and in the 1990s and even those living in big cities were involved. Only 20% of their respondents did not use home preserved food.

Following Ferman et al (1987) Chavdarova (1993) defines the irregular economic activity as those that avoid monitoring and paying taxes. So in this understanding it is closer to hidden or shadow economy. Irregular economic activity can be full time or part time, stable or casual, wage labour or self-employment. It can be a work off the books for a verbally agreed remuneration or a written contract based on the minimal wage (on which social security payments are calculated) while the actual remuneration is higher. In a later article Chavdarova (1996) discusses other closely related terms, such as ‘parallel economy’, ‘black economy’, ‘criminalised economy’, ‘informal economy’. She accepts the typology offered by Henry (1981).

Table 4. Types of Economies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official</th>
<th>Unofficial</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Regular (official employment)</td>
<td>Informal (bribes, volunteer labour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>Criminal (prostitution, drug trafficking)</td>
<td>Hidden (thefts from work, amateur trading)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Henry (1981)

The last one is best suited to reflect the ‘processes of informalisation of Bulgarian economy’ (p. 50, Italics of the author). Her research has shown that the share of informal economy depends mostly on the ways in which the formal sector is protected by the state, of the flexibility of the labour relations in the official economy. She argues that the greater flexibility of the formal sector the less incentives to develop the informal sector as its advantages decline.

In a more recent study (Chavdarova, 1996:20) the same author presents more arguments for the process of informalisation of Bulgarian economy: a further decline of the share of job pay in household incomes and a growth of the share of income from natural production, a rise of the work in the black economy and the appearance of new sources for such labour.

Stanchev (1996:35) contends that the informal economy is a mass phenomenon in Bulgaria and is linked to the parallel functioning of different markets of labour, natural resources, capital and entrepreneurship. The role of parallel labour markets is significant – when workers cannot find jobs in the legal labour market they offer their labour for a lower pay in the non-regulated labour market to private employers. In the study of Vladimirov et al (1998) two thirds of the unemployed expressed readiness to work without a written labour contract and with no social security. One fifth (17%) of those employed were already working under such conditions. The authors argue that this is an indicator of an ‘anomic consciousness’ (p. 26).

A 1996 survey of the Institute for Market Economy (UNDP, 1997:45) reveals the vast scale of this type of flexible labour. One third of the employed in the country work in the black or grey economy. Every tenth legally employed person receives additional remuneration from the em-
ployer that both sides conceal. Close to 80% of all employers hide parts of their income. The share of the officially registered as unemployed who have worked during the week preceding the survey, have been 13%. They have done this mostly without any written contract and for a limited period - up to a month. A particular form of the shadow economy is the so-called ‘suit-case trade’ – small-scale smuggling in which between a third and a quarter of all those employed in the private sector are involved (Todorov et al, 2000).

Dimitrova (1999) publishes data from an international research project in which the Bulgarian partner is the National Statistical Institute. It measured that in 1996 the share of hidden economy in the GDP was 22% in Bulgaria, 15% in the Czech Republic, 20.4% in Estonia, 9% in Hungary, 12% in Latvia, 20.8% in Lithuania. Other studies using different methods estimate this share as 39.13% and 45%.

A common assumption in the discussion about the informal economy in Bulgaria is that it is a form of survival strategy of Bulgarian households, an exit from poverty and/or unemployment (Chavdarova, 1993; Tilkidziev, 1998; Kovacheva, 1999; Raychev, 2000).

4. FLEXIBILITY AS A TYPE OF HOUSEHOLD STRATEGIES

The studies of household strategies in Bulgaria have several common features:

- Usually they discuss individual behaviour rather than joint household goals and activities (Georgieva, 1995; Daskalova et al, 1996; Vladimirov et al, 1998). Whenever gender and age differences are discussed, this is done on the level of society as a whole and not inside the household.
- The studies of household strategies commonly reach the conclusion that the population as a whole is unprepared to adapt to the new economic conditions. The most common type is the passive strategy. Active and flexible people are a minority (Rakadzijska, 1994; Atanasov et al, 1995; Georgieva et al, 1997; Mirchev, 1998).
- Flexibility is perceived as a desired personal trait in the transition to a market economy and a factor for economic success (Daskalova et al, 1996; Vladimirov et al, 1998).
- The relationship between work and family is rarely explicated, as is the link between informal, domestic and additional work. In Bulgarian social sciences research of household strategies is closely linked to studies of social stratification, most often of poverty and unemployment, also on topics such as home production, agricultural work, readiness for business start.

4.1. The Flexibility of Active Income Earning Strategies

Research into household strategies usually starts from the economic situation of the household measured usually on the basis of two subjective indicators:

- the self-evaluation of the living standard of the household (usually given by one respondent within the household)
- the expectations about the future standard of the household.

In a study of the Institute of Sociology (Georgieva, 1995) ‘the life strategies of the Bulgarian family in the period of transition’ are studied by comparing the self-evaluation of their economic situation and their income strategies.
Table 5. Family Types according to Their Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family types</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Approval (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>We expect to slide down further.</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surviving</td>
<td>We will manage to keep our present status.</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>I don’t think about this – everything will fall into its place.</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>I and my family will advance and prosper.</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Georgieva, 1995

However, the analysis inside the types follows individual characteristics and not group features. Within the first type of family strategy Georgieva finds there are more women than men, more older rather than younger people, individuals with low incomes, unemployed and retired. One quarter of all those holding a second job and one tenth of company owners also belong to this group.

The second indicator measuring household strategies in this study (Georgieva, 1995) is the question: ‘How do you intend to manage your financial situation next year?’ Georgieva constructs the following types of strategy (again on the individual level and not of the household) on the basis of its answers (Table 6).

Table 6. Types of Income Earning Strategies (per cent of households falling into each type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without Perspective</th>
<th>31.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not rely on anything in particular</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on pensions only</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on income from land</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on income from restitution of property</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will sell to live</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Dependent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on state support</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on welfare payments</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-qualification</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Georgieva, 1995

The author concludes that there is a strong correlation between the type of expectations about the family and the type of income earning strategy (Georgieva, 1995: 77-78) but does not explicate whether high expectations encourage active strategies or vice versa, active strategy gives assurance for high expectations. One of the recommendations from this study is directed toward the employers who seek labour – they should provide opportunities for ‘flexible employment’ (offering no interpretations).

A simpler typology of household strategies is used by Rakadziska (1994, 1995) and Zheljazkova (1995). They distinguish between:
- survival strategy
- stabilisation strategy
- expansion strategy

Their study (conducted in 1993 and then again in 1994) shows that the choice of strategy is strongly influenced by the type of living place – the share of households following an expansion strategy is declining when we move from the capital, through a big and a small town to a village and correspondingly the share of survival strategy is growing in the same direction. The article does not comment what factors from the locality influence the strategies: is it the local labour market, the economic situation in general, out-migration, demographic structure or anything else. Rakadziska (1994: 122) – a passive attitude of waiting, reliance upon a support coming from somewhere although you do not know where.
What is interesting in this study is that it offers information about the process of decision taking in the family. Zheljazkova (1995: 287) presents a typology of the families along this criterion:

- **integrative model** – common decision making
- **authoritative model** – one member decides
- **diffusive model** – everybody decides for him/herself.

This typology is based on one self-evaluation question. The author does not provide data on the distribution of answers. However, she argues that ‘the unification of efforts and the relative closure within the families act as a factor compensating for the objective conditions born by the crisis’ (p. 288). This conclusion is confirmed by another indicator in the study: ‘Whom would your household turn to if you needed help?’. Over half of the respondents would ask relatives for help. Friends are placed second, while the state is mentioned by less than 3 per cent of the respondents.

The same reliance upon the close informal circle was found in a situation of unemployment and when starting one’s own business (Kovacheva, 1997). Rather than relying upon the new institutions such as the state labour offices, the state or private banks, the non-governmental sector and their programmes, the young unemployed and the young self-employed received the greatest support in the form of money, advice, information and contacts from their family, close relatives and friends (See Figure 1). Especially during unemployment it was the parents’ support offered as long as needed that allowed the young to wait for better jobs for an indefinite period of time.

![Figure 1. The Source of Greatest Support in Unemployment](source)

A study of Dimitrov (1998) on attitudes toward the system of social security has shown a wide spread distrust toward all forms of health, property and pension security schemes and a manifested inclination to seek greater reliance upon the family, close group of friends and co-workers. Many surveys have measured the tendency of rise in the importance of the family. In the current curve of Bulgaria’s modernisation (Dimitrov, 1995) the value of the family far overpasses other social goods. A study conducted by NOEMA (1993) has shown that the family unquestionably takes the first place in a list of values (See Table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family and children</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not so important</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and children</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work, career</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion, church</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NOEMA, 1993
The above study reveals a high degree of economic solidarity among generations. About 70% of the respondents are involved in the intergenerational exchange of money, food, housework and house repairs, child rearing, and care for the elderly. Only 7% have said that there is a total break in the relations between parents and children. Vladimirov et al (1998) also argue that the family is the most important social institution for social integration. In the transition to a market economy it has started to play a very important economic function – the house production which is an indispensable means for survival in the difficult economic situation.

The retreat into the private family life is accompanied with a decline in social trust and in general, by reducing the social capital in society. The Centre for Liberal Strategies and Sova-5 (UNDP, 2000:69) have done a study of the social capital in Bulgaria. It has measured a low level of social capital in the country – the Bulgarians are not inclined toward trust and co-operation, or toward long-term strategic thinking. The study showed that a high concentration of social capital in a given segment of society did not always lead to the development of the wider community. Examples for such negative concentration were the closed criminal circles who used their high social capital against society as a whole and the closed village households who limited their support inside the family.

It is this lack of diffusion of social capital from the particular segment toward a wider circle that limits human development in Bulgaria. The authors contend that the traditional models of behaviour in the patriarchal families contradict and prevent the development of the modern culture in which most important values are participation, engagement, and civic involvement.

The turn toward a closed family life is a strategy that was common for communist Bulgaria both for political and economic reasons. The family was a non-political niche, a (relatively) free place from state interference and Party mobilisation. Kinship relations helped households and families survive under the conditions of permanent shortages of goods and services. What is new for the transition to a market economy is that this reliance upon the family is realised in a situation characterised by a decrease in the numerical and generational composition of the family. Nuclear families comprise 53% of the families in Bulgaria and one-parent families are 10% (Spassovska, 1998: 106). There is a high concern for the negative demographic trends in the country, and for the decline in the rate of marriages (Vladimirov et al, 1998: 57).

4.2. The Impoverishment of Bulgarian Households as a Barrier to Flexibility

One of the most common findings of all studies on households in Bulgaria is the mass scale of impoverishment. For the five years of the transition the real income of the average Bulgarian household was reduced by 50% (Stoyanova, 1996: 48). She calculates that the share of households living below the existence-minimum has risen from 24% in 1989 to 47% in 1995 and those living below the social minimum – from 41% to 62%. The author provides an interesting indicator of the financial situation of the households – their differentiation according to whether their income equals, falls below and rises above their expenditures (p. 63): (See Table 8.)
Table 8. Types of Households according to the Ratio of Their Income and Expenditure (Shares of Households per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Income equals Expenditure</th>
<th>Income higher than Expenditure</th>
<th>Income lower than Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stoyanova, 1996: 48

While the share of the households whose incomes are higher than their expenditures (meaning they save money) decreases from a half to a fifth of the whole, the share of those spending more than the income they receive has risen to a quarter of all households. In their study Stoyanova (1996: 90) and her colleagues from the Institute of Economics have found that the social policy has preserved its ‘paternalistic character’ and does not provide incentives for individual mobilisation.

The fall of living standards strongly affects people’s self-evaluation. Vladimirov et al (1998) have measured that 78% of the respondents consider that their household is worse off than 10 years ago (before the start of the transition), 16% do not see a significant difference and only 6% declare that they are better off now than before. When they compare themselves with the rest of the population, the majority of the respondents feel that they have moved down the social ladder (Vladimirov, 1998: 27).

Table 9. Household Situation Now and Before the Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you evaluate the income of your household in comparison with the rest in our country now and before 1989?</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Before 1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vladimirov, 1998: 27

Raychev et al (2000) conducted a study on poverty commissioned by the World Bank. They found that two thirds of the population believed that they had belonged to the middle layers of society before 1989. At present only one fourth claims the same. In the country the cultural model of poverty has already been formed with the specific feelings for powerlessness, pessimism, apathy, passivity, hopelessness, living from day to day. Studies of the economic situation of the households commonly reveal a mass feeling of impoverishment. Rakadzijska (1998: 80) presents data from a study about poverty in 1995: only 3% of Bulgarian households declare their financial situation as very good. Another 32% consider it passable, 41% – very bad and 17% say they can hardly manage to make both ends meet. Rakadzijska argues that for the Bulgarian context the most significant problem is not so much poverty itself as the process of impoverishment, which leads to marginalisation. In an earlier study (Rakadzijska, 1996) she finds that even 30% of the households in the highest income consider themselves poor.

Yossifov and Naumov (1998) make an attempt to create a typology of the cultural models of poverty in Bulgaria. They distinguish between ‘normal’, ‘ideological’, ‘fatal’, ‘pauper’, and ‘pseudo-poverty’. These categories remain rather theoretical and separated from the empirical data, which the two authors provide in their article. Although they did not reveal the link between ‘the models of poverty’ and the types of economic behaviour, the data on the latter are interesting in themselves:
Nedelcheva (1994:44) argues that poverty goes hand in hand with reducing social activity. Three quarters of those who regard themselves as poor while only a fifth of those who do not define themselves as poor consider themselves unable to change anything and improve their situation. Resignation is the dominant attitude not only among the poor but also among those with middle level of income.

Research conducted by the polling agency ASSA-M has shown that passive strategies dominate among the population in the country. Less than a half or the respondents rely on their labour for improving their situation and are future oriented. Mirchev (1998:212) argues that there is an ‘amazing passivity, lack of enterprising spirit, resignation to the threats of poverty, preferring to stretch out a begging hand instead of ensuring incomes through hard work and flexibility’. Studies done from a psychological perspective also find a predominance of the passive against the active attitude (Georgieva et al, 1997:186).

Other authors also consider that poverty is a barrier in front of flexibility as a strategy appropriate to the quickly changing situation. Atanasov et al (1995) have established a low adaptability of the population in the face of the new social risks: high crime rate, organised crime, unemployment, mass impoverishment, drug abuse. They have found the following groups concentrating risky factors in the course of the transition: the young, the children, the unemployed, and the poor. The dominant strategy is that of survival – passive expectations for the things to improve and the state to restore order and material well being of the population.

Quite in contrast with the above mentioned studies, Vojnova (1998) presents a study of poverty in which she discovers a growing inclination among the population toward flexible household
strategies: holding several jobs at the same time, work in the shadow economy and increasing in-kind (barter-driven) activities and relations. Her calculations show that 85% of the officially em-
ployed produce food for their own private needs. Close to two thirds of the self-employed do the same.

4.3. Home Production – A Flexible Strategy Out of Poverty

The informal economy was already referred to in this article as a form of flexible labour. It was ex-
amined as an individual response to unemploy-
ment. Here it is necessary to once more discuss it because social research has defined it as a flexible strategy of the household in search of an exit from poverty. From this perspective home production is seen as a survival strategy under the conditions of economic hardship for the households.

The first most common indicator for the growth of home production is the decline of the share of market exchange in the structure of in-
comes and expenditures of the household. Many studies have pointed at the growth in the real vol-
ume and share of the income from the home econ-
yomy in money and goods (See Stoyanova, 1996: 48). Vladimirov et al (1998: 100) examine the tendency of ‘naturalisation’ of incomes – a quarter of the respondents claim that all food staffs in their household are produced by themselves. For a further quarter more than a half of the edibles are home production.

Zeljazkova (1998) also finds a ‘clear tendency toward de-marketization in the economic strategies of the households in Bulgaria. She discloses three dimensions of de-marketization:

- the salary has been reported to form only 38% of the incomes;
- a significant growth of home economy and
- naturalisation of consumption.

This, together with the high percentage of in-
volvement in the second economy (through un-
registered activities and parallel forms of labour) have proved to be the most successful ways of poverty alleviation. Zeljazkova criticises state policies as encouraging this strategy of the house-
holds: the untaxed minimum income is 35 USD,
young is out-migration, semi-criminal or criminal business.

Low territorial mobility was confirmed in the research conducted by Vladimirov et al (1998) - 87% of the respondents have lived in their town or village for over 20 years. The authors see this as a precondition for closeness, solidarity and mutual help (p. 30). The reliance upon the family and friends is a guarantee against the drastic fall in incomes. The authors argue that it is the mutual support floating down the channels of kinship relations that provide households with additional income and security. A greater flexibility understood as a greater propensity for territorial mobility was found among the highly educated (Stoilova, 1993:41). Those with higher education are more mobile and more willing to change their place of living in search of a better job.

The intergenerational social mobility is quite low according Vladimirov et al (1998) The authors measure it by the self-evaluation of the respondents - two thirds of them consider that they are on the same place on the social ladder as their parents. A third consider that they live worse than their parents did when they had been at the same age as the respondents. This is not a very precise account for a society, which has been subject to a speeded industrialisation for the 40 years of communist rule. The parents of the respondents have belonged to different generations - that who have lived in the period of the numerous wars in the Balkan peninsula in the beginning of the century which have been very destructive for the country, the generation who have lived between the two world wars at the times of slow and inconsistent modernisation and those who have been the ‘brigadiers’ (unpaid labourers) in the forced construction of socialism.

Kovacheva’s research (1999) of the young unemployed in Bulgaria has shown that unemployment in the country has not yet become a family destiny stretching over generations. The young unemployed had parents whose present situation and past career did not differ significantly from those of the parents of a sample of young self-employed. However, the high incidence of unemployment has started to affect the households notably - Vladimirov et al (1998) have found that every fourth household has a member who seeks and cannot find a job and half of these households have two or more unemployed members. The hardest hit are those with low qualifications, the young, citizens in small towns, Roma and other ethnic minorities.

The greatest social mobility in Bulgarian society has been established in terms of educational degrees. Over a third of the respondents in Vladimirov’s study (1998) have a higher education than their parents. However, most of them consider that this has not helped them to find a better paid job. The turn of households toward home production has resulted in a low propensity to flexibility in other spheres. The same study (Vladimirov et al, 1998) has established that ready to change their occupation are 30% of the respondents, while for 60% this is out of question. A very high proportion - 85% - have not had the opportunity or willingness to ever try entrepreneurship. The majority (78%) prefer low reward and low risk. A quarter are ready to emigrate abroad in search of a better job. When asked how they would manage if economic difficulties increased, the respondents pointed at economising (cutting expenses) at the first place (55% of the answers), followed by harder work (41%). The authors conclude that the strategies for survival dominate over the strategies striving for success.

Similar are the results of Daskalova’s research (1996). In it the main indicator for an active survival strategy of the household is the declared intentions of the respondents to manage an imaginary situation of a redundancy. If they lose their job only 7% were ready to search for a new one in another place of living and 9% would consider emigration abroad. Only 29% were ready to change their qualifications or start self-employment. Most of the respondents chose ‘passive options’ such as registering in a Labour office and waiting for a job in the same field of activity and in the same living place.
4.4. Back to the Land – Flexible Strategy for Survival

Closely related to home production is work on the land. For Bulgarians, as in fact for many other peoples in the world, in their history the land has been a major source of income and a basic strategy for survival and prosperity. In Bulgaria’s transition to democracy there were high expectations encouraged by government’s declarations that the return to private ownership of the land would provide maintenance for many households and wealth for a significant proportion of them.

Dobreva’s research (1997) starts with this perception – that the land and agricultural work is a great resource for Bulgarians. Their own agricultural land possess 84% of households living in villages and almost a half of those living in towns and cities. However, what the study has shown is that in almost all cases these are small plots of land – up to 40 decars. Over 80% of the urban and over 60% of the village households work on plots up to 5 decars. This reflects the nature of agricultural production – family farming whose produce is for the family and relatives in the cities rather than for the market. Dobreva’s survey found that 88% of the village and 75% of the urban households did not plan to sell or buy land. (1997:22-23). Two thirds of the village households and 82% of the urban households who owned were only 1% of the urban and 3% of the agricultural households. Raising livestock was also popular – it concerns 89% of the village households and 27% of the urban ones. This reflects the nature of agricultural work as a family maintenance for the family and relatives in the cities rather than for the market. Dobreva’s survey found that 88% of the village and 75% of the urban households did not plan to sell or buy land. Over 80% of the urban and over 60% of the village households work on plots up to 5 decars. This reflects the nature of agricultural production – family farming whose produce is for the family and relatives in the cities rather than for the market. Dobreva’s survey found that 88% of the village and 75% of the urban households did not plan to sell or buy land. (1997:22-23). Two thirds of the village households and 82% of the urban households who owned were only 1% of the urban and 3% of the agricultural households. Raising livestock was also popular – it concerns 89% of the village households and 27% of the urban households. It was again done for family consumption mainly, although it might bring money income as well. Cases of concentration of stock rearing and market orientation were very rare.

Agricultural work was predominantly seen as a means for survival (family maintenance) and not as a resource for wealth (Dobreva, 1997: 154). The respondents perceived the agricultural produce as a source to help with the family budget, a source for additional work, psychological necessity (self-confidence, creative work, stress relief) (p.42). This acts a continuation of the tradition from communism when villagers were allowed to have ‘personal subsidiary farms’.

If the villagers do not sell at the market, then where do they find means to maintain the family farms? Dobreva (1997:103) found that for 91.4% of the village households and for 94.6% of the urban ones the main source for investment is money income not associated with farming: salaries, pensions, social benefits.

Lekov (2000) found that agricultural work was common especially for people who have lost their jobs in the state industry. Among the registered unemployed in Bulgaria there is a large group of people farming a few decars of land, raising a few animals or selling at an open air stall – their income is not enough to provide for themselves and their families but they are not truly unemployed. All this created difficulties for research into social stratification in present day Bulgaria.

Studies on social stratification in Bulgaria (Tilkidziev, 1999; Raychev et al, 2000) have always found difficulties in defining the respondent’s status as a result of their work (and income) in family farming – it is very common for those who define themselves as pensioners or unemployed but also for people employed officially in state of private companies.

Dobreva (1999:23) criticises the stratification research in Bulgaria which define the property and financial status of the individual only on the basis of his/her individual income and property, while these are characteristics of the household. She talks about the return of the economic function of the household.

In her latest research (Dobreva, 1999) classifies village households into four groups: prospering, stabilising, surviving, and impoverishing. The prospering households have a great variety of sources of money income (three or more), high activity rate, usually consist of several generations and many members. Typical for the poor households is having one source of income and self-limitation in consumption (economising). She
finds that different generations have their own sphere of activities: the pensioners – in the family farming, the adults in paid employment in state or private companies, the young – into family business or paid employment.

Koleva (1999) studies the trends in employment in the village: rising levels of youth and female unemployment. Many of them have worked in industrial enterprises in the nearby towns and when these closed or reduced their staff, youth and women were dismissed disproportionately high and had to return in the village. The proportion of those working outside the village drops significantly. For them work in the family farm is temporary employment, work for survival and not a strategy for permanent work realisation. Another trend is the rising proportion of those working part-time, seasonal jobs, or occasional self-employment. Full-time employment on a permanent basis declines from 48% to 31%. Part-timers rise from 0.4 to 0.7%. Close to 22% of villagers employed officially have an additional work, usually in the family farm. Full-time or part-time employment differentiate people not only according to income but also according to work status (permanent or unstable), prestige, self-confidence.

In their study Raychev et al (2000) tried to apply the ESOMAR classification of 8 social strata to the situation in Bulgaria. What they found was that in group A (well educated top managers and specialists) 15 per cent grew their own vegetables. The same group owned less PCs than group 3 (well-educated administrators, lower level managers, small business owners). For the authors this is a mismatch between statuses and consumption, dis-concordance between status (class) indicators. Citing Peter Mitev’s phrase ‘In the Bulgarian transition to capitalism people ate the sheep’ (unlike in the initial phase of capitalism in the UK where ‘the sheep ate the people’), they argue that the dying of Bulgarian industry is realised in a urbanised and modern society which results in a drastic reduction of consumption of wide circles of the population and this begins to exert serious pressure over their social statuses (p. 59). The drama of Bulgarian society at the end of the XXth century is the struggle between the pressure coming from the declining consumption and people’s efforts to keep (hold) their social statuses gained under the previous social order. Bulgarians are trying hard to preserve their property statuses – 93% of the households own a flat or a house, two thirds own land, telephonisation is 70%. The people have developed norms of educational, cultural, health and material consumption. Compare this with other indicators of consumption:

- 9% eat only food which they had produced themselves,
- 45% rely mostly on home produced food
- 50% of the respondents eat only potatoes produced in the home (or by their parents)
- 35% eat only chicken meet which they or (their parents) have produced
- 46% themselves or their parents produce all the fruits and vegetables which they consume.
- 28% themselves (their parents) produce all the yoghurt they eat
- 24% themselves (their parents) produce all the cheese they eat.

The authors agree that this is a survival strategy but that it is not without price. It leads to a process of de-qualification of the employees, a form of de-capitalisation of the labour force. After the de-capitalisation of the economy comes the decapitalisation of the labour force – the doctor grows potatoes instead of reading journals, the engineer paints his flat, the turner milks cows while waiting his factory to pay the salaries delayed for several months...
4.5. Flexibility in Gender and Age Division of Labour in the Household

In Bulgarian social science literature gender and age division of labour is usually discussed within society as a whole – in the labour market, in politics, etc., rather than within the household. Even rarer the combination between age and gender inequalities has been an object of research (See for exceptions Aadnanes, 1999; Kovacheva, 2000).

On the individual level flexibility is found most often in the strategies of women. Dimitrova (1997) argues that self-employed women seek in self-employment and entrepreneurship flexibility that allows them to combine paid labour and family care, as well as to raise the family living standards. While other studies have found a low level of women’s mobility in terms of readiness for retraining, working place and place of living (Todorova, 1994: 46), this one reveals a high psychological flexibility among businesswomen. Almost half of them have changed their occupation when they left their jobs in the state or private sector and have started self-employment. Close to a third of self-employed women work long hours - over 10 hours a day.

In a comparative study of economic elite in Bulgaria and Hungary in 1994 (Kostova, 1994) the Bulgarian elite was found to be older and male dominated. Women comprised 38% of Hungarian economic leaders while only 17% of those in Bulgaria. In her study of women entrepreneurs in Bulgaria Nikolova (1994) argues that business women concentrated on the lower layers of the middle class under formation while the top layers were dominated by men.

When studying women’s employment in the private sector of the economy, Nikolova (1997:31) points at their lower share than that of men and attributes it to women’s lower inclination to risk and higher attachment to greater stability and security in work. Women are less willing to leave the state sector. Among employed women the younger group (15-24) is most often found in the private sector. Among self-employed women the youngest group is with the lowest share, the highest is the share of those aged 55-64 and 65 and over. The author finishes with a suggestion the state to support women in their business start. In a later publication Nikolova (1998) compares the incomes of women employed in the private sector and finds a significant age difference – women in the lowest and highest age groups have the lowest incomes. Her research also found that women working in the private sector had to cope with bad conditions of work – over 50% said stress was a permanent state for them, 30% worked on two shifts, for 20% the working time was not regulated and they had often to work longer hours. Many women had been employed on the condition that they would not have children – if they got pregnant they had to leave themselves.

Women’s pay is only 74% of men’s (UNDP, 1996:48). Dimitrova (1997) maintains that women in Bulgarian economy are over-represented among the low paid, low quality and low security jobs in the private sector, as well as in the shadow economy where they work with no labour contract. Women are twice as many as men among the unpaid family workers. Twice more women than men are ready to take any job available when unemployed. When discussing the social policy measures which can improve women’s situation in the labour market, Dimitrova (1997:195) underlines the need of ‘securing flexibility in the conditions of employment.’ According to the author, this will give more choice to employed women and to employers, will alleviate unemployment and provide an adequate answer to women’s individual needs.

Kirova (1998) also argues in favour of state policy supporting women in their business start. Self-employment is particularly relevant for women (although they are under represented in it) as a lot of it might be realised in the home and allow the women to combine work with family responsibilities. Kirova (1998) suggests that our labour laws should be changed to allow greater flexibility in terms of time and place for women. She points at the USA and Germany as successful.
practices for flexible forms of employment. In Bulgaria only 8.7% of employed women work part-time. Mothers can have long paid leaves but cannot combine child rearing and paid work due to ‘the lack of flexibility in the reglamentation of working time’ (p. 59).

A flexible system of working time has many advantages:

- reduction of the number of unemployed women
- contribution to the family budget and a rise in the family living standard
- against losing working skills
- more free time to use for professional qualification
- less expenses paid to others to care for the children
- more rational combination between work and family functions

Kirova (1998) sees also negative aspects of flexibilisation concerning women: it reduces the unemployment benefits and influences pensions to decline, but she considers that they are much less important than the advantages.

Who works and what is the division of labour within the households? Dobreva (1997:123) claims that the norm is that all family members participate in food production. However, the most active part is taken by the adults (30-60 year olds), then pensioners - over 60%, then those younger than 30. Children and students participate very rarely, especially the boys (p.66). The expected return of young enterprising people in the village who could not find work in the towns did not happen. Employed labour is used very rarely, the villagers pay to outsiders only for some operations done by machines. Family members who have left the household (e.g. married daughters and their families) often help when necessary. Such work is usually not paid in cash but with products from the farm (p. 66). Agricultural work was the only activity for a half of the respondents living in the village. The other half comprised of industrial workers (20%), clerks (5%), employees in other private farms (5%), etc. (p.67).

In Bulgaria the liquidation of the co-operatives was done so abruptly that with it collapsed the whole agriculture – unlike Hungary and the Czech Republic where the restructuring was done gradually.

In their study of the social protection system in Bulgaria Gocheva and Stoyanova (1994) found that households with children most often fall below the existence-minimum. In addition, the greater the number of children in the household, the greater the gap between the actual consumption and the existence-minimum and this difference reaches two and a half times (p. 49). They have also found that the share of state pensions is declining in the incomes of households of pensioners. For two years since 1992 this has dropped from 79% to 49%, while the share of home production has grown from 8% to 37%.

Stoilova (1993) argues for a rise in the conflicts between generations within the family in the 1990s. In a study of the young unemployed in Bulgaria over a half could not point at any positive examples in their parents’ experiences. Her survey has revealed a significant value shift between generations. The parents of a half of the unemployed had advised them to rely upon hard labour for success in life. Only a quarter of the young themselves shared this conviction. The most important factors for success among the young were the readiness to risk, intelligence, professionalism.

Zlatanova and Georgieva (1993) have found a readiness among the young employed to change their job, involve in training courses or start entrepreneurship - this was common for about a third of their respondents. They argue (See also Mitev, 1996; Stoilova, 1993; UNDP, 1996) that the young are more inclined to risk and establish their own business. Zlatanova and Georgieva (1993) recommend the state to provide a programme supporting the business start of the young. This is quite the opposite of what Roberts et al (1999) have concluded on the basis of their study in Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. According to Roberts et al (1999) there is a greater need of state support for small businesses to de-
velop into medium sized quality firms that are able to offer quality jobs rather than for encouraging only the business start. It is the low quality jobs that the present private and state sectors in the post communist societies offer to the young which make them unwilling to get stuck into such jobs and ready to wait for indefinite periods (relying upon the family) for new opportunities.

Studying the social milieu of the unemployed, Kotseva (1993) finds out that dominant are the supportive attitudes of the family: more than two thirds of the unemployed respondents declared a lack of conflicts or critical approach by other family members. In a similar study Todorova (1993:78) also detects a wide spread readiness of the family to support the unemployed members, providing material help and psychological relief.

How is it that the profound value change between generations in Bulgaria does not diminish the intergenerational support and does not lead to youth revolts as in Germany in 1968? A possible answer is found in Raychev et al (2000:87). Analysing the relations between the generations in the country, the authors denote ‘a traumatic consciousness of the parents’ – they have failed to achieve economic success and they understand the lack of legitimacy to provide models of behaviour or advice to their children. The children themselves notice this consciousness and are tolerant for their parents’ incapability.

Another aspect of the intergenerational relations that this research (Raychev et al, 2000) has addressed is the transfer of poverty and exclusion from the parents to the children. In the three lowest decile groups according to their income fall 60% of the children in the country. For the young generation in these families computer literacy and language skills are impossible to achieve.

Bulgaria has 1.23 Internet links to 1000 persons of the population – for comparison in Hungary this number is 9.4, in Poland – 3.37, in Croatia – 2.12. The phone network is quite dense in Bulgaria – 38% posts per 100 persons but it varies a lot between the regions. In Sofia it is 52%, in Haskovo – 21% (UNDP, 2000:70). The access to Internet is about 5-6% of the population and the profile is highly educated, aged 31-40 with income above the average. About 90% of all users are from cities and 50% of all alive in the capital Sofia.

Table 10. Children’s Access to Personal Computers in Bulgaria (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Location</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At an Internet Club</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No access</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNDP, 2000:70

Data from this research clearly indicate that the decline of status despite all family support and active survival strategies to home production and agricultural work affects the household as a whole and will be reproduced and deepened in the next generations.

**CONCLUSIONS**

In Bulgarian context flexibility is most commonly understood in a positive way as a feature (and advantage) of the advanced late modern market economies. In social policy studies it is undoubtedly declared as a strategy for active labour market policy and a solution to the problem of high rates of general unemployment, women’s unemployment, youth unemployment, and long-term unemployment. It is a policy recommendation of supra-national bodies as the EU, OECD, World Bank, etc. The flexible firm is advocated as an effective resolution of problems in company efficiency in studies of human resource management. Flexible business organisation is the undisputed advantage in self-employment as it increases its adaptability to the quickly changing economic environment.
situation in modern societies and especially in developing post-communist societies.

Despite the 'positive' expectations from the flexible regulations in the labour market and in company management, research into the current processes shaping the social fabric of the Bulgarian society provide a much more complex view of flexible labour. Under the conditions of a transition from a centrally planned economy to a market economy and a deep and persistent economic crisis, the global trend to flexibility results in unregulated work in the grey or black economy, a naturalisation of production and consumption and a marginalisation of a growing share of the population in the country. In labour market studies part-time work is most often perceived as inferior work leading to concentration of social disadvantages in those who are denied the right of full time jobs.

The home as a new venue for paid labour has been neglected in social research, so flexibility in terms of place has not attracted research attention. Flexibility in terms of time and conditions of work has been most often examined on the individual level while its implications on the relationship between work and family have not been truly researched and discussed. Age and gender relations have been presented in the broad picture of society as a whole but not studied in detail on the level of the individual household. Research of household strategies have concentrated on the balance of expenditures and incomes, self-evaluations and future intentions but less on the fragile harmony between formal and informal, domestic and additional work.

Having been concerned more with the policy implications of the probable growth of flexible labour, social research in Bulgaria have not produced enough information and understanding of flexible workers, their social backgrounds, experiences and life expectations. We know little whether these working arrangements have been a desired or a forced option for them and their households. We lack enough knowledge about family strategies and how these have been influenced by the non-standard work patterns of household members. And last but not least, we do not know how the relationships between genders and generations within the household have affected decisions about standard and non-standard working arrangements and whether they in turn have resulted in changes in family relations. All these questions have to be duly addressed and studied if we are to understand the nature and course of the current social transformation in Bulgaria.
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