



SEVENTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME
THEME SSH-2007-3.2.1
Youth and social exclusion

YOUNEX

www.younex.ch

Starting date of the project: 1 May 2008
Overall duration of the project: 40 months

WP3 Report
Integrated Report on Individual Survey

Workpackage n°3
Deliverable n°10
Due date: 31st August 2011
Dissemination level: PU
Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: KAU

Name: Individual Survey
Name: Integrated Report on Individual Survey
Submission date: 30th July 2012

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n°216122.



Table of contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
SOCIAL BACKGROUND	3
RELATION TO WORK AND UNEMPLOYMENT.....	5
SOCIAL EXCLUSION.....	8
POLITICAL EXCLUSION	10
WELL-BEING	13
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	14
REFERENCES.....	17
NATIONAL REPORTS	18
WP3: National report Switzerland	18
WP3: National report Germany	50
WP3: National report Italy	75
WP3: National report France	108
WP3: National report Sweden	128
WP3: National report Poland	150

Introduction

This report is produced within the project 'Youth, unemployment, and exclusion in Europe: A multidimensional approach to understanding the conditions and prospects for social and political integration of young unemployed' (YOUNEX). The project has a cross-national comparative design and the countries included in the study are France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland. The report is based on work package 3 in the project, which is an individual survey conducted with three categories of young people (18-34 years old) in each country; long-term unemployed, precarious and regularly employed. The intention with this survey was that it would be carried out by means of computer-assisted telephone interviews with a random sample of 400 young adults per category and country. This was also the way in which it mainly was conducted. However, in some cases we were forced to give up from either the randomness in the selection process or the planned data collection method. These deviations are reported in each country's national report. The respondents amount to a total of 7102 persons and Table 1 shows the final number in each category and country.

Table 1: *Number of respondents in each category and country.*

Country	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
France	405	410	396
Germany	329	411	407
Italy	480	480	484
Poland	396	399	400
Sweden	428	400	399
Switzerland	304	254	320
Total	2342	2354	2406

The questionnaire that was used contains questions about social background, attitudes to work and unemployment, social and political inclusion/exclusion and well-being. Some comparative results are briefly presented below and the content is based on national reports from the countries participating in the project. For more detailed information, these national reports are attached.

Social background

Regarding the respondents' social background, there is information about gender, age, education, country of birth, marital status, partnership, parenthood, finances, personal income and whether they are unemployed; are receiving any benefits or measures, or have ever had a paid job. We can conclude that from this perspective there are major differences between the respondents in different countries and it is difficult to find similarities. This is of course reflected in their attitudes to work and unemployment and their experiences of social and political exclusion and well-being.

Starting with gender, we can see from Table 2 that there is a significant correlation between labour-market status and gender in France, Germany, Italy and Sweden. This cannot be observed in Poland and Switzerland. These correlations, however, take different forms. The highest percentage of women is found among the precarious in Italy, Sweden and Switzerland, whereas in Germany and Poland they dominate in the

regularly employed and in France among the long-term unemployed. An unexpected observation is that the proportion of women is higher among the regularly employed in Germany, Italy and Poland in comparison to men. This suggests that there is a low response rate among employed men in these countries.

Turning to age, we can also see a significant correlation with labour market status in most countries. The exception is France. Here, too, the nature of the correlation differs between countries. The percentage of regularly employed aged 18-24 is lowest in Sweden, Poland and Germany. This may suggest that the average age for entering the labour market is higher in these countries than in Switzerland, France and Italy.

As regards education, there is also a significant correlation with labour-market status in all countries with the exception of France. Germany, Poland, Sweden and Italy have the highest correlation. These correlations indicate that the less secure the connection to the labour market, the greater is the proportion of unskilled young people (just primary/compulsory education) and the more stable the labour market connection the greater the proportion of highly educated people (upper secondary education or higher). However, the level of education varies considerably between the countries. The lowest rate of unskilled people is found in Sweden where 12 percent of the long-term unemployed, 3 percent of the precarious group and 2 percent of the regularly employed are unskilled. This may be compared with the long-term unemployed in Germany, where the highest level of unskilled can be found (71 percent).

Table 2: *Percentage women, people between 18 and 24 years and unskilled (just primary/compulsory education).*

Gender, age and education level/country	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Proportion of women			
France (<i>Cramer's V=.08 *</i>)	49	45	39
Germany (<i>Cramer's V=.09 **</i>)	46	53	57
Italy (<i>Cramer's V=.08 **</i>)	52	62	59
Poland (<i>Cramer's V=.05</i>)	53	52	57
Sweden (<i>Cramer's V=.10 ***</i>)	51	61	49
Switzerland (<i>Cramer's V=.07</i>)	49	56	48
Proportion of the younger (18-24 years)			
France (<i>Cramer's V=.02</i>)	33	33	35
Germany (<i>Cramer's V=.21 ***</i>)	14	27	9
Italy (<i>Cramer's V=.10 **</i>)	60	61	50
Poland (<i>Cramer's V=.32 ***</i>)	38	31	6
Sweden (<i>Cramer's V=.40 ***</i>)	45	20	4
Switzerland (<i>Cramer's V=.24 ***</i>)	27	47	20
Proportion of unskilled			
France (<i>Cramer's V=.06</i>)	58	61	66
Germany (<i>Cramer's V=.44 ***</i>)	71	24	24
Italy (<i>Cramer's V=.12 **</i>)	10	12	20
Poland (<i>Cramer's V=.21 ***</i>)	23	13	5
Sweden (<i>Cramer's V=.20 ***</i>)	12	3	2
Switzerland (<i>Cramer's V=.20 ***</i>)	29	12	15

***p≤ .001, **p≤.01, *p≤.05

Marital status is another background variable related to labour market status, regardless of country. This may be the background variable most similarities between the countries. In all cases, the highest level of single young people is found among the long-

term unemployed and this is certainly explained by the fact that the percentage of youngest people is highest in this group.

The percentage with a foreign background in the three groups also varies between countries. The greatest difference is seen between long-term unemployed in Poland where there are no citizens from other countries and long-term unemployed in Switzerland where about 50 per cent are citizens from other countries.

To summarize, when comparing long-term unemployed, precarious and regularly employed young adults in Europe in terms of gender, age, education, country of birth, marital status, partnership, parenthood, finances and personal income, major differences between countries can be observed. These differences have naturally affected their answers to the other questions in the survey and are therefore important to keep in mind when interpreting and explaining the results below. They also indicate that recommendations cannot be general but must be adapted to the context in which they will be implemented. We now turn to the relation to work and unemployment among young adults.

Relation to work and unemployment

This section deals with attitudes to work and unemployment in general as well as attitudes to work and employment from a gender perspective. The questionnaire had one question about the values young people mainly attribute to work. The respondents were asked to value aspects such as salary, regular activities, social contacts, status and identity and personal development. The results show that among the unemployed in Germany, Sweden and Switzerland personal development is the most important aspect that the greatest percentage sees as an important function of a job. In France, Italy and Poland salary is the most important aspect.

The respondents were also asked to answer to what extent they agree with various statements about work and unemployment taken from the work involvement scale proposed by Nordenmark (1999). The results from four of the statements is presented in Table 3 where the figures show the percentage of those who agree with these statements. Most young people in Europe seem to be of the opinion that having a paid work is very important. Over 90 per cent in most categories agree with this statement. The exceptions are all categories in Poland and the long-term unemployed in Sweden. In most countries the regularly employed value work most. Correspondingly, there are far fewer who answered that they would stop working immediately if they won a large sum of money. As we see in the table, the proportion who agrees with this statement varies between 13 and 28 per cent except for France where the levels are between 54 and 56 per cent. These results are in line with a new Swedish study which shows that most people who have actually won a large sum of money did not change their relation to work; they did not stop working, they did not take an extra time off and they did not cut their working hours to any great extent (Hedenus 2011).

If we focus on the answers from the group of long-term unemployed we can conclude that in most countries 90 per cent or more of the unemployed people agree that having a paid work to go to is very important. The exceptions are Poland and Sweden where only about 75 per cent agree with this statement. Italy and Sweden have the highest proportion who agree that being unemployed is one of the worst things that can happen to a person. Only between 20 and 24 per cent of the unemployed in most of the countries would stop working if they won a large sum of money. Here the exceptions

are Sweden and France where 30 and 54 per cent respectively would do so. In France, Poland and Switzerland about half of the respondents says that the most important things that happen in life do not involve work. The corresponding figures are much lower in the other countries.

Table 3: Percentages of those who agree to different statements regarding work and unemployment

Statements /Country	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Having a paid work to go to is very important			
France (Cramer's $V=.03$)	91	90	89
Germany (Cramer's $V=.06$)	95	93	96
Italy (Cramer's $V=.10$ ***)	90	93	96
Poland (Cramer's $V=.10$ **)	76	82	86
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.27$ ***)	76	93	96
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.05$)	96	94	96
If I won a large sum of money I would stop immediately to work			
France (Cramer's $V=.02$)	54	54	56
Germany (Cramer's $V=.11$ **)	23	13	20
Italy (Cramer's $V=.10$ ***)	21	18	28
Poland (Cramer's $V=.07$)	20	18	13
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.14$ ***)	30	17	18
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.13$ **)	24	16	30
Unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person			
France (Cramer's $V=.06$)	53	55	49
Germany (Cramer's $V=.09$ *)	72	62	67
Italy (Cramer's $V=.06$)	70	72	77
Poland (Cramer's $V=.12$ ***)	59	67	73
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.21$ ***)	74	50	55
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.11$ **)	53	40	47
The most things that happen in life do not involve work			
France (Cramer's $V=.04$)	50	55	53
Germany (Cramer's $V=.08$ *)	30	38	40
Italy (Cramer's $V=.08$ **)	29	27	20
Poland (Cramer's $V=.02$)	50	51	49
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.09$ **)	37	46	45
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.08$)	51	42	51

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

A preliminary interpretation of these results is that a paid work is very important for all categories of young people. The long-term unemployed in Germany and Italy are the most work oriented followed by those in Sweden and Switzerland, while work orientation is the least widespread among the long-term unemployed in France and Poland.

What then, is it that is valued so highly in a job? The questionnaire contained a question about the values young people mainly attribute to work. The respondents were asked to value aspects like salary, regular activities, social contacts, status and identity and personal development. An overall result is that all aspects are important which is in line with Marie Jahoda's thesis on the latent functions of work (Jahoda 1982). She believes that in addition to a salary, work has five latent functions that few or no other

institutions in society can provide. She believes that work first gives us a special sense of time. Second, it broadens our social horizons beyond the family, our circle of friends and the immediate neighbourhood. Third, we have an anchor in a community whose strength exceeds our own. Fourth, it provides us with work status and identity. Fifth and finally, we are forced by work to perform acts whose purpose lies beyond personal aims. A more detailed comparison between countries shows that among unemployed in Germany, Sweden and Switzerland personal development is the most important aspect of a job. In France, Italy and Poland salary is the corresponding aspect.

Gender perspective

Attitudes to work and employment from a gender perspective, were investigated by two sets of questions: In the first, respondents were asked to mark on a scale of 0 to 10 how important they think it is for a woman and a man respectively to have a paid job in order to be considered as an adult. They were also asked to assess the importance of having a job for people with children under 3 years of age.

Regarding the importance of work as an entrance ticket to adulthood, is it clear from Table 4 that all categories rank this importance higher for men than for women. A job is not as important for a woman to be seen as an adult as it is for a man.

Table 4: *The importance of having a job for women and men to be considered as adults and the importance of having a job for women and men with children aged under 3 (average based on a scale of 0 to 10).*

Importance of having a job/Country	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
For women to be considered adults			
France ($Eta^2=.00$)	7.2	7.1	7.0
Germany ($Eta^2=.01$ **)	6.4	5.7	5.8
Italy ($Eta^2=.01$ **)	7.1	7.1	6.6
Poland ($Eta^2=.00$)	5.4	5.6	5.4
Sweden ($Eta^2=.02$ ***)	5.1	4.3	4.0
Switzerland ($Eta^2=.03$ ***)	7.1	6.0	6.4
For men to be considered adults			
France ($Eta^2=.01$ *)	7.9	7.7	7.6
Germany ($Eta^2=.03$ ***)	8.0	7.0	7.0
Italy ($Eta^2=.00$)	7.5	7.6	7.4
Poland ($Eta^2=.00$)	6.9	6.9	7.0
Sweden ($Eta^2=.02$ ***)	5.5	4.6	4.2
Switzerland ($Eta^2=.04$ ***)	8.0	6.7	7.0
For women with children under 3			
France ($Eta^2=.00$)	5.9	6.1	6.0
Germany ($Eta^2=.08$ ***)	4.4	6.3	6.4
Italy ($Eta^2=.00$)	6.6	6.9	6.5
Poland ($Eta^2=.01$ *)	5.1	5.7	5.5
Sweden ($Eta^2=.04$ ***)	6.2	7.6	7.7
Switzerland ($Eta^2=.01$ *)	5.9	6.6	6.4
For men with children under 3			
France ($Eta^2=.00$)	7.6	7.8	7.8
Germany ($Eta^2=.00$)	7.2	7.2	7.4
Italy ($Eta^2=.01$ ***)	7.6	8.0	8.1
Poland ($Eta^2=.00$)	8.7	8.8	8.8
Sweden ($Eta^2=.03$ ***)	7.0	8.0	7.7
Switzerland ($Eta^2=.00$)	7.8	7.7	7.7

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

In almost all countries, the long-term unemployed value work higher as a criterion for adulthood than other categories. Although the patterns above are general, there are also differences between the countries. One is the level of the importance. It is consistently higher for women in France, Italy and Switzerland than in Germany, Poland and Sweden. Regarding men, the importance of work for adulthood is highly valued in all countries except Sweden. In terms of whether it is important to have a job when you have children under 3 all categories ranked the importance higher for men than for women. Here, however, the unemployed ranked it lower than the precarious and regularly employed did.

In the second set of questions about gender, respondents were asked whether they agreed or not with the following three statements: 'A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family', 'Men should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children' and 'When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women'. The responds alternatives were totally disagree, disagree, agree and totally agree. The table below shows those who agreed or totally agreed with each statement.

Table 5: Percentages of those who agree to different statements regarding the roles of men and women.

Statements /Country	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family			
France (Cramer's $V=.08$ *)	56	55	58
Germany (Cramer's $V=.08$ *)	60	49	51
Italy (Cramer's $V=.20$ ***)	62	70	68
Poland (Cramer's $V=.08$ **)	66	64	59
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.16$ ***)	14	26	27
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.04$)	54	50	51
Men should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children			
France (Cramer's $V=.06$)	76	85	88
Germany (Cramer's $V=.09$ **)	90	95	94
Italy (Cramer's $V=.15$ ***)	80	95	91
Poland (Cramer's $V=.08$ *)	96	98	96
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.16$ ***)	95	98	97
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.08$)	93	93	97
When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women			
France (Cramer's $V=.08$ *)	33	25	29
Germany (Cramer's $V=.21$ ***)	25	7	8
Italy (Cramer's $V=.27$ ***)	21	19	33
Poland (Cramer's $V=.12$ ***)	34	27	20
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.19$ ***)	6	2	2
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.15$ ***)	19	10	11

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

Between 49 and 70 per cent in all groups in all countries, except Sweden, agreed to the statement that a woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family. In Sweden between 14 and 27 per cent agreed to this statement. Most people in all categories, however, believed that men should take as much responsibility

as women for their home and children. These results are paradoxical, given that so many answered that a woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid job for the sake of her family and that men should take as much responsibility as women for their families. What are the women supposed to do if they reduce their working hours while their husbands do half the housework?

Looking at the situation when work is scarce, we can again conclude that the gender equality concept is not very widespread among young adults in Europe. It appears that a relatively large proportion in most countries think that men have more right than women for the jobs available.

Social exclusion

To examine the social exclusion, we asked questions about social relations, participation in social activities and experiences of being discriminated. Social exclusion was also explored by questions about receiving help from and giving help to different groups such as family members, friends, acquaintances, colleagues and neighbours, as well as questions about whether the respondents had borrowed money from anyone during the past 12 months. This section concentrates on the number of friends (social relations), participation in social activities and experiences of discrimination.

Regarding the number of friends, respondents were asked: 'How many friends do you have – people with whom you feel well and feel you can talk about private issues or asking for help if necessary?'. The alternatives for answers were none, 1-2 people, 3-7 people and more than 7 people. Regarding participation in social activities there was one question formulated like this: 'Compared to other people of your age, how often would you say you take part in social activities?' Here the response options were much more seldom than most people in my age, more seldom than most, about the same, more often than most, much more often than most. Finally, the experience of discrimination was measured by the question: 'Would you describe yourself as being a member of a group that is discriminated in this country?' If the respondents answered yes on this question, they were asked to say on what grounds they felt themselves discriminated; due to colour or race, nationality, religion, language, ethnic group, age, gender, sexuality, disability or employment status.

In Table 6 we present the percentage of those who have fewer than 3 friends, who take part in social activities much more seldom than most people of their age and those who have experienced discrimination. With regard to social relations, it is clear from the table that there is a significant correlation between this and labour market status in four countries. The exceptions are France and Poland. Both these countries are characterized by high percentage of people with low degree of social contact in all groups. For the precarious and regularly employed these countries even have the highest proportion. Among the long-term unemployed, Poland and Sweden have the highest share of people with a small social network. We can also see that the smallest proportion with few social contacts among the unemployed is found in Switzerland.

Concerning participation in social activities, we can see the same pattern with a significant correlation to labour market status in the same countries as mentioned above. Again, this connection is missing in France and Poland.

Table 6: Percentages of those who have fewer than 7 friends (people they fell well with and can talk with about private issues or ask for help if necessary), percentage of those who take part in social activities much more seldom than most people in their age and percentage of those who have experiences of being discriminated against.

Aspects of social exclusion/Country	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Have fewer than 3 friends			
France (Cramer's $V=.05$)	36	35	36
Germany (Cramer's $V=.25^{***}$)	30	8	5
Italy (Cramer's $V=.19^{***}$)	39	25	29
Poland (Cramer's $V=.07$)	46	40	44
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.32^{***}$)	47	8	9
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.12^{***}$)	20	8	13
Take part in social activities much more seldom than most people in their age			
France (Cramer's $V=.06$)	27	24	23
Germany (Cramer's $V=.25^{***}$)	60	33	27
Italy (Cramer's $V=.19^{***}$)	29	28	30
Poland (Cramer's $V=.07$)	45	47	51
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.25^{***}$)	62	35	36
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.15^{***}$)	38	20	22
Have experiences of being discriminated			
France (Cramer's $V=.05$)	21	23	22
Germany (Cramer's $V=.30^{***}$)	35	15	7
Italy (Cramer's $V=.04$)	9	12	11
Poland (Cramer's $V=.12^{***}$)	11	7	1
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.32^{***}$)	41	19	9
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.33^{***}$)	40	14	10

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

In three of the countries (Germany, Sweden and Switzerland) in this correlation there is a large gap between the figures for long-term unemployed and the other groups; the long-term unemployed participate in social activities to a much lower extent than they do in the other groups. Concentrating on this group, we can conclude that the highest proportion of those who take part in social activities more seldom than most people in their age are in Sweden and Germany, and the lowest in France and Italy.

With respect to discrimination and labour market status, there is a correlation in Germany, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland which indicates that the weaker the connection to the labour market, the more likely people are to feel discriminated. If we look at the group of unemployed people, Sweden and Switzerland have the largest proportion of respondents that feel discriminated, while the proportion is lowest in Italy and Poland.

Political exclusion

Political exclusion was probed by some questions and statements about political interest, political efficacy, trust in public institutions, political satisfaction, political participation and associational involvements. In this section we will describe the results for political interest, political efficacy, trust in the government and some dimensions of political participation. Political interest was explored by the question 'How interested would you say you are in politics?' and the respond options were not interested at all, not very interested, fairly interested and very interested. Political efficacy is captured by

the statement 'Parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion' and we look at those who agreed with this. On the subject of trust we asked the respondents about to what extent they trusted the government. The level of trust was to be given on a scale by 0 to 10, where 0 represented no trust at all and 10 complete trust.

It can be concluded that most young people in the study are not very interested in politics and in all countries except for Switzerland there are a significant correlation between labour market status and political interest. This correlation, however, takes different forms in different countries. In France, Italy and Switzerland the lack of interest in politics is greatest among the regularly employed, while it is the greatest among long-term unemployed in Germany, Poland and Sweden. In all countries except for Poland precarious young people seems to be those most interested in politics.

Regarding the statement about the political parties' interest in the electorate, between 18 and 56 per cent agree that the parties are only interested in people's votes and not in their opinions. In all countries, it is the group of precarious that most strongly believes that this is true.

Table 7: Percentages of those who are not at all or not very interested in politics, who agree that parties are only interested in our votes and not in our opinion and the level of trust in the national government (average based on a scale of 0 to 10).

Dimension of political exclusion/Country	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not interested in politics			
France (Cramer's $V=.13$ ***)	63	53	67
Germany (Cramer's $V=.15$ ***)	62	44	46
Italy (Cramer's $V=.18$ ***)	58	55	75
Poland (Cramer's $V=.12$ ***)	83	79	71
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.20$ ***)	76	54	56
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.06$)	58	52	59
Agree that parties are only interested in peoples votes and not in their opinion			
France (Cramer's $V=.06$)	37	47	33
Germany (Cramer's $V=.09$ **)	38	56	54
Italy (Cramer's $V=.15$ ***)	42	45	25
Poland (Cramer's $V=.08$ *)	18	34	30
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.16$ ***)	25	46	44
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.08$)	42	48	41
Do not trust the national government			
France ($Eta^2=.00$)	5.0	5.2	5.3
Germany ($Eta^2=.03$ ***)	5.7	5.7	5.7
Italy ($Eta^2=.00$)	4.8	4.6	4.6
Poland ($Eta^2=.02$ ***)	3.6	4.0	4.3
Sweden ($Eta^2=.12$ ***)	4.1	5.8	6.0
Switzerland ($Eta^2=.00$)	5.6	5.8	5.9

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

With regard to trust in government, there is a correlation with labour market status in Germany, Poland and Sweden which shows that the stronger the connection to the labour market, the more trust in the government. The lowest degree of trust is found among long-term unemployed in Poland and the highest degree of trust can be seen among regularly employed in Sweden. These two countries exhibit the largest gap between low and high degrees of trust.

Political exclusion can be seen as a lack of political participation and finally in this section, we report the results from four different aspects of political participation; aspects that can be found in, among others, Milbrath (1965) and Dalton (1988). These are whether those who were eligible to vote in the last national election also did so and whether they during the last twelve months signed a petition, participated in a demonstration and / or boycotted certain products.

Table 8: Percentages of those who were eligible to vote and participated in last national election and those who during the last 12 month have signed a petition, have taken part in a public demonstration and/or have boycotted certain products.

Dimension of political participation/Country	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Participation in last national election			
France (Cramer's $V=.07$)	79	84	85
Germany (Cramer's $V=.33$ ***)	58	89	88
Italy (Cramer's $V=.09$ **)	79	87	84
Poland (Cramer's $V=.22$ ***)	52	69	77
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.27$ ***)	71	88	94
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.10$)	49	60	49
Signed a petition			
France (Cramer's $V=.01$)	39	40	38
Germany (Cramer's $V=.13$ ***)	14	27	20
Italy (Cramer's $V=.11$ ***)	13	23	17
Poland (Cramer's $V=.07$)	2	6	5
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.21$ ***)	22	44	44
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.13$ ***)	47	62	48
Taken part in a public demonstration			
France ($Eta^2=.06$)	29	24	24
Germany ($Eta^2=.09$ **)	14	21	14
Italy ($Eta^2=.05$)	29	31	25
Poland ($Eta^2=.04$)	0	1	1
Sweden ($Eta^2=.05$)	7	10	8
Switzerland ($Eta^2=.11$ **)	18	25	14
Boycotted certain products			
France (Cramer's $V=.07$)	23	23	17
Germany (Cramer's $V=.13$ ***)	20	35	26
Italy (Cramer's $V=.05$)	3	3	2
Poland (Cramer's $V=.06$)	0	2	2
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.24$ ***)	25	54	44
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.05$ *)	30	35	35

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

The results indicate a correlation between labour market status and turnout in almost all countries, which suggests a political exclusion of long-term unemployed young adults and shows that the regularly employed vote to the greatest extent. The exception is Switzerland where the level of participation in elections is similar among long-term unemployed and regularly employed. Here the precarious seem to be the most politically included. The Swiss pattern is repeated in several countries when it comes to questions about signing a petition, taking part in a public demonstration and boycotting certain products for political reasons. It may be concluded that the level of political exclusion is the highest among the long-term unemployed. However, it is not clear in which group the highest level of political inclusion is found; among the regularly employed or among the precarious.

Well-being

Finally we will describe the experiences of well-being among the three categories of respondents. Well-being is defined by the following dimensions: experience of happiness, optimism about the future and experience of good health in general. Happiness was analysed by the question 'Taking all things together, how happy would you say you are?' This was measured on a scale of 0 to 10. People's degree of optimism about their future was examined by the question 'Are you rather optimistic or pessimistic about your future?' and the response options were very optimistic, quite optimistic, quite pessimistic and very pessimistic. Answering very or quite optimistic indicates a high level of well-being. The health in general was captured by a part of the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) developed by Goldberg (1972). This is an additive index based on different statements about strain, self-confidence and the ability to structure one's everyday life. The number of statements varies between different studies, such as 30, 20 or 12. In this study, like Nordenmark (1999) we used 12 different statements. In our version, the values vary from 0 to 36; the higher the score, the higher the well-being.

Table 9: Happiness (average based on a scale of 0 to 10, optimism (percentage who is very or quite optimistic about the future) and health (average based on a scale from 0 to 36) among different categories of young adults in different countries.

Dimension of well-being/Country	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Happiness			
France ($Eta^2=.54$ ***)	3.5	4.9	7.8
Germany ($Eta^2=.17$ ***)	6.0	7.6	7.8
Italy ($Eta^2=.02$ ***)	6.8	7.4	7.5
Poland ($Eta^2=.02$ ***)	7.3	7.7	8.0
Sweden ($Eta^2=.21$ ***)	5.8	7.7	8.0
Switzerland ($Eta^2=.07$ ***)	7.0	7.9	8.1
Optimism about the future			
France (Cramer's $V=.14$ ***)	73	75	87
Germany (Cramer's $V=.11$ ***)	75	87	87
Italy (Cramer's $V=.22$ ***)	69	78	79
Poland (Cramer's $V=.10$ ***)	86	91	95
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.30$ ***)	62	90	94
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.08$ ***)	82	86	89
Experience of a good health in general			
France (Cramer's $V=.01$ ***)	26	28	27
Germany (Cramer's $V=.19$ ***)	25	30	30
Italy (Cramer's $V=.08$ **)	25	26	26
Poland (Cramer's $V=.07$ *)	28	30	30
Sweden (Cramer's $V=.30$ ***)	20	29	31
Switzerland (Cramer's $V=.09$ *)	26	27	28

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

Regarding happiness, in Table 9 we can see a clear pattern that occurs in all countries: The stronger the connection to the labour market, the more likely it is that you are happy and vice versa; the weaker the relation to labour market, the less likelihood of experienced happiness. The differences are particularly significant between the long-term unemployed and the other two groups. In the latter case, France differs from the

other countries. The group of precarious young adults in France is closer to the group of unemployed than to the employed. This may be interpreted as having a job is always better for well-being, even if it is just a temporary job; to be in a precarious situation is better than being long-term unemployed. One particular difference between the countries is the level of happiness, especially when it comes to the unemployed. The highest levels of happiness in this group are found in Switzerland and Italy and the lowest levels are found in Sweden and France.

Concerning the level of optimism about the future the same pattern applies: The stronger the connection to the labour market, the greater the proportion who are optimistic about the future. We can also see that the percentage of optimists within the groups of the precarious and the employed are rather similar to those of the long-term unemployed. France is an exception in this aspect too. A comparison between the countries shows that the greatest differences are found in the group of long-term unemployed, with the highest level of optimism in Poland and the lowest in Sweden.

With regard to health in general, the pattern noted for previous aspects is repeated here. Sweden stands out with the highest health rate in the group of employed, and the lowest health rate in the group of unemployed.

To summarize, we can see that a similar pattern is dominating in all countries. The stronger the connection to the labour market, the more likely it is that you are happy, optimistic about your future and that your health is good, and vice versa – the weaker the link to the labour market, the less likelihood of happiness, optimism and health. The differences are particularly large between long-term unemployed and the other groups. However, this does not mean that most long-term unemployed people are unhappy, pessimistic and unhealthy. On the contrary, even in this group most people are happy, optimistic and healthy.

Summary and conclusion

Long-term unemployed young adults in Europe are not a homogenous group. They differ in a variety of aspects; their socio-demographic background, their attitudes to work, employment and unemployment, their experiences of social and political exclusion vary as well as their experiences of well-being.

Relation to work and unemployment

Most young people in Europe seem to be of the opinion that having a paid work is very important. Over 90 percent in most categories agree with this statement. The exceptions are all categories in Poland and the long-term unemployed in Sweden who show slightly lower figures. In most countries the regularly employed values work most. Corresponding to this, the proportion who agrees that they would stop working immediately if they won a large sum of money, lies between 13 and 28 percent. France is an exception with levels over 50 percent.

Italy and Sweden have the greatest proportion who agree that being unemployed is one of the worst things that can happen to a person. Only just above 20 per cent of the unemployed in most of the countries would stop working if they won a large sum of money. Here the exceptions are Sweden and France where 30 and 54 per cent respectively would stop working. In France, Poland and Switzerland about half of the respondents says that the most important things that happen in life do not involve work. Corresponding figures are much lower in the other countries.

A preliminary interpretation of the results indicates that the level of work orientation is strong in all countries. Focusing on the long-term unemployed, we can conclude that the most work oriented unemployed are found in Germany and Italy, followed by those in Sweden and Switzerland, while work orientation is the least widespread among long-term unemployed in France and Poland.

Regarding the importance of work as an entrance ticket to adulthood from a gender perspective, it is clear that all categories rank the importance of work higher for men than for women. A job is not as important for a woman to be seen as an adult as it is for a man.

In almost all countries, the long-term unemployed value work higher as a criterion for adulthood than other categories, although the level of importance is consistently higher in France, Italy and Switzerland than in Germany, Poland and Sweden when focusing on women. Looking at men, the importance of work for adulthood is highly valued in all countries except Sweden. In terms of whether it is important to have a job when you have children under 3, all categories have ranked the importance higher for men than for women.

Between 49 and 70 percent in all groups in all countries except Sweden agreed to that a woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family. In Sweden only 14 to 27 percent agreed with this statement. Most people in all categories, however, thought that men should take as much responsibility as women for their home and children. As regards handling the situation when work is scarce, we can again conclude that the gender equality concept is not very widespread among young adults in Europe. It appears that a relatively large proportion in most countries think that men have more right than women to available jobs.

Social exclusion

Regarding social relations, the results show that the weaker the links with the labour market, the fewer social contacts people have. There is a significant correlation between a low number of social contacts and labour market status in four countries. The exceptions are France and Poland. Both these countries are characterized by high percentage of people with low numbers of social contacts in all groups. For the precarious and regularly employed these countries also have the highest number of contacts. Among the long-term unemployed, Poland and Sweden have the highest share of people with a small social network. We can also see that the smallest proportion with few social contacts among the unemployed is found in Switzerland.

With respect to participation in social activities we can see the same pattern, with a significant correlation with labour market status in the same countries as above. Again, this connection is missing in France and Poland. In three of the countries (Germany, Sweden and Switzerland) that have this correlation there is a large gap between the figures for the long-term unemployed and the other groups; the long-term unemployed participate in social activities to a much smaller extent than they do in the other groups. Concentrating on this group, we can conclude that the highest proportion of those who take part in social activities more seldom than most people in their age can be found in Sweden and Germany, and the lowest in France and Switzerland.

Concerning discrimination and labour market status, there is a correlation in Germany, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland which indicates that the weaker the connection to the labour market, the more likely people are to feel discriminated. If we look at the group of unemployed people, Sweden and Switzerland have the largest proportion that feel discriminated, while the proportion is lowest in Italy and Poland.

Regarding social contacts, it can be concluded that the group of long-term unemployed in all the countries are in a vulnerable situation and run the risk of social exclusion.

Political exclusion

It can be concluded that most of the young people in the study are not very interested in politics. According to our results, there is a significant correlation between labour market status and political interest in all countries except for Switzerland. This correlation, however, takes different forms in different countries. In France, Italy and Switzerland the lack of interest is greatest among the regularly employed while it is greatest among the long-term unemployed in Germany, Poland and Sweden. In all countries except for Poland precarious young people appear to be the most interested in politics.

Regarding the statement about the political parties' interest in the electorate, between 18 and 56 percent agree that the parties are only interested in people's votes and not in their opinions. Here too, a correlation with labour market status can be found in all countries except Switzerland.

With respect to trust in government there is a correlation with labour market status in Germany, Poland and Sweden which indicates that the stronger the connection to the labour market the more trust to the government. The lowest degree of trust is found among long-term unemployed in Poland and the highest degree of trust can be seen among regularly employed in Sweden.

With regard to political exclusion we have concluded that the level of politically exclusion is highest among the long-term unemployed. However, it is not clear where the highest level of political inclusion can be found; among the regularly employed or among the precarious.

Well-being

The results show that a similar pattern dominates in all countries; the stronger the connection to the labour market, the more likely it is that you are happy, optimistic about your future and that your health is good and vice versa – the weaker the relation to the labour market, the less likelihood of happiness, optimism and health. The differences are particularly marked between long-term unemployed and the other groups. However, this does not mean that most long-term unemployed people are unhappy, pessimistic and unhealthy. On the contrary, even in this group most people are happy, optimistic and healthy.

Regarding happiness, we can see a clear pattern that occurs in all countries: the stronger the connection to the labour market, the more likely it is that you are happy and vice versa – the weaker the relation to labour market, the less likelihood of experienced happiness. The differences are particularly significant between the long-term unemployed and the other two groups. In the latter case France differs from the other countries. The group of precarious young adults in France is closer to the group of unemployed than to the employed people. This may be interpreted as having a job is always better for the well-being, even if it is only a temporary job; to be in a precarious situation is better than being long-term unemployed. One particular difference between the countries is the level of happiness, especially when it comes to the unemployed. The highest levels of happiness in this group are found in Switzerland and Italy and the lowest levels are found in Sweden and France.

Looking at the level of optimism about the future the same pattern applies: the stronger the connection to the labour market, the greater the proportion who is

optimistic about the future. We can also see that the share of optimists within the groups of the precarious and the employed are rather similar compared to the long-term unemployed. France is an exception in this aspect, too. A comparison between the countries shows that the greatest differences are found in the group of long-term unemployed, with the highest level of optimism in Poland and the lowest in Sweden.

Concerning health in general, the pattern we noted regarding previous aspects is repeated here. Sweden stands out with the highest health rate in the group of employed, and the lowest health rate in the group of unemployed.

Concluding statements

Overall, the results of this study can be concluded in the following statements:

- Long-term unemployed young adults in Europe are not a homogenous group.
- A paid job is very important for all categories of young people.
- The gender equality concept is not very widespread among young adults when it comes to work and employment.
- Long-term unemployed young adults are in a vulnerable situation and run the risk of social exclusion.
- Long-term unemployed young adults can be described as a politically excluded group.
- Long-term unemployed young adults are likely to experience low levels of well-being.

Although, these patterns characterize all countries, there are also differences between them that need to be examined on national level.

References

- Dalton, R.J. (1988); *Citizen Politics in Western Democracies: Public Opinion and Political Parties in the United States, Great Britain, West Germany, and France*. Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House Publishers.
- Goldberg, D.P. (1972): *The Detecting of Psychiatric Illness by Questionnaire – A technique for the identification and assessment of Non-psychotic Psychiatric Disease*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hedenus, A. (2011): *At the End of the Rainbow – Post-winning life among Swedish lottery winners*. Gothenburg: Studies in Sociology No 45, University of Gothenburg.
- Jahoda, M. (1982): *Employment and unemployment. A social-psychological analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milbrath, L.W. (1965): *Political participation: how and why do people get involved in politics*. Chicago.
- Nordenmark, M. (1999): 'Employment Commitment and Psychological Well-Being among Unemployed Men and Women.' *Acta Sociologica* 42 (2): 135-149.

WP3: National Report Switzerland

Jasmine Lorenzini

1. Introduction

The unemployment rate in Switzerland is low compared to other European countries and even youth unemployment rate remains below average. Nevertheless unemployment rose during the last decade and in particular in some canton – like Geneva who due to labor market specificities and geographical situation suffers from higher unemployment rates. In general unemployment rates are much higher in the French-speaking part of Switzerland and they also rise in the industrial areas, as well as in the border canton.

During the spring and summer 2010, the period during which we conducted the survey unemployment rates in Geneva and in Switzerland were as follows 6.92 for Geneva and 3.64 for Switzerland. Whereas regarding youth unemployment, the official statistics include the age category 15 to 24 years old and their unemployment rate is 4.16, while for our category of youth ranging from 18 to 34 the level of unemployment is 3.99¹. Regarding precarious employment it is more difficult to obtain data on precarious employment for both Geneva and Switzerland. We have some data based on a survey conducted in 2008 that we already presented in the national report relating to the institutional analysis. In Geneva there were 17'400 temporary workers all categories included and 10'300 of them are youth temporary workers, aged 15 to 39 years old. This represents a share of 7% of the overall job offer in Geneva.

The survey data we analyze in this report were collected through telephone interviews that lasted 30 to 40 minutes and that were conducted by a survey institute. The sampling was based on two different procedures. First we searched for young long-term unemployed and precarious youth through the general population of Geneva residents aged 18 to 34 years old. And then in a second-step, in order to increase the number of respondents among the long-term unemployed, we recruited young long-term unemployed willing to participate through the unemployment agencies. We also conducted interviews with regularly employed youth sampled through the general population sample. So our first sampling permitted to conduct the 320 interviews with the control group of youth regularly employed for more than one year and the 254 precariously employed youth, while it only permitted to conduct 89 interviews with long-term unemployed. We then recruited other participants being unemployed for one year

¹Source: <http://www.amstat.ch/amstat/public/index.jsp>

These data have been retrieved from the SECO (Swiss Secretariat of Economics) and include unemployment rates for the months of May, June, July, August and September 2010.

or more through letters sent to them by the unemployment agency announcing the survey and asking whether or not they were willing to participate – those who wanted had to send their phone number through a prepaid post-card through this method we received 137 phone numbers. Since the number of long-term unemployed respondents was not sufficient yet, we decided to be posted in front of the unemployment office during two weeks, the last two weeks of the month when unemployed need to hand in their job search in order to receive next month unemployment benefits, and there we recruited 274 more long-term unemployed aged 18 to 34 years old willing to answer our survey through telephone interviews. We ended up with a sample of 304 young long-term unemployed.

In the following parts of the national report on Geneva, we will present the multiple dimensions that our survey is able to address with regards to un-employment and inclusion or exclusion. Regarding the employment situation and work path followed by the respondents to our survey, we have questions related to the objective situation, as well as other questions on the subjective dimension of employment importance, stability and personal involvement. The presentation of these results will be the object of the first part of our report. Concerning the dimensions of inclusion and exclusion, we have included questions on youth social inclusion, but also on youth political participation and finally on their well-being and health. These aspects will be presented in three different parts of the reports: the social inclusion, the political inclusion and the well-being. But first we will turn to the socio-demographic composition of our sample and see who are the individuals who answered to our survey.

2. Social background

The first table we present enables us to know what is the socio-demographic composition of our sample and in particular of the specificities of the three groups. This is important in order to understand "who are the unemployed", "who are the precarious", but also "who are the regularly employed youth" in terms of gender, age, education level and migratory background. But also to understand what are the conditions, in which they live, are they living alone, do they have children living with them and how much money do they have. All these elements will be important, later on, in order to understand what are the effects of unemployment on their everyday life.

Starting with gender and age, we can see that the percentage of men and women in our three groups is more or less 50% so we have a sample composed half of women and half of men. In fact if we look at the Phi value we can see that there is no significant difference between the groups with regards to their gender composition (Phi is not significant). Whereas in the case of age, we find a connection between the age of our respondents and their employment situation (Phi is .242***, highly significant²), the younger the less numerous in the three groups and this is probably due to the high percentage of youth aged 18 to 24 years old who are still undergoing education and training. Hence our sample of unemployed is mostly composed of youth older than 25 (77%), a similar trend appears in the group of regularly employed youth where the difference is even more striking, 81% are aged 25 years old or more and only 19% are

² Phi measures the degree of association between two binary variables.

younger. The group of precarious workers is the most balanced in terms of age, with almost half and half between the two age categories. Here we start to see that a large share of precarious jobs is occupied by the younger age cohorts, not corresponding to the pattern of regular employment where older youth prevail.

Moving on to education levels, we can see that once again we have a significant relation between education level and the labour market situation (Cramer's $V = .166^{***}$, highly significant³). A large share of the unemployed, 29%, only have very basic education having only completed mandatory school or not even. Whereas in the other two groups, precarious workers and regular workers, they only represent 12% and 14%. When moving on to upper levels of education such as upper and post secondary, we see no big differences across the three groups. Only when looking at those who achieved tertiary education we can see that unemployed are fewer (21%), while regularly employed are 34% and precariously employed up to 41%. Hence we can see that among our sample of precarious workers we have highly qualified youth, above the average we could say, and that the unemployed have stopped at the lower levels of education.

Turning now to immigration and more generally to the migratory background of our respondents, we can see that there is a significant relationship between employment status and migratory history ($\Phi = .178^{***}$). In fact, among the unemployed we have a big share of non-natives, 72%, while the shares of non-natives among the other two groups are lower: 59% for the precarious and 52% for the regular workers. The unemployed are more likely to have a migratory background than the precarious or regular workers.

We have now looked at the main socio-demographic variables, let us also present other elements related to both socio-demography and living conditions. First marital status, there is a slightly significant relationship between employment status and marital status ($\phi = .101^*$), in particular the employed workers are more likely to be in a relationship (66%) while in the other two groups 55% of the unemployed and 57% of the precarious workers are in a relationship. The fact of living alone or with someone is also connected to the employment situation ($\Phi = .116^{**}$) and the relationship between the two is more significant (from 0.05 to 0.01 level). But here, the precarious are those who are more likely to live with someone rather than alone, 86% of the precarious live with someone and for the unemployed and employed, these percentages drop respectively to 75 and 78 percent. A part from living alone or not, we also looked at whether the respondents of the three groups live with children or not and we see that the unemployed (36%) and the employed (34%) are those who have the biggest share of the group living with children, while only 13% of the precarious have children living with them. Hence almost all the precarious (13% out of 14%) who live together with someone live with children. Among the employment status and the variable related to living with children we find a significant relationship ($\Phi = .226^{***}$).

³ Cramer's V measures the degree of association between two categorical variables (when having more than a four cells contingency table).

Table 1: Percentage of different categories who answered the questionnaire.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
<i>Gender</i>			
Men (1)	51%	44%	52%
Women (2)	49%	56%	48%
Phi= .148	n= 304	n=254	n=320
<i>Age</i>			
18-24 (>=1985)	23%	44%	19%
25-34(<1985)	77%	56%	81%
Phi= .242***	n=288	n=250	n=316
<i>Education</i>			
Not completed compulsory	3%	-	1%
Completed compulsory school	26%	12%	14%
Upper secondary school	43%	39%	42%
Post Secondary school	7%	7%	9%
Tertiary education	21%	41%	34%
Cramer's V= .166***	n=299	n=251	n=317
<i>Native or immigrant</i>			
Native	28%	41%	48%
Immigrant	72%	59%	52%
Phi= .178***	n=301	n=251	n=320
<i>Marital status</i>			
Single	45%	43%	34%
In partnership	55%	57%	66%
Phi= .101*	n=301	n=251	n=320
<i>Living conditions</i>			
Living alone	25%	14%	22%
Living together with someone	75%	86%	78%
Phi= .116**	n=302	n=250	n=320
<i>Parenthood</i>			
Living with children	36%	13%	34%
Living without children	64%	87%	66%
Phi= .226***	n=228	n=220	n=250
<i>Finances</i>			
Salary	23%	87%	97%
Unemployment benefits	54%	-	-
Social aid	7%	1%	1%
Family members	9%	9%	1%
Other	7%	2%	2%
Cramer's V= .539***	n=301	n=252	n=320
<i>Personal income</i>			
Mean (CHF)	2501	3264	4909
Median (CHF)	2500	2700	4500
Eta ² = .074***	n=269	n=223	n=294
<i>If unemployed</i>			
Benefiting from an active measure	40% n=284		
Have never had a paid job	93% n=304		

[†] Significance levels: NS: the relationship is not significant, *=significant on the 0.05 level, **=significant on the 0.01 level, ***=significant on the 0.001 level.

Living conditions also depend on financial situation, so let us now look at the income and sources of income of our three groups and see what we find differences across the groups. First of all, 97% of the employed live out of their salary which means that our control group serves its purpose, it is composed of workers who have good enough jobs for them to live out of their work. While for the precarious workers 87%, 10% less, live out of their salary and only 23% of the unemployed. Here it is important to note that unemployed can have what the unemployment office calls *intermediary earnings* that is salaries coming from jobs they do while still unemployed, short term jobs or internships. A part from those unemployed who receive *intermediary earnings* only 54% receive unemployment benefits and 7% receive social aid, the remaining 16% rely on private support from family members or other sources. In the other two groups, social aid, family support or other forms of help are quite rare. No surprise then that we have a significant and strong relation between the sources of income and employment situation (Cramer's V .539***).

Looking more specifically at the amount of money, mean and median, young unemployed, precarious workers and regularly employed live on we see big differences. The mean ranging from 2'500 CHF for the unemployed to 4'900 CHF for the employed and the median from 2'500 for the unemployed to 4'500 CHF for the employed, we can see that the income are in tight relation with the employment situation and that the difference between the three groups runs in proportions of half and double. Hence it is not a surprise to find that the difference between the three groups is statistically significant although the relationship is not very strong. Nevertheless the respondents wage, compared to wages in Switzerland, represent a below the median income for the region of the Lemman lake (including three cantons: Geneva, Vaud and Valais) where the median income is 5'906 CHF (rough income)⁴.

Based on the presentation of socio-demographic variables we have seen that our survey respondents differ between the three groups with regards to education level and migratory background in particular. The individuals with low levels of education are over-represented among the young unemployed, whereas among youth with a precarious employment high levels of education are over-represented. Regarding immigration, we find that two thirds of the unemployed have a migratory background, while the other two groups are closer to a half and half division corresponding to the reality of Geneva in terms of migrants' share of the population. On the financial and living conditions, we have seen that the long-term unemployed have to deal with reduced incomes and financial difficulties that are not always reduced thanks to unemployment benefits. In fact only half of the unemployed sample lives out of unemployment benefits, another quarter works and other cope with social aid, savings or private aid. Hence we start to see who the long-term unemployed and precarious workers are, we will now move on to other aspects of their lives.

⁴ Source:

http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/fr/index/themen/03/04/blank/key/lohnstruktur/nach_branche.html

Median income is based on data for the year 2008, calculating rough income for the month of October 2008 based on a full time employment.

2. Relation to work and unemployment

Now that we have gotten to know the respondents to our survey, we will turn to the relation to work that the members of the three groups have and see how youth perceive their employment situation. First in table 2, we look at employment satisfaction, among precarious and regular workers, and we can see that there are no big differences in the mean levels of satisfaction that are respectively 7.57 and 7.68. Slightly higher for the regularly employed youth, but the difference is not significant as we can see with the Eta squared score.

Table 2: Work satisfaction (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Work satisfaction in generally during the last 12 months (Eta ² =NS)	-	7.57 N=252	7.68 N=320

Moving on to hopes and fears, expectations of improving their situation or facing a worst one we look at table 3 and see that 34% of the unemployed have low hopes of getting a job, quite an important share, one third of the long-term unemployed, evaluate their chances of finding a job in a pessimistic way. If we turn to the precarious and regularly employed youth and look at their hopes of improving their employment situation we can see that 41% and 52% respectively situate their chances of finding a better job as being low. We can see that precarious workers are less likely to believe that their chances of finding a better job are low and the relation between the two variables is slightly significant (Phi .141*). Whereas concerning the fears of losing their jobs, the two groups are more similar and the relationship between the two variables is not significant. Here the picture is more positive, only 17% of the precarious and 12% of the employed have high fears of losing their job.

Table 3: Percentage of those who have low hopes of getting a job/a better job within one year and percentage of those who has high fears of losing their job

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Low hopes of getting a job	34% n=295		
Low hopes of getting a better job Phi= .141*		41% n=237	52% n=302
High fears of losing the job Phi= NS		17% n=246	12% n=318

In table 4 we try to situate employment among other important aspects of life as evaluated by the youngsters we interviewed. In particular we look at the importance given to family, friends, leisure time, politics, religion, voluntary activities and of course work which we will situate in relation to other life aspects and we can see that family is the aspect of life that has the highest importance mean for the three groups, 9.23 for the unemployed, 9.10 for the precarious and 9.36 for the employed. Hence we can say that family has the highest importance in their lives and this is true in the eye of youth pertaining to the three groups. Second in terms of importance in their lives come friends for the precarious and the employed, with means of 8.67 and 8.86, but not for the unemployed who's second most important aspect of life is work with a mean of 8.54. Their experience of unemployment led them to value work more than those who are

employed, either on a regular basis or not. In fact there is a significant difference between the three groups with an Eta square of 0.045***. Among the life aspects we examine, we can see that there is also a significant difference with the importance given to both politics and voluntary organizations. Unemployed value more voluntary organizations (6.15) than the other two groups (5.66 for both), whereas in the case of politics it is the opposite, the unemployed have the lowest mean with regards to importance of politics (4.23) while the precarious have the highest (4.96, not so high) and the regular workers come in between (4.66). But overall we can say that politics is not given a high importance, below the middle point. The only other item that has a mean of less than 5 is religion with scores very low for the 3 groups, 4.06 for the unemployed, 3.62 for the precarious and even 3.45 for the regularly employed.

Table 4: The importance of different aspects of life (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family	Eta ² = NS	9.23 n=304	9.10 n=254	9.36 n=320
Friends	Eta ² = .012**	8.43 n=304	8.67 n=254	8.86 n=320
Leisure time	Eta ² =NS	7.90 n=304	7.85 n=253	8.13 n=319
Politics	Eta ² = .012**	4.23 n=304	4.96 n=253	4.66 n=318
Work	Eta ² = .045***	8.54 n=304	7.76 n=254	7.81 n=320
Religion	Eta ² =NS	4.06 n=304	3.62 n=253	3.45 n=320
Voluntary organizations	Eta ² = .009*	6.15 n=300	5.66 n=254	5.66 n=316

In the next table, we look at work involvement through items taken from the work involvement scale proposed by Nordenmark⁵ and we can see that the proportion of respondents who say having a paid job is very important is high, 96% for unemployed and employed and 94% for the precarious. Less than 5% overall do not say that having a paid job is important, although there is a slightly significant correlation of these two variables due to a lower share of precarious saying that this is very important. Regarding other significant relationships between employment status and work involvement we have the item 'I would stop to work if I won a large sum of money' and here it is important to note that the respondents are not ready to stop working even if they had the financial opportunity to do so. Only 16% of the precarious would stop working in this case and 24% of the unemployed and 30% of those who have a regular job, the regularly employed include the bigger share of those who would stop to work in case of winning a large sum of money. Then on the next item, we find correlations between employment status and the evaluation of unemployment (Phi .148*), 53% of the unemployed say it is 'one of the worst thing that can happen to a person', while 40% of the precarious and 47% of the employed also agree with that. Here having

⁵Nordenmark, Mikael. 1999. "Employment Commitment and Psychological Well-Being among Unemployed Men and Women." *Acta Sociologica* 42:135-146.

experienced unemployment changes the perception of the unemployment and a bigger share of the unemployed say it is one of the worst thing that can happen. But the strongest relation between employment status and work involvement appears in the next item 'I quickly get bored when I have no work to do' (Phi .156**). A large majority of the unemployed agree, 83%, while 74% of the precarious and 70% of the employed also agree. Hence the more one is engaged on the labour market; the least problematic it is for him or her to occupy their free time, time out of work. For the other items we do not find correlations with employment status, half or the respondents say 'the most important things in life do not involve work' and between 50% and 60% agree with the idea that 'being without a job gives time to spend on other things' and very few agree that 'if unemployment benefit was very high they would not want a paid job to go to' and this among the three group at similar levels, around 10%.

Table 5: Percentage of those who agree to different statements about work and unemployment (5-point scale, collapsed categories "agree" and "totally agree").

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Having a paid job to go to is very important		96%	94%	96%
	Phi= .141*	n=304	n=254	n=319
If I won a large sum of money I would immediately stop working		24%	16%	30%
	Phi= .149*	n=302	n=253	n=320
Unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person		53%	40%	47%
	Phi= .148*	n=301	n=253	n=319
I get bored quickly when I have no work to do		83%	74%	70%
	Phi= .156**	n=303	n=254	n=317
The most important things that happen in life do not involve work		51%	42%	50%
	Phi= NS	n=302	n=254	n=317
Being without a job gives time to spend on other important things		57%	59%	50%
	Phi= NS	n=302	n=252	n=316
If the unemployment benefit was very high I would not want a paid job to go to		10%	10%	8%
	Phi=NS	n=300	n=246	n=313

What are the important functions of work? Having a salary, regular activities, social contacts and personal development are all considered important aspects of having a job. The least important one, as appears in table 6, is giving an identity and status and the two most important elements are the salary and personal development. Here we see both the instrumental dimension of employment, earning a living, and the personal dimension of employment through the support of personal development. Regarding the salary, 98% of the unemployed and 99% of the other two groups say it is important or very important for a job to give you a salary. On this item there is no correlation with employment status. On the personal development, not correlated to employment statuses either, 99% of the unemployed, 98% of the precarious and 97% of the employed say it is important. Social contacts come just after, still above 90% of agreement among our respondents. Moving on to the identity and status 88% of the unemployed, 84% of the precarious and 87% of the regularly employed say it is quite or very important. The percentage is not low, but for the other 4 items we have scores above the 90%, hence we can say that status and identity are not the most important functions of work in the eyes of youth, but nevertheless they count as well. Finally we should stop to note that the only item correlated with the employment status is 'regular

activities' in fact the Phi is .124* in this case, but the significance is low and the strength of the relation as well.

Table 6: Percentage of those who consider different functions of work as being important (4-point scale, collapsed categories "quite important" and "very important").

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The salary	Phi= NS	98% n=304	99% n=254	99% n=320
Regular activities	Phi= .124*	92% n=303	91% n=254	92% n=318
Social contacts	Phi= NS	94% n=304	97% n=253	94% n=320
Gives an identity and status	Phi= NS	88% n=302	84% n=254	87% n=316
Personal development	Phi= NS	99% n=299	98% n=253	97% n=319

The importance of working and having a paid job might vary according to gender and in particular due to different attitudes towards men's and women's involvement in paid job. In the tables below, we look first at the importance of having a paid job for men and women to be considered adults, and then also at the different attitudes towards full time job for men and women who have a family, who have children. Then, in table 8, we will turn to the question of work and family conciliation more specifically.

As mentioned we first examine differences across the three groups in the importance given to having a full time job for men and women in order to be considered adults. The means between the three groups are significantly different when we compare the answers related to men full time jobs, as well as women full time jobs (η^2 of respectively .039*** and .025***) and we can see that the group of unemployed has the highest mean in the two cases, 8.00 and 7.09 as opposed to 6.71 and 6.96 for the means of precarious and regularly employed on men full time job and 6.00 and 6.41 on women full time job. Hence the unemployed are those who agree most with the idea that having a full time job is important for both men and women in order to be considered adults. Nevertheless it is worth mentioning also that the mean agreement with these propositions drops from almost 1 point between men and women, unemployed consider that having a full time job is less important for women to be considered adults. In the other two groups we find a similar pattern precarious and employed agree less in the case of women than men that a paid full time job is important to be considered adults.

Then if we consider the importance of a full time job for men and women who have children, we can see that the agreement with having a full time job for those who have young children is not the same if the worker is a man or woman, it varies from 7.78 for men and 5.94 for women in the answers of long-term unemployed, the mean approval towards women working while having young children is 1.84 points lower than for men. The same tendencies appear in the answers of precariously and regularly employed youth, 7.66 and 6.55 for the precarious and 7.69 and 6.43 for the employed, although the differences are smaller, respectively 1.10 and 1.26. The differences between the

means of the three groups are only significant in the case of women. Overall it is important to note that respondents' approval is lower regarding women who have small children and work full time.

Table 7: Attitudes to the importance of having a full time job for men and women to be considered adults, with and without small children (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The importance a full time job to be considered an adult for men Eta ² = .039***	8.00 n=293	6.71 n=252	6.96 n=315
The importance a full time job to be considered an adult for women Eta ² = .025***	7.09 n=290	6.00 n=250	6.41 n=313
Approval of men with children younger than 3 having a full time job Eta ² =NS	7.78 n=297	7.66 n=250	7.69 n=317
Approval of women with children younger than 3 having a full time job Eta ² = .008*	5.94 n=298	6.55 n=248	6.43 n=315

In the next table, we dig more into the question of gender equality and find that around 50% of all the respondents agree with the idea that women should reduce their paid work when having a family. Here we do not find differences across the three groups, no correlations between the employment status and the item. Although more than 90% in all groups say that men should take as much responsibility as women in the family. Once more the relation between the item and the three employment statuses is not statistically significant. Finally, low percentages agree that men should be favoured on the labour market when job are scarce, only 10% of the employed agree and 11% of the precarious workers. The percentage rises for the unemployed with 19% of agreement. In this case, there is a correlation with employment situation, respondents who are out of job are more likely to say that men should be first to obtain jobs in cases when job are scarce.

Table 8: Percentages of those who agree to different statements regarding the roles of men and women (4-point scale, collapsed categories "agree" and "totally agree").

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family. Phi= NS	54% n=303	50% n=249	51% n=316
Men should take as much responsibility as women for their home and children. Phi= NS	93% n=302	93% n=254	97% n=320
When jobs are scarce, men should have jobs in the first place. Phi= .215***	19% n=300	10% n=250	11% n=317

In these tables we have seen that satisfaction with work is high in the case of both precarious and regularly employed and that they are committed to work and consider it an important dimension of their social life. Employment structures their day and gives them opportunity for personal development and social contacts. Here we can see that employment is more than work and salary, it is a social activity valued for the multiple resources it brings and for the recognition inherent to employment status. Whereas for the unemployed, although they evaluate quite pessimistically their chances of finding a job they remain committed to employment, work is the second most important element in their lives after family and before friendship. Far from the idea that long-term unemployed get disconnected to employment, we can see that they remain involved with employment and would like to re-enter the labor market for other reasons than financial ones as we have seen through the work involvement scale. What about their social life? Did they remain connected to their family and friends? We will turn to these questions in the next part of the report.

3. Social exclusion

In this section we will analyze the social exclusion or inclusion of youth in Geneva. We will look at friendship, social contacts, social activities and insertion in networks of help giving and receiving. This will enable us to see the impact of employment situation on other life dimensions and start to look into the question whether unemployment affects social inclusion.

In table 9 we can see that long-term unemployed have fewer friends, 3% if they do not have any friends, while only 1% of the employed and no precarious say they do not have friends, and 17% only have 1 or 2 friends, while 8% of the precarious and 12% of the employed say so. Consequently, the percentage of the unemployed who have more than 7 friends is the lowest of all three groups with 22% compared to 37% and 29% respectively for the precarious and the employed. The relationship between employment status and number of friends is statistically significant, although not very strong (Cramer's $V = .123^{***}$). The unemployed having fewer friends and the precarious being those who have the highest number of friends, more than the employed youth.

Table 9: Percentage of those who have different number of friends⁶.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
None	3%	-	1%
1-2 people	17%	8%	12%
3-7 people	58%	55%	58%
More than 7 people	22%	37%	29%
Cramer's $V = .123^{***}$	n=303	n=251	n=320

A part from having more or less friends, it is important to look at the frequency of contacts with different groups of people. In table 10 we look at the percentages of those

⁶ We specified in the question what we intended by friends: 'people with whom they feel well and can talk about private issues or ask for help if necessary'.

who have not seen family, friends or acquaintances during the last month and here we find that all three relations are significant, although not very strong (Phi .148*; .158*** and .156**). Among the unemployed we find the higher percentages of respondents who say they have not once met their family (18%), their friends (6%) or their acquaintances (11%) during the last month. The numbers are considerably lower for the precarious and for the employed, respectively 10 and 12% did not see their family and only 2 and 3% did not meet with their friends during the last month. Meeting their acquaintances is also a way of looking at the breadth of social relations and here again the long-term unemployed are a bigger share that did not meet them 11%, while only 3% of the precarious did not meet acquaintances and a bigger share of the regularly employed with 8%.

Table 10: Percentage of those who have not met different categories of people during the last month.

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family members not living in the household	Phi= .148**	18% n=304	10% n=254	12% n=319
Friends not living in the household	Phi= .158***	6% n=304	2% n=253	3% n=318
Acquaintances not living in the household	Phi= .156**	11% n=302	3% n=252	8% n=320

Even more important might be the possibility of receiving help from someone in case one needs it. Hence in the next table we look at the percentages of respondents who received help from various persons during the last year. First of all we find a significant relation between employment status and receiving help from no one, Phi .103*, although the relation is not highly significant and not very strong it is surprising since long-term unemployed are those who might be more in need of help due to their employment situation and they are those who have the higher percentage of respondents who did not receive help during the last year with 55% as opposed to the 49% of the precarious and 43% of the employed.

Table 11: Percentage of those who did not receive help from different categories of people during the last 12 months.

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one	Phi= .103**	55% n=304	49% n=253	43% n=318
Partner	Phi= NS	25% n=131	21% n=125	19% n=180
Family members (not in the same household)	Phi= NS	12% n=136	7% n=128	7% n=182
Friends	Phi= NS	4% n=137	4% n=128	7% n=182
Acquaintances	Phi= NS	29% n=137	23% n=128	26% n=182
Colleagues or former colleagues	Phi= .216**	48% n=137	36% n=128	30% n=182
Neighbors (not being friends or acquaintances)	Phi= NS	59% n=137	55% n=128	54% n=182

Whether we look at receiving help from partner, family or acquaintances we always find that the unemployed are those among which a larger share did not receive help from them. If we take family as an example we see that 12% of the unemployed did not receive help from them, while only 7% of the other two groups did not receive help from their family. A similar pattern is found with help received from former colleagues, among the unemployed 48% did not receive help from former colleagues, while the precarious were 36% and the employed only 30% not to receive help from colleagues. Here the relation between the two variables significant and quite strong ($\Phi = .216^{**}$), this is not surprising since long-term unemployment might lead to reduction and even cutting of ties with former colleagues. In the case of friends the situation is a bit different, the employed being those who did not receive help from friends in a bigger proportion 7% as opposed to 4% for the other two groups.

Social inclusion is not only related to receiving help, but also as in any form of social relationship, offering back one's help. Hence in table 12 we look at the percentage of respondents who have not offered their help during the last 12 months to the same persons presented in table 11. Between one third (for the unemployed) and one fourth (for the regularly employed) of the respondents did not provide help during the last 12 months. There is no correlation between offering help and the employment status.

Table 12: Percentage of those who did not offer help to different categories of people during the last 12 months.

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one		33%	28%	25%
	$\Phi = .NS$	n=303	n=252	n=320
Partner		27%	22%	22%
	$\Phi = NS$	n=202	n=178	n=237
Family members (not in the same household)		16%	8%	8%
	$\Phi = .150^*$	n=204	n=182	n=239
Friends		6%	2%	3%
	$\Phi = NS$	n=204	n=181	n=239
Acquaintances		21%	12%	18%
	$\Phi = NS$	n=202	n=182	n=236
Colleagues or former colleagues		37%	30%	23%
	$\Phi = .159^*$	n=203	n=182	n=239
Neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances)		57%	49%	54%
	$\Phi = NS$	n=204	n=182	n=239

Friends and family are the two categories for which it is less likely that the respondents did not provide help during the last 12 months, only 6% (for the unemployed) to 2% (for the precarious) did not provide help to friends. Regarding the family, the share is a little bit higher with 16% of the unemployed who did not provide help to them, while 8% of the precarious and regularly employed did not provide help to their families. Here the relation between the two variables is slightly significant with a Φ of $.150^*$ meaning that indeed the unemployed have been less engaged in helping their family than the other two groups. On the other items, not surprisingly the persons to whom the respondents are more likely not to have offered help are the neighbours, across all three groups and again as expected there is a difference between the three groups in terms of help proposed to the colleagues and former colleagues. Among the unemployed, 37% did not help former colleagues, whereas 30% of the precarious did not and 23% of the

regularly employed. Here we can see that being without a job or in a precarious job position also involves not being tightly connected to colleagues. In the case of precarious it might be due to the frequency of changes in their employment situation and for unemployed it might be related to their distancing from former colleagues.

Giving and receiving help is a broad category, we also included a more specific one related to a specific form of help that the unemployed and precarious youth might be confronted with, having to borrow money. In table 13 we look at the difficulty that borrowing money represents and in table 14 at the percentages who have had to borrow money and to whom they turn.

Table 13: People sorted by how difficult or easy it would be to borrow money if they were in serious financial difficulties (percentage).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Very difficult	39%	17%	21%
Quite difficult	37%	36%	35%
Quite easy	20%	38%	34%
Very easy	4%	9%	10%
Cramer's V= .177***	n=300	n=248	n=312

In table 13 we see that the unemployed have more difficulties in borrowing money, 39% say it would be very difficult, while only 17% of the precarious say so and 21% of the regularly employed. This might be due to the social environment of the individuals; long-term unemployed as we have started to see above have fewer friends and are less integrated in some specific exchange networks. Hence this might lead to more difficulties in borrowing money. It might also be due to the homogeneity of their groups of pairs and family, if other persons also face difficult situations in terms of employment it might be more difficult to borrow money from them or it might be due to the fact that during their year or more of unemployment they already had to borrow money and now it becomes more and more difficult. We won't be able to know which is the cause of this difficulty, but these were some potential explanations. We also see in table 13 that the relationship between the two variables, difficulty of borrowing money and employment status, is statistically significant although the correlation is not very strong (Cramer's V .177***).

In table 14, we see what are the proportions of members of the three groups who did borrow money, 38% of the unemployed and 24% of the precarious, while only 11% of the regularly employed borrowed money during the last 12 months. Here we have a steady decrease in the percentages who have borrowed money when we move from one category to the next, so we can say that both unemployment and precarious employment can lead to financial difficulties and here the relationship between the two variables is not only highly significant, but also quite strong (Phi .262***).

We will also look at who are the persons from which our respondents borrow money. In this aspect there are no significant correlations between the variables, all three groups seem to turn to the same persons when they need to borrow money. First of all they turn towards their family, 75% of the unemployed, 72% of the precarious and 56% of the employed ask their family when they need to borrow money. Then come their friends

and only in the third position their partners, this might be due either to the fact that not all the respondents indeed have a partner or to the fact that the partner is already helping and unable to lend money or that he or she is in a similar situation. We also see in table 14 that borrowing money to persons that are not in the closest circles of relationships is more rare, 5 to 8% borrow money to their neighbours and 12 to 14% to their colleagues.

Table 14: Percentage of those who have borrowed money from someone during the past 12 months and from whom they have borrowed the money.

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Have borrowed money during the past 12 months	Phi= .262***	38% n=302	24% n=252	11% n=320
From their partner	Phi= NS	49% n=109	41% n=59	33% n=36
From family members (not in the same household)	Phi= NS	75% n=114	72% n=60	56% n=36
From friends	Phi= NS	57% n=114	60% n=60	42% n=36
From acquaintances	Phi= NS	19% n=114	22% n=60	17% n=36
From colleagues or former colleagues	Phi= NS	12% n=114	12% n=60	14% n=36
From neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances)	Phi= NS	5% n=114	2% n=60	8% n=36

Financial difficulties might lead to a reduced social life, in the next set of tables we analyze spare times activities such as going out, doing sports or hobbies in order to see how unemployment and precarious employment affect youngsters social life. First we look at table 15 and see how the respondent situate their social life in comparison to other persons their age and we can see that the unemployed are more likely to say that they take part in social activities 'much more seldom than most people' 9% of the respondents said so in the group of unemployed, while only 3% said so in the other two groups. Moving on to the category 'more seldom than most' the unemployed again are a bigger percentage in this category 29% as opposed to 17% for the precarious and 19% of the employed. Then the tendency is inverted in the last two answers that state the person takes part in more activities than average. The relationship between the two variables is statistically significant with a Cramer's V of .16***

Table 15: Taking part in social activities⁷.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Much more seldom than most people	9%	3%	3%
More seldom than most	29%	17%	19%
About the same	48%	57%	58%
more often than most	10%	19%	15%
Much more often than most	4%	4%	5%
Cramer's V= .16***	n=299	n=251	n=319

⁷ Here we asked the respondents to quantify the frequency of their social activities in comparison to other people of their age.

Turning then to spare time activities, we see in table 16 that the unemployed and the employed have the same percentages of respondents who are not active in any hobby or sport, 18%, while only 12% of the precarious are in a similar situation. But here the correlation between the two variables is not statistically significant. We will then look at the reasons given for the lack of spare time activities; they might not be the same across the three groups. In fact, we see in table 16 that the unemployed are much more likely to say that they cannot afford their hobbies or sports, 50%, whereas in the case of precarious this is only 10% and for the regularly employed 18%. Here we have a statistically significant and quite strong relationship between the two variables, Cramer's $V = .289^{***}$.

Table 16: People who are not active in any 'spare time' activities such as hobbies or sports and reasons why they are not active in that kind of activities (percentage).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not active Phi= NS	18% n=304	12% n=253	18% n=320
Because they have no hobby/sport	6%	16%	9%
Because they are not interested in it anymore	6%	19%	19%
Because they cannot afford it anymore	50%	10%	18%
Because of another reason Cramer's $V = .289^{***}$	39% n=54	55% n=31	54% n=57

Let us now turn to a different dimension, we will look at discriminations experienced by the respondents we interviewed and also at their perception of negative and positive stereotypes on unemployed. Discriminations and negative perceptions of the image that unemployed have in our society might also affect the way they live their unemployment and have indirect effects on their social life and social inclusion. If one is ashamed of his or her social situation and believes that others share a negative image of them, they might avoid social contacts in order to reduce negative experiences and feelings of shame.

First on the discriminations we are interested in, they can either be related to employment situation or to other socio-demographic identities such as gender, nationality and ethnicity. In a first step we look at the percentages of our respondents who suffered from discriminations and we can see that it varies across groups. In particular the unemployed are more likely to have faced discriminations; only 61% did not experience discriminations while this number rises to 90% for the regularly employed and 87% for the precarious. Hence it is not a surprise to find that the correlation between these three variables is statistically significant and quite strong, $\Phi = .325^{***}$.

Those who experienced discrimination were asked which kind of discrimination they had experienced and the most frequent answer was discriminations based on nationality in both three groups. But here be careful in the interpretation of this result since the n , the number of respondents, for the precariously and regularly employed youth are small, respectively 34 and 32 respondents had suffered from discriminations and specified the origin of it. Hence we will focus on the discriminations faced by the long-term unemployed and not make comparison among the three groups. We find that employment status is a source of discrimination for 26% of those who experienced

discriminations among the unemployed, as well as colour or race for 21% of the unemployed. The other categories listed correspond to discriminations faced by small percentages of the long-term unemployed, ranging from 8 to 2 percent. And 23% of the respondents among the unemployed have faced discriminations that we did not include or think about in our list of discriminations.

Table 17: Experiences of discrimination (percentage of those who consider themselves as belonging to a discriminated group).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No	Phi= .325***	61% n=298	87% n=252	90% n=320
Colour or race	Phi= NS	21%	18%	13%
Nationality	Phi= NS	32%	32%	41%
Religion	Phi= NS	6%	9%	6%
Language	Phi= NS	3%	-	6%
Ethnic group	Phi= NS	3%	3%	6%
Age	Phi= NS	8%	12%	3%
Gender	Phi= NS	4%	9%	9%
Sexuality	Phi= NS	2%	3%	3%
Disability	Phi= NS	3%	3%	-
Employment status	Phi= .272***	26%	6%	3%
Other	Phi= NS	23% n=117	24% n=34	22% n=32

Moving to table 18 we see the common attitudes about unemployment perceived by the three groups, in particular statements concerning the causes of unemployment, we could also talk about social judgments on the unemployed. If we look at the first two items which include negative statements about the unemployed, we can see that the unemployed are more likely to say they are present among most or many people and the two items are correlated with employment status with Phi being respectively .122*** on the item 'they are lazy' and .113** on 'they intend to take advantage of the system'. If we look at the percentages we can see that the unemployed are 54% to say that a majority of persons think 'Unemployed are lazy' as opposed to 39% of the precarious and 44% of the regularly employed. For the second statement 'unemployed take advantage of the system' the unemployed are 61% to think that the populations sees them like that, while the precarious are only 47% and the employed only 50%. On the other items, that are not correlated to employment status, we find that the difference between the three groups is reduced ranging from 44% for the unemployed to 42% among the other two groups for the item 'unemployed are passive, without initiative'. On the item 'unemployed have themselves to blame', here again the unemployed are more likely to perceive this a shared social attitude towards unemployed, 45% versus 37% for the other groups, but the correlation is not significant. In general we note that the unemployed are more likely to think that most or many people share negative conceptions of the unemployed and negative judgments about why they are in such a situation. Although the regularly employed are more likely to support the idea that people think 'the unemployed are victims of the socio-economic development'.

Table 18: Percentage of those who think that different kinds of attitudes to unemployed people occur among most or many people (4-point scale, collapsed categories “many people” and “most people”).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
They are lazy	Phi= .122**	54% n=295	39% n=249	44% n=313
They intend to take advantage of the system	Phi= .113**	61% n=299	47% n=249	50% n=317
They are passive/without initiative	Phi= NS	44% n=296	42% n=251	42% n=317
They have bad luck	Phi= NS	38% n=301	41% n=249	42% n=319
They have themselves to blame	Phi= NS	45% n=296	37% n=251	37% n=315
They have no job because of alcohol or drug problems	Phi= NS	17% n=289	11% n=251	13% n=316
They are people who have become victims of the socio-economic development	Phi= NS	58% n=293	58% n=248	60% n=317

Through this part of the national report we have looked at the social inclusion of youth in relation to their employment status. We now have a more precise picture about the social life of youth living in Geneva. We have seen that the long-term unemployed have fewer friends and reduced social activities. Although the picture is not too dark and we could see that a majority of the young long-term unemployed we interviewed remained connected to their families and friends. Moreover they have persons they can turn to in case of financial difficulties or other forms of help they would need. Nevertheless they are more isolated than the precarious or regularly employed youth and it can be difficult for them to find someone to borrow money. Overall we can say that long-term unemployment has an impact on their social life, although this effect does not appear as very strong in the dimensions we explored. In the next section we will analyze political inclusion or exclusion in order to see whether the effect of labor market inclusion is stronger in that case.

4. Political exclusion

In this part of the report we study the political exclusion or inclusion of youth and try to see whether employment status has an impact upon their political integration. The variables on politics that we included in our survey and that we present below are related to attitudes on the one hand and behaviours on the other – attitudes include for instance interest and feeling of efficacy and political behaviours are translated in multiple forms of political participation such as voting, taking part in protest or boycotting certain products for political reasons.

We start the analysis of political inclusion or exclusion with a variable on political interest. Although there are some variations between the percentages of youth who are not interested and very interested in politics among the three groups, the relationship between the two variables is not statistically significant. The unemployed are 29% to

say they are not interested at all in politics, whereas the employed are 24% and surprisingly this percentage drops for the precarious, only 19% of the precarious say they are not at all interested in politics. We find the same tendency at the other end of the table with those who are very interested in politics, the precarious being those who have the highest percentage of persons very interested in politics with 12%, while the unemployed have the lowest, 7%.

Table 19: Political interest (percentage).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not interested at all	29%	19%	24%
Not very interested	29%	33%	35%
Fairly interested	35%	37%	32%
Very interested	7%	12%	10%
Cramer's V= NS	n=303	n=252	n=319

In the next table we turn to attitudes towards citizenship and in particular what it means to be a good citizen for the respondents. As we can see in the table 20, 'supporting people who are worse off' is considered important in order to be a good citizen by a majority of respondents from the three groups, 91% for the unemployed and precarious and 92% for the regularly employed and the relationship between the two variables is not significant. Another dimension of citizenship considered important is obeying the law, 93% of the unemployed say it is important or very important in order to be a good citizen as well as 91% of the employed, the proportions drops a little for the precarious who are 87% to say it is either important or very important to 'always obey the laws and regulations'. In this case the relationship is slightly significant, but not very strong (Phi .085*).

Then come different forms of political activities, first voting is considered important by 84% of the unemployed, 88% of the employed and by 90% of the precarious, but 'being active in voluntary organizations' and 'being engaged in politics' are not considered so important by the respondents of the three groups. Concerning voluntary organizations activities around 50% of the respondents say it is important in order to be a good citizen with the highest percentage among the precarious (56%) and the lowest for the employed (46%), the unemployed stand close to the precarious with 54%. Among the unemployed almost one quarter say it is important or very important to be engaged in politics (23%), but the percentage who say so diminish in the other two groups, 20% for the precarious and 17% for the employed. Here we see that those who are most excluded from the labour market, the unemployed, are those who value more political activities as an important aspect of being a good citizen. Among these three items only 'being active in voluntary organizations' is correlated with employment status, but the relation is not very strong and not highly significant.

Finally we have not mentioned yet 'forming one's own opinion independently' and we can see in the table that this item is also considered important in order to be a good citizen, 91% of the unemployed say so and 94% of the precarious, the percentage is a little lower for the regularly employed with 89%. And here again the relationship between this item and the employment status is not significant.

Table 20: The importance of different political activities (percentages, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very important” and “quite important”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Supporting people who are worse off Phi= NS	91% n=300	91% n=250	92% n=319
Voting in elections Phi= NS	84% n=297	90% n=253	88% n=319
Obedying laws and regulations Phi= .085*	93% n=302	87% n=252	91% n=320
Forming your own opinion independently Phi= NS	91% n=295	94% n=252	89% n=319
Being active in voluntary organizations Phi= .084*	54% n=301	56% n=252	46% n=319
Being active in politics Phi= NS	23% n=300	20% n=251	17% n=319

In the next table we turn to the feeling of political efficacy that various individuals have, this feeling of efficacy depends on various elements related to social status such as education level, occupation, age and gender as well as on interest and knowledge about politics.

Here we will see whether or not there is a correlation between employment status and various items that permit to measure political efficacy. In fact we can see in table 21 that the unemployed are more likely to agree with the statement ‘parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion’, it is the case for 62% of the unemployed, whereas only 54% of the regularly employed and even only 46% of the precarious agree with the same statement. Hence we have a statistically significant correlation between the two variables although this relation is not very strong with a Phi of .129***.

Then on personal influence on politics and on the degree of complexity of politics, we do not find significant correlations between the items and the employment status. It is interesting to note that less than 30% of the regularly employed youth agree with the statement ‘people like me definitely have an influence on governmental politics’, while this percentage is higher for the precarious, 32%, and even higher for the unemployed, 35%. Hence we have a bigger percentage of persons who believe they can have an influence on the way the government political orientations among the unemployed than among the precariously or regularly employed youth. But at the same time, the unemployed are those who have the biggest percentage of respondents who agree with ‘sometimes politics is so complicated that people like me do not understand anymore what is going on’. Here we have 74% of the unemployed who agree with it, while only 68% of the employed and 65% of the precarious do so. Quite surprisingly the feeling that individuals can have an influence on politics and political knowledge follow different tendencies, but here again there are no significant relations between the two items and the employment status variable.

Table 21: Percentage of those who agree in different statements about political efficacy (4-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion Phi= .129***	62% n=298	46% n=250	54% n=317
People like me definitely have an influence on governmental politics Phi= NS	35% n=297	32% n=247	29% n=311
Sometimes politics is so complicated that people like me do not understand anymore what is going on Phi= NS	74% n=304	65% n=251	68% n=319

In the next two tables we deal with the questions of trust and satisfaction in/with different institutions. We measured individuals' trust in institutions through a scale ranging from 0 to 10 and here we present the means for each institution per group. And for the items measuring satisfaction with how the government deals with different issues, we proceeded in the same way.

First in table 22 we present trust in various institutions at the local, regional and national levels. We will start with the highest means and then turn to the significant differences between the groups in order to make sense of this table. First come the Courts with the highest mean trust for all three groups: 6.27 for the unemployed, 6.63 for the precarious and 6.84 for the employed a second come the trade unions for the unemployed (6.24), but not for the precarious who have a mean trust towards the trade unions of 6.08 and 5.98 for the regularly employed. This result is quite surprising since historically the trade unions were not able to protect and attract the unemployed; they focus on the employed and job protection. Moreover they also have difficulties in reaching the precarious; nevertheless they have a highest mean score for trust among the unemployed and among the precarious than in the group of regularly employed. This might be due to age or to the contacts or absence of contacts they had with members of the three groups. Still on the second position the police comes second for the other two groups 6.82 for the regularly employed and 6.22 for the precarious, only 6.13 for the unemployed.

If we move now to the other end of the table, those institutions in which youth trust the least, we find religious institutions and this finding corresponds to the previous result that religion is not an important dimension in youth lives. The media are another institution in which youth do not trust. Concerning religion we have a mean of trust for the unemployed of 3.94 and respectively 3.66 and 3.82 for the precarious and regularly employed. This mean level of trust is way below the 5, the middle point of our scale, so we can say that youth are rather distrustful of religion. For the media, the sentence is not more clement, youth give an average trust score between 4.28 and 4.68 to the media, closer to the middle point of our scale but still rather distrustful. The unemployed are those who trust the media the least and the regularly employed the most trustful towards them.

Table 22: Trust in different parts of the political system (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Civil servants	Eta ² = .011**	5.51 n=303	5.93 n=251	6.05 n=315
Geneva city government	Eta ² = NS	5.45 n=279	5.49 n=235	5.79 n=301
Geneva city parliament	Eta ² = .010**	5.37 n=288	5.76 n=241	5.86 n=305
The police	Eta ² = .017***	6.13 n=304	6.22 n=253	6.82 n=318
Geneva cantonal parliament	Eta ² = NS	5.50 n=289	5.80 n=242	5.85 n=307
Geneva cantonal government	Eta ² = .008*	5.55 n=290	5.84 n=242	6.02 n=308
Religious institutions	Eta ² = NS	3.94 n=297	3.66 n=244	3.82 n=306
Swiss government	Eta ² = NS	5.59 n=293	5.79 n=246	5.91 n=310
The courts	Eta ² = .011**	6.27 n=300	6.63 n=248	6.84 n=312
Swiss parliament	Eta ² = NS	5.69 n=294	6.00 n=245	6.10 n=308
The institutions of the European Union	Eta ² = NS	5.10 n=294	5.33 n=241	5.18 n=307
Employers and enterprises	Eta ² = .020***	5.47 n=298	5.75 n=249	6.15 n=317
The media	Eta ² = NS	4.28 n=304	4.55 n=253	4.68 n=316
Trade unions	Eta ² = NS	6.24 n=298	6.08 n=245	5.98 n=311

All the political institutions come in between these two extremes; the local, regional and national parliament and government have scores around 5.5 among the three groups. They all have mean trust scores just above the middle point and the Swiss parliament is the one that gets the best score with 5.69 among the unemployed, 6.00 among the precarious and 6.10 among the regularly employed. The mean levels of trust of the political institutions included in this battery are difficult to classify as trustful or distrustful, they are on the average.

In this last paragraph, we will look at the differences among the three groups and in particular at those that are statistically significant. First we should say that although we find some significant differences between the three groups all are small⁸. The most important difference in trust is that towards employers and enterprises, not surprisingly those who have a regular job are more trustful towards them (6.15) that are the precarious (5.75) or the unemployed (5.47). Another difference appears in the trust towards the police, the unemployed are less trustful of the police (6.13) than the other two groups (6.22 and 6.82), as well as differences in the trust towards the courts and the Parliament of the city of Geneva. But more interestingly there is a significant difference in the trust towards civil servants and unemployed have the lowest mean trust towards them, 5.51, while the two other groups are quite close at 5.93 for the precarious and 6.05 for the employed. Here it might be linked to experiences that the

⁸ Eta square scores around .01 are considered small.

unemployed might had with civil servants, not all positive, which affected their overall trust towards them as a group.

Moving on to table 23, we will look at the mean levels of satisfaction with the way democracy works and with the way the government deals with different issues. Satisfaction with the way democracy works is highest among the regularly employed youth with a score of 7.02, whereas in the two other groups the score is 6.42 for the unemployed and 6.64 for the precarious youth and here the difference is statistically significant, although it is quite small (Eta squared .015***). Nevertheless among the three groups satisfaction with the way democracy works is quite high.

Table 23: Satisfaction with democracy and with government management of different issues (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The way democracy works	Eta ² = .015***	6.42 n=299	6.64 n=252	7.02 n=315
Economy	Eta ² = NS	5.99 n=297	6.14 n=248	6.19 n=316
Poverty	Eta ² = .009*	4.81 n=299	5.01 n=246	5.32 n=311
Education	Eta ² = NS	6.60 n=299	6.70 n=251	6.66 n=317
Unemployment	Eta ² = .018***	5.01 n=302	5.47 n=250	5.68 n=311
Health care	Eta ² = NS	6.23 n=302	6.24 n=252	5.99 n=317
Precarious employment	Eta ² = .015**	4.68 n=285	5.05 n=236	5.26 n=298
Environment/ Sustainable development	Eta ² = NS	6.56 n=300	6.33 n=250	6.41 n=317
Youth	Eta ² = NS	5.59 n=301	5.83 n=245	5.91 n=310

Turning to more specific degrees of satisfaction based on government actions in different issue fields we find more diversity. Starting with the items poverty, unemployment and precarious employment, we can see that the unemployed are less satisfied with the way the government deals with these issues. In particular on unemployment the unemployed have a mean score of 5.01, while for the precarious satisfaction raises to 5.47 and for the employed to 5.68. Also on precarious employment the mean satisfaction varies, it ranges from 4.68 for the unemployed to 5.05 for the precarious and 5.26 for the regularly employed and similar trends appear in the mean satisfaction related to how the government deals with poverty, 4.81 for the unemployed and 5.01 for the precarious and 5.32 for the employed. Differences in the means of these three items are statistically significant, but again with low scores. Nevertheless they tell us that youth who do not pertain to the labour market in a stable way are less satisfied with the way the government deals with issues related to employment and to financial living conditions or poverty. Whereas we can use issues such as education or health to control for tendencies among unemployed, and to a certain extent among precarious, to be less satisfied. And here we see that the unemployed and the precarious do not differ significantly from the employed on their mean satisfaction towards how the government deals with these issues. Hence we can say that the lower

satisfaction on questions of employment and poverty are related to youth employment situations that make them evaluate differently specific government actions.

In the preceding tables we have looked at the attitudes; let us now move on to the behaviors of youth in the political field. First we will examine voting patterns at both the local and national levels and then turn to other forms of political participation with a battery of 15 types of political participation, including group activities, contacting politicians and taking part in a strike that respondents could have undertaken in the last year.

Table 24: Participation in elections (percentage of those who voted in the last elections, only among those eligible to vote).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Voted at last national election	Phi= NS	49% n=164	60% n=148	49% n=179
Voted at last local election	Phi= NS	35% n=131	46% n=125	41% n=153

On voting, we see in table 24 that there are no significant differences among the three groups in terms of voting behaviours, neither at the national nor at the local levels. We also see that the precarious are those who participate the most through voting, 60% voted at the national level and 46% did so at the local level, whereas 49% of the unemployed and the regularly employed did so at the national level and 35% of the unemployed and 41% of the employed at the local level. Overall half of the respondents said they voted, but this numbers have to be taken cautiously since we know that respondents tend to overstate their voting turn out while answering to survey due to the perceived social desirability of voting. In general, voting turn out in Switzerland is lower than 50% and it is surprising to find a 50% turn out among youth.

Then table 25 presents other forms of political participation such as contacting, protesting and buying or boycotting certain products for political reasons. If we look first at differences across groups we can see that there are few items of political participation on which the three groups differ. We only have 'signing a petition', 'taking part in public demonstrations', 'contacting a solicitor or a judicial body' and for all of them the strength of the relation is quite limited. Concerning signing a petition the main difference lies between precarious, who have signed a petition in the last year in a larger proportion, 62%, than the other two groups who share a similar level of participation on this item (47% for the unemployed and 48% for the regularly employed). On the item on public demonstration the trend is the same, precarious are those who say they have done it during the last 12 months more than the other two groups, 25% versus 17% for the unemployed and 14% for the employed. Here the members of the group of regularly employed are those who are less active in this type of political action. Finally on the item 'contacting a solicitor or a judicial body' and here the precarious are those with the lower percentage of respondents who have done it 4% as opposed to the 7% of regularly employed and the 10% of unemployed. Here the unemployed stand out as those being most active in this type of political activity.

The political activities presented in the table below also vary in the proportion of youth they mobilize, for some 50% more or less engage in those activities and for other less

than 10% do so. The activities that are most common among youth who responded to our survey are 'signing a petition' 47% of the unemployed and 48% of the employed have done and even 62% of the precarious. This is by far the political activity undertaken by the biggest share of our sample. Then come 'boycotting certain products', from 30% of the unemployed to 35% of the other two groups, 'taking part in protest', between 25 and 14% and 'deliberately buying certain products', from 18% among the precarious to 14% among the employed and 12% among the unemployed. On the other side, those activities that include the smallest share of our sample, a part from the violent and illegal actions, we have working in political groups and taking part in strikes. These two activities might be little diffused among our sample due to the fact that they are connected to both having the resources to engage in those activities as well as being recruited for them. Youth might not yet have the resources and networks to engage in these kinds of activities. Nevertheless they engage in other demanding activities such as writing to politicians or government officially and to the medias, in small proportions between 5 and 10 percent of our sample does that, but still it is worth noting that this is not an easy task and that it demands skills and feeling of legitimacy to do so.

Table 25: Political activity (percentage of those who have taken part in different kinds of political activities).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Contacted a politician	Phi= NS	7% n=303	8% n=253	5% n=320
Contacted a national or local government official	Phi=NS	6% n=303	5% n=251	4% n=320
Worked in a political action group	Phi=NS	1% n=303	2% n=251	1% n=320
Wear or displayed a badge	Phi=NS	7% n=301	8% n=253	4% n=320
Signed a petition	Phi= .134***	47% n=303	62% n=252	48% n=318
Taken part in a public demonstration	Phi= .110**	17% n=303	25% n=253	14% n=320
Boycotted certain products	Phi= NS	30% n=302	35% n=253	35% n=320
Deliberately bought certain products for political reasons	Phi= NS	12% n=303	18% n=251	14% n=320
Donated money to a political organization or group	Phi= NS	16% 302	13% 251	14% 320
Taken part in a strike	Phi= NS	3% n=302	3% n=253	1% n=320
Contacted the media	Phi= NS	5% n=303	7% n=253	6% n=320
Contacted a solicitor or judicial body (non personal reasons)	Phi= .087*	10% n=303	4% n=252	7% n=320
Participated in an illegal action	Phi= NS	3% n=301	5% n=251	4% n=320
Participated in a violent action	Phi= NS	2% 302	2% 252	1% 320

Last for this section on political inclusion or exclusion we look at table 26 that presents organizational membership. We can see that youth overall have low levels of

engagement in various types of organizations. But perhaps the most striking result is that 30% of the unemployed are members of trade unions, as opposed to 12% of the precarious and 18% of the employed. This is quite surprising, unemployed are the group with the highest proportion of trade union members. We would need to investigate this further to understand how to explain it. Moreover the relationship between trade union membership and employment status is statistically significant, although not very strong ($\Phi = .184^{***}$). Still on table 26 we can see that youth overall are little engaged in political parties, only 4% in each group is engaged in a political party. Some of the respondents are members of other civil society organizations; the biggest share is among the precarious youth with 20% and then among the regularly employed youth with 13% and last among the unemployed with 8%. Here the relationship between membership to these other civil society organizations and employment status is statistically significant with a Φ of $.138^{***}$. But there is no way we can know what are these other civil society organizations and really interpret this result.

Table 26: *Earlier or present membership in different organizations (percentage of those who are or have been members of different kinds of organizations).*

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Political party	$\Phi = \text{NS}$	4% n=304	4% n=253	4% n=320
Trade union	$\Phi = .184^{***}$	30% n=304	12% n=253	18% n=320
Religious organization	$\Phi = \text{NS}$	7% n=304	11% n=253	6% n=320
Cooperative	$\Phi = \text{NS}$	6% n=302	6% n=251	9% n=319
Social movement	$\Phi = \text{NS}$	7% n=304	7% n=252	4% n=318
Other civil society organization	$\Phi = .138^{***}$	8% n=303	20% n=253	13% n=319

Concluding on this political dimension we can say that youth are not very interested in politics and this overall limited interest in politics is traduced in also low levels of political participation and associational membership. Youth in this political dimension do not differ much according to their position on the labour market. We have found that long-term unemployed are less satisfied with the way the government deals with certain issues and their means levels of trust towards public institutions are on the whole lower than for the other two groups. Moreover young long-term unemployed have reduced feelings of political efficacy. Nevertheless, differences in terms of political participation are minor and mainly related to the fact that the precariously employed youth are more likely to be engaged in political activities. They are the ones who differ from the other two groups. In fact, surprisingly the unemployed and regularly employed youth are quite similar in terms of political participation. These findings would need further investigation, but for now we will move on to the last dimension we explore in this report, the well-being of our respondents.

5. Well-being

The last section of this national report is dedicated to indicators permitting to measure what we called the well-being dimension and which includes health related questions as well as mental well-being and happiness related questions. As in the previous parts of this report, we will proceed with the analysis of the following tables through group comparison starting with the overall level of happiness and the general health of the respondents pertaining to the three groups.

Table 27 includes the two different, but correlated dimensions that we are addressing in this part of the report, mental well-being and health. The first item happiness is based on a question that asked the respondent to rank their degree of happiness based on a scale going from 0 to 10, 10 being very happy and 0 not happy at all. Here we can see that the unemployed have a mean happiness lower than the other two groups with 6.93 compared to 7.86 for the precarious and 8.10. More generally we can say that the degree of happiness increases with the stability of the job situation and that the differences between the three groups are statistically significant (Eta squared .072***).

Another related item is the 'optimism about the future' and here, although there is no significant relationship between the items (Cramer's V), we can see that the unemployed are slightly less numerous to say that they are very or quite optimistic about their future. The unemployed are 82% to say they are optimistic about the future, while 87% of the precarious say so and 89% of the regularly employed youth.

The last item moves on to the question of health, asking for a general statement about one's own health. Here we find a slightly significant difference between the three groups (Cramer's V .093*) and we can see that those who give a good statement about their health are more numerous among the precarious with 97%, while 95% of the regularly employed say so and only 91% of the unemployed. But we will dig more into the topic of health in the next question; this was an introduction into the question.

Table 27: Happiness (average based on a scale from 0 to 10), optimism (percentage, 4-point scale, collapsed categories "very optimistic" and "quite optimistic"), and good health (percentage, 4-point scale, collapsed categories "very good" and "good").

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Happiness Eta ² = .072***	6.93 n=302	7.86 n=252	8.10 n=319
Optimistic about the future Cramer's V= NS	82% n=300	87% n=252	89% n=318
Experience a good health in general Cramer's V= .093*	91% n=303	97% n=253	95% n=320

In fact table 28 deals with the question of health more thoroughly, through a battery of questions based on the General Health Questionnaire. We have 12 different items which try to tackle the multiple and combined effects of unemployment on health. They address questions related to anxiety, as well as to loss of sleep or self esteem. We will

start the analysis by looking at the items for which there is a statistically significant difference between the three groups and then we will move on to other striking results.

On the differences, we can see that there is one on the question of sleep, Phi .247***. The unemployed are more likely to say they 'have lost much sleep over worry' than the other two groups, with 29% as opposed to 14% for the precarious and 7% for the regularly employed. Here it is important to mention that the lack of a job is a source of worry, but also the instability regarding the employment situation as we can see through the category of precarious workers.

Table 28: General Health Questionnaire (percentage who agree to different statements concerning health, 4-point scale, collapsed categories "agree" and "totally agree").

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
I have lost much sleep over worry	Phi= .247***	29% n=301	14% n=252	7% n=320
I feel that I am playing a useful part in things	Phi=.102*	82% n=295	85% n=248	91% n=318
I feel capable of making decisions about things	Phi= NS	95% n=301	97% n=253	96% n=320
I feel constantly under strain	Phi= NS	37% n=300	36% n=249	32% n=320
I feel that I cannot overcome my difficulties	Phi= .177***	16% n=297	6% n=251	5% n=320
I am able to concentrate on whatever I am doing	Phi= NS	84% n=300	88% n=252	87% n=320
I am able to face up my problems	Phi= .124***	93% n=300	96% n=252	98% n=320
I feel unhappy and distressed	Phi= .159***	14% n=299	7% n=252	4% n=320
I have lost confidence in myself	Phi= .223***	27% n=300	11% n=252	9% n=320
I think of myself as a worthless person	Phi= .091*	8% n=299	4% n=253	4% n=318
I feel considerably happy, all things considered	Phi= .175***	84% n=299	96% n=253	93% n=319
I am able to enjoy my normal day-to-day activities	Phi= .132***	93% n=301	97% n=251	99% n=320

The second most important difference across the three groups is on the question of self-confidence (Phi .223***). On the item 'I have lost much confidence in myself' the unemployed are 27% to agree or totally agree, while this is the case for only 11% of the precarious and 9% of the employed. Here we can see that the lack of employment leads to reduced self-confidence and that it is also related to a perceived incapacity to overcome one's difficulties (Phi .177***) and to face one's problems (Phi .124***). These two items are correlated with the employment status and we can see that 16% of the unemployed 'feel they cannot overcome their difficulties' while it is the case for only 6% of the precarious and 5% of the employed youth. The differences are smaller in the case of ability to face up problems, 93% of the unemployed say they can face up, while 96% of the precarious say so and even 98% of the regularly employed. There is also a last variable that is slightly correlated to employment status 'I feel I am playing a useful part in things', Phi .102*. Here the unemployed are less likely to say so, 82% agree with this statement and not much more of the precarious, 85%, whereas the regularly

employed are 91% to think they play a useful part in things. Employment is correlated to the feeling of being useful in societies where working is such a global social event.

Employment situation also have an impact on more positive items such as 'I feel considerably happy, all things considered'. Here the relationship between the two variable is also statistically significant with a Phi of .175*** and if we look at the percentages we can see that the unemployed are 84% to agree with this statement, while more than 90% of the other two groups do so (96% for the precarious and 93% for the employed). We have a similar trend on the 'ability to enjoy day-to-day activities', far from the common idea that unemployed gives time to do other things, unemployed state that it is difficult for them to enjoy their day-to-day activities, 93% say they can, but this is lower than for the other two groups with 97% for the precarious and 99% for the employed. Here again the relationship between the two variables is statistically significant (Phi .132***).

Table 29: Percentage of those who have visited different public institutions.

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The doctor's, the hospital	Phi= .084*	67%	75%	75%
		n=302	n=252	n=319
The social service office	Phi= .239***	22%	7%	5%
		n=301	n=251	n=319
Own child's school or training agencies	Phi= .103**	36%	25%	27%
		n=303	n=252	n=318
The employment agency, job centre	Phi= .744***	79%	12%	2%
		n=303	n=251	n=319
The housing agency, own landlord	Phi= NS	18%	14%	16%
		n=303	n=252	n=319
Any other community office	Phi= NS	21%	21%	19%
		n=301	n=251	n=317

The last two tables are based on services that one can get at different public institutions and the feeling of not having received the service one was entitled to, we talk then about institutional discriminations. But let us first look at table 28 and see how many of our respondents visited the following institutions.

Table 29 shows that the unemployed are more likely to visit the social services as well as the employment office, this is not as such as big surprise, but we will need to keep it in mind while looking at the next table. On the other items the proportions of respondents who have visited them are in the same range, except for the doctor or hospital, in this case the unemployed have been fewer to visit it, only 67% compared to 75% for the other two groups. Here we might see the translation of financial difficulties in reduced access to doctors and health services; we would need to look carefully at this relation.

Hence moving to the next table 30 we can see that similar percentages within the three groups perceive they have not received services they were entitled to. In fact there are no significant correlations between the various items and the three employment statuses. Nevertheless, we can see that among the institutions that retain less satisfaction with the service received is the social service office with 46% of the unemployed saying they did not receive a service they were entitled to there. Another

institutions that is seen as not delivering the services it should is the employment agency, here few employed have gone to it, but among the unemployed and precarious youth 37% and 35% respectively say they did not receive the services they were entitled to. Just before these two institutions come the housing agency, with percentages high for the three groups, and here we can see a reflection of the housing situation in Geneva which is very bad, few housing available and great difficulties in finding accommodations. Overall we can see that within the health sector few respondents did not receive the services they were entitled to, 21% of the unemployed, 13% of the precarious and 18% of the employed.

Table 30: Percentage of those who have not got a service they feel they were entitled to when they visited the institutions below.

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, the hospital		21%	13%	18%
	Phi= NS	n=202	n=189	n=239
At the social service office		46%	35%	25%
	Phi= NS	n=65	n=17	n=16
At their own child's school or training agencies		25%	23%	24%
	Phi= NS	n=109	n=62	n=85
At the employment agency, job centre		37%	35%	57%
	Phi= NS	n=234	n=31	n=7
At the housing agency, own landlord		54%	56%	44%
	Phi= NS	n=56	n=36	n=52
At any other community office		52%	31%	36%
	Phi= .187*	n=63	n=51	n=59

Here we have been looking at youth health and well-being and found that there are relations with employment statuses. In particular, young long-term unemployed evaluate their overall happiness and health with lower scores than do the precariously and regularly employed youth. The health problems faced by long-term unemployed are mainly related to anxiety and loss of self-confidence, not surprisingly these two dimensions can easily be connected to the absence of employment. Finally, this section included an analysis of institutional discrimination and we have found that long-term unemployed do not perceive specific forms of institutional discrimination more than the other two groups. We will now try to conclude for the all report in the next section.

6. Conclusion

We have come to the concluding part of this report on youth employment situations and the related social and political exclusions as well as their health and overall well-being. Throughout the report we have gotten to know the respondents in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics, their employment situations and relations to employment and work, as well as their inclusion in networks of family and friends, the forms of political engagement they undertake and finally their mental and physical health. We will now conclude by highlighting some of the main findings concerning young long-term unemployed and precarious youth in Geneva and open the discussion towards first policy recommendations.

Regarding the socio-demographic variables, we have seen the importance of education. Among the long-term unemployed we find an over-representation of persons who did not finish mandatory school or only have basic levels of education. Emphasis should be put on the importance of qualifications, which in Switzerland can take various forms, some more scholars and some oriented towards practice. The possibilities of going through an apprenticeship should be enhanced and also offered to young unemployed in order to avoid long periods of unemployment and their negative consequences. Regarding the precarious, in Geneva, they are not precarious due to the lack of or limited education, rather they are the group amongst which we find the highest levels of scholar achievement. For them the question is rather a question of being able to enter the labor market on a long-lasting basis and to some extent to have better economic situations since we have seen that they face financial difficulties. Continuing on this financial situation question we have seen that the long-term unemployed are living on reduced incomes, face financial difficulties and often have to borrow money. The unemployment insurance does not cover all the long-term unemployed and neither does it cover all their needs for those who benefit from unemployment insurance coverage. This might be either related to the length of their unemployment – they do not receive unemployment benefits anymore – or to their status of youth – they did not have high-income jobs or no job at all which means reduced unemployment benefits.

Related to the socio-demographic questions, it is also important to note that the question of migration is an important one, young long-term unemployed are more likely to come from a migratory background and they are also more likely to face discriminations. These two elements can be related since those who had experienced discriminations have suffered from discriminations based on nationality, race or skin colour and ethnicity mainly. Fighting discriminations could also be an important element in order to reduce both long-term unemployment and its negative consequences. We should also try to see whether there is a relation between education levels and migration and try to propose ways to support both the recognition of foreign education and facilitate integration in the Swiss scholar system.

We have also seen in the table that unemployment is not related to a negative conception of employment or to, as we sometimes hear among public or everyday discourses, a lack of willingness to work. Rather, as we have seen through the work involvement scale measures, young long-term unemployed are committed to work, they want to work and they value work. We have also seen that youth see the importance of work not only for the money and financial possibilities it offers, but also for the social relationships, personal development and identity building that it permits to do. And here young-long term unemployed do not differ much from the other two groups or rather if they differ it is because they are more conscious of the value of paid work. Hence policies that try to fight the supposed 'youth unwillingness to work' and force them back to work through cuts in the unemployment benefits are condemned to miss their target.

For now we have focused on the relationship between employment and unemployment, another important question we were addressing is: what are the consequences of long-term unemployment on youth social life? In particular we have looked at social isolation and social activities, social isolation was measured through number of friends and youth encounters with them. We have seen that long-term unemployed have reduced networks of friends and that they are more likely not to be in touch with a great variety of

persons. While the precarious workers seem to be those who are most included in various groups of people and have the richer social life. Also when we look at social activities we can see that young unemployed are less active than the others and that young precarious are the most active group. Nevertheless we did not find dramatic differences in terms of social life and social networks, a majority of young unemployed remain connected. This is also important because it enables them to borrow money when they need to do so; although they mainly ask their family as the other groups due. But the long-term unemployed more seldom than the other groups ask or receive other kinds of help. In this case the unemployed might suffer from their reduced network.

We also studied the political life of youth and in particular that of long-term unemployed and precarious youth. The biggest surprise was probably to find that the precarious workers are not only those who are most interested in politics, but also those who are most active in political terms. The second surprising finding is that long-term unemployment does not have a big impact upon political attitudes and behaviours. Long-term unemployment are a little bit less trustful towards the institutions and less satisfied with the way the government deals with employment and poverty related issues, but they are not less engaged in political activities than are the regularly employed youth. The same is true for associational involvement, regarding which the long-term unemployed are even those who have the highest proportion of trade union members. Hence we cannot say that long-term unemployment leads to political apathy or political radicalism.

Finally, on health maybe here we have the dimension in which unemployment has the biggest effect. In fact long-term unemployed suffer from a reduced overall well-being and worst health conditions. In fact they are less happy and less optimistic about the future than the other two groups, as well as, related to their health, they are more prone to anxiety related problems and loss in self-confidence that can be related to the absence of a paid work. We have seen that unemployment has consequences on health and this is an important aspect to take into account when studying the consequences of long-term unemployment on other life dimensions, such as social and political inclusion.

WP3 National report Germany

Christian Lahusen and Bettina Grimmer

1. Introduction

Cologne has a relatively high unemployment rate. In 2009, the average rate was 10.6% (compared to 8.2% nationwide and 6.9% in Western Germany). Youth unemployment is also slightly higher in Cologne: whereas it was 7.8% on the national level, 8.7% of the inhabitants of Cologne aged less than 25 were unemployed. The rate of long-term unemployed was 42.6%, which was considerably above the national average (29.7%). Men are somewhat more affected by unemployment than women: 11.1% of them were without employment in Cologne (8.4% on the national level), while 10.0% of the women were unemployed in the city (7.9% nationwide). The unemployment rate of migrants without German citizenship is about twice as high as the average. It was 20.7% in Cologne and 16.6% nationwide.

Precarious employment has become an issue in Germany especially during the last ten years. Most notably the 'Hartz' reforms of social and labour market policies have led to a flexibilisation of labour market regulations. In 2007, one quarter of the overall working population were in a non-standard employment situation. During the four years after the reforms were completed, the number of temporary workers has doubled. While 1.7% of all employed worked for a temporary work agency in Cologne in 2004, the number increased to 3% in 2008 (on the national level, it increased from 1.3% to 2.5%). Nevertheless, the number of temporary workers is quite low in Germany if compared to other European countries. The most common form of precarious employment in Germany is the fixed-term contract. In 1995, 7.8% of all contracts were terminated, in 2003 12.2% and in 2008 14.9%. Among young people, this rate was even higher. 33.0% of all employees aged 35 or younger worked on the basis of a fixed-term contract.

The data on which this report is based were retrieved between October and December of 2009 through a university-related polling institute (Sozialwissenschaftliches Umfragezentrum SUZ GmbH, Duisburg). The sampling followed a multi-step strategy. The polling institute received a random pool of address data from 18-34 years old inhabitants of the municipality of Cologne. Those whose telephone numbers could be found from the public telephone register were called for computer-assisted telephone interviews. Unfortunately, a considerable part of the data was incorrect. Thus, the sampling had to be replenished by random dialling. To reach the quota of long-term unemployed respondents, the federal employment agency provided randomly drawn address data from long-term unemployed residents of Cologne aged from 18 to 34. Those whose numbers could be retrieved were also called, but again, the yield was relatively low. Hence, the polling institute sent letters to the unemployed and asked

them to contact them promising an incentive of 15 €; otherwise an interviewer would show up and ask for a face-to-face interview. Only few unemployed answered the letter, but many complied with face-to-face interviews when an interviewer came to their home. The face-to-face interviews were computer-assisted as well and are thus methodologically comparable to the telephone interviews. Finally, the survey yielded a sample of 407 regularly employed, 411 precariously employed and 329 long-term unemployed.

2. Social background

Table 1 shows the composition of the German sample with regard to socio-economic background data.

Gender: Among the long-term unemployed, there are slightly more men than women, whereas among the regularly employed, and especially among the precarious, women are somewhat overrepresented. However, gender differences between the groups are rather small.

Age: Concerning age, our sample is very unbalanced for all of the three groups. People aged from 18 to 24 are strongly underrepresented – especially among the regularly employed and the long-term unemployed. One reason for this bias could be the fact that our sampling included mainly those who have a fixed telephone network, which is less common among younger people.

Education: The distribution of different education levels among the three groups is not surprising. The unemployed have a lower educational attainment than the employed. More than two thirds of them have merely completed compulsory school or not completed compulsory school, whereas less than one fourth of the employed have left the educational system at this early stage. Differences are apparent in regard to higher educational levels too. Compared to the regularly employed, the precarious are higher educated. Almost half of them have received an academic degree.

Migration: About half of the unemployed have a migration background – either they have immigrated to Germany, or their parents or grandparents did so. Among the precarious, about one third have a migration background, and in the group of the regular employed, the rate is still lower.

Partnership: The unemployed are less often in a partnership (regardless if married or not) than the employed: slightly less than half of them are singles. In contrast, two thirds of the precarious and somewhat more of the regularly employed live in a steady relationship.

Living conditions: More than two thirds of the long-term unemployed live together with someone. Among the precarious, slightly more persons live alone, and considerably more of the regularly employed do so.

Children: Since social parenthood (more than the biological one) is an important factor determining one's living conditions, we asked our interviewees if they lived together with children. The results are very evident. Almost half of the unemployed have children living in their household, whereas more than four of five employed respondents are living without children.

Table 1: Percentage of different categories who answered the questionnaire.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
<i>Gender</i>			
Men	54.1	46.7	43.0
Women	45.9	53.3	57.0
($\Phi=0.089^{**}$) ⁹	(n=329)	(n=411)	(n=407)
<i>Age</i>			
18-24	14.9	28.7	8.6
25-34	85.1	71.3	91.4
($\Phi=0.23^{***}$)	(n=329)	(n=411)	(n=407)
<i>Education</i>			
Not completed compulsory school	11.0	0.7	0.5
Completed compulsory school	60.1	22.8	23.4
Upper secondary school	23.5	30.4	36.5
Post secondary school	0.6	1.7	3.0
Tertiary education	4.9	44.4	36.7
(Cramer's $V=0.352^{***}$)	(n=328)	(n=408)	(n=406)
<i>Native or immigrant</i>			
Native	48.9	64.3	71.2
Immigrant	51.1	35.7	28.8
($\Phi=0.186^{***}$)	(n=327)	(n=409)	(n=403)
<i>Marital status</i>			
Single	45.9	33.9	30.9
In partnership	54.1	66.1	69.1
($\Phi=0.130^{***}$)	(n=327)	(n=407)	(n=405)
<i>Living conditions</i>			
Living alone	24.1	28.9	40.2
Living together with someone	75.9	71.1	59.8
($\Phi=0.145^{***}$)	(n=328)	(n=409)	(n=405)
<i>Parenthood</i>			
Living with children	44.3	16.5	18.9
Living without children	55.7	83.5	81.1
($\Phi=0.311^{***}$)	(n=327)	(n=407)	(n=403)
<i>Finances</i>			
Salary	4.0	90.0	96.1
Unemployment benefits	79.3	1.7	0.2
Social aid	6.5	0.2	0.2
Family member	6.2	4.4	2.0
Other	4.0	3.6	1.5
(Cramer's $V=0.643^{***}$)	(n=324)	(n=411)	(n=407)
<i>Personal income</i>			
Mean (€)	617.30	1395.66	1781.21
Median (€)	500.00	1200.00	1700.00
($\text{Eta}^2=0.280^{***}$)	(n=303)	(n=367)	(n=334)
<i>If unemployed</i>			
Benefiting from an active measure/ employment measure	24.7 (n=328)		
Have never had a paid job	10.0 (n=329)		

Main source of income: For four out of five unemployed, unemployment benefits are the main source of income. They consist of payments from the unemployment insurance as well as tax-financed benefits for employable needy persons. Since the maximum

⁹ Significance levels: no star: the relationship is not significant, *=significant on the 0.05 level, **=significant on the 0.01 level, ***=significant on the 0.001 level.

duration of insurance-based unemployment benefits is one year (at least for the age group we refer to), it is assumed that all of our respondents obtain the tax-financed benefits. Social aid is only provided for those who are formally not employable. The six percent of the unemployed obtaining social aid thus belong to this group – they must have shifted from unemployment benefits to social aid during the period from summer to winter 2009, e.g. because of illness. Formally, they are currently not employable, but still looking for an employment (since this was a criterion to be included into the sample). A small minority (4%) of the unemployed lives mainly on her or his salary. According to German law, unemployed may work for some hours a week; the main amount of the salary will be subtracted from the unemployment benefits. We assume that this applies to this group (e.g., they earn 400 € from an occasional employment and obtain an additional 300 € from the labour agency in order to make their living) – another possibility is that they work in the shadow economy. Another 6 percent of the unemployed live mainly on money from family members. This rate is quite low, given the fact that taxed-financed benefits are only paid to those not being able to get support from family or household members. Hence, we assume that most of the long-term unemployed in our sample have families and/or partners with very poor financial resources. For nearly all of the regularly employed and most of the precarious, the main source of income is their salary. A small minority of them is dependent on family members. Some few of the employed rely mainly on unemployment benefits or social aid. This means they have a regular paid job, but do not earn enough money to make their living and thus obtain additional means-tested benefits from the state. For the precarious, those alternative income sources beyond the salary play a slightly bigger role than for the regularly employed. Generally, we can see that almost all of our respondents rely on individual income (be it the salary or unemployment benefits) – financial support through the family is not a major issue.

Personal income: The income of the long-term unemployed is 617 € on average. A look at their median income (500 €) reveals that more than half of them live below the (national) poverty threshold. The precarious earn nearly 1400 € at the average, and their median income is 1200 €. Hence, more than half of them do not face the risk of poverty; although they earn considerably less than the regularly employed (1781 € average).

About one fourth of the unemployed have currently been taking part in an active measure (an employment or training measure). This is consistent with the general population of this age group in Cologne. Most of the long-term unemployed have already gained experiences on the labour market. Only one of ten of them has never had a paid employment.

To sum up, we have found several characteristics in which the unemployed exceed the other groups. Compared to the employed, they are low-educated; they often have a migration background, and they often have children. These are the ‘classical’ risks of poverty, and it seems that these factors are also main obstacles for entering the labour market.

The precarious are, compared to the regularly employed, somewhat younger and a little higher educated. Less often they have children, and most of them live together with other people (mostly parents or friends). These characteristics lead to the conclusion that most of our precarious work under these conditions because they are at the stage of transition from the educational system into the labour market. Most of them do not

belong to the ‘working poor’ type of precarious workers with low chances of social mobility, instead they are only temporarily precarious. A look at their kind of contract corroborates this assumption. 82.5 percent of them have a fixed-term contract, only six percent work ‘on project’, and less than five percent have a temporary contract. Other types of atypical employment are negligible. These figures correspond closely to those of the population (see introduction).

3. Relation to work and unemployment

The following section deals with our interviewees’ relation to work and unemployment. Table 2 illustrates the general satisfaction with their work. The regularly employed are slightly more satisfied with their job, but the differences between the groups are very small.

Table 2: *Work satisfaction (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Work satisfaction in generally during the last 12 months ($\eta^2=.005^*$)		7.11 (n=410)	7.37 (n=407)

Table 3 shows future optimism of the three groups regarding their job perspectives. Almost half of the unemployed have low hopes of getting a job during the next year. In contrast, the precarious are quite optimistic: less than one fourth of them have low hopes of getting a better job during the next year – compared to 40 percent of the regularly employed. This finding again substantiates the earlier assumption about the precarious; that their employment is only a preliminary stage of their career.

Table 3: *Percentage of those who have low hopes of getting a job/a better job within one year and percentage of those who have high fears of losing their job (4-point scale, collapsed categories “low hopes” and “very low hopes”/“high fears” and “very high fears”).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Low hopes of getting a job	46.3 (n=324)		
Low hopes of getting a better job ($\Phi=-.191^{***}$)		22.5 (n=382)	40.2 (n=356)
High fears of losing the job ($\Phi=-.145^{***}$)		20.3 (n=395)	9.9 (n=405)

The next table presents the importance the different groups attach to certain aspects of life based on a scale from 0 (totally disagree) to 10 (totally agree).

Family is considered very important for the respondents. There are no significant differences between the groups. Friends are perceived as quite important as well, but the importance differs by employment status. For the regularly employed, friends are almost as important as family is, whereas for the precarious, they are slightly less important; and the unemployed consider friends to be even less important. Leisure time has about the same importance for the precarious and the regularly employed. For the unemployed, it is significantly less important. The same is true for politics. There are

almost no differences between the employed groups, but for the unemployed, politics is considerably less important.

Table 4: *The importance of different aspects of life (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family ($\eta^2=.003$)	9.34 (n=327)	9.14 (n=411)	9.22 (n=405)
Friends ($\eta^2=.035^{***}$)	8.37 (n=328)	8.79 (n=411)	9.10 (n=407)
Leisure time ($\eta^2=.027^{***}$)	7.53 (n=328)	8.04 (n=411)	8.18 (n=407)
Politics ($\eta^2=.037^{***}$)	5.07 (n=326)	6.18 (n=411)	6.15 (n=407)
Work ($\eta^2=.045^{***}$)	8.84 (n=326)	8.09 (n=411)	8.16 (n=407)
Religion ($\eta^2=.010^{**}$)	4.61 (n=326)	3.96 (n=410)	3.83 (n=407)
Voluntary organizations ($\eta^2=.002$)	5.43 (n=322)	5.19 (n=410)	5.38 (n=406)

Concerning work, we find a different pattern. Again, the employed groups do not differ significantly. But for the unemployed, work has a higher importance. Religion is also more important for the unemployed than for the employed. And voluntary organisations are more important for the unemployed and the regularly employed than for the precarious. Generally speaking, the unemployed seem to focus more on traditional social relations, while there are no clear differences between the precarious and the regularly employed.

In order to measure their work involvement, we asked the respondents to say to what extent they agree or disagree with different statements regarding work. Table 5 shows the percentage of those who agree with the statements.

Almost all of our interviewees agreed that having a paid job to go is very important. There are no significant differences by employment status. If they won a large sum of money, nearly one fourth of the unemployed would immediately stop working. This applies also to every seventh precarious and every fifth regularly employed, which is significantly less. On the other hand, the statement “unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person” is the most agreed by the unemployed. For the precarious, unemployment is the least bad. More than three quarters of the long-term unemployed say they get bored quickly when they have no work to do. Among the employed, about two thirds agree with this statement, which is significantly less. The same tendency can be found in the next two statements. The unemployed agree less often that the most important things that happen in life do not involve work and that being without a job gives time to spend on other important things. However, they agree slightly more that if the unemployment benefit was very high they would not want a paid job to go. This could indicate that some of the unemployed cope with their lack of employment, but suffer particularly from their poor financial resources.

Table 5: Percentage of those who agree to different statements about work and unemployment (4-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Having a paid job to go to is very important (<i>Phi</i> =.057)	95.1 (n=329)	92.7 (n=411)	95.6 (n=407)
If I won a large sum of money I would immediately stop working (<i>Phi</i> =.105**)	23.4 (n=325)	13.4 (n=410)	19.9 (n=407)
Unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person (<i>Phi</i> =.086*)	72.3 (n=328)	62.0 (n=411)	66.6 (n=407)
I get bored quickly when I have no work to do (<i>Phi</i> =.100**)	76.9 (n=329)	68.1 (n=411)	65.8 (n=407)
The most important things that happen in life do not involve work (<i>Phi</i> =.083*)	30.3 (n=323)	37.8 (n=410)	40.1 (n=406)
Being without a job gives time to spend on other important things (<i>Phi</i> =.081*)	33.2 (n=328)	43.1 (n=411)	39.7 (n=406)
If the unemployment benefit was very high I would not want a paid job to go to (<i>Phi</i> =.111***)	9.5 (n=328)	7.8 (n=409)	3.0 (n=406)

We can conclude that the unemployed have a higher work involvement than the employed groups. Further, if their unemployment was compensated on a high financial level (through unemployment benefits or lottery prize), only a minority of them would prefer to remain without an employment – but this proportion is slightly higher than among the employed groups. It seems that the salary is, among other things like traditional values, a very important aspect about having a job for them (because most of them experience poverty). The precarious seem to be the opposite. For them post-material values of work seem the most important.

Table 6 allows going more into detail about this assumption. But the hypotheses of material unemployed and non-material precarious does not longer hold true if they are asked directly about the importance of different function of work.

Table 6: Percentage of those who consider different functions of work as being important (4-point scale, collapsed categories “quite important” and “very important”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The salary (<i>Phi</i> =.016)	92.4 (n=329)	92.7 (n=410)	93.4 (n=407)
Regular activities (<i>Phi</i> =.130***)	94.8 (n=328)	85.6 (n=410)	85.5 (n=407)
Social contacts (<i>Phi</i> =.015)	95.1 (n=329)	94.4 (n=411)	94.3 (n=407)
Gives an identity and status (<i>Phi</i> =.036)	84.0 (n=324)	85.9 (n=411)	87.1 (n=404)
Personal development (<i>Phi</i> =.074*)	95.4 (n=326)	97.1 (n=411)	98.5 (n=407)

The vast majority of the respondents consider all of the functions of work (salary, regular activities, social contacts, status and identity, and personal development) as being important. We have significant (but very small) differences only for regular

activities and personal development. Among the unemployed, more respondents see regular activities being important, whereas the employed groups do not differ. Personal development is slightly less important for the unemployed, and for the precarious it is not as important as for the regularly employed. But still, the differences are very small.

Another important issue in the realm of work and unemployment is the attitude about gender roles. Table 7 presents the importance of having a fulltime job for men and women attached by the respondents. We asked them how important it is for a women/a man to have a fulltime job to be considered an adult, and to what extent they approve/disapprove if a woman/a man has a fulltime job while she/he has a child aged fewer than three.

Table 7: Attitudes to the importance of having a fulltime job among men and women, with and without small children (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The importance for men ($Eta^2=.025^{***}$)	7.99 (n=319)	6.94 (n=397)	6.97 (n=398)
The importance for women ($Eta^2=.010^{**}$)	6.36 (n=318)	5.66 (n=395)	5.76 (n=388)
The importance for men with children younger than 3 ($Eta^2=.002$)	7.21 (n=321)	7.22 (n=396)	7.43 (n=396)
The importance for women with children younger than 3 ($Eta^2=.082^{***}$)	4.40 (n=322)	6.31 (n=398)	6.43 (n=396)

In general, all of the respondents considered having a fulltime job more important for men than for women. The difference between the importance for men and women is the same for all employment status groups. However, besides gender, having a fulltime job to be considered an adult is significantly more important for the long-term unemployed than for the employed, who do not differ by type of employment. Further, most of the interviewees approve if a man is fulltime employed while he has children aged fewer than three. There are no significant differences between the groups. Again, the respondents' approval of fulltime-working women with young children is lower. This is particularly true for the unemployed, who differ significantly from the employed groups. They consider having a fulltime job more important than the employed, even for women, but they favour more traditional gender roles and rather disapprove of working mothers. This tendency can be substantiated with a look at table 8.

Table 8: Percentages of those who agree to different statements regarding the roles of men and women (4-point scale, collapsed categories "agree" and "totally agree").

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family ($Phi=.081^*$)	59.9 (n=324)	50.9 (n=403)	51.1 (n=399)
Men should take as much responsibility as women for there home and children ($Phi=.076^*$)	90.2 (n=325)	94.6 (n=409)	94.1 (n=406)
When jobs are scarce, men should have jobs in the first place ($Phi=.243^{***}$)	25.3 (n=324)	6.8 (n=409)	8.2 (n=403)

About half of the respondents think that a woman should be prepared to cut down her paid work for the sake of her family. Among the unemployed, slightly more respondents agree to this statement, but the difference is quite small. Almost all of the respondents see that men should take as much responsibility as women for their home and children. Again, the unemployed agree a little less frequently, but the difference is small as well. We find a medium significant effect only in the last item. One fourth of the unemployed agree that when jobs are scarce, men should have them in the first place, whereas only 7% of the precarious and 8% of the regularly employed agree to this statement.

To conclude, we do not find apparent differences in attitudes to work and unemployment among precariously and regularly employed. However, the unemployed seem to consider having a paid employment somewhat more important. They focus rather on traditional values, and prefer a more traditional division of gender roles as long as children are to be cared for.

4. Social exclusion

To grasp the social dimension of exclusion, we asked our respondents about their social capital (social contacts, reciprocal support and assistance), their social activities and their experiences of discrimination. The following section presents the results.

Table 9 shows the number of friends. The regularly employed have the most friends; the unemployed have the least. There is a considerable significant effect of employment status on the number of friends. The same pattern can be detected for social contacts.

Table 9: *Percentage of those who have different number of friends (people they feel well with and can talk with about private issues or ask for help if necessary).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
None	4.9	0.5	0.2
1-2 people	25.3	7.3	4.4
3-7 people	47.6	50.9	44.7
More than 7 people	22.3	41.4	50.6
(Cramer's $V=.254^{***}$)	(n=328)	(n=411)	(n=407)

Table 10 shows the proportion of those who have not met family members, friends, and acquaintances during the last month. Among the unemployed, we find the highest percentages of people not having met someone, the lowest among the regularly employed. The precarious are allocated between the unemployed and the regularly employed, but closer to the latter.

Table 10: *Percentage of those who have not met different categories of people during the last month.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family members not living in the household ($\Phi=.127^{***}$)	18.4 (n=326)	10.7 (n=411)	8.4 (n=407)
Friends not living in the household ($\Phi=.208^{***}$)	15.4 (n=312)	4.4 (n=409)	3.0 (n=406)
Acquaintances not living in the household ($\Phi=.257^{***}$)	34.3 (n=327)	14.6 (n=411)	10.3 (n=407)

Hence, unemployment seems to lead to a considerable decline of social contacts and relationships. The same seems to be true for precarious employment, but in a more moderate manner.

Table 11 presents the proportions of those who did not receive help from different groups of people during the last year.

Table 11: *Percentage of those who did not receive help from different categories of people during the last 12 months.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one (<i>Phi</i> =.171***)	32.8 (n=329)	15.9 (n=410)	19.2 (n=406)
Partner (<i>Phi</i> =.134**)	21.6 (n=167)	10.3 (n=282)	11.5 (n=270)
Family members (not in the same household) (<i>Phi</i> =.132***)	15.5 (n=220)	9.0 (n=344)	5.5 (n=328)
Friends (<i>Phi</i> =.184***)	11.8 (n=221)	3.5 (n=345)	1.8 (n=328)
Acquaintances (<i>Phi</i> =.134***)	29.5 (n=220)	16.7 (n=341)	17.5 (n=326)
Colleagues/former colleagues (<i>Phi</i> =.445***)	69.6 (n=207)	24.5 (n=343)	17.4 (n=328)
Neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances) (<i>Phi</i> =.109**)	60.0 (n=220)	51.0 (n=343)	45.8 (n=325)

Of those who live in a partnership, about one tenth of the precarious and slightly more of the regularly employed did not receive help from their partner. Among the unemployed, the percentage is twice as high. The same is true for the other categories of people. The unemployed did receive significantly less help from others, regardless of their category. Almost one third of them did not receive help from anyone, compared to one fifth of the regularly employed and only one sixth of the precarious. The latter seem to receive even more help from others than the regularly employed. However, this does not apply to every category of people. While the precarious rely slightly more on their partner and on acquaintances, the regularly employed receive more often help from family members, friends, colleagues or former colleagues, and neighbours.

Table 12: *Percentage of those who did not offer help to different categories of people during the last 12 months.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one (<i>Phi</i> =.117***)	12.8 (n=327)	4.9 (n=411)	7.7 (n=405)
Partner (<i>Phi</i> =.136***)	19.3 (n=212)	9.1 (n=318)	9.4 (n=310)
Family members (not in the same household) (<i>Phi</i> =.186***)	18.1 (n=282)	9.3 (n=389)	4.0 (n=374)
Friends (<i>Phi</i> =.082*)	4.6 (n=285)	1.8 (n=390)	1.6 (n=374)
Acquaintances (<i>Phi</i> =.056)	17.3 (n=283)	14.7 (n=389)	12.3 (n=373)
Colleagues/former colleagues (<i>Phi</i> =.496***)	63.1 (n=260)	14.9 (n=389)	11.5 (n=374)
Neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances) (<i>Phi</i> =.036)	40.8 (n=284)	44.9 (n=390)	41.6 (n=370)

Further, we asked if our respondents had offered help to different groups of peoples during the last year. As table 12 illustrates, the percentages are generally lower, which means that the respondents report to give help more often than to receive help, independently from their employment status.

Apart from that, we find the same pattern as above. The long-term unemployed have given significantly less help to other people, except of acquaintances and neighbours. In these categories, there are no significant group differences. Again, among the precarious the rate of those who have not given help to anybody is lowest.

Table 13 shows the interviewees' answers to the question how difficult it would be to borrow money if they were in serious financial difficulties. There is a considerable significant effect of status group on this issue. For the unemployed, it would be the most difficult to borrow money; for the regularly employed the easiest. The precarious are located in between. More than two thirds of the unemployed say it would be difficult for them, compared to 38% of the precarious and less than one third of the regularly employed.

Table 13: *People sorted by how difficult or easy it would be to borrow money if they were in serious financial difficulties (percentage).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Very difficult	43.1	16.1	9.2
Quite difficult	34.5	21.6	23.0
Quite easy	16.6	41.4	43.3
Very easy	5.8	20.8	24.5
(Cramer's $V=.298^{***}$)	(n=325)	(n=403)	(n=404)

Nevertheless, the unemployed are those who have most frequently borrowed money from someone (see table 14). More than half of them have borrowed money during the last 12 months, compared to 22% of the precarious and 13% of the regularly employed.

Table 14: *Percentage of those who have borrowed money from someone during the past 12 months and from whom they have borrowed the money.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Have borrowed money during the past 12 months ($\Phi=.375^{***}$)	53.5 (n=329)	21.9 (n=411)	12.8 (n=407)
From their partner ($\Phi=.133$)	33.1 (n=130)	46.7 (n=75)	31.7 (n=41)
From family members not living in the same household ($\Phi=.026$)	72.0 (n=175)	74.2 (n=89)	74.5 (n=51)
From their friends ($\Phi=.337^{***}$)	60.9 (n=174)	29.5 (n=88)	23.5 (n=51)
From acquaintances ($\Phi=.232^{***}$)	27.6 (n=174)	11.5 (n=87)	5.9 (n=51)
From their colleagues or former colleagues ($\Phi=.090$)	10.3 (n=165)	6.7 (n=89)	3.9 (n=51)
From their neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances) ($\Phi=.112$)	8.0 (n=174)	3.4 (n=88)	2.0 (n=51)

The vast majority of those who have asked for money, borrowed it from family members; fewer from their partner. There are no significant differences between the

groups for these categories of people. The same is true for (former) colleagues and neighbours, whom the respondents very seldom ask for money. The unemployed tend to do this relatively more often, but the group differences are not significant either. However, the unemployed have borrowed money from friends and acquaintances significantly more often than the precarious, and those more often than the regularly employed. This finding can be understood having in mind that these groups have more difficulties in finding someone who is able to lend them money. Thus, we can conclude that the harder the financial situation and the weaker the social surrounding, the more one has to rely on her or his broader social network.

Table 15 presents the perception of our respondents of how often they take part in social activities compared to other people in their age. Regardless of their employment status group, all of them tend to feel that they take part in social activities rather more seldom than others. But in spite of this general bias, there are significant group differences. The long-term unemployed say that they take part clearly more rarely, and the precarious even slightly less often than the regularly employed.

Table 15: *Taking part in social activities (percentage of the extent compared to other people of the same age).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Much more seldom than most people in their age	23.4	6.6	2.5
More seldom than most	36.4	26.1	24.8
About the same	25.5	48.3	54.1
More often than most	11.2	15.6	16.0
Much more often than most (Cramer's $V=.245^{***}$)	3.4 (n=321)	3.4 (n=410)	2.7 (n=407)

Table 16 shows the proportions of those who are not active in any spare time activities such as a hobby or sports. The percentage of the 'inactive' is more than twice as high among the unemployed, while there are no differences between precarious and regularly employed. Reasons for not being active are different for the different groups.

Table 16: *People who are not active in any 'spare time' activities such as hobbies or sports and reasons why they are not active in that kind of activities (percentage).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not active (Phi=.248***)	37.4 (n=329)	14.8 (n=411)	15.0 (n=407)
Because they have no hobby/sport	8.1	11.5	10.0
Because they are not interested in their hobbies/sports anymore	7.3	4.9	1.7
Because they can not afford it anymore	52.8	21.3	11.7
Because of another reason (Cramer's $V=.305^{***}$)	31.7 (n=123)	62.3 (n=61)	76.7 (n=60)

About 10% of the 'inactive' just do not have a hobby; this rate is even lower among the unemployed. On the other hand, they have the highest rate of those who are not interested in their hobby anymore, but again, this is the minority. The most frequent reason for the unemployed is that they cannot afford it anymore; this applies to more than half of them, compared to about one fifth of the precarious and one of nine regularly employed. Most of the latter are not active due to other reasons (three fourths of them, compared to less than two thirds of the precarious and less than one third of the unemployed). Hence, not being active in spare time activities seems to be a

financial issue for those who have a low income. This applies mainly to the long-term unemployed and to a somewhat lower degree to the precarious. The financial aspect is clearly much more important than a decline of interest caused by unemployment.

Another important issue concerning social exclusion are experiences of discrimination. As table 17 shows, the rate of those who consider themselves belonging to a group that is discriminated in the German society is considerably higher among the unemployed. More than 30% perceive themselves to be discriminated; while about 15% of the precarious and only 7% of the regularly employed do so.

Table 17: *Experiences of discrimination (percentage of those who consider themselves as belonging to a discriminated group).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No (<i>Phi</i> =.297***)	65.2 (n=325)	84.9 (n=410)	93.3 (n=405)
Colour or race (<i>Phi</i> =.013)	7.1	6.5	7.4
Nationality (<i>Phi</i> =.043)	31.9	35.5	29.6
Religion (<i>Phi</i> =.127)	22.1	12.9	11.1
Language (<i>Phi</i> =.157)	9.7	3.2	0.0
Ethnic group (<i>Phi</i> =.070)	11.5	8.1	14.8
Age (<i>Phi</i> =.089)	1.8	0.0	0.0
Gender (<i>Phi</i> =.258***)	0.9	14.5	7.4
Sexuality (<i>Phi</i> =.314***)	2.7	12.9	29.6
Disability (<i>Phi</i> =.069)	4.4	1.6	3.7
Employment status (<i>Phi</i> =.439***)	43.4	4.8	3.7
Other (<i>Phi</i> =.096)	16.8 (n=113)	22.6 (n=62)	11.1 (n=27)

The reasons for which the interviewees experience discrimination are diverse. The main issue is connected to a migration background, like nationality (this reason applies to about one third of the discriminated group), followed by religion, ethnic group, colour or race, and language. There are no significant differences among those categories between the employment status groups. Discrimination because of disabilities is mentioned less often, and age seems to be no reason for discrimination at all. The only significant group differences occur among the categories gender, sexual orientation and employment status. Almost none of the long-term unemployed feel discriminated for their gender, compared to 7% of the regularly employed and nearly 15% of the precarious. This fact is in line with the pattern observed above, because the unemployed have the most traditional values about gender roles, while the precarious favour gender equality to the highest extent. Having in mind that the precarious are the highest and the unemployed the lowest educated group, we assume that higher education raises awareness about gender inequality. Sexual orientation seems not to be an issue of discrimination for the unemployed as well. However, for 13% of the

precarious and 30% of the regularly employed their sexual orientation is the reason for experiencing discrimination. This finding is hard to explain. Either there is a bias in the sample, or the unemployed and, to a lower extent, the precarious do not experience such a discrimination because of other reasons (e.g. discrimination of those with a migration background could outweigh discrimination due to their sexual orientation), or discrimination because of sexual orientation takes place mainly in the job, where the unemployed and the precarious are less involved. Finally, their employment status is a major reason for the unemployed to experience discrimination, while this does not seem to be a big issue for the precarious. Almost half of those unemployed that feel discriminated do so because they are unemployed and/or live on welfare. This is 15% of the total long-term unemployed group in our sample.

Closely related to discrimination of unemployed people are prejudices against the unemployed based on stereotypes. Table 18 shows the proportions of those who think, apart from their own opinion, that most or many have certain attitudes towards unemployed people.

Table 18: *Percentage of those who think that different kinds of attitudes to unemployed people occur among most or many people (4-point scale, collapsed categories “many people” and “most people”).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
They are lazy (<i>Phi=.043</i>)	71.9 (n=327)	67.7 (n=409)	67.2 (n=406)
They have intended to take advantage of the system (<i>Phi=.082*</i>)	67.6 (n=324)	62.4 (n=410)	57.6 (n=406)
They are passive/without initiative (<i>Phi=.007</i>)	68.8 (n=324)	69.6 (n=408)	69.2 (n=406)
They have had bad luck (<i>Phi=.035</i>)	35.0 (n=326)	37.2 (n=409)	39.3 (n=405)
They have themselves to blame (<i>Phi=.084*</i>)	57.2 (n=327)	50.0 (n=410)	46.8 (n=404)
They have no job because of alcohol or drug problems (<i>Phi=.219***</i>)	50.6 (n=324)	31.1 (n=409)	25.3 (n=403)
They are people who have become victims of the socio-economic development (<i>Phi=.065</i>)	53.1 (n=324)	51.1 (n=408)	58.8 (n=405)

Regardless of their employment status, the majority of our interviewees think that many or most people have prejudices against the unemployed. About two thirds of them believe that many or most people think that unemployed people are lazy. The rate is slightly higher among the long-term unemployed, but group differences are not significant. The same holds true for the stereotype “they are passive/without initiative”. Again, two thirds believe that most or many people think so, independently of their employment status. Accordingly, only little more than one third thinks that most or many people consider the unemployed people just having had bad luck. At least somewhat more than half of the respondents think that most or many people see that the unemployed are people who have become victims of the socio-economic development. Group differences are not significant for these items either. However, there are three items for which the long-term unemployed believe that prejudices against the unemployed are more common. Two thirds of them think that most or many people think that they have intended to take advantage of the system, compared to 58% of the regularly employed. A similar pattern can be found for the stereotype “the unemployed

have themselves to blame”. Concerning the stereotype “unemployed people have no job because of alcohol or drug problems” this tendency is even more evident. Half of the unemployed believe that most or many people think so, compared to about one third of the precarious and only one fourth of the regularly employed.

To sum up, our data validates the thesis that long-term unemployment leads to an erosion of social capital and social activities. The unemployed have significantly less friends and less social contacts than the other groups. They receive and give help to other people less often, and they take part in social activities and hobbies more seldom – mainly due to financial reasons. Although it is far more difficult for them to borrow money, they have to do so more frequently. The percentage of those who consider themselves belonging to a group that is discriminated is much higher. Moreover, they assume that prejudices against them are somewhat more common. An erosion of social capital can be observed among the precarious as well, although less clearly and in a more moderate manner. The precarious have less financial difficulties than the unemployed, but still significantly more than the regularly employed. In some cases, this makes them give up their hobbies. More generally, financial hardship could also explain why the precarious take part in social activities and have less social contacts than their regularly employed contemporaries. However, it seems that the precarious compensate their limited financial resources through reciprocal support and assistance. They receive help from other people more often than the regularly employed, and they also give more help to other people. Regarding discrimination and their belief in prejudices against the unemployed, they are located between the regularly employed and the unemployed.

5. Political exclusion

The following section deals with the political dimension of exclusion. It includes the issues political interest, political efficacy, generalized trust in public institutions, political satisfaction, political participation and associational involvement. Table 19 presents the figures of political interest between the employment status groups.

Table 19: *Political interest (percentage).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not interested at all	24.9	6.3	7.4
Not very interested	36.8	37.5	39.1
Fairly interested	24.9	35.8	38.3
Very interested	13.4	20.4	15.2
(Cramer's $V=.188^{***}$)	(n=329)	(n=411)	(n=407)

The percentages reveal that the long-term unemployed are far less interested in politics than the other groups. Especially the number of those who are not interested at all is more than three times as high than among the regularly employed, and the proportion of those who are fairly interested is respectively much lower. In contrast, the percentages of those who are not very interested and of those who are very interested do only differ very little. The precarious, on the other hand, are even slightly more interested in politics than the regularly employed. Further, we asked for the importance of different political activities for a person to be a good citizen (see table 20).

Table 20: The importance of different political activities (percentages, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very important” and “quite important”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Supporting people who are worse off than themselves (<i>Phi</i> =.040)	95.7 (n=323)	93.4 (n=411)	93.9 (n=407)
Voting in elections (<i>Phi</i> =.248***)	74.5 (n=325)	92.5 (n=411)	92.9 (n=407)
Obedying laws and regulations (<i>Phi</i> =.088*)	82.3 (n=327)	74.9 (n=411)	82.4 (n=404)
Forming your own opinion independently of others (<i>Phi</i> =.115***)	93.6 (n=326)	97.8 (n=411)	98.3 (n=406)
Being active in voluntary organisations (<i>Phi</i> =.045)	46.5 (n=327)	40.9 (n=411)	43.7 (n=405)
Being active in politics (<i>Phi</i> =.061)	36.8 (n=326)	38.9 (n=411)	32.1 (n=405)

The great majority of the respondents said it was important to support people that are worse off than themselves. There are no significant differences between the groups. The same is true for “being active in voluntary organisations”, which is considered important by little less than half of the interviewees, and for “being active in politics”, which is important for somewhat more than one third. However, there are some activities for which we find clear differences between the groups. Voting in elections is important for almost every one of the precariously and regularly employed, but only for three of four long-term unemployed. Always obeying laws and regulations is slightly less important for the precarious than for both the unemployed and the regularly employed, and forming one’s opinion independently from others is, although considered important by most of the respondents, slightly less important for the unemployed.

Table 21 shows the proportions of those who agree to different statements about political efficacy. It seems to be a widespread opinion that parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion. About 60% of the regularly employed and slightly less of the precarious think so, compared to almost four of five long-term unemployed. The statement “people like me definitely have an influence on governmental politics” is agreed by somewhat less than one third of the respondents. There are no significant differences by employment status. Almost three fourths of the unemployed think that politics sometimes is so complicated that people like them do not understand anymore what is going on. Among the regularly employed, less than two thirds agree to this statement, and only a good half of the precarious. Hence, we can conclude that the unemployed estimate political efficacy considerably lower than the employed groups, whereas the precarious assess it somewhat higher than the regularly employed.

Table 21: Percentage who agree in different statements about political efficacy (4-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion (<i>Phi</i> =.187***)	79.1 (n=325)	58.4 (n=406)	60.7 (n=402)
People like me definitely have an influence on governmental politics (<i>Phi</i> =.048)	28.2 (n=319)	30.4 (n=408)	25.3 (n=403)
Sometimes politics is so complicated that people like me do not understand anymore what is going on (<i>Phi</i> =.147***)	73.6 (n=326)	56.0 (n=409)	62.2 (n=407)

Another important indicator for political integration is trust in public institutions. Table 22 presents the respondents' trust in different institutions. On the local level, they were asked for trust in civil servants and employees in civil service, in the government of Cologne, and in the Cologne city council. Significant differences occur only for civil servants and employees in civil service. The unemployed trust them the least, the regularly employed the most – but the differences are very small. Concerning the government and the city council, the degree of trust does not differ significantly by employment status.

Table 22: Trust in different parts of the political system (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Civil servants and employees in civil service ($Eta^2=.007^*$)	5.23 (n=319)	5.57 (n=402)	5.70 (n=399)
The government of Cologne ($Eta^2=.004$)	5.50 (n=299)	5.23 (n=388)	5.13 (n=392)
The Cologne city council ($Eta^2=.001$)	5.26 (n=298)	5.38 (n=377)	5.23 (n=382)
The police ($Eta^2=.011^{**}$)	6.53 (n=325)	6.93 (n=410)	7.17 (n=406)
The regional parliament ($Eta^2=.032^{***}$)	4.72 (n=293)	5.65 (n=398)	5.55 (n=397)
The regional government ($Eta^2=.021^{***}$)	4.86 (n=300)	5.61 (n=398)	5.55 (n=397)
The churches ($Eta^2=.002$)	4.26 (n=306)	4.55 (n=394)	4.56 (n=396)
The national government ($Eta^2=.028^{***}$)	4.77 (n=315)	5.65 (n=411)	5.70 (n=403)
The courts ($Eta^2=.015^{***}$)	6.30 (n=324)	6.99 (n=407)	6.88 (n=402)
The national parliament ($Eta^2=.043^{***}$)	4.72 (n=309)	5.83 (n=405)	5.81 (n=400)
The institutions of the European Union ($Eta^2=.015^{***}$)	4.88 (n=281)	5.61 (n=390)	5.38 (n=391)
Employers and enterprises ($Eta^2=.016^{***}$)	4.39 (n=321)	4.72 (n=396)	5.08 (n=400)
The media ($Eta^2=.002$)	3.88 (n=324)	3.98 (n=407)	4.12 (n=405)
Trade unions ($Eta^2=.007^*$)	5.47 (n=302)	5.94 (n=388)	5.81 (n=397)

Trust in the police is highest among the regularly employed. In the precarious group it is a little lower, and even considerably lower among the unemployed. All items considered, the police obtained the highest trust scores, followed by the courts. The precarious trust them to the highest extent, the scores of the regularly employed are only little lower, and the unemployed mistrust them significantly more often.

For the regional level, we asked about trust in the regional parliament and the regional government of North Rhine-Westphalia. In the groups of the precarious and the regularly employed (who do not differ on this point), trust scores in the regional institutions are slightly higher than in local level institutions (maybe this is a specific local characteristic since the municipality of Cologne is especially known for nepotism and corruption). Among the unemployed, however, the degree of trust in regional

institutions is clearly lower than in the local institutions. The unemployed suspect the regional institutions significantly more often than the employed. Exactly the same pattern can be found for national institutions as well as for the institutions of the European Union, which score about the same as the regional authorities.

Trust in the churches is relatively low and does not differ significantly by group. The media obtain lowest trust rates, and group differences are not significant either. A small group effect can be found for trust in employers and enterprises. The regularly employed trust them the most, the unemployed the least. Finally, trust scores of the trade unions differ less. Again, the unemployed trust them the least, but in contrast to employers and enterprises, we find the highest scores in the precarious group. However, it is noteworthy that all groups trust the unions clearly more than the employers. This could be an effect of the economic crisis.

Table 23 presents the respondents' satisfaction with democracy in general and with government performance in different policy fields in particular. Satisfaction with the way democracy works is significantly lower among the unemployed, whereas the other groups score exactly the same. The way the national government¹⁰ managed economic issues is seen differently. The regularly employed are the most satisfied, the precarious slightly less and the unemployed much less. The same applies to poverty, even though the scores are generally lower. Regarding education as well as health care, there are no significant group differences. For government management of unemployment, precarious employment, environment/sustainable development, and youth, the satisfaction scores follow the same pattern as for economy and poverty. The unemployed are the least and the regularly employed are the most satisfied. Differences are wider for precarious employment and unemployment than for youth and environment.

Table 23: Satisfaction with democracy and with government management of different issues (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The way democracy works ($\eta^2=.042^{***}$)	5.11 (n=325)	6.22 (n=411)	6.22 (n=406)
Economy ($\eta^2=.060^{***}$)	4.20 (n=287)	5.34 (n=375)	5.59 (n=389)
Poverty ($\eta^2=.041^{***}$)	3.29 (n=300)	4.19 (n=372)	4.43 (n=376)
Education ($\eta^2=.004$)	4.48 (n=302)	4.51 (n=375)	4.80 (n=392)
Unemployment ($\eta^2=.082^{***}$)	3.33 (n=313)	4.41 (n=378)	5.04 (n=395)
Health care ($\eta^2=.002$)	4.48 (n=309)	4.72 (n=377)	4.71 (n=394)
Precarious employment ($\eta^2=.056^{***}$)	3.06 (n=279)	3.95 (n=350)	4.34 (n=348)
Environment/sustainable development ($\eta^2=.010^{**}$)	4.95 (n=296)	5.33 (n=375)	5.52 (n=387)
Youth ($\eta^2=.026^{***}$)	3.76 (n=297)	4.43 (n=344)	4.60 (n=367)

¹⁰ We asked about the grand coalition (conservatives and social democrats) that was in office until October 2009.

Besides group differences, precarious employment and poverty are the issues with lowest satisfaction scores, while environment/sustainable development and economy obtained the highest.

To grasp political participation, we asked about voting in elections and about different forms of political activities. Table 24 illustrates the number of those who have participated in the last election on the national and on the local level. The results are striking. While four of five employed have voted on the national level, the number of voters among the unemployed is only half as high. The same applies for the national level. Two thirds of the regularly employed and slightly less of the precarious have cast their ballots, compared to less than 30 percent of the unemployed.

Table 24: *Participation in elections (percentage of those who voted in the last elections).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The last national election (<i>Phi</i> =.389***)	40.7 (n=329)	80.3 (n=411)	80.7 (n=404)
The last local election (<i>Phi</i> =.331***)	29.2 (n=325)	61.7 (n=407)	68.6 (n=404)

Concerning political activities, group differences are not so evident (see table 25). About ten percent of the respondents have contacted a politician; differences are not significant. Working for a political party has been done by about 4% of the interviewees, and this does not differ by employment status. The same is true for other activities like having worn or displayed a badge, sticker or poster, having donated money to a political organisation or group, having taken part in a strike, having contacted the media, and having contacted a solicitor or judicial body.

However, there are some political activities for which the proportions differ by employment status group. For example, among the employed groups, about nine percent have contacted a national government official, but significantly less of the unemployed have done so.

But the unemployed are not in any case the least active. For instance, six percent of them have worked for a political action group, compared to nine percent of the precarious, but only four percent of the regularly employed. And in having taken part in a public demonstration, the unemployed equal the regularly employed (14%); only the proportion among the precarious is higher (21%). Political actions in which the unemployed were less engaged are: having signed a petition, having boycotted certain products and having deliberately bought certain products for political reasons. Non-legitimate political actions play a minor role. The regularly employed have been engaged almost not at all. Illegal actions have been carried out by three percent of the precarious; the percentage among the unemployed is half as high. These have participated more often in violent actions, though. But still it is important to stress that only a very little minority has taken part in non-legitimate actions.

Table 25: Political activity (percentage of those who have taken part in different kinds of political activities).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Contacted a politician (<i>Phi=.054</i>)	9.1 (n=329)	10.7 (n=411)	13.3 (n=407)
Contacted a national or local government official (<i>Phi=.076*</i>)	4.9 (n=329)	9.2 (n=411)	9.6 (n=406)
Worked for a political party (<i>Phi=.008</i>)	4.3 (n=329)	3.9 (n=411)	4.2 (n=407)
Worked in a political action group (<i>Phi=.075*</i>)	6.1 (n=329)	8.8 (n=411)	4.4 (n=407)
Worn or displayed a badge, sticker or poster (<i>Phi=.046</i>)	8.8 (n=329)	12.2 (n=411)	9.8 (n=407)
Signed a petition (<i>Phi=.126***</i>)	13.9 (n=324)	26.7 (n=408)	20.2 (n=406)
Taken part in a public demonstration (<i>Phi=.089**</i>)	14.0 (n=329)	20.7 (n=410)	13.8 (n=407)
Boycotted certain products (<i>Phi=.134***</i>)	19.7 (n=325)	34.5 (n=409)	25.5 (n=406)
Deliberately bought certain products for political reasons (<i>Phi=.130***</i>)	7.3 (n=328)	17.5 (n=411)	10.6 (n=407)
Donated money to a political organisation or group (<i>Phi=.034</i>)	7.9 (n=329)	9.8 (n=410)	10.3 (n=407)
Taken part in a strike (<i>Phi=.018</i>)	7.9 (n=328)	7.1 (n=411)	8.1 (n=407)
Contacted the media (<i>Phi=.050</i>)	7.0 (n=329)	6.8 (n=411)	4.4 (n=407)
Contacted a solicitor or a judicial body for non-personal reasons (<i>Phi=.024</i>)	2.7 (n=329)	1.9 (n=411)	2.0 (n=407)
Participated in an illegal action (<i>Phi=.085*</i>)	1.5 (n=329)	3.4 (n=409)	0.7 (n=407)
Participated in a violent action (<i>Phi=.100**</i>)	1.8 (n=329)	0.2 (n=409)	0.0 (n=407)

Hence, table 25 makes clear that the unemployed are not generally less active than the regularly employed. While the regularly employed sign petitions and contact government officials more often, the unemployed organise themselves in political action groups more frequently. The precarious are definitely the politically most active group. This holds true for almost all categories of political actions. Independently of the employment status, boycotting products is the most common form of political protest, followed by petitions and public demonstrations.

Finally, table 26 illustrates the proportions of those who are members of different civil society organisations. Overall, respondents tend to be more often members of religious organisations, trade unions, sport and cultural groups, and less often part of political parties and social movement organisations. Group differences in organisational membership are not so clear either. They are not significant for political parties (5-8%), cooperatives (10%) and social movement organisations (3-5%). Significant differences can be found for trade unions, religious organisations, and other civil society organisations. The regularly employed are most often members of a trade union, followed by the precarious; the unemployed are union members slightly less often. This is not surprising, since unions are open to everyone, but only employees benefit from

their wage agreements and legal protection. The membership rate of the precarious is considerably low, especially when considering the fact that they are the most politicized group. More than half of the precariously and regularly employed are members of a religious organisation, but only one good third of the unemployed are so. The vast majority of members of religious organisations are member of the catholic or protestant church. This fact can explain the difference. About half of the unemployed are migrants, among whom the rate of Christians is considerably lower. Finally, the unemployed are less often members of other civil society organisations. Again, there is a simple explanation. Most of these organisations mentioned were sport clubs and other leisure associations, and as we have seen in the section of social dimension, the unemployed have significantly less spare time activities and hobbies. Nevertheless, this is rather an aspect of their social life than of their political integration.

Table 26: *Earlier or present membership in different organizations (percentage of those who are or have been members of different kinds of organizations).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Political party (<i>Phi=.061</i>)	4.6 (n=329)	8.3 (n=410)	7.6 (n=407)
Trade union (<i>Phi=.103**</i>)	13.7 (n=328)	15.1 (n=410)	22.6 (n=407)
Religious organisation (<i>Phi=.171***</i>)	36.0 (n=328)	55.9 (n=410)	53.8 (n=407)
Cooperative (<i>Phi=.012</i>)	10.4 (n=327)	9.5 (n=410)	10.1 (n=406)
Social movement organisation (<i>Phi=.047</i>)	3.0 (n=328)	5.1 (n=408)	3.4 (n=407)
Other civil society organisation (<i>Phi=.140***</i>)	23.7 (n=329)	36.8 (n=410)	39.6 (n=407)

Summing up, we can characterize our respondents' relationship to politics as follows: The precarious seem to be generally more political than the regularly employed. They are generally more interested in politics and believe more strongly in their political efficacy. On the other hand, they are sometimes more sceptical about political institutions and less satisfied with governmental management of certain issues. This may be the reason why they are more often engaged in political actions. Further research should investigate the causes for this finding. Either precariousness leads to a higher affinity to politics, or this is an indirect effect. We should keep in mind that in our sample, the precarious are on average higher educated than the regularly employed. This could explain their higher political awareness.

The unemployed tend to be less political than the employed. They are less interested in politics, they express doubts about their political efficacy. In addition, they tend to mistrust public institutions in general and are dissatisfied with their government. Many of them answer with non-voting. But then, their participation rates in political activities and membership in political organisations is not significantly lower than among the employed. Hence, the unemployed seem to be a very heterogeneous group. On the one hand, the group of the 'politically excluded', as described above, is larger than among the employed. This leads to lower averages in political efficacy, trust, and satisfaction. On the other hand, the group of those who are very interested and/or active in politics is not smaller than among the employed. Thus, the unemployed seem to be more decided

or even radical in their opinion. Among them, less are fairly interested and more or less satisfied. To put it succinctly, either they just write off politics, or they engage in it.

6. Well-being

The last dimension of exclusion we investigated in our research is individual well-being, including institutional discrimination and both physical and mental health. Table 27 shows three different indicators of general well-being.

Table 27: *Happiness (average based on a scale from 0 to 10), optimism (percentage, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very optimistic” and “quite optimistic”), and good health (percentage, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very good” and “good”).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Happiness ($\eta^2=.165^{***}$)	5.95 (n=328)	7.60 (n=411)	7.78 (n=406)
Optimistic about the future ($\phi=.136^{***}$)	75.5 (n=326)	86.6 (n=411)	86.7 (n=407)
Experience a good health in general ($\phi=.238^{***}$)	77.1 (n=328)	93.2 (n=411)	94.1 (n=404)

The results are striking. While there are practically no differences between the precarious and the regularly employed, unemployment seems to have a considerable impact on well-being. The unemployed are far less happy, less optimistic about the future and experience a worse health in general. However, despite these clear differences, it should be noted that this does not mean that all of the unemployed are unhappy, pessimistic and not healthy. After all, their happiness score is above the scale average. Three fourths of them are still optimistic about the future, and about the same number of them experiences a good health.

Before asking about institutional discrimination, we asked the respondents whether they have visited different public institutions at all during the last 12 months. Table 28 presents the results.

Table 28: *Percentage of those who have visited different public institutions.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital ($\phi=.076^*$)	79.0 (n=329)	84.6 (n=409)	85.7 (n=407)
At the social service office, by social worker ($\phi=.467^{***}$)	38.0 (n=326)	4.6 (n=409)	1.7 (n=407)
At their child's school, training agency ($\phi=.195^{***}$)	37.2 (n=323)	22.7 (n=396)	16.4 (n=391)
At the employment agency, job centre ($\phi=.697^{***}$)	88.1 (n=328)	30.3 (n=409)	4.4 (n=406)
At the housing agency, by their landlord ($\phi=.053$)	27.5 (n=327)	29.2 (n=408)	23.7 (n=405)
At any other community office ($\phi=.152^{***}$)	36.5 (n=329)	55.3 (n=409)	44.8 (n=406)

Although they experience a worse health, the unemployed have slightly less often seen a doctor or visited a hospital. Moreover, they have been at any community office more seldom than the regularly employed; the precarious have been there the most often. For

obvious reasons, the vast majority of the unemployed has visited the employment agency or job centre during the past 12 months, and among the precarious, still 30% have been there. The social service office or a social worker has been visited by more than one third of the unemployed, while such institutions seem not to play a major role for the regularly and precariously employed. Educational institutions have also been visited mostly by the unemployed, followed by the precarious. Contacts to the housing agency or the landlord, finally, do not differ by employment status. The next table presents the proportions of those who said they have not got a service in these institutions although they felt they were entitled to.

Table 29: *Percentage of those who have not got a service they feel they were entitled to when they visited the institutions below.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital (<i>Phi</i> =.118***)	21.4 (n=252)	15.7 (n=344)	10.6 (n=348)
At the social service office, by social worker (<i>Phi</i> =.072)	40.5 (n=121)	42.1 (n=19)	57.1 (n=7)
At their child's school, training agency (<i>Phi</i> =.161*)	13.7 (n=117)	21.3 (n=89)	6.3 (n=64)
At the employment agency, job centre (<i>Phi</i> =.200***)	43.9 (n=280)	22.6 (n=124)	33.3 (n=18)
At the housing agency, by their landlord (<i>Phi</i> =.138)	37.1 (n=89)	22.7 (n=119)	25.0 (n=96)
At any other community office (<i>Phi</i> =.233***)	29.9 (n=117)	11.5 (n=226)	8.8 (n=182)

About one of five long-term unemployed said they had not got a service they felt they were entitled to at the doctor's or at the hospital, compared to about one of six precarious and one of nine regularly employed. At the social service office or by a social worker, there are no group differences in institutional discrimination. However, the numbers are considerably high – almost half the respondents said they felt wronged there. At educational institutions, the precarious felt discriminated most often, followed by the unemployed. Almost half of the unemployed felt deprived of certain rights at the labour agency or job centre. Among the precarious, this number is only half as high. The unemployed also did not get a service from their landlord or housing agency most often, but the group differences are not significant. Finally, almost one third of the unemployed felt discriminated at any other community offices. This is almost three times as high as that proportion among the employed groups.

Table 30 illustrates the respondents' answers to the general health questionnaire. It is an indicator for mental health and includes questions about depression and self-confidence. Nearly half of the unemployed said they had lost much sleep over worry. Among the employed, this number is much lower, while differences by type of working contract are very small. About the same proportion of the unemployed said they feel constantly under strain. Here, the differences to the employed are smaller, although still significant. One third of the precarious and slightly less of the regularly employed agreed to this statement. Almost all of the employed and the vast majority of the unemployed felt they were playing a useful part in things. However, the differences between employed and unemployed are significant. The same pattern can be found for similar statements like "I feel capable of making decisions about things" and "I am able to face up my problems". However, 18% of the unemployed said they felt they could not

overcome their difficulties. This is again a quite high number compared to the precarious (3%) and the regularly employed (5%).

Table 30: General Health Questionnaire (percentage who agree to different statements concerning health, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
I have lost much sleep over worry (<i>Phi</i> =.322***)	46.8 (n=327)	16.8 (n=410)	15.2 (n=407)
I feel that I am playing a useful part in things (<i>Phi</i> =.077*)	89.1 (n=320)	93.6 (n=409)	93.6 (n=407)
I feel capable of making decisions about things (<i>Phi</i> =.118***)	93.5 (n=324)	96.1 (n=411)	99.0 (n=407)
I feel constantly under strain (<i>Phi</i> =.159***)	47.7 (n=323)	33.1 (n=411)	29.2 (n=407)
I feel that I can not overcome my difficulties (<i>Phi</i> =.235***)	17.8 (n=325)	2.9 (n=408)	4.9 (n=407)
I am able to concentrate on whatever I do (<i>Phi</i> =.034)	73.8 (n=328)	73.7 (n=410)	76.8 (n=405)
I am able to face up to my problems (<i>Phi</i> =.124***)	89.0 (n=326)	94.6 (n=410)	96.3 (n=407)
I feel unhappy and distressed (<i>Phi</i> =.360***)	30.9 (n=327)	4.9 (n=410)	4.7 (n=407)
I have lost confidence in myself (<i>Phi</i> =.266***)	17.1 (n=327)	2.4 (n=411)	2.5 (n=407)
I think of myself as a worthless person (<i>Phi</i> =.184***)	12.1 (n=323)	3.2 (n=411)	2.5 (n=406)
I feel reasonably happy, all things considered (<i>Phi</i> =.200***)	82.6 (n=327)	94.6 (n=409)	95.3 (n=406)
I am able to enjoy my normal day-to-day activities (<i>Phi</i> =.305***)	72.1 (n=323)	93.2 (n=411)	95.1 (n=406)

The same tendency arises in three further indicators. Nearly one third of the unemployed felt unhappy and distressed, while less than 5% of the employed did so. 17% of the unemployed said they had lost confidence in themselves, and 12% of them even said they thought of themselves as a worthless person. Nevertheless, the vast majority of the unemployed said they felt reasonably happy, all things considered, although their rate is still significantly lower than the percentage of the employed agreeing to this statement. Finally, slightly less than three fourths of the unemployed said they were able to enjoy their normal day-to-day activities, compared to about 95% of the employed. The only item for which we do not find group specific differences is “I am able to concentrate on whatever I do”. About three out of four respondents agreed to this statement, regardless of their employment situation.

Thus, unemployment seems to have a big impact on well-being. The unemployed are less happy, less optimistic, and less healthy. They experience not getting services they feel they are entitled to clearly more often than the employed groups. They suffer from mental health problems more often, they feel able to actively shape their lives themselves less often, and are likely to have low self-confidence. The precarious, in contrast, do not clearly differ from the regularly employed in terms of mental health, physical health and optimism. However, they feel slightly less happy than them and tend to experience discrimination in institutions slightly more often. Nevertheless, we cannot assume that precariousness has a definite impact on individual well-being.

7. Summary and conclusion

At a first glance, unemployment and precariousness seem to have very different impacts on exclusion. Our research corroborates the thesis that long-term unemployment leads to a decline of social capital. The long-term unemployed have less social contacts and are engaged in less social activities, and they receive less support and assistance. To sum up, they have weaker social networks. Moreover, they experience discrimination and prejudices more often. In the political dimension the unemployed are very heterogeneous. On the one hand, we find a high number of those who are in fact politically excluded. They are not interested in politics at all, do not trust in public institutions and are politically inactive – they do not even vote. On the other hand, the proportion of those who are politically very interested and active is not lower than among the regularly employed. Unemployment thus seems to harbour the risk of exclusion especially for those who are fairly interested and not active in politics, but does not affect those who have an affinity with politics. Finally, unemployment leads to a considerable decline of individual well-being, such as happiness, health, optimism, and self-confidence.

The precarious, in contrast, do not differ considerably from the regularly employed. Indeed, they have slightly less social contacts and leisure time activities on average, but on the other hand they manage to compensate their somewhat weaker financial resources through mutual support and assistance. They experience discrimination slightly more often than the regularly employed, but this finding could be a result of the sample consistence, because a higher percentage of them have a migration background. In general, the precarious show a higher political awareness and involvement than the regularly employed. Concerning well-being, we could not find a clear impact of precariousness.

However, we should treat these findings with caution. Although the precarious are not clearly more excluded than the regularly employed, we cannot conclude that a precarious employment is always better than unemployment. The precariously employed in our sample are young people that are mostly at the stage of transition from the educational system into the labour market. The majority of them are highly educated and willing and optimistic to find a better job. Thus, we can just conclude that precarious employment as an entry into the labour market, especially for white-collar workers, does not have any negative effect in terms of exclusion. The results of this study are not able to supply information on long-term effects of precarious employment, especially not in terms of low-paid jobs with few career opportunities.

WP3 National Report Italy

Simone Baglioni and Matteo Bassoli

1. Introduction

This report presents a selection of the results of a large survey carried out with young people living in Turin aged 18-35. The survey has been conducted by Format Srl, a professional polling institute, on behalf of Bocconi University for the YOUNEX project.

The survey has been realized with the CATI system (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews): **1444 interviews** have been fully completed and serve as basis for this report. Partial interviews, failed calls, etc. have been 13627 (90,4%) with a 95% interval of confidence (Error $\pm 2,6\%$). Interviews have been conducted in the **period 23 June-2 November 2009** following the ethical code of conduct established by ESOMAR as well according to the Italian legislation on individual privacy. All interviewees have received a symbolic compensation of a mobile phone recharge (5 Euros) for their time and cooperation.

Turin and its province are experiencing since several years an economic and industrial crisis with a strong negative impact on the local labour market. A report of the Chamber of Commerce of Turin entitled "Torino Economia 2007" that was available while preparing the survey presented rather discouraging unemployment trends. The unemployment rate passed from 4.1% in 2006 to 4,7% in 2007 and that would become even worst in the following years (6.8 per cent in 2009). The youth are those most hit by these trends: from 2009 to 2010, the number of new jobs for the *under34* has increased of only 3.6 per cent whereas for the *over35* it has increased of 13 per cent (Ires-Morosini 2010:1).

If we consider the employment rate, Turin has the lowest youth (15-24 years old) employment rate in the region Piedmont (30.5 per cent while at regional level it is 35.4 per cent), whereas for the other ages cohorts it is on the regional means. According to the Chamber of Commerce data, self-employed represent 9.6 per cent of the overall employed population: this is reflected by our survey where the percentage of self-employed is 7 per cent. Concerning the socio-demographic composition of our sample, women with an high school diploma prevail (52 per cent). The overall percentage of employed with a certain educational level is 17.8 per cent (in the report Torino Economia 2007 it was equals to 17.4 per cent).

2. Social background

Table 1 presents an overview of the socio-demographic composition of our three interviewed groups.

Table 1: socio-demographic composition of the sample (percentages)

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
<i>Gender</i>	47.7	38.1	40.9
Men	52.3	61.9	59.1
Women	(n=480)	(n=480)	(n=484)
(Cramer's $V = .081^{**}$) ¹¹			
<i>Age</i>	61.5	61.0	60.8
18-24	38.5	39.0	39.2
25-34	(n=480)	(n=480)	(n=484)
(Cramer's $V = .10^{***}$)			
<i>Education</i>	10.1	11.8	19.5
Compulsory school	75.5	66.7	52.0
Upper secondary school	0.9	1.3	8.4
Post secondary school	10.5	11.8	13.2
Tertiary education first stage	3.1	8.4	6.9
Tertiary second stage	(n=457)	(n=475)	(n=477)
(Cramer's $V = .187^{***}$)			
<i>Native or immigrant</i>	98.7	98.1	95.4
Native	1.3	1.9	4.6
Immigrant	(n=458)	(n=474)	(n=483)
(Cramer's $V = .089^{**}$)			
<i>Marital status</i>	45.7	37.9	40.0
Single	54.3	62.1	60.0
In partnership	(n=455)	(n=467)	(n=440)
(Cramer's $V = .067^{*}$)			
<i>Living conditions</i>	9.6	7.4	9.8
Living alone	90.4	92.6	90.2
Living together with someone	(n=479)	(n=473)	(n=471)
<i>Parenthood</i>			
Living with children	15.6	18.5	18.7
Living without children	84.4	81.5	81.3
(Phi = .311 ^{***})	(n=436)	(n=449)	(n=447)
<i>Finances</i>			
Salary	0.0	68.3	84.7
Unemployment benefits	0.9	0.0	0.0
Social aid	3.4	0.0	0.0
Family member	89.9	31.3	14.9
Other	5.8	0.4	0.4
(Cramer's $V = .521^{***}$)	(n=445)	(n=467)	(n=478)
<i>Personal income</i>			
Mean (€)	123.74	793.08	1048.94
Median (€)	0.00	765.00	1097.00
(Eta ² = .450 ^{***})	(n=151)	(n=238)	(n=185)
<i>If unemployed</i>			
Benefiting from an active measure/employment measure	0.2		
	(n=468)		
Have never had a paid job	26.4		
	(n=470)		

¹¹ Significance levels: no star: the relationship is not significant, *=significant on the 0.05 level, **=significant on the 0.01 level, ***=significant on the 0.001 level.

Women are slightly more numerous than men in all the groups as well as younger cohorts (18-24) that represent 60 per cent of the sample. The majority of our interviewees has completed an upper secondary school education whereas only a minority has completed a tertiary education curriculum (and the percentage of interviewees with a degree is lower among unemployed than among the other two groups).

A first effect of unemployment on our young interviewees may be derived from the data concerning the marital status where we find that those who are employed (either permanently or on a non-standard base) tend to live in partnership more than unemployed. As expected, not to have a job, that is not to have an income, is a factor obstructing the transition to adulthood. This is also confirmed by the figures concerning parenthood showing that there are fewer unemployed than employed with children (on these aspects, see the Italian National Report on WP4 for a more detailed analysis).

Furthermore, the effect of unemployment on the capacity of a young person to move towards an adult and independent life emerges clearly from the figures about interviewees' incomes/funding. Most of the unemployed have to rely on their family members for their financial/economic needs, while "only" a third of those who are on a non-standard form of employment, and only 15 per cent of those who work regularly, declare recurring to parents' financial support.

Finally, the scarce means of the Italian welfare system are reflected by the last dimension presented at the bottom of table 1: only 0.2 per cent of unemployed declare being under an active policy measure or covered by an unemployment protection scheme. This as well contributes preventing young Italian unemployed from becoming 'adults'.

3. Relation to work and unemployment

This section of the report deals with the perceptions and ideas young people have concerning various aspects of their life, including (un)employment. The first glimpse offered by table 2 shows the diffusion of work satisfaction between the two groups of the survey we could check this, i.e. precarious workers and regularly employed. General work satisfaction, measured on a 0-10 points scale, is quite high in both groups, although, unexpectedly, it is higher among precarious workers than regularly employed youth. We can make speculations about such a result: precarious workers are very often young people having found a job after a medium to long period of unemployment and as such they tend to appreciate the simple fact of having finally a job. Or, another interpretation of such a result could rely on a certain 'work fatigue' developed by regularly employed youth: they may develop a certain routine-led approach to their activity which reduces their initial enthusiasm and their work appreciation. But we do not have the possibility to explore these speculations more in depth here.

Table 2: *Work satisfaction (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Work general satisfaction during the last 12 months		8.30 (n=480)	7.74 (n=484)

The survey has been carried out in the midst of the global economic crisis with unemployment rates skyrocketing everywhere, especially in Italy, one of the countries with a traditional higher youth unemployment rate in Europe. This situation is well reflected in the results of our survey: almost half of the young unemployed we interviewed (44.8 per cent) have low hopes to find a job and one third of both the precarious workers (28.8 per cent) and the regularly employed (34.3 per cent) do not envisage as a realistic opportunity finding a better job (see table 3). Furthermore, more than one third among both young precarious workers and young employed fear of losing their job (respectively 34.4 per cent and 32 per cent).

Table 3: *Percentage of those having low hopes for getting a job/a better job within one year and percentage of those having high fears of losing their job.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
<i>Low hopes of getting a job</i>	44.8 (n=480)		
<i>Low hopes of getting a better job</i> (Phi=-.316***)		28.8 (n=480)	34.3 (n=484)
<i>High fears of losing the job</i> (Phi=.098*)		34.4 (n=480)	32.0 (n=484)

We have asked our interviewees to state how important several aspects of life are, among such aspects there is of course also work (see table 4). We can begin by noting that although having a job is considered very important across the three groups, other aspects of life like family, friends but also leisure time, appear as equally or in some cases even more important than work. In general, it does not seem that the position in the labour market (being in or out of it) is associated with major discrepancies in how important specific aspects of life are: the differences among unemployed, precarious workers and regularly employed about what counts in life are small (when they exist at all). However, we can point out that where the three groups differ most is vis-à-vis their consideration of politics. As we examine and discuss more in depth in the next sections of this report, being an unemployed or a precarious worker in Turin is associated with a stronger political consciousness. A final aspect worth to be noted is a certain confirmed secularisation of contemporary youth cohorts: religion results from our survey as the less relevant aspect of life, among those listed.

There is a gap in the perception of unemployment between those who experience it and the others, that is, there are differences in the consideration of the status of unemployment between those who are unemployed and those who do have a (permanent or precarious) job. The unemployed, in fact, present their status less dramatically than those who see it from 'the other side of the river': only half of the young unemployed affirm getting bored quickly when they have no work to do in contrast with 71 per cent of precarious workers and 65.7 per cent of the regularly employed.

Table 4: *The importance of different aspects of life (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family	9.28 (n=480)	9.06 (n=480)	9.54 (n=484)
Friends	9.17 (n=480)	9.61 (n=480)	8.30 (n=484)
Leisure time	8.74 (n=480)	8.12 (n=480)	8.50 (n=484)
Politics	6.09 (n=480)	5.62 (n=480)	4.74 (n=484)
Work	8.38 (n=480)	8.42 (n=480)	8.63 (n=484)
Religion	5.82 (n=480)	5.37 (n=480)	5.78 (n=484)
Voluntary organizations	9.11 (n=480)	7.40 (n=480)	9.70 (n=484)

Similarly, almost one third of the unemployed admit that the most important things in life do not involve work while only 20 per cent of those in regular work do (see table 5).

Table 5: *Percentage of those who agree to different statements about work and unemployment.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Having a paid job to go to is very important (<i>Phi</i> =.188***)	90.1 (n=480)	92.7 (n=480)	96.2 (n=484)
If I won a large sum of money I would immediately stop working (<i>Phi</i> =.243***)	20.6 (n=480)	17.7 (n=480)	27.9 (n=484)
Unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person (<i>Phi</i> =.185***)	70.0 (n=480)	72.3 (n=480)	76.9 (n=484)
I get bored quickly when I have no work to do (<i>Phi</i> =.286***)	51.5 (n=480)	70.9 (n=480)	65.7 (n=484)
The most important things that happen in life do not involve work (<i>Phi</i> =.312***)	28.8 (n=480)	26.9 (n=480)	20.0 (n=484)
Being without a job gives time to spend on other important things (<i>Phi</i> =.340***)	36.1 (n=480)	32.8 (n=480)	32.0 (n=484)
If the unemployment benefit was very high I would not want a paid job to go to (<i>Phi</i> =.251***)	12.5 (n=480)	11.0 (n=480)	9.7 (n=484)

These data, however, should be complemented with those we gathered through in-depth interviews with young unemployed (see WP4 National report for Italy), as from those interviews even the few positive aspects one may associate with unemployment (like extra spare time for leisure or friends) are not considered at all by young unemployed as positive opportunities.

Salary and social contacts result from this survey as the most important factors related to work with a substantial equal weight at the eyes of our young interviewees (see table 6), other aspects of work like personal development are more appreciated by those with an active working positions than by unemployed. Interestingly, and maybe not surprisingly, the role of work as an identity provider is more relevant among those with a permanent job or those with a precarious one than among the unemployed that need to count on “substitutive identities” (see on this aspect our WP4 report).

Table 6: *Percentage of who consider different functions of work as being important*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The salary (<i>Phi</i> =.107*)	93.8 (n=480)	96.3 (n=480)	97.1 (n=484)
Regular activities (tradotto come attività routinarie però) (<i>Phi</i> =.242***)	64.2 (n=480)	69.6 (n=480)	65.5 (n=484)
Social contacts (<i>Phi</i> =.152***)	93.0 (n=480)	97.7 (n=480)	96.5 (n=484)
Gives an identity and status (<i>Phi</i> =.143**)	85.0 (n=480)	89.6 (n=480)	92.4 (n=484)
Personal development (<i>Phi</i> =.372***)	92.5 (n=480)	99.2 (n=480)	97.9 (n=484)

Tables 7 and 8 allow to ascertain the persistence of gendered views and considerations of work among cohorts of young people.

Table 7: *Attitudes to the importance of having a fulltime job among men and women, with and without small children (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The importance for men	8.62 (n=480)	7.58 (n=480)	7.85 (n=484)
The importance for women	8.26 (n=480)	7.32 (n=480)	6.81 (n=484)
The importance for men with children younger than 3	8.69 (n=480)	7.96 (n=480)	9.06 (n=484)
The importance for women with children younger than 3	7.28 (n=480)	8.60 (n=480)	7.21 (n=484)

As we see from these tables, small ‘gendered’ views do persist: regularly employed interviewees consider more important for a man than for a woman to get a job (cfr. first and second lines of table 7) and this sensible preference for men is acknowledged across our three groups of interviewees.

Table 8: Percentages of those who agree to different statements regarding the roles of men and women.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family ($\Phi=0.283^{***}$)	60.2 (n=324)	69.0 (n=403)	67.6 (n=399)
Men should take as much responsibility as women for there home and children ($\Phi=0.214^{***}$)	79.5 (n=325)	94.8 (n=409)	90.5 (n=406)
When jobs are scarce, men should have jobs in the first place ($\Phi=0.392^{***}$)	20.7 (n=324)	18.6 (n=409)	32.8 (n=403)

The same pattern of ‘genderisation’ of work perceptions is unveiled by table 8 where men are considered to be preferred to women in getting a job in a period of scarcity, although from an overall minority of interviewees, e.g. only 20 per cent among unemployed and precarious workers and 32.8 per cent among regularly employed youth (see last line of table 8).

4. Social exclusion

Social exclusion is a complex concept, which conveys different meanings in different societies. Indeed, who becomes excluded and how in a given society is a matter of the differential between individual social activities and the average man in a given society. Even though for the comparative studies we are carrying out it is very important to be able to identify characteristics of social exclusion without relying on the distribution of the variables in the society, at this stage we will focus on the concept of social exclusion as the (relative) lack of certain social activities or support. Therefore we will take a ‘social capital’ driven approach. More precisely, the idea provided by the social capital literature is that social connections are inherently positive. Moving from a collective interpretation of social capital (Putnam, 1993; Coleman, 1990), authors have developed an individual level understanding of social capital (Burt, 1993; 1998, 2005), closely linked to individual capacity for action. The success of action is linked to the quality of social capital, among other factors (Lin 2001:59-77): individual access to social capital (number of connections of an individual) and the advantage of social ties (strength of weak connections as well as strong ones). Indeed, Alejandro Portes argues that social capital typically refers to ‘the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures’ (Portes, 1998: 6). Therefore, at the individual level, the positive effects of a denser social network can be conceived of in a number of different ways: the raw number of friends, acquaintances and family

relations; the capacity of support of one's social network; the level of social embeddedness measured in terms of number of associations a person belong to, etc.

We will hence take into account:

1. the density of human relations (number of friends/acquaintances) and the frequency of contact;
2. the presence of social support;
3. the real social activities carried out in the spare time;
4. as well as a more direct clue to social exclusion in terms of perceived discrimination.

Dimensions of human relations

The first dimension of social exclusion we consider builds on the lack of social network as a raw measure of individual scarcity of social capital. In this study, it is important to understand whether labour status influences the likelihood that an individual will have a denser or a narrower social network. This has been operationalised with variables focusing on number of friends – that is *people an individual feels comfortable with and can talk with about private issues or ask for help if necessary* – and the frequency of social contacts (with friends but also with acquaintances or family members).

As presented by Table 9, precarious youth have the highest number of friends (if we sum the values “3-7 people” and “More than 7 people”) closely followed by regularly employed, whereas the unemployed have the lowest number of friends. Again, the unemployed are also the second group for lack of friends (5.3 per cent of them declaring not having friends) while regularly employed youth are those among which only very few (0.8 per cent) declare not having friends at all. Hence, having a regular employment is associated, in these data, with a stronger social capital in terms of number of friends while being unemployed corresponds to a poorer social capital.

Table 9: *Percentage of individuals with different numbers of friends – people they feel comfortable with and can talk with about private issues or ask for help if necessary.*

Frequencies (SD15/1-4)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	regularly employed
None	5,3	11,1	0,8
1-2 people	33,8	13,4	28,2
3-7 people	41,6	49,1	54,9
More than 7 people	19,3	26,5	16,1

*N= 1433 (n1=471 n2=479 n3=483); Cramer's V = 0,194****

A similar picture comes from considering the second variable we use to measure individual social embeddedness (frequency of contacts). Table 10 shows the proportion of those who have not met with family members, friends, and acquaintances during the last month. Among the precarious youth, there is the highest percentage of people not having met someone of each specific group of people (family members 28%, friends 10% and acquaintances 18%); the lowest percentage is registered twice among the regularly employed (10% with family members and 6% with friends) and once among long-term unemployed (7% with acquaintances).

When considering the first two types of relationships (family members and friends), the long-term unemployed are between the two groups, closer to the regularly employed. Hence, the impact of precariousness seems to be particularly strong, producing a decline in social contacts and relationships. The same seems to be true, although at a lesser extent, for long-term unemployment when considering relationship with family members.

Table 10: Percentage of those who has not met different categories of people during the last month.

Categories (SD14,16,17/1)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family members not living in the household <i>Cramer's V</i> =.159***	17,2 (<i>n</i> =471)	28,0 (<i>n</i> =475)	10,1 (<i>n</i> =483)
Friends not living in the household <i>Cramer's V</i> =.132***	7,9 (<i>n</i> =470)	10,3 (<i>n</i> =478)	6,0 (<i>n</i> =484)
Acquaintances not living in the household <i>Cramer's V</i> =.147***	7,4 (<i>n</i> =473)	17,9 (<i>n</i> =476)	7,9 (<i>n</i> =479)

Presence of social support

Another dimension of social exclusion considered here is the lack of social support; it is therefore quite unsurprising that this variable behaves in accordance with those presented above. However, some specifications have to be made when considering the different source of social support.

Indeed, table 11 shows that those with a regular job tend to have better support (with some exceptions); the group registering the lowest support, however, changes according to subject offering the support. More precisely, when considering a general support (help from anybody), the long-term unemployed are those who receive the least support (57,5% of cases), closely followed by precarious youth (51,3%). On the other hand, regularly employed individuals without any support are a little more than half (34,7%). However, a different pattern can be found when considering the specific categories of people giving support.

Table 11: Percentage who did not receive help from different categories of people during the last month.

Categories (SD 20,20b/1)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one <i>Cramer's V</i> =.193***	57,5 (<i>n</i> =480)	51,3 (<i>n</i> =480)	34,7 (<i>n</i> =484)
Partner <i>Cramer's V</i> =.214***	34,5 (<i>n</i> =197)	37,2 (<i>n</i> =231)	22,4 (<i>n</i> =313)
Family members (not in the same household) <i>Cramer's V</i> =.116**	11,3 (<i>n</i> =204)	8,5 (<i>n</i> =234)	12,3 (<i>n</i> =316)
Friends <i>Cramer's V</i> =.293	9,8 (<i>n</i> =204)	10,3 (<i>n</i> =234)	12,3 (<i>n</i> =316)
Acquaintances <i>Cramer's V</i> =.120***	36,5 (<i>n</i> =203)	44,9 (<i>n</i> =234)	38,9 (<i>n</i> =316)
Colleagues/former colleagues <i>Cramer's V</i> =.215***	50,2 (<i>n</i> =203)	60,3 (<i>n</i> =234)	49,4 (<i>n</i> =316)
Neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances) <i>Cramer's V</i> =.236***	46,8 (<i>n</i> =203)	73,9 (<i>n</i> =234)	64,9 (<i>n</i> =316)

Of those who live in a partnership, 37,2% of precarious and 34,5% of long-term unemployed individuals did not receive support from their partner (against the 22,4% of those with a regular job), similarly to those who did not receive help from friends, acquaintances and (former) colleagues. Finally, a completely different pattern is observed when the support received by family members is considered on its own: the regularly employed groups register the least support (12,3%), closely followed by unemployed (11,3%) and precarious youth (8,5%).

The research investigates also the specular question of ‘giving support’ to different groups of people during the last year. As table 12 illustrates, the percentages are generally slightly lower for precarious youth and regularly employed individuals, which means that the respondents report giving help more often than receiving it. On the other hand, long-term unemployed youth tend to give less support than they receive (with the exception of help given to friends). Small differences also regard specific cases for the other two groups, such as acquaintances (who give more support than they received from precarious youth), partners (who give more support than they received from regularly employed individuals).

The inter-group pattern is similar to the one depicted above. Again, among the young people with a regular job the rate of those who have not given help is generally lowest. On the other hand the rate of precarious and long-term unemployed youth changes according to the category considered. Therefore when considering giving help to anybody, precarious youth are closer to regularly employed individuals (24,5% for the former, 22,2% for the latter); however, the same group is the one least supportive towards family members (13,6%), friends (10,8%), acquaintances (46,1%) and neighbours (68,5%). Clearly, long-term unemployed is the group that displays the least support towards the other categories: anybody (45,9%), partner (37,7%) and (former) colleagues (61,1%). More interestingly, the precarious and long-term unemployed groups seem to behave quite similarly (with the only exception of “supporting anybody”).

Table 12: Percentage who did not offer help to different categories of people during the last month.

Categories (SD21, 21b/1)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one <i>Cramer's V</i> =.231***	45,9 (<i>n</i> =477)	24,5 (<i>n</i> =478)	22,2 (<i>n</i> =483)
Partner <i>Cramer's V</i> =.140***	37,7 (<i>n</i> =247)	35,1 (<i>n</i> =356)	27,3 (<i>n</i> =373)
Family members (not in the same household) <i>Cramer's V</i> =.142**	12,5 (<i>n</i> =257)	13,6 (<i>n</i> =361)	10,7 (<i>n</i> =375)
Friends <i>Cramer's V</i> =.130***	7,8 (<i>n</i> =256)	10,8 (<i>n</i> =361)	5,3 (<i>n</i> =376)
Acquaintances <i>Cramer's V</i> =.120***	45,0 (<i>n</i> =258)	46,1 (<i>n</i> =360)	36,4 (<i>n</i> =376)
Colleagues/former colleagues <i>Cramer's V</i> =.166***	61,1 (<i>n</i> =257)	55,4 (<i>n</i> =359)	42,0 (<i>n</i> =376)
Neighbours (who are not friends or acquaintances) <i>Cramer's V</i> =.131***	65,9 (<i>n</i> =258)	68,5 (<i>n</i> =359)	58,8 (<i>n</i> =376)

The same dimension of social support can be grasped more concretely by considering a specific aspect that is the support provided by money transfer. In order to consider both the availability of resources and the actual resources received, the questionnaire posed two different questions: one related to the first aspect (*how difficult or easy it would be to borrow money if they were in serious financial difficulties*) and one to the second (*actual borrowing of money from someone during the past 12 months*).

Concerning the first aspect, Table 13 shows the interviewees' answers to this question along the four possible categories (from very difficult to very easy to borrow money in the case of serious financial difficulties). There is a considerably significant effect of status group on this issue. For the unemployed, it would be the most difficult to borrow money; for the precarious youth the easiest. The young people with a regular job are located in between, except for the answer 'very easy' where they rank first, registering double the percentage of the long-term employed group.

Table 13: Percentages by group for how difficult or easy it would be to borrow money if they were in serious financial difficulties.

How difficult or easy (BQ14/1-4)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Very difficult	23,2	17,3	23,2
Quite difficult	41,1	35,4	33,5
Quite easy	31,4	40,7	34,4
Very easy	4,3	6,6	8,9

$N = 1381$ ($n1=462$ $n2=457$ $n3=462$); Cramer's $V = 0,089^{***}$

When considering the people who actually borrowed money in the past years, the percentage is about 11-15% and it is not affected by labour status. However, if we take into account where the money comes from, some interesting differences emerge. Indeed, the regularly employed have a wider pool of sources made up of family, partner and friends (as the other groups) but also acquaintances, colleagues and neighbors.

Table 14: Percentage who have borrowed money from someone during the past 12 months and from whom they have borrowed the money.

Borrowed money and from whom	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Have borrowed money during the past 12 month (SD22/1) Cramer's $V = .138$	11,3 ($n=468$)	14,0 ($n=479$)	15,7 ($n=483$)
From their partner (SD22bA/2-4) Cramer's $V = .173$	33,3 ($n=51$)	31,3 ($n=67$)	45,3 ($n=75$)
From family members not living in the same household (SD22bB/2-4) Cramer's $V = .255^{***}$	82,4 ($n=51$)	82,1 ($n=67$)	73,7 ($n=76$)
From their friends (SD22bC/2-4) Cramer's $V = .143$	32,0 ($n=50$)	29,9 ($n=67$)	31,9 ($n=72$)
From acquaintances (SD22bD/2-4) Cramer's $V = .256^{***}$	5,9 ($n=51$)	13,4 ($n=67$)	34,2 ($n=76$)
From their colleagues or former colleagues (SD22bE/2-4) Cramer's $V = .307^{***}$	2,0 ($n=51$)	1,5 ($n=67$)	31,6 ($n=76$)
From their neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances (SD22bF/2-4) Cramer's $V = .281^{***}$	3,9 ($n=51$)	4,5 ($n=67$)	32,9 ($n=76$)

NB. The Cramer's V is not directly related to this table, but it has been assessed by the overall distribution in four categories of interest for each by each group. Values in the table are the sum of any positive answer.

The differential size is astonishing: almost thirty points divide the regularly employed from the other two groups for the latter source of money. On the other hand the differential is very small (and not significant) for the percentage of people receiving money from partners and friends. Finally, the family seems to be the most importance source of 'additional' income for the long-term unemployed as well as for the precarious youth. This finding can be understood bearing in mind that these two groups have more difficulties in finding someone who is able to lend them money. Clearly, the harder the financial situation and the weaker the social surrounding, the more one has to rely on family, stressing once again the importance of family network (and support) in Italian society.

Social activities carried out in spare time

The third dimension investigated in order to understand the social exclusion of Italian youth in Turin is linked to the (absence of) involvement in social activities. This has been articulated in two different aspects: the first one (Tab. 15) is about the perception of how often respondents take part in social activities compared to other people in their age group; the second (Tab. 16) focuses on the proportions of those who are not active in any spare time activities such as a hobby or sports. While the former aspect relies on two competing assumptions – either each person's network is composed of the same percentage of people in the three groups, or each interviewee has a perfect capacity for understanding the 'mean' value of the society, the latter is a raw measure of personal activity. For this reason we present both results but we will focus on the latter one.

As regards the first factor, individuals' perception of their relative social involvement is quite similar regardless of their employment status group. The general feeling is that our interviewees take part in social activities rather more seldom than others. But in spite of this general tendency, there are significant group differences. The regularly employed youth say that they take part much more often than any other group (12,4% against 2,9% for long-term unemployed and 8,6% for precarious youth).

Table 15: *Taking part in social activities. Percentages compared to other people of the same age.*

Frequency in relation to other people (SD19/1-5)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Much more seldom than most people in their age group	3,6	14,4	3,8
More seldom than most	25,8	14,0	26,0
About the same	52,7	48,0	48,0
More often than most	14,9	15,0	9,9
Much more often than most	2,9	8,6	12,4

*N= 1432 (n1=476 n2=479 n3=477); Cramer's V = 0,192****

As already mentioned, Table 16 gives a more reliable picture of the societal activation of the youth in Turin, since it does not require any specific assumption. The table is

composed of two parts; the first row gives the percentage of the 'inactive', while each of the following rows specifies a reason for such inactiveness.

Clearly, the percentage of inactive long-term unemployed youth is higher; however, it is more than twice the percentage of precarious youth (the lowest with 12,9%) and ten points higher than that of people with a regular job (15,9%). This latter figure is strongly influenced by the older profile of regularly employed individuals, since the age variable is positive correlated to inactiveness (the older the person, the higher the likelihood of inactivity). Reasons for not being active are quite similar for the different groups. However, some differences can be singled out. About 23% of the 'inactive' precarious youth just do not have a hobby; this rate is lower among the unemployed (17,1%) and those with a regular job (11,7%). On the other hand, precarious youth also have the lowest rate of those who are not interested in their hobby any more (9,85%), while long-term unemployed and regularly employed score similar results (20,3% and 22,1% respectively). The most frequent reason for every group is that they cannot afford it any more: the figures range from a 39.0% of regularly employed to 47,5% of precarious youth. This indication is quite interesting since 'not being active in spare time activities' seems to be more a financial issue than anything else, independently of labour status. The financial aspect is clearly much more important for precarious youth (and long-term unemployed), also considering the different age composition of the three groups. Indeed, younger people (who are more present in these two groups) tend not to use such explanations, lowering *ceteris paribus* the probability of the financial reason for these groups.

Table 16: People who are not active in any 'spare time' activities such as hobbies or sports and reasons why they are not active in these kind of activities. Percentage.

Are not active in spare time activities and reasons why	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not active (SD13/2) <i>Cramer's V</i> =,150***	26,5 (<i>n</i> =480)	12,9 (<i>n</i> =480)	15,9 (<i>n</i> =484)
Because they have no hobby/sport (SD13b/1)	17,1	23,0	11,7
Because they are not interested in their hobbies/sports any more (SD13b/2)	20,3	9,8	22,1
Because they cannot afford it any more (SD13b/3)	43,9	47,5	39,0
Because of another reason (SD13b/4)	18,7	19,7	27,3

N= 261 (*n*₁=123 *n*₂=61 *n*₃=77); *Cramer's V* = 0,227

Perceived discrimination

The last dimension of social exclusion discussed focuses on self-perception of experienced discrimination. More precisely the questionnaire asked the interviewees to mention if they have ever felt discriminated (10,9% of our sample) and for what reason. The reasons are diverse, but the most important one is employment status (25% on average), closely followed by the age (24,4%). Unlikely anything we have already presented, all differences are not significant across the groups, including employment status. On the other hand if we control for age groups (18-24 and 25-34 years old) the differences became significant in three cases: older youth are more discriminated on

grounds of nationality, gender and sexuality. The lack of significance is probably connected to the low figures involved, however differences are quite wide (in percentage): the linguistic prejudice affects only long-term unemployed, while ethnic origin (and disability) is a major problem only for regular workers. Finally, gender is an important issue twice as often among regularly employed (14%) than for long-term unemployed.

Table 17: *Experiences of discrimination. Percentage who consider themselves as belonging to a discriminated group.*

Different groups (WBD7/2, WBD8/1-11)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No <i>Cramer's V=.247</i>	90,9 (n=474)	87,6 (n=475)	88,8 (n=484)
Colour or race <i>Cramer's V=.074</i>	7,0 (n=43)	3,4 (n=59)	3,7 (n=54)
Nationality <i>Cramer's V=.043</i>	7,0 (n=43)	5,1 (n=59)	7,4 (n=54)
Religion <i>Cramer's V=.108</i>	7,0 (n=43)	6,8 (n=59)	1,9 (n=54)
Language <i>Cramer's V=.130</i>	2,3 (n=43)	0,0 (n=59)	0,0 (n=54)
Ethnic group <i>Cramer's V=.178</i>	0,0 (n=43)	1,7 (n=59)	7,4 (n=54)
Age <i>Cramer's V=.146</i>	32,6 (n=43)	25,4 (n=59)	16,7 (n=54)
Gender <i>Cramer's V=.100</i>	7,0 (n=43)	10,2 (n=59)	14,8 (n=54)
Sexuality <i>Cramer's V=.107</i>	4,7 (n=43)	11,9 (n=59)	7,4 (n=54)
Disability <i>Cramer's V=.124</i>	0,0 (n=43)	3,4 (n=59)	5,6 (n=54)
Employment status <i>Cramer's V=.016</i>	25,6 (n=43)	25,4 (n=59)	24,1 (n=54)
Other <i>Cramer's V=.158</i>	7,0 (n=43)	6,8 (n=59)	0,0 (n=54)

Having controlled for perceived discrimination, we then assessed prejudices against the unemployed based on stereotypes. Table 18 shows the proportions of those who think, apart from their own opinion, that most or many people have certain attitudes towards unemployed people. Regardless of their employment status, the majority of our interviewees think that many or most people have prejudices against the unemployed. According to the average interviewee half of all people believe that unemployed people are lazy and inactive (without initiative), moreover half thinks that they take advantage of the system or they faced bad luck.

If we compare groups, rates are higher among the long-term unemployed. The only exceptions are in those attitudes where the difference is not relevant (as being lazy or having a bad luck). Otherwise, long-term unemployed individuals' perception of people's feeling towards them is always the most negative, reaching almost thirty points of difference when the perception is about alcohol or drugs as a source of stereotypes.

Table 18: Percentage who think that different kinds of attitudes to unemployed people occur among most or many people.

Different kinds of attitudes about unemployed people	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
They are lazy (SD10A/3,4) <i>Cramer's V=.025</i>	54,9 (n=463)	57,9 (n=478)	56,1 (n=481)
They intend to take advantage of the system (SD10B/3,4) <i>Cramer's V=.069*</i>	54,3 (n=475)	46,4 (n=478)	47,7 (n=478)
They are passive/without initiative (SD10C/3,4) <i>Cramer's V=.013</i>	51,7 (n=474)	50,1 (n=475)	50,8 (n=484)
They have bad luck (SD10D/3,4) <i>Cramer's V=.019</i>	49,2 (n=474)	49,1 (n=479)	47,1 (n=482)
They have themselves to blame (SD10D/3,4) <i>Cramer's V=.147***</i>	42,9 (n=476)	27,7 (n=477)	28,8 (n=483)
They have no job because of alcohol or drug problems (SD10D/3,4) <i>Cramer's V=.184***</i>	38,7 (n=470)	20,5 (n=474)	22,3 (n=480)
They are people who have become victims of the socio-economic development (SD10D/3,4) <i>Cramer's V=.115***</i>	46,2 (n=472)	32,5 (n=476)	37,4 (n=481)

To conclude, the sample of youth in Turin tends to confirm (to some extent) the thesis that long-term unemployment leads to an erosion of social capital and social activities. The unemployed have significantly fewer friends than the other groups. They receive and give help to other people less often, and they take part in social activities and hobbies more seldom. However, there is a new 'competing' group, that of precarious people, that face similar conditions above all when it comes to the frequency of contacts, perceived involvement in social activities (compared to peers) and receiving support from specific groups of people (such as acquaintances and neighbours). Moreover the percentage of those who consider themselves as belonging to a group that is discriminated against is slightly higher for precarious people than for long-term unemployed. Generally the erosion of social capital can be observed for both groups, but its impact and its influence are different. A better assessment of these differences should be carried out controlling also for other variables. On the other hand, having a regular job does consistently help in creating social inclusion for each dimension analyzed, with the only major exception of involvement in social activities where precarious youth score better.

5. Political exclusion

Political exclusion is deeply intertwined with social exclusion; it is nonetheless characterized by the existence of a process of exclusion within the context of the political sphere. More precisely, political exclusion may be considered as the other side of political participation. Indeed in this project political exclusion has been conceptualised as the relative lack of political participation.¹² This it is often considered

¹² Since the absolute lack of political participation is very rare (see below), political exclusion has to be considered as the relative absence of political participation; i.e. if political participation is made up of six forms (or activities), exclusion has to be measured by the average number vis-à-vis the total number or any other benchmark.

as the range of activities aimed (directly or indirectly) 'at influencing the selection of governmental personnel and/or the actions they take' (Verba and Nie, 1972 cited in Conway, 1991: 32). However, the range of such activities has often been contested because it is time- and space- contingent. Lester Milbrath's seminal work of 1965, for example, identifies some fourteen items in the spectrum of political activities (Box 1). Although this list (or ladder) is highly considered among scholars (Ruedin, 2007), it has been challenged in many respects.

Box 1: *Forms of political participation, adaptation from Milbrath 1965.*

1. To expose oneself to political stimuli
2. To vote
3. To start a political discussion
4. To try to persuade someone else to vote in a certain way
5. To carry a political badge
6. To be in contact with a political operative or manager
7. To contribute money to a party or a candidate
8. To take part in a rally or a public meeting
9. To contribute one's time to a political campaign
10. To become an active member of a political party
11. To take part in a meeting where political decisions are made
12. To solicit financial contributions for political causes
13. Candidate for office
14. Holding office

More precisely, its major problems are related to the huge variety it encompasses: latent types of participation (political exposure), institutionalised activities (electoral participation) as well as specific behaviours (being part of the establishment). The latter one has been disputed by some scholars (Pasquino, 1975: 55) because it mixes political participation with actual decision-making. Moreover, Milbrath's list does not consider any form that is not directly connected with political institutions. Later on, Dalton (1998) reorganised and expanded Milbrath's list to encompass non-conventional forms of participation (Box 2): those attitudes and activities not oriented towards institutional politics, i.e. the new political forms that have spread through Western countries from the 1970s onwards.

Box 2: Forms of participation, adaptation from Dalton, 1988.

Writing to journals; Boycotting a product or company Self-reduction of taxes or rent; Building occupation; Traffic blocking; Signing a petition Sit-in; Participating to a 'wild' strike; Participating in a demonstration Damaging private property; Deliberate use of violence against people.

Even though the 'listing' procedure is unable to overcome the historical contingencies, as well as the local/national idiosyncrasies, it remains the most convenient approach used in surveys and panel data. Therefore it is always useful to remember that this list is only a proxy for the general idea of political participation, which is made up of 'all voluntary activities by individual citizens intended to influence either directly or indirectly political choices at various levels' (Barnes and Kaase, 1979: 36-37).

Once it is more clear what political exclusion is (the relative lack of political participation), it is important to stress the importance of sociological features of individuals in affecting their political behaviour. Indeed, demographic variables (age, sex, ethnicity) as well as socio-demographic ones (social class, level of education, employment situation, social status) are strong factors in explaining political participation. More precisely education is one of the strongest predictors of individual political participation (La Due Lake and Huckfeldt, 1998:567). More educated people are more likely to participate in political activities. Hence, considering the correlation between education and labour status it is possible to hypothesise that the higher the educational level, the more stable the job situation and the more active will be the person.

However, since the focus of the YOUNEX project is on unemployed and precarious youth, this paragraph will mainly address the correlation between employment status and different expressions of political exclusion/involvement (being informed, institutional trust, specific modes of participation), since the correlation between education and labour condition has to be better specified (see Tab. 1).

On the basis of this broad framework, some questions can be formulated: How does political involvement among young people differ for the three statuses of employment? What are the different types of political interests and involvement among these three categories?

It will be interesting to examine how the young population's involvement in politics, highlighted in recent research (Caniglia, 2007; EUYOUNG, 2005; Buzzi et al., 2007) is affected by the unemployment and temporary work contract phenomenon. The following are the hypotheses that can be made from the current literature regarding the employment status of young people and their involvement in politics:

1) The level of interest, trust and involvement (latent and active) in politics among the sample of young people will be, for the most part, very low and in line with recent national and European surveys (EUYOUPART 2005; Buzzi et al. 2007). It will be interesting to verify if there is a clear distinction between the two age categories, 18-25 and 26-35.

2) According to the studies conducted by Buzzi et al. (2007) and Caniglia (2007) the most common types of involvement among young people are non-conventional.

3) The level of political involvement will be lower among the unemployed in the sample compared to the other two categories (coherent with the hypothesis on social marginalization as the result of lack of contacts and social and environmental networks linked with the workplace). On the other hand, according to the specific findings of Bay and Blekesaune¹³ (2002), trust in Italian national institutions and overall satisfaction with national politics will be greater among unemployed youth. Indeed, according to these authors 'the high unemployment in Italy also contributes to a normalising of the situation of being unemployed. One is no longer an outsider in society. The basis for a lack of political confidence is thus less. But perhaps equally important: political distrust is a majority attitude in Italy. [...]. Bluntly stated, it can be maintained that it is those who are satisfied who form the deviant group in Italy'. (Bay and Blekesaune, 2002: 138).

Concerning the first hypothesis, the low level of political participation among European youth has to be divided into at least three major components: latent participation (being informed and/or interested), active participation (other forms of participation) and trust. This division is more a matter of empirical research feasibility; indeed while active participation can be directly assessed, the latent can only be grasped indirectly. In the YOUNEX questionnaire this variable has been operationalised by considering interest in politics as the best way to understand the latent effect on political exclusion, since the level of political exposure is quite hard to assess fully.

As concerns the question 'How interested are you in politics?', the answers are astonishing: overall 65,8% of respondents are not interested (33,5% not interested at all; 29,3% not very interested). This follows the hypothesis of the low level of interest in politics among young cohorts (EUYOUPART 2005; Buzzi et al. 2007). Meanwhile, when assessing the influence of labour status on the variable 'interested in politics' a more complex picture emerges (Tab. 19). Indeed, the most politically active group is that made up of precarious workers (45,0%), followed by unemployed (42,0%) and lastly the regularly employed youths (interest score 24,8%). These figures do not support the idea that political exclusion is related to job insecurity, above all considering that the baseline for political inclusion is political interest.

Table 19: Political interest. Percentage.

Grade of interest (PD1/1-4)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not interested at all	30,8	36,0	33,7
Not very interested	27,3	19,0	41,5
Fairly interested	33,8	35,8	16,5
Very interested	8,2	9,2	8,3

*N= 1440 (n1=476 n2=480 n3=484); Cramer's V = 0,170****

¹³ Italy is the only European country where precarious people have a higher level of trust than those who are regularly employed.

Even though there is a striking difference among the groups analysed, this has to be better defined. It is useful, for example, to understand the perception of politics expressed by different groups. The following table (Tab. 20) is a cross-tabulation of the percentage of interviewees (divided into labour-status groups) that considers specific behaviours as related to 'good citizenship'.¹⁴ Clearly, most of these behaviours are perceived as strongly positive (minimum value 76,6%) with the exception of 'being active in politics' which scores very low (31,1% for unemployed; 37,1% for the precarious youth and 34,8% for the permanent workers). Overall the survey corroborates a negative perception of active politics by Italian youth, with the only exception being voting (79,9%, 87,2% and 83,6% for each group respectively)¹⁵. Considering the different groups, the picture is more complex: while precarious youth are the ones giving higher scores for most items (voting in elections, obeying laws and regulations, forming your own opinion independently of others, being active in voluntary organisations, being active in politics, i.e. *less excluded*), they trail the regularly employed in a few items (supporting people who are worse off than themselves).

Table 20 is just a summary of the actual distribution of the perceived importance of these behaviours. Indeed, each item could be ranked on three levels (ranging from not important at all to very important); the Cramer's V suggests that the difference among groups is always significant. Thus it is possible to confirm the hypothesis that long-term unemployed do not consider political activities as important as the other groups.

Table 20: *The importance of different political activities. Percentages who consider the following political activities as important.*

Aspects of politics (PD2/3,4)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Supporting people who are worse off than themselves <i>Cramer's V=.169***</i>	91,5 (N=472)	97,5 (N=478)	99,2 (N=483)
Voting in elections <i>Cramer's V=.079**</i>	80,8 (N=478)	87,2 (N=475)	83,6 (N=475)
Obeying laws and regulations <i>Cramer's V=.138***</i>	91,6 (N=477)	97,9 (N=478)	97,3 (N=483)
Forming your own opinion independently of others <i>Cramer's V=.114***</i>	92,6 (N=474)	97,9 (N=480)	96,9 (N=484)
Being active in voluntary organisations <i>Cramer's V=.122***</i>	76,6 (N=477)	87,4 (N=477)	84,6 (N=482)
Being active in politics <i>Cramer's V=.051</i>	31,1 (N=471)	37,1 (N=480)	34,8 (N=483)

¹⁴ The question was 'To be a good citizen, how important would you say it is for a person to...'

¹⁵ The political participation of young people in democratic representative procedures is not surprisingly high. Indeed the voters' turn-outs for national elections (78,4% in the 2008 election and 83,4% in the 2006 one) in Turin are as high as that measured by the survey. This confirms the general tendency of the democratic system in Italy to be based on representative channels, given the lack of other influential forms of participation and the demise of Italian 'partitocracy' after 1993 (Pappalardo 2006, Pasquino 2006).

However, this aspect of political understanding moves towards different conclusions when compared to other dimensions of political inclusion (see Tab. 21). More precisely, when the research assessed the level of political efficacy, the relative positions of the three groups change. The long-term unemployed, who have been scoring lowest so far, are those with the highest perception of political efficacy. Indeed, the long-term unemployed are convinced that they have an influence on government politics (25,6% against 19,5% and 18,6%), they feel to a lesser extent the difficulty of understanding politics (61,8% against 72,4% and 65,3%) and they have a similar percentage for “considering parties interested only in their votes” (differences are not significant). These results are fairly robust, and indeed they hold also when controlling for age influence (remembering that older youth are concentrated among regular workers). Older people are significantly more optimistic towards parties’ behaviours (and partially more pessimistic towards their influence) when considering a four point scale; thus the high score of the regularly employed for the first item would be even higher if the age distribution was more even.

Table 21: *Percentage of agreement with different statements about political efficacy.*

Statements (PD3/3,4)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion <i>Cramer's V=.030</i>	81,4 (N=478)	82,2 (N=477)	84,1 (N=478)
People like me definitely have an influence on governmental politics <i>Cramer's V=.091**</i>	25,6 (N=472)	19,5 (N=477)	16,8 (N=482)
Sometimes politics is so complicated that people like me do not understand what is going on any more <i>Cramer's V=.093**</i>	61,7 (N=473)	72,3 (N=477)	65,3 (N=479)

The complexity of political exclusion is fundamental to understanding the different level of trust given by the three groups. Indeed, the three groups do not show any constant ranking as regards trust in different parts of the political system (city government, the police, regional parliament, the courts, institutions of the European Union, etc.). While the exact distributions (on a scale from zero to ten) are always significantly different between groups, their average is not. Therefore Table 22, although non-statistically foolproof, is only a useful tool to present the idea that each group has a different level of (dis)trust in specific parts of the system. Indeed, the scores are very low: they hardly reach six, and quite often are lower than five. The trust level of unemployed youth is slightly higher with respect to City assembly, National Government, National Parliament, the Police and Trade Unions, while the trust level of precarious youth is relatively higher when considering Civil Service, City Government, Regional Parliament, Regional Government, European Union, the Media. Generally, regularly employed individuals are those who having the least trust in the system, with the only exceptions being Religious Institutions, the Courts, Employers and enterprises.

Table 22. *Institutional trust (average based on a scale from zero to ten).*

Public institutions (PD4/average)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Civil servants and employees in civil service	5,52	5,67	5,45
[City]government	5,43	5,56	5,34
The [City assembly]	5,40	5,39	5,38
The police	6,63	6,61	6,61
[Where relevant] regional parliament	5,35	5,41	5,40
[Where relevant] regional government	5,16	5,36	5,30
Religious institutions	4,69	4,59	4,88
[Country] government	4,80	4,63	4,59
The courts	5,72	5,71	5,74
[Country] parliament	5,06	4,83	4,75
The institutions of the European Union	6,00	6,15	5,98
Employers and enterprises	5,68**	6,01**	6,13**
The media	4,62	4,79	4,76
Trade unions	5,31	5,03	5,13

**Anova routine measure of significance at 95% level of confidence.

As it is clear from this listing, the trust of regularly employed youth is concentrated in non-political institutions; moreover, if we do not take into account the Regional level¹⁶, their trust in political institutions scores the lowest among the three groups. This is much more clear when aggregating the answers related to political institutions (Local and National government and assembly) while controlling for the different groups (Tab. 22.a). Overall the most trustful group is the long-term unemployed one, followed by precarious people, concluding with the regularly employed who are the least trustful.

Table 22.a: *Trust in political institutions (percentage).*

Public institutions (PD4/sum)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No trust (from 1 to 10)	7,8	9,4	12,2
Little trust (from 11 to 20)	35,6	35,0	36,9
Trustful (from 21 to 30)	52,3	51,4	45,4
Very trustful (from 31 to 40)	4,3	4,2	4,4

N= 1364 (n1=438 n2=457 n3=469); Cramer's V = 0,056 n.s.

Indeed, this idea that the three groups, although different, do not show any coherent trend (as regards trust, opinion and efficacy) towards the political sphere is confirmed by the figures related to the satisfaction with political decisions and the overall democratic functioning. More precisely, the regularly employed group seems to be more satisfied overall, although the values are fairly low (from 3,92 to 5,35). They score higher on a few key issues: the way Italian democracy works¹⁷ (the difference is significant only at the level of 94%), and the management of poverty, education and precarious employment. Precarious youth have a more positive perception related to the economic situation and the way government deals with unemployment. Finally, long-term

¹⁶ The fact that the Regional level (both Government and Assembly) is quite different from other institutional actors is a factor that should be deeply analysed; however, it does not change the overall picture depicted here.

¹⁷ The question taken from the ESS was "On the whole, how satisfied are you with the way democracy works in your country?".

unemployed have a better opinion (although still very low) on the way government deals with healthcare (5,35), environment (4,96) and youth (4,67). These results do not confirm the Bay-Blekesaune hypothesis on political trust. Indeed, not even the question they used for their research (the one on democratic functioning) seems to confirm their finding, since it is one of those with a higher score for the regularly employed youth (although not statistically different). Moreover, controlling for age (since Bay and Blekesaune use a different age group, 15-24) there is no significant distinction, although older people are less satisfied (lowering the value for the regularly employed group).

Table 23: *Satisfaction with political decisions (average based on a scale from zero to ten).*

Political aspects (PD5 and PD6/average)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The way democracy works	5,22	5,01	5,35
Economy	4,64	4,66	4,63
Poverty	4,19	4,21	4,26
Education	4,50	4,45	4,79
Unemployment	4,11	4,31	4,25
Health care	5,35*	4,98*	4,97*
Precarious employment	3,88	3,89	3,92
Environment/sustainable development	4,96*	4,50*	4,75*
Youth	4,67	4,54	4,60

*Anova routine measure of significance at 95% level of confidence

To conclude the assessment of the influence of the employment status on the perceived dimensions of political exclusion (trust, opinion, efficacy, satisfaction), it is difficult to confirm or to contest any of the hypotheses mentioned before. Moreover there is a common ranking neither on single issues (such as political efficacy) nor across different aspects. Therefore it is almost impossible to give a clear picture on the perceived political exclusion. For this reason in Table 24.1 there is a brief summary of the relative position of the three groups as regards certain items, with values from 1 to 3, where the lowest value is the group to be considered most excluded.¹⁸ Even though the three groups behave quite differently across items, overall (last row) the perceived political exclusion is higher for the regular workers, followed by long-term unemployed. Most of this result, however, is linked to the highly perceived efficacy of the latter group as compared to regularly employed youth. On the contrary, the feeling of better inclusion perceived by temporary workers is more homogenous across items, with a few key exceptions: satisfaction towards democracy and political efficacy.

Table 24.1: *Relative position on different political aspects (the lower score, the more excluded).*

Political items	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Interest in politics	2	3	1
Good citizen (general)	1	2,67	2,33
Good citizen (political active)	1	3	2
Political efficacy	3	1,33	1,67
Trust in political institutions (no regional level)	2,50	2,50	1
Satisfaction towards democracy	2	1	3
Satisfaction towards government policy making	2	1,87	2,13
Overall measure	1,93	2,20	1,88

¹⁸ Values are the average of the ranking for the three groups in each sub-item, see table above.

If perceived political exclusion has proved to be a difficult dimension to address, an easier task is the understanding voting participation. Indeed there is a coherent behaviour of the three groups: the precarious youth are the most active, followed by the regularly employed one. Long-term unemployed people clearly lag behind in most of the items analysed. Clearly not all political activities are the same, above all in cross-national projects such as YOUNEX. For this reason special attention has been given to the most prominent ones. So for example ‘voting’, which has been always considered the most basic way of fully participating in democratic societies, is one of the crucial dimensions, although it can hardly be compared cross-nationally (since the average Italian electoral turn-out is much higher than those of most European counterparts). As regards the Turin sample, an important finding has to be put forward on a ‘precarious related hypothesis’: although precarious youth do not have more trust, they have a higher political involvement. Indeed this is statistically confirmed (the precarious youth vote much more than the other groups), while the first hypothesis (low level of participation) is not confirmed. Overall, most of the Turin youth vote both at the national (83,2%) and local elections (82,5%), with a peak at the local level for precarious youth (91,5% of cases). Overall voting behaviours are significantly different at both elections; however, on the local level, age is a determinant aspect (statistically significant) so that older youth (25-35) are less likely to vote. Since the presence of older individuals is disproportionately higher among regularly employed youth, their low score can be considered as a co-product of age and working status.

Table 25: *Participation in elections (percentage who voted in the last elections).*

Kind of election (PD8,PD9/1)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The last national election <i>Cramer's V = 0,092**</i>	78,8** (N=452)	87,1** (N=466)	83,6** (N=464)
The last local election <i>Cramer's V = 0,174***</i>	75,8*** (N=458)	91,5*** (N=449)	80,4*** (N=455)

Moving onto other political activities (see table 26), the ‘precarious hypothesis’ is statistically confirmed in all cases, with the only exception being ‘taking part in a strike’ which is skewed towards regularly employed youth. Hence Italy is confirmed to be the country where precarious workers make up the most politically active group as compared to long-term unemployed and regularly employed youths. On the contrary, the ‘standard’ hypothesis about political exclusion of long-term unemployed is not confirmed at all. Most notably, the long-term unemployed group scores better than regularly employed one in most of the cases (Tab. 26). There are only two exceptions: displaying a badge and signing a petition. However, on these issues, the age variable plays an important role increasing the chance for older people to be active. Since the older youth are more present in the regularly employed group, it is possible that the ‘relative’ high score could be due to the age effect. On the other hand, the same age effect (that is often significant) is not strong enough to help regularly employed youth to score better.

Table 26: Political activity. Percentage who have taken part in different kinds of political activities (* when age is significant with a 95% level of confidence with higher values for older youth, - for those with lower level).

Political activities (PD11/1)	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Contacted a politician <i>Cramer's V</i> =.078**	4,2 (<i>N</i> =480)	5,2 (<i>N</i> =480)	1,7 (<i>N</i> =474)
Contacted a national or local government official <i>Cramer's V</i> =.056 n.s.	4,6 (<i>N</i> =476)	5,4 (<i>N</i> =479)	2,7 (<i>N</i> =477)
Worked for a political party <i>Cramer's V</i> =.081**	0,8 (<i>N</i> =480)	1,9 (<i>N</i> =479)	0,0 (<i>N</i> =480)
Worked in a political action group <i>Cramer's V</i> =.066**	1,5 (<i>N</i> =480)	1,9 (<i>N</i> =480)	0,2 (<i>N</i> =480)
+ Worn or displayed a badge, sticker or poster <i>Cramer's V</i> =.020 n.s.	1,5 (<i>N</i> =480)	1,7 (<i>N</i> =480)	2,1 ⁺ (<i>N</i> =480)
+ Signed a petition <i>Cramer's V</i> =.105***	13,1 (<i>N</i> =480)	23,0 (<i>N</i> =479)	17,4 ⁺ (<i>N</i> =477)
- Taken part in a public demonstration <i>Cramer's V</i> =.051 n.s.	28,7 (<i>N</i> =478)	30,8 (<i>N</i> =480)	25,3 ⁻ (<i>N</i> =479)
Boycotted certain products <i>Cramer's V</i> =.045 n.s.	2,5 (<i>N</i> =479)	3,1 (<i>N</i> =480)	1,5 (<i>N</i> =479)
+ Deliberately bought certain products for political reasons <i>Cramer's V</i> =.020 n.s.	4,8 (<i>N</i> =480)	5,4 (<i>N</i> =480)	4,4 ⁺ (<i>N</i> =480)
+ Donated money to a political organisation or group <i>Cramer's V</i> =.051 n.s.	1,3 (<i>N</i> =476)	2,5 (<i>N</i> =480)	1,0 ⁺ (<i>N</i> =480)
Taken part in a strike <i>Cramer's V</i> =.274***	1,0 (<i>N</i> =478)	17,6 (<i>N</i> =478)	23,6 (<i>N</i> =479)
+ Contacted the media <i>Cramer's V</i> =.122***	5,2 (<i>N</i> =480)	8,5 (<i>N</i> =480)	1,9 ⁺ (<i>N</i> =480)
+ Contacted a solicitor or a judicial body for non-personal reasons <i>Cramer's V</i> =.066**	1,9 (<i>N</i> =476)	2,7 (<i>N</i> =480)	0,6 ⁺ (<i>N</i> =480)
+ Participated in an illegal action <i>Cramer's V</i> =.100***	2,7 (<i>N</i> =480)	3,1 (<i>N</i> =480)	0,0 ⁺ (<i>N</i> =480)
Participated in a violent action <i>Cramer's V</i> =.037 n.s.	0,2 (<i>N</i> =478)	0,4 (<i>N</i> =480)	0,0 (<i>N</i> =480)

Concerning the second hypothesis (Buzzi et al., 2007; Caniglia, 2007), suggesting that non-conventional forms of participation should be more widespread, this appears to be almost confirmed: youth prefer new political actions (Dalton, 1988) to traditional ones (Milbrath, 1965). However, the most astonishing exception is voting, which is the most common political action (83,2% at the national level and 82,5% at the local level). On the other hand, considering participation in any other activity, the rate reaches only 43,6%: among these actions, the most common are the non-conventional ones. The three most important actions are all non-conventional: taking part in a public demonstration scores highest (28,3%), followed by signing a petition (17,8%) and participating in a strike (14,1%). On the other hand the most traditional political actions are least used, along with some non-conventional ones: contacting media (5,2%), contacting a governmental official (4,3%), buying specific products (4,9%), contacting a politician (3,7%), boycotting products (2,4%), participating in an illegal action (1,9%) wearing a badge and contacting a solicitor (1,7%), donating money (1,6%), action group

(1,2%), work for a party (0,9%), participating in a violent action (0,2%). To have a better measure of the striking difference between these two sets of actions, it is possible to build two variables according to the division: contacting vs. protesting (Teorell *et al.* 2007) Thus the ‘contacting youths’ (i.e. interviewee contacting either a person or the media) are only 10,3%; while protesting ones are 37,2%¹⁹ (that means that almost half of the young people signing a petition did not take part in any protest and vice versa).

To conclude, the last factor analysed is the one linked to the societal activation of youth in Turin. Indeed ‘voluntary associations’ are the prime means by which the function of mediating between the individual and the state is performed. Through them the individual is able to relate himself effectively and meaningfully to the political system (Almond and Verba, 1963: 300–1). The sample conforms to the general Italian trend that sees young people more involved in civil society organisations than in political parties (or trade unions) (Tab. 27). Indeed only a small number of the interviewees hold membership of political parties (3,4%), while a rather larger part is involved in other civil society organisations (15,9%). The most important sector is made up of general associations (7,5%), followed by religious associations (4,6%), cooperatives (4,4%) and trade unions (3,0%).

Table 27: *Earlier or present membership in different organizations (percentage who are or have been members of different kinds of organizations) (* when age is significant with a 95% level of confidence with higher values for older youth, - for those with lower level).*

Kind of organisations	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
⁺⁺ Political party <i>Cramer's V=.077*</i>	5,1 (N=468)	1,7 (N=474)	3,5 ⁺⁺ (N=480)
⁺⁺⁺ Trades unions <i>Cramer's V=.069*</i>	2,2 (N=456)	2,1 (N=471)	4,7⁺⁺⁺ (N=472)
⁺⁺⁺ Religious organisation <i>Cramer's V=.043 n.s.</i>	5,5 (N=473)	4,9 (N=473)	3,4 ⁺⁺⁺ (N=477)
Cooperative <i>Cramer's V=.059 n.s.</i>	3,0 (N=469)	5,9 (N=472)	4,2 (N=478)
Social movement organisation	0,0 (N=480)	0,0 (N=480)	0,0 (N=480)
⁺⁺⁺ Other civil society organisation <i>Cramer's V=.060 n.s.</i>	7,9 (N=469)	9,2 (N=457)	5,4 ⁺⁺⁺ (N=464)

From a general perspective, it is interesting to note two specific aspect: first of all the relatively higher membership of religious organisations, and secondly the relative low level of trades union membership. As regards the first aspect it must be stressed that the major scouting association in Italy (ten times bigger than the following lay one) is a religious association called Agesci. This is one of the associations most frequently mentioned by interviewees. As regards the second aspect (the low membership of trades unions) it is important to have a better look at inter-group differences. As is clear from the huge literature developed on the Italian welfare system (Ferrera 1993), trades unions play an important role in protecting insiders – i.e. workers. This is clearly the case for our sample that sees trade unions’ membership scores double among regularly

¹⁹ To take part in a strike cannot always be considered a political protest, since it may be a firm-related issue. Moreover the added value is only a small 1,9%.

employed youth compared with precarious long-term unemployed individuals. On the other hand, when considering any kind of membership, precarious workers are still the most active in the sample (20,0%), followed by regularly employed workers (15,8%) and long-term unemployed youth (16,7%). This difference is not significant, probably because there is an age bias (which is significant at the level of 99,9%) that increases the number of regularly employed workers holding membership in organisations.

6. Well being and unemployment

The central role of work in contemporary societies appears in its full relevance if we consider the relation between individuals' perception of well-being or health and their position in the labour market. There is consensus among scholars of various disciplines that unemployment is positively related with depression, sense of insecurity and incapacity of dealing with everyday needs (Bambra and Eikemo 2009; Bartley and Plewis 2002; Montgomery et al. 1999). Moreover, it is not only psychological illness that is considered as an outcome of being unemployed, but physical health too tends to be negatively affected by unemployment as this reduces income, hence visiting doctors may become unaffordable, and it also increases risks of alcohol use and smoking. Furthermore, medical studies have also associated unemployment with an increase of mortality: Martikainen and Valkonen (1996) on a study covering the Finnish population in a period comprised between 1987 and 1992 have found that individuals who experienced unemployment had greater mortality than those in employment after control for age, occupational class, and marital status. These studies argue that unemployment effects on income, psychological well being, social embeddedness and self esteem have an impact on health and mortality.

In addition to unemployment, more recent studies have indicated that also precarious working conditions (e.g. working under non standard forms of employment, such as ad interim jobs, jobs on call, short term contracts etc.) are associated with declining well being and health. In particular, the condition of protracted stress associated with non-stop job hunting and new working environments to deal with every few months have bad consequences on people's health. In fact, medical research has proved that if episodically stress may be beneficial for our well being as it stimulates bodies' reactions to adversities improving our immune system, on the contrary, living under a situation of continuous stress decreases our capacity to face physical and psychological adversities (Cardano 2009). Furthermore, European specialized agencies report that non-standard forms of employment are accompanied in all countries by declining working conditions. Employers tend to be less scrupulous when dealing with non permanent workers concerning safety issues, and often the latter are dealing with dangerous tasks (Benavides and Benach 1999).

Because of the high diffusion of non-standard forms of employment in the last decades, it seems relevant analysing, together with unemployed, also precarious workers' well being and health. Studying the effect of unemployment and precariousness on health becomes even more interesting if we focus on young people. The existence of a positive relation between youth unemployment or/and precariousness and a deterioration in youth physical and psychological health does not only bear obvious

political and ethical concerns, but it would also have economic policy implications. Young cohorts of unhappy and ill people will further burden funding-exhausted welfare states, and will seriously threaten the sustainability of National Health Systems.

Starting with well-being, our survey confirms previous literature as it shows a linear positive relation between having a permanent position in the labour market and self perception of well being. A first overview of such a relation can be grasped by considering table 27 that presents the self perception of our respondents concerning three questions shading light on their general well-being: a) general assessment of happiness; b) optimism about the future; c) whether they experienced an overall good health status.

For all these indicators, the young unemployed scored lower than the other two groups (precarious workers and regularly employed youth). Whether we measure the general assessment of well-being in terms of happiness (first row of table 27), optimism about the future (second row of table 27) or feeling of good health in general (third row of table 27), unemployed are always those with lower levels of well being. In particular, if we focus on happiness, we have asked respondents to provide a general appreciation of their life by placing themselves on a scale ranging from 0 (no happy at all) to 10 (very happy). The average scores among Turin young people presented in table 27 show that jobless youth are the less happy of the groups (average 6.73), followed by precarious workers (average 7.36), whereas youth with regular employment have the higher score of happiness (7.46).

Table 27: *Happiness (average based on a scale from 0 to 10), optimism and good health (percentage).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Happiness (WBD1) ($Eta^2=.024^{***}$)	6.73 (n=462)	7.36 (n=478)	7.46 (n=423)
Optimistic about the future (WBD2/1,2) ($Phi=.310^{***}$)	68.7 (n=470)	77.9 (n=479)	78.6 (n=473)
Experience a good health in general (WBD3/3,4) ($Phi=.116^{***}$)	91.1 (n=478)	95.6 (n=487)	93.3 (n=474)

The same linear positive relation between a stable position in the labour market and well being emerges if we consider another question of the survey aiming at understanding the optimism of respondents: the second row of table 27 shows that regularly employed people are longer more optimist than the unemployed: there is a difference of ten points percentage between the two groups, with 68.7 per cent of unemployed being optimist about their future compared to 78.6 per cent of permanent workers. This same row of table 27 tells also that precariousness does not appear as a factor preventing optimism, as the difference in optimism between permanent workers and precarious ones is insignificant (respectively 77.9 percent against 78.6).

Finally, if we consider self-reported health, although the overall majority of respondents declare being in good health, once again, the young unemployed are those who report lower values, 91.1 per cent declaring having a good health against 95.6 per cent of precarious workers and 93.3 per cent of regularly unemployed. However, if the unemployed are those reporting lower levels of health across the three groups, they are

those who report visiting doctors less frequently than precarious workers and regularly employed do. In fact, from the first row of table 28 we learn that there is a ten-point percentage difference in visiting doctors or going to the hospital between young unemployed (54.6 of them) and young regularly employed (64.0 per cent).

This does not mean that the former are in better health than the latter, on the contrary as we have seen above, young unemployed declaring being in good health are fewer than those regularly employed. Instead, the fact that unemployed youth go less frequently to see a doctor means, as other studies have argued (Bambra and Eikemo 2009), that they have less economic resources and motivational incentives to go to the doctor than people at work. Moreover, unemployment has been indicated also as a negative predictor of peoples' involvement in social and political spheres (see *infra* for more details on these aspects) like if joblessness tends to discourage people to consider themselves as parts of a community or of a society.

To grasp whether unemployment prevent or not people from getting in contact with public institutions that may help them we have asked respondents to indicate from a list of various public institutions they might have dealt with (doctor, child's school, employment agency, housing agency, other community office) those they had visited in the past 12 months. Table 28 presents the answers to that question and it shows that in all cases apart from one (employment agency) the unemployed are those who have visited the less the listed public institutions. The difference between young unemployed and young regularly employed are strong and significative: if we compare, for example, the percentage of young people having visited general community offices (last row of table 28) we see that there is a difference of almost a quarter between the unemployed (24.0 per cent) and the regularly employed (37.8 per cent) among those who visited one of the community offices, with precarious workers placed in between the two (30.2 per cent).

Table 28: *Percentage that have visited different public institutions.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital (<i>Phi</i> =.101***)	54.6 (n=480)	65.8 (n=480)	64.0 (n=484)
At the social service office, by social worker (<i>Phi</i> =.040)	4.0 (n=480)	2.5 (n=480)	4.1 (n=484)
At their child's school, training agency (<i>Phi</i> =.138***)	3.5 (n=480)	3.8 (n=480)	10.5 (n=484)
At the employment agency, job centre (<i>Phi</i> =.127***)	28.1 (n=480)	21.7 (n=480)	15.3 (n=484)
At the housing agency, by their landlord (<i>Phi</i> =.097***)	2.5 (n=480)	3.8 (n=480)	7.2 (n=484)
At any other community office (<i>Phi</i> =.123***)	24.0 (n=480)	30.2 (n=480)	37.8 (n=484)

Young unemployed prevail over the other two groups only when we consider “employment agencies”, obviously those who have a job don’t need to visit an employment agency that frequently as the unemployed do, or *should do*. In fact, concerning this aspect, the point worth to be made is that less than one third of the surveyed young unemployed admit having visited an employment centre, whereas the largest majority of young unemployed seem not to consider visiting an employment centre something worth to do. This is a result that policy makers should think about when considering the efficacy of the Italian tools to fight unemployment. Furthermore, as we are told by table 29, almost one third (27.4) of those who visited an employment agency are not satisfied with the services provided to them, and a similar lack of satisfaction emerges also when we consider the other types of services provided by public institutions: unemployed and precarious young people in Turin declare being highly unsatisfied for the services provided by social services units and by social workers (42.9 per cent of unemployed and 36.4 per cent of precarious workers that did not receive a service they feel they were entitled to)²⁰.

Table 29: *Percentage of interviewees that did not receive a service they felt they were entitled to when they visited the institutions below.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor’s, hospital (<i>Phi</i> =.112***)	6.9 (n=261)	10.1 (n=316)	15.5 (n=310)
At the social service office, by social worker (<i>Phi</i> =.312)	42.9 (n=14)	36.4 (n=11)	11.8 (n=17)
At their child’s school, training agency (<i>Phi</i> =.126)	13.3 (n=15)	16.7 (n=18)	25.5 (n=51)
At the employment agency, job centre (<i>Phi</i> =.094)	27.4 (n=135)	18.3 (n=104)	24.3 (n=74)
At the housing agency, by their landlord (<i>Phi</i> =.351**)	.0 (n=12)	22.2 (n=18)	41.2 (n=34)
At any other community office (<i>Phi</i> =.128*)	21.5 (n=93)	10.1 (n=119)	14.0 (n=121)

We know from previous studies that economic downturn, unemployment and difficult working conditions have a strong negative effect on health as they interfere with physical (poor people tend to adopt less healthy life style and are more reluctant—also for lack of economic means—to visit a doctor) and mental well being (being unemployed or working under precarious conditions generate continuous forms of stress). If we analyse more in detail the situation of our groups of youth in Turin we receive a confirmation of such a negative interaction between work and well being. Table 30 presents the answers to a battery of questions aiming at measuring self perception about both physical and mental health. A first alarming result is provided by the first row of table 30 where we find that almost one every two young person in Turin has sleeping troubles, a result that is more salient for precarious (52.6 per cent) and unemployed

²⁰ On these aspects cfr. also the Italian National Reports on WP4 and WP6

(45.2) but that is remarkable also for regularly employed youth (42.5). Perhaps the fact that our survey was carried out in the mid of a harsh economic downturn may explain this result for regularly employed, but this could also be the effect of stress due to excessive workload (Gallie 2007), we do not have instruments to control for these inferences though.

Table 30: *General Health Questionnaire (percentage who agree to different statements concerning health).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
I have lost much sleep over worry (<i>Phi</i> =.166***)	45.2 (n=477)	52.6 (n=474)	42.5 (n=484)
I feel that I am playing a useful part in things (<i>Phi</i> =.194***)	84.4 (n=463)	84.5 (n=478)	88.6 (n=483)
I feel capable of making decisions about things (<i>Phi</i> =.253***)	87.9 (n=471)	97.5 (n=479)	99.2 (n=484)
I feel constantly under strain (<i>Phi</i> =.227***)	43.1 (n=475)	45.8 (n=478)	40.6 (n=483)
I feel that I can not overcome my difficulties (<i>Phi</i> =.223***)	23.2 (n=470)	19.5 (n=478)	17.6 (n=483)
I am able to concentrate on whatever I do (<i>Phi</i> =.227***)	79.0 (n=476)	75.5 (n=473)	83.8 (n=482)
I am able to face up to my problems (<i>Phi</i> =.245***)	85.0 (n=473)	93.5 (n=476)	96.2 (n=479)
I feel unhappy and distressed (<i>Phi</i> =.181***)	10.5 (n=476)	9.6 (n=477)	8.0 (n=478)
I have lost confidence in myself (<i>Phi</i> =.190***)	8.2 (n=475)	5.4 (n=478)	3.9 (n=479)
I think of myself as a worthless person (<i>Phi</i> =.125**)	2.9 (n=477)	1.7 (n=478)	3.1 (n=482)
I feel reasonably happy, all things considered (<i>Phi</i> =.141***)	89.2 (n=475)	90.2 (n=478)	93.1 (n=481)
I am able to enjoy my normal day-to-day activities (<i>Phi</i> =.132***)	91.3 (n=472)	95.2 (n=478)	94.9 (n=472)

The effect of unemployment on well being in terms of self-esteem is clear if we consider the third row of table 30 reporting the percentages of respondents agreeing on the fact that they “*feel capable of making decisions about things*”. Almost all the regularly employed youth are in measure of taking decisions (99.2 per cent) whereas ‘only’ 87.9 per cent of young unemployed do. Thus, there is a difference of almost twelve points between the two groups concerning their perceived capacity to deal with problems and decisions in everyday life.

A similar distance in terms of self-esteem at the disadvantage of the jobless youth appears if we focus on the respondents stating that they are “able to face up to problems” (seventh row of table 30): here unemployed are ten points percentage less capable of facing problems than permanent workers. Furthermore, almost a quarter of young unemployed declare feeling they cannot overcome their problems (fifth row of table 30).

7. Summary and conclusion

This report has investigated the relationship between (un)employment and individual social and political inclusion as well as between employment status and well-being. By means of a large survey of young people aged 18-35 in Turin divided in three study groups (long-term unemployed, precarious workers, and regularly employed) we have discussed the multiple implications of employment on our life.

The results of YOUNEX survey in Turin show that also in post-modern societies the employment status is still a good predictor of individuals happiness and sense of belonging to or inclusion in a specific (glocal) community. Among the surveyed groups, the young unemployed present the lower levels of self-perception of good-health, of social participation, and of sense of community membership. However, they are closely followed by young precarious workers: this suggests that in Italy new non-standard forms of employment are producing worryingly comparable effects with those of unemployment. Young unemployed and young precarious workers in fact are quite similar in terms of lack of self-esteem, poor perceived health and well-being, as well as limited social embeddedness.

Furthermore, the survey unveils the existence of a vicious circle: the young unemployed that are those more in need of support services (e.g. hospital, health advisors, employment services) are those who more seldom use them (for their own personal limits or for the bad functioning of such services is not given to know through our survey and would need further study). Hence, for the community or for the state, this is a circle worth dismantling not only for ethical concerns but also for more pragmatic economic and political-economy reasons.

However, where our survey has provided surprisingly results is in the political awareness or political embeddedness of our interviewees. Contrary to other EU countries, including YOUNEX members, in Italy precariousness, and on a certain extent also unemployment, does not push young people far from political involvement, as common sense and existing literature may have led to expect. On the contrary, having a non-standard form of employment, or not having a job, have functioned as pushing factors for young people to be interested in politics and to actively do something in politics, primarily by means of unconventional forms of political participation. So perhaps the strong and long lasting public debate about precariousness that has invested the country since the early 1990s onward (see della Porta and Baglioni 2010 and Baglioni et al. 2008 for a detailed account of such a debate) has not been vain in its (often unconscious) attempt to stimulate political awareness among young Italians. How far this may really turn into a youth mass stimulus to social and political change goes beyond the aims of this report, but would be worth studying in the years to come.

8. References

- Almond, G. and Verba, S. 1963, *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Baglioni, S., D. della Porta and P. Graziano, 2008, "The Contentious Politics of Unemployment. The Italian Case in Comparative Perspective" European Journal of Political Research, 47 (6):827-851
- Bambra, C. and T.A. Eikemo, 2009, "Welfare state regimes, unemployment and health: a comparative study of the relationship between unemployment and self-reported health in 23 European countries", Journal of Epidemiology Community Health, 63:92-98.
- Barnes, S. and Kaase, M. (1979). *Political Action. Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Bartley, M. and I. Plewis, 2002, "Accumulated labour market disadvantage and limiting long-term illness: data from the 1971-1991 ONS longitudinal study" International Journal of Epidemiology, 31: 336-41
- Bay, A. and Blekesaune, M. 2005 "Youth, unemployment and political marginalization", International Journal of Social Welfare, 11: 132-139.
- Benavides, F.G. and J. Benach, 1999, *Precarious employment and health related outcomes in the European Union*, *European Foundation for the Improvement of Working and Living Conditions*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Burt, R. 1998, "The Gender of Social Capital", Rationality and Society, 10 (1), 5–46.
- Burt, R. 2005, *Brokerage and Closure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buzzi, C., A. Cavalli and A. de Lillo, 2007 *Rapporto giovani: sesta indagine dell'Istituto IARD sulla condizione giovanile in Italia*, *Studi e Ricerche*. Bologna: Il Mulino
- Camera di Commercio di Torino, 2008, *Torino Economia 2007*, Torino: Camera di Commercio.
- Caniglia, E. 2002 *Identità, partecipazione politica e antagonismo nella politica giovanile*. Catanzaro: Edizioni Rubbettino.
- Cardano, M., 2009, "Disuglianze sociali, povertà e salute", in Brandolini, A., C. Saraceno and A. Schizzerotto (eds.) *Dimensioni della disuguaglianza in Italia: povertà, salute, abitazione*, Bologna: il Mulino, pp. 121-163
- Dalton, R. J. 1988 *Citizen Politics in Western Democracies*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham
- Della Porta, D. and S. Baglioni, 2010, "Il discorso pubblico in Italia su disoccupazione ed immigrazione negli anni novanta: ipotesi di una comparazione", Politica e Società, 1: 111-142.
- Ferrera, M. 1993, *Modelli di solidarietà, politiche e riforme sociali nelle democrazie*, Bologna: il Mulino
- Gallie, D., 2007, *Employment regimes and the quality of work*, Oxford: Oxford University

Press

- Ires-Associazione Lucia Morosini, 2010, *Giovani e disoccupazione*, Nota informativa Ires, 13 Dicembre 2010
- Lin, N. 200,1 *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martikainen, P. and T. Valkonen, 1996, "Excess mortality of unemployment men and women during a period of rapidly increasing of unemployment" Lancet vol. 348, 5:909-912.
- Montgomery, S., D. G. Cook, M. J. Bartley and M. EJ Wadsworth, 1999, "Unemployment pre-dates symptoms of depression and anxiety resulting in medical consultation in young men" International Journal of Epidemiology 28: 95-100
- Pasquino, G. 2006, "The Italian political system after the 9 - 10 April 2006 elections", Journal of Modern Italian Studies, 11: 4, 465 — 471
- Pappalardo, A. 2006 "Italian bipolarism and the elections of 2006. End of the line or just a connecting stop?", Journal of Modern Italian Studies, 11: 4, 472 — 493
- Portes, A. 1998 "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology", Annual Review of Sociology 24: 1–24.
- Putnam, R., with Leonardi, R. and Nanetti, R. 1993 *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ruedin, D. 2007, "Testing Milbrath's 1965 Framework of Political Participation: Institutions and Social Capital", Contemporary Issues and Ideas in Social Sciences, North America, 3 Dec. 2007. Available at: <http://journal.ciiss.net/index.php/ciiss/article/view/43/50>. Date accessed: 18 Oct. 2010.
- Teorell, J., M. Torcal, and J-R. Montero. 2007. "Political Participation: Mapping the Terrain." in J. W. van Deth, J-R. Montero and A. Westholm (eds.), *Citizenship and Involvement in European Democracies: A Comparative Analysis* London: Routledge.

WP3 National Report France

Didier Chabanet, Manlio Cinalli and Christophe Fay

1. Introduction

This report presents a selection of the results of a large survey carried out with young people living in Lyon aged 18-35. The survey has been conducted by POLYENCO, a professional polling institute that is specialised in local surveys in the Lyon area, on behalf of the CEVIPOF, Sciences Po, for the YOUNEX project. The survey has been conducted through CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews), covering an overall sample of 1211 individuals who were interviewed between May and July 2009 (406 long-term unemployed; 410 precarious workers; and 395 permanent workers). Lyon and its broader urban area have been characterised by growing unemployment rates over the last decade, particularly when one focuses on unemployment of young people (cf. French national report for workpackage 1). In what follows, the analysis of survey data deals with the socio-demographic composition of sample, the relation of interviewees to work and unemployment, as well as with a more detailed treatment of social exclusion, political exclusion, and well-being respectively.

5. Social background

Table 1 shows the composition of the Lyon sample with regard to socio-economic background data for each group respectively.

Among the long-term unemployed, there are slightly more men than women, whereas among the regularly employed, and especially among the precarious, men are overrepresented. In fact, gender differences are particularly strong in the last category, in which a gap of 10.6% is registered between men and women. It is also noticeable that the distribution of different educational levels among the three groups shows that the unemployed have not a lower level of educational attainment than the employed. In general they do achieve high levels of education in terms of post-secondary and tertiary education. Differences are rather small also when focusing on the distinction between natives and people of migrant background (up till two generations). About three fifths of the interviewed people is made of French natives, with no visible differences between employed and unemployed interviewees.

Table 1: Percentage of different categories who answered the questionnaire.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
<i>Gender</i>			
Men	51.4	55.4	60.6
Women	48.6	44.6	39.4
($\Phi=.076^*$) ²¹			
<i>Age</i>			
18-24	25.1	25.4	28.4
25-34	74.9	74.6	71.6
($\Phi=NS$)			
<i>Education</i>			
Not completed compulsory school	.8	.5	-
Completed compulsory school	1.3	-	.8
Second stage of basic education	17.8	18.6	20.3
Upper secondary school	32.3	39.9	39.0
Post secondary school	23.5	19.4	15.2
Tertiary education	23.7	20.3	23.8
(Cramer's $V=.111^{**}$)			
<i>Native or migrant background</i>			
Native	61.4	59.9	59.6
Migrant	38.6	40.1	40.4
<i>Marital status</i>			
In partnership	57.6	65.0	68.2
Single	42.4	35.0	31.8
($\Phi=.92^{**}$)			
<i>Living conditions</i>			
Living alone	37.8	42.0	40.7
Living together with someone	62.2	58.0	59.3
($\Phi=NS$)			
<i>Parenthood</i>			
Living without children	79.5	74.7	72.4
Living with children	20.5	25.3	27.6
($\Phi=.068^*$)			
<i>Personal income</i>			
Mean (€)	529.34	623.66	906.73
Median (€)	550.0	600.0	600.0
<i>If unemployed</i>			
Benefiting from an active measure/ employment measure	51.6		
Have never had a paid job	.7		

The unemployed are less often in a partnership (regardless if married or not) than their employed counter-parts (whether precarious or permanent workers); yet they do leave together with someone else (who is not their child). Not surprisingly, they have a lower income vis-à-vis the precarious and permanent workers.

²¹ Significance levels: no star= the relationship is not significant, *=significant on the 0.05 level, **=significant on the 0.01 level, ***=significant on the 0.001 level.

3. Relation to work and unemployment

The following section deals with our interviewees' relation to work and unemployment. Table 2 illustrates the general satisfaction with their work.

Table 2: *Work satisfaction (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Work satisfaction in generally during the last 12 months ($Eta^2=.005^*$)	3.49	4.95	7.96

The regularly employed are more satisfied with their job when one compares with both the unemployed and the precarious workers. As regards future optimism of the three groups regarding their job perspective, table 3 shows that more than half of the unemployed have low hopes of getting a job during the next year. But the same holds true for the precarious workers, who also have low hopes of finding a better employment (66.3%). With regard to the regularly employed, it is clear that they do not have high hopes of finding a better job, but rather, they have high fears of losing their current employment.

Table 3: *Percentage of those who have low hopes of getting a job/a better job within one year and percentage of those who has high fears of losing their job*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Low hopes of getting a job	63.4	63.4	-
Low hopes of getting a better job	-	66.3	71.1
High fears of losing the job	-	84.3	82.4

For all the respondents, family stands out as their crucial aspect of life. In fact, table 4 shows that there are no significant gaps among the answers of the groups concerning it. Friends are another important element common to all of interviewees, without relevant differences among the groups. Then, leisure time has almost the same importance for the three groups. When focusing on politics there are not important differences either, with the exception of a slightly major interest of the regularly employed. Importance of religion and voluntary organizations is slightly higher for full-time workers than it is for the long-term unemployed and precarious.

Table 4: *The importance of different aspects of life (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family	8.41	8.77	8.67
Friends	7.32	7.58	7.74
Leisure time	6.46	6.58	6.76
Politics	3.92	3.80	4.17
Work	7.10	6.83	6.74
Religion	3.75	3.51	4.00
Voluntary organisations	3.50	3.51	3.91

In order to measure their work involvement, we asked respondents to say to what extent they agree or disagree with different statement regarding work. Table 5 shows the percentages of those interviewees who agree with each statement respectively. As regards attitudes towards work and unemployment, table 5 shows once again only minor differences across the three groups of long-term unemployed, precarious workers, and regular workers. However, figures do indicate that those who are in a permanent position are less 'conscious' of work necessity (indicators 2, 3 and 4).

Table 5: *Percentage of those who agree to different statements about work and unemployment (5-point scale, collapsed categories "agree" and "totally agree").*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Having a paid job to go to is very important	90.3	89.1	88.6
If I won a large sum of money I would immediately stop working	53.7	53.8	55.8
Unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person	52.7	55.2	48.5
I get bored quickly when I have no work to do	54.2	53.3	48.4
The most important things that happen in life do not involve work	49.6	54.5	52.9
Being without a job gives time to spend on other important things	39.3	42.2	40.3
If the unemployment benefit was very high I would not want a paid job to go to	22.0	19.2	20.2

As regards the long-term unemployed, they possibly appreciate most the instrumental dimension of work that is related to the wage-gaining (indicators 1 and 7). That is, the unemployed show a somewhat higher work attachment than the employed groups. Further, if their unemployment was compensated on a high financial level (through unemployment benefits or lottery prize), only a minority of them would prefer to remain

without employment – but this proportion is slightly higher than among the employed groups. It thus seems that the salary is, among other things like traditional values, a very important aspect about having a job for them, owing to their more likely personal experience of poverty.

Table 6 goes into further details about this. When they are asked directly about the importance of different functions of work, the vast majority of respondents consider them (salary, regular activities, social contacts, status and identity, and personal development) as being important. We have some relevant differences only for regular activities and personal development. Among the regular employed, more respondents see regular activities being less important as the unemployed and precarious do. Personal development is also less important for the regularly employed (and most important for the precarious).

Table 6: *Percentage of those who consider different functions of work as being important (4-point scale, collapsed categories “quite important” and “very important”).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The salary	92.0	94.9	93.7
Regular activities	88.1	90.0	86.5
Social contacts	82.3	83.3	82.7
Gives an identity and status	84.3	82.6	82.2
Personal development	82.1	83.0	79.4

Another important issue in the realm of work and unemployment is the attitude about gender roles. Table 7 presents the importance of having a fulltime job for men and women attached by the respondents. We asked them how important it is for a women/a man to have a fulltime job to be considered an adult, and to what extent they approve/disapprove if a woman/a man has a fulltime job while she/he has a child aged fewer than three.

Table 7: *Attitudes to the importance of having a full time job for men and women to be considered adults, with and without small children (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The importance a full time job to be considered an adult for men	7.93	7.66	7.57
The importance a full time job to be considered an adult for women	7.19	7.06	6.96
Approval of men with children younger than 3 having a full time job	7.57	7.79	7.76
Approval of women with children younger than 3 having a full time job	5.88	6.08	6.01

In general, all of the respondents considered having a fulltime job more important for men than for women. The difference between the importance for men and women is the same for all employment status groups. However, besides gender, having a fulltime job to be considered an adult is more important for the long-term unemployed than for the employed, who do not differ by type of employment. Further, most of the interviewees approve if a man is fulltime employed while he has children aged fewer than three, with no relevant differences between the groups. By contrast, the respondents' approval of fulltime-working women with young children is much lower. This is particularly true for the unemployed, who differ significantly from the employed groups. This finding suggest that the long-term unemployed consider having a fulltime job more important than the employed, even for women, but they favour more traditional gender roles and rather disapprove the idea of working mothers. This tendency can be substantiated with a look at table 8.

Table 8: Percentages of those who agree to different statements regarding the roles of men and women (4-point scale, collapsed categories "agree" and "totally agree").

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family.	55.5	54.5	58.1
Men should take as much responsibility as women for their home and children.	86.3	85.3	87.5
When jobs are scarce, men should have jobs in the first place.	33.2	25.4	29.2

In this case, data show that well over half of the respondents think that a woman should be prepared to cut down her paid work for the sake of her family, with the agreement being higher amongst the people in regular work. A prevalent majority of the respondents see that men should take as much responsibility as women for their home and children, with a slightly higher agreement amongst the regular workers. Lastly, a lower impact is noticeable in the case of the last item. One third of the unemployed agree that when jobs are scarce, men should have them in the first place. Regular workers agree to a lesser extent with this statement, whereas the precarious are those who agree the least, with 'only' one fourth of the respondents.

To conclude, we do not find clear differences in terms of attitudes towards work and unemployment among precariously and regularly employed, though the regularly employed seem to consider having a paid employment somewhat more important. The picture is also complex when focusing on the gender dimension. The approval of the unemployed for full-time working women with young children is lower than that of the other two groups, suggesting that the unemployed may favour more traditional gender roles and rather disapprove the idea of working mothers. Yet, permanent workers stand out for their support for most traditional divisions of gender roles when children are to be cared for.

4. Social exclusion

To grasp the social dimension of exclusion, we asked our respondents about their social capital (social contacts, reciprocal support and assistance), their social activities and their experiences of discrimination. Table 9 shows the number of friends. The unemployed have the highest number of friends ('more than 7 people'); the employed have the least, showing a potential relationship between the employment status and the number of friends.

Table 9: *Percentage of those who have different number of friends²².*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
None	2.5	2.0	4.1
1-2 people	33.4	33.2	32.1
3-7 people	44.9	46.4	47.8
More than 7 people	19.2	18.0	15.9

A different pattern can be detected for social contacts. Table 10 shows the proportion of those who have not met family members, friends, and acquaintances during the last month. Among the unemployed, we find the highest percentages of people not having with met family members, while the lowest percentage can be found among the regularly employed. The precarious stand somewhere between the unemployed and the regularly employed. Amongst those who have not met with friends and acquaintances, the full time workers stand out as the group with highest percentage. That is, unemployment does not always lead to a considerable decline of social contacts and relationships. And the same holds for those in precarious employment, as they meet quite often with 'friends not living in the household'.

Table 10: *Percentage of those who have not met different categories of people during the last month.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family members not living in the household	13.4	11.7	10.3
Friends not living in the household	3.2	3.7	5.3
Acquaintances not living in the household	6.4	7.1	8.4

Table 11 presents the proportions of those who did not receive help from different groups of people during the last year. Of those who live in a partnership, about one fourth of the precarious and of the unemployed did not receive help from their partner. Among the employed, the percentage is slightly lower. The unemployed did receive significantly less help from others, regardless of their category. About 64% of them did not receive help from anyone, compared to 60% of the precarious and only 56.3% of the regularly employed. However, this does not apply to every category of people. On

²² We specified in the question what we intended by friends: 'people with whom they feel well and can talk about private issues or ask for help if necessary'.

acquaintances and partners, the regularly employed receive more often help than the unemployed and the precarious workers.

Table 11: *Percentage of those who did not receive help from different categories of people during the last 12 months.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one	64.6	60.0	56.3
Partner	22.8	22.4	19.2
Family members (not in the same household)	9.6	13.5	10.7
Friends	10.4	12.9	16.4
Acquaintances	62.9	68.4	60.1
Colleagues or former colleagues	57.1	55.6	60.2
Neighbors (not being friends or acquaintances)	73.7	81.3	75.0

Further, we asked if our respondents had offered help to different groups of peoples during the last year. As table 12 illustrates, the percentages are generally lower, which means that the respondents report to give help more often than to receive help, independently from their employment status. Comparing patterns with those found in table 11, one notices that in general precarious workers stand out as the group giving less help to the identified categories (with the exception of partners).

Table 12: *Percentage of those who did not offer help to different categories of people during the last 12 months.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one	58.2	49.4	59.5
Partner	29.9	21.9	12.9
Family members (not in the same household)	7.3	8.6	6.8
Friends	6.1	12.3	6.3
Acquaintances	54.2	58.6	51.4
Colleagues/former colleagues	62.3	60.3	54.5
Neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances)	62.0	72.7	54.7

Table 13 shows the interviewees' answers to the question how difficult it would be to borrow money if they were in serious financial difficulties. There is a considerable significant effect of status group on this issue.

Table 13: People sorted by how difficult or easy it would be to borrow money if they were in serious financial difficulties (percentage).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Very difficult	9.0	5.8	4.1
Quite difficult	44.3	43.8	35.6
Quite easy	39.1	42.7	51.2
Very easy	7.6	7.8	9.1
(Cramer's $V=.298^{***}$)			

For the unemployed, it would be the most difficult to borrow money; for the regularly employed the easiest. The precarious are located in between. More than 44% of the unemployed say it would be difficult for them, compared to 43% of the precarious and 35,6 of the regularly employed.

Nevertheless, the unemployed are those who have most frequently borrowed money from someone (see table 14). The 25.5% of them have borrowed money during the last 12 months, compared to 25.2% of the precarious and 24.6% of the regularly employed. However, differences among the three groups are not particularly wide.

Table 14: Percentage of those who have borrowed money from someone during the past 12 months and from whom they have borrowed the money.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Have borrowed money during the past 12 months ($\Phi=.375^{***}$)	25.8	25.2	24.6
From their partner ($\Phi=.133$)	29.6	36.9	45.2
From family members not living in the same household ($\Phi=.026$)	57.1	60.3	53.5
From their friends ($\Phi=.337^{***}$)	32.5	27.9	25.4
From acquaintances ($\Phi=.232^{***}$)	6.2	4.5	6.0
From their colleagues or former colleagues ($\Phi=.090$)	8.9	8.1	7.5
From their neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances) ($\Phi=.112$)	4.1	15.9	4.5

The vast majority of those who have asked for money borrowed it from family members; fewer have borrowed from their partner. There is a relevant gap between regularly employed who borrowed money from partners and unemployed, whereas the precarious are between the two. There are no significant differences between the groups for the categories of colleagues and neighbours, whom the respondents very seldom ask for money (with the exception of precarious borrowing money from neighbours). However, the unemployed have borrowed money from friends and acquaintances significantly more often than the precarious and those more often than the regularly employed. This finding can be understood having in mind that these groups have more difficulties in finding someone who is able to lend them money. Thus, we can conclude that the harder the financial situation and the weaker the social surrounding, the more one has to rely on her or his broader social network.

Table 15 presents the perception of our respondents of how often they take part in social activities compared to other people in their age. In this case it is very interesting to notice some significant differences amongst groups. In particular, the long-term unemployed say that they take part clearly more rarely, while the precarious say that they take part more often. As regards the regularly employed, percentages are more even between those who think that they took part in social activities more than other people of same age on the one hand, and those who think the opposite on the other hand.

Table 15: *Taking part in social activities (percentage of the extent compared to other people of the same age).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Much more seldom than most people in their age	3.3	4.0	5.1
More seldom than most	23.9	19.8	17.6
About the same	50.3	48.0	53.7
More often than most	19.8	24.1	20.9
Much more often than most	2.8	4.0	2.8
<i>(Cramer's V=.245***)</i>			

Table 16 shows the proportions of those who are not active in any spare time activities such as a hobby or sports. The percentage of the 'inactive' is higher among the unemployed, while there are no relevant differences between precarious and regularly employed. Reasons for not being active are different for the different groups. About 20% of the 'inactive' just do not have a hobby; this rate is much lower among the employed. By contrast, permanent workers have the highest rate of those who are not interested in their hobby anymore. The most frequent reason for the unemployed is that they cannot afford it anymore; but this also applies to the precarious and the regularly employed (with higher percentages).

Table 16: *People who are not active in any 'spare time' activities such as hobbies or sports and reasons why they are not active in that kind of activities (percentage).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not active	27.7	24.9	24.2
<i>(Phi=.248***)</i>			
Because they have no hobby/sport	21.4	22.2	13.9
Because they are not interested in their hobbies/sports anymore	29.8	24.2	35.4
Because they can not afford it anymore	48.9	53.5	50.6
<i>(Cramer's V=.305***)</i>			

Another important issue concerning social exclusion is experiences of discrimination. As table 17 shows, the rate of those who consider themselves belonging to a group that is discriminated in the French society is considerably higher among the precarious and the unemployed. 80% perceive themselves to be discriminated; while only 25% of the regularly employed do so. Figures, however, do not allow detecting clearly the reasons for which the interviewees experience discrimination.

Table 17: Experiences of discrimination (percentage of those who consider themselves as belonging to a discriminated group).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No (<i>Phi</i> =.297***)	20.3	23.0	75.7
Colour or race (<i>Phi</i> =.013)	8.4	11.5	9.2
Nationality (<i>Phi</i> =.043)	13.9	9.3	8.4
Religion (<i>Phi</i> =.127)	3.0	1.2	0.8
Language (<i>Phi</i> =.157)	65.4	68.3	77.0
Ethnic group (<i>Phi</i> =.070)	3.2	1.2	1.0
Age (<i>Phi</i> =.089)	1.0	1.5	1.8
Gender (<i>Phi</i> =.258***)	0.7	1.7	0.3
Sexuality (<i>Phi</i> =.314***)	1.2	1.0	0.8
Disability (<i>Phi</i> =.069)	1.2	2.0	.0
Employment status (<i>Phi</i> =.439***)	1.2	1.2	0.3

Closely related to discrimination of unemployed people are prejudices against the unemployed based on stereotypes. Table 18 shows the proportions of those who think, apart from their own opinion, that most or many have certain attitudes towards unemployed people.

Table 18: Percentage of those who think that different kinds of attitudes to unemployed people occur among most or many people (4-point scale, collapsed categories “many people” and “most people”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
They are lazy (<i>Phi</i> =.043)	59.7	58.8	59.8
They have intended to take advantage of the system (<i>Phi</i> =.082*)	58.7	57	65
They are passive/without initiative (<i>Phi</i> =.007)	55.3	53.7	51.5
They have had bad luck (<i>Phi</i> =.035)	39	43.3	39.9
They have themselves to blame (<i>Phi</i> =.084*)	39.1	40.8	41.0
They have no job because of alcohol or drug problems (<i>Phi</i> =.219***)	21.2	20.6	22.2
They are people who have become victims of the socio-economic development (<i>Phi</i> =.065)	50.9	54.4	65.1

Regardless of their employment status, the majority of our interviewees think that many or most people have prejudices against the unemployed. Almost 60% of them believe that many or most people think that unemployed people are lazy and group differences

are not significant. The same holds true for the stereotype “they are passive/without initiative” though with lower percentages. 40% ca. of people across the groups think that most or many people consider the precarious people just having had bad luck. At least somewhat more than half of the respondents think that most or many people see that the unemployed are people who have become victims of the socio-economic development. Group differences are not significant for these items either. However, there are three items for which the long-term unemployed shows significantly different patterns. About 58% of them think that most or many people think that they have intended to take advantage of the system, compared to 65% of the regularly employed. Concerning the stereotype “unemployed people have no job because of alcohol or drug problems” the same trend is even more evident. Lastly, permanent and precarious workers agree that the unemployed ‘have themselves to blame’.

5. Political exclusion

The following section deals with the political dimension of exclusion. It includes the issues political interest, political efficacy, generalised trust in public institutions, political satisfaction, political participation and associational involvement. Table 19 presents the figures of political interest between the employment status groups. The percentages reveal that differences are significant yet only marginal.

Table 19: *Political interest (percentage).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not interested at all	22.2	21.9	20.5
Not very interested	41.1	44.6	46.8
Fairly interested	31.7	28.9	28.6
Very interested	5.0	4.5	4.2
<i>(Cramer's V=.188***)</i>			

Further, we asked for the importance of different political activities for a person to be a good citizen. Findings are reported in table 20 in the following page. The great majority of the respondents said it was important to support people that are worse off than themselves, but there are no significant differences between the groups. The same is true for “being active in voluntary organisations”, which is considered important ca. 40% across groups, and for “being active in politics”, which is important for somewhat more than 15%. Voting in elections is important for more than 80% of the interviewees and particularly for precarious workers, this time with significant differences. Always obeying laws and regulations is significantly less important for the employed than for both the unemployed and the precarious, while forming one’s opinion independently from others is, although considered important by most of the respondents, slightly less important for the employed.

Table 20: The importance of different political activities (percentages, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very important” and “quite important”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Supporting people who are worse off than themselves (<i>Phi</i> =.040)	81.8	79.3	75.4
Voting in elections (<i>Phi</i> =.248***)	83.5	87.9	85.5
Obedying laws and regulations (<i>Phi</i> =.088*)	84.4	81.5	78.1
Forming your own opinion independently of others (<i>Phi</i> =.115***)	86.8	85.6	79.8
Being active in voluntary organisations (<i>Phi</i> =.045)	42.3	38.7	37.2
Being active in politics (<i>Phi</i> =.061)	15.3	17.4	18.9

Table 21 shows the proportions of those who agree to different statements about political efficacy. It seems to be a widespread opinion that parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion. About 73% of the regularly employed and slightly more of the precarious think so, compared to 72% of long-term unemployed. The statement “people like me definitely have an influence on governmental politics” is agreed by somewhat less than half of the respondents, but this time there are no significant differences by employment status. About 72% of the unemployed think that politics sometimes is so complicated that people like them do not understand anymore what is going on. Among the regularly employed, less than two thirds agree to this statement, and a bit more of the precarious. In this case, differences across groups are significant. Hence, we can conclude that overall the unemployed estimate political efficacy quite lower than the employed groups.

Table 21: Percentage who agree in different statements about political efficacy (4-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion (<i>Phi</i> =.187***)	72.2	75.1	73.8
People like me definitely have an influence on governmental politics (<i>Phi</i> =.048)	40.8	43.5	40.7
Sometimes politics is so complicated that people like me do not understand anymore what is going on (<i>Phi</i> =.147***)	72.1	69.3	61.7

Another important indicator for political integration is trust in public institutions. Table 22 presents the respondents’ trust in different institutions. On the local level, they were asked for trust in civil servants and employees in civil service, in the city government, and in the city assembly. Significant differences occur only for civil servants and employees in civil service. The unemployed trust them the least, the precarious employed the most – but the differences are very small. Concerning the government and the city council, the degree of trust does not differ significantly by employment status. Trust in the police is highest among the precarious. In the employed group it is a

little lower, and even lower among the unemployed. The precarious trust in the courts to the highest extent, the scores of the unemployed are only little lower, and the employed mistrust them little more often.

For the regional level, we asked about trust in the regional parliament and the regional. In the groups of the precarious and the regularly employed (who do not differ on this point), trust scores in the regional institutions are slightly higher than in local level institutions. Among the unemployed, however, the degree of trust in regional institutions is quite lower than in the local institutions. The unemployed suspect the regional institutions significantly more often than the employed. Exactly the same pattern can be found for national institutions as well as for the institutions of the European Union, which score lowly as the regional authorities.

Trust in the churches is relatively low and does not differ significantly by group. The media also obtain low trust rates, and group differences are not significant either. A group effect can be found for trust in employers and enterprises. The regularly employed trust them the most, the unemployed the least.

Table 22: Trust in different parts of the political system (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Civil servants and employees in civil service ($Eta^2=.007^*$)	5.93	6.27	6.23
The city government ($Eta^2=.004$)	6.08	6.20	6.10
The city assembly ($Eta^2=.001$)	5.84	6.02	5.88
The police ($Eta^2=.011^{**}$)	5.74	6.00	5.92
The regional parliament ($Eta^2=.032^{***}$)	5.77	6.11	5.84
The regional government ($Eta^2=.021^{***}$)	5.78	6.19	6.22
The churches ($Eta^2=.002$)	3.80	4.02	4.39
The national government ($Eta^2=.028^{***}$)	5.01	5.21	5.34
The courts ($Eta^2=.015^{***}$)	6.36	6.56	6.15
The national parliament ($Eta^2=.043^{***}$)	5.01	5.45	5.36
The institutions of the European Union ($Eta^2=.015^{***}$)	5.19	5.53	5.48
Employers and enterprises ($Eta^2=.016^{***}$)	4.91	5.73	5.83
The media ($Eta^2=.002$)	4.42	4.52	4.63
Trade unions ($Eta^2=.007^*$)	5.81	5.61	5.91

Finally, trust scores of the trade unions differ less. The precarious trust them the least and, but as for employers and enterprises, we find the highest scores in the employed group. However, it is noteworthy that all groups trust the unions clearly more than the employers.

Table 23 presents the respondents' satisfaction with democracy in general and with government performance in different policy fields in particular. Satisfaction with the way democracy works is significantly lower among the unemployed, whereas the other groups score almost the same. The way the national government managed economic issues is seen differently. The precarious are the most satisfied, the employed slightly less and the unemployed quite less. The same applies to poverty, even though the scores are generally lower. Regarding education as well as health care, there are no significant group differences. For government management of unemployment, precarious employment, environment/sustainable development, and youth, the satisfaction scores follow the same pattern as for economy and poverty. The unemployed are the least and the regularly employed are the most satisfied. Besides group differences, employment and poverty are the issues with lowest satisfaction scores, while health obtained the highest.

Table 23: Satisfaction with democracy and with government management of different issues (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The way democracy works ($\eta^2=.042^{***}$)	6.43	6.55	6.58
Economy ($\eta^2=.060^{***}$)	4.81	5.24	5.17
Poverty ($\eta^2=.041^{***}$)	4.57	4.69	4.58
Education ($\eta^2=.004$)	5.58	5.60	5.44
Unemployment ($\eta^2=.082^{***}$)	4.24	4.62	4.86
Health care ($\eta^2=.002$)	6.34	6.56	6.60
Precarious employment ($\eta^2=.056^{***}$)	4.55	4.73	4.88
Environment/sustainable development ($\eta^2=.010^{**}$)	5.82	5.74	5.80
Youth ($\eta^2=.026^{***}$)	5.60	5.37	5.82

To grasp political participation, we asked about voting in elections and about different forms of political activities. Table 24 illustrates the number of those who have participated in the last election on the national and on the local level. The results are striking. While the 85% of employed have voted on the national level, the number of voters among the unemployed is much lower. The same applies for the local level. More than two thirds of the precarious and slightly less of the regularly employed have cast their ballots, compared to 53 percent of the unemployed.

Table 24: *Participation in elections (percentage of those who voted in the last elections).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The last national election (<i>Phi=.066</i>)	79.3	84.2	85.0
The last local election (<i>Phi=.127***</i>)	53.2	64.6	67.7

As regards political activities, group differences are not so evident, as it is shown in table 25. About four percent of the respondents have contacted a politician, with the exception of precarious whose percentage is 3.2%. Working for a political party, having worn or displayed a badge, sticker or poster, having donated money to a political organisation or group, having taken part in a strike (the activity most performed), having contacted the media, and having contacted a solicitor or judicial body are all actions that show higher percentages for permanent workers.

Table 25: *Political activity (percentage of those who have taken part in different kinds of political activities).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Contacted a politician (<i>Phi=.054</i>)	4.4	3.2	4.6
Contacted a national or local government official (<i>Phi=.076*</i>)	11.4	9.0	10.0
Worked for a political party (<i>Phi=.008</i>)	6.5	4.0	8.6
Worked in a political action group (<i>Phi=.007</i>)	10.6	10.9	10.3
Worn or displayed a badge, sticker or poster (<i>Phi=.046</i>)	13.1	9.3	13.6
Signed a petition (<i>Phi=.126***</i>)	38.5	39.1	37.8
Taken part in a public demonstration (<i>Phi=.089**</i>)	28.5	23.5	23.7
Boycotted certain products (<i>Phi=.134***</i>)	23.0	23.2	17.3
Deliberately bought certain products for political reasons (<i>Phi=.130***</i>)	15.1	13.0	11.7
Donated money to a political organisation or group (<i>Phi=.034</i>)	8.2	7.6	9.7
Taken part in a strike (<i>Phi=.018</i>)	16.9	17.8	21.8
Contacted the media (<i>Phi=.050</i>)	4.5	3.7	7.4
Contacted a solicitor or a judicial body for non-personal reasons (<i>Phi=.024</i>)	4.7	3.9	7.4
Participated in an illegal action (<i>Phi=.085*</i>)	7.4	2.2	3.3
Participated in a violent action (<i>Phi=.100**</i>)	4.2	1.5	0.5

But the unemployed are not in any case the least active. For instance, 23 percent of them have boycotted certain products, compared to the same percent of the precarious,

but only 17.3 percent of the regularly employed. And in having taken part in a public demonstration, the unemployed are the first (28.5). That is, data show that the unemployed are not systematically less active than the regularly employed.

Finally, table 26 illustrates the proportions of those who are members of different civil society organisations. Overall, respondents tend to be more often members of trade unions and political parties and less often part of religious groups and social movement organisations. Group differences in organisational membership are not so relevant either.

Membership of trade unions is low across different groups. Few precarious workers and regularly employed are members of a religious organisation, and even fewer of the unemployed are so.

Table 26: *Earlier or present membership in different organisations (percentage of those who are or have been members of different kinds of organizations).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Political party ($\Phi=0.061$)	2.1	4.1	5.4
Trade union ($\Phi=0.103^{**}$)	4.3	4.2	4.3
Religious organisation ($\Phi=0.171^{***}$)	1.5	0.8	2.2
Cooperative ($\Phi=0.012$)	0.7	0.5	0.5
Social movement organisation ($\Phi=0.047$)	1.0	0.5	0.5
Other civil society organisation ($\Phi=0.140^{***}$)	1.8	2.5	5.1

Finally, the unemployed are less often members of other civil society organisations. Again, there is a simple explanation. Most of these organisations mentioned were sport clubs and other leisure associations, and as we have seen in the section of social dimension, the unemployed have significantly less spare time activities and hobbies. Nevertheless, this is rather an aspect of their social life than of their political integration.

6. Well-being

The last dimension of exclusion we investigated in our research is individual well-being, including institutional discrimination and both physical and mental health. Table 27 shows two main indicators of general well-being. Findings show that there are only marginal differences, though significant, across groups in terms of experiencing a good health in general. However, both the unemployed and the precarious are substantially less happy than permanent workers.

Table 27: Happiness (average based on a scale from 0 to 10), optimism (percentage, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very optimistic” and “quite optimistic”), and good health (percentage, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very good” and “good”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Experience a good health in general (<i>Phi</i> =.140***)	90.3	89.9	92.2
Optimistic about the future (<i>Phi</i> =.204***)	68.7	71.2	84.6

Respondents were then asked whether they visited different public institutions at all during the last 12 months. Table 28 suggests that the unemployed did not experience a worse health, and in fact they have slightly more often seen a doctor or visited a hospital than the permanent workers. Moreover, they have been at any community office more seldom than the regularly employed; the precarious have been there even less. The social service office or a social worker has been visited by almost two thirds of the permanent workers, with lower percentages for both the unemployed and the precarious. of the unemployed, while such institutions seem not to play a major role for the precariously employed. Contacts to the housing agency or the landlord, finally, differ by employment status, since it is visited mostly by the employed group and least by the precarious.

Table 28: Percentage of those who have visited different public institutions.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital (<i>Phi</i> =.076*)	64.9	60.2	64.8
At the social service office, by social worker (<i>Phi</i> =.467***)	60.3	59.7	62.9
At their child's school, training agency (<i>Phi</i> =.195***)	21.4	9.6	5.8
At the employment agency, job centre (<i>Phi</i> =.697***)	24.9	12.4	-
At the housing agency, by their landlord (<i>Phi</i> =.053)	20.8	14.5	27.1
At any other community office (<i>Phi</i> =.152***)	25.9	21.0	38.2

The next table presents the proportions of those who said they have not got a service in these institutions although they felt they were entitled to. About 30% of unemployed said they had not got a service they felt they were entitled to at the doctor's or at the hospital, compared to about 9% of precarious and 14% of regularly employed. At the social service office or by a social worker, one finds similar dynamics in terms of institutional discrimination. At educational institutions, the unemployed felt discriminated most often, followed by the employed. One third of the precarious employed felt deprived of certain rights at the labour agency or job centre, while among the unemployed the percentage is lower. No significant differences are noticeable in terms of services from landlords or housing agencies.

Table 29: Percentage of those who have not got a service they feel they were entitled to when they visited the institutions below.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital (<i>Phi=.118***</i>)	29.4	9.3	13.9
At the social service office, by social worker (<i>Phi=.072</i>)	26.0	12.9	13.7
At their child's school, training agency (<i>Phi=.161*</i>)	46.8	40.4	42.5
At the employment agency, job centre (<i>Phi=.200***</i>)	26.5	33.3	-
At the housing agency, by their landlord (<i>Phi=.138</i>)	20.5	19.2	23.6
At any other community office (<i>Phi=.233***</i>)	21.8	23.1	-

Finally, table 30 illustrates the respondents' answers to the general health questionnaire, including questions about depression and self-confidence. The 22% of the unemployed said they had lost much sleep over worry. Among the employed and the precarious, this number is much lower, but differences by type of working contract are very small. About half of the unemployed said they feel constantly under strain. Here, the differences with the regularly employed are wider and significant. Higher percentage of the employed and the vast majority of the precarious felt they were playing a useful part in things, but in this case the differences are not significant.

Table 30: General Health Questionnaire (percentage who agree to different statements concerning health, 4-point scale, collapsed categories "agree" and "totally agree").

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
I have lost much sleep over worry (<i>Phi=.322***</i>)	22.0	13.9	12.0
I feel that I am playing a useful part in things (<i>Phi=.077*</i>)	71.5	76.3	78.2
I feel capable of making decisions about things (<i>Phi=.118***</i>)	58.8	58.7	58.2
I feel constantly under strain (<i>Phi=.159***</i>)	49.7	48.7	43.6
I feel that I can not overcome my difficulties (<i>Phi=.235***</i>)	28.0	21.2	20.3
I am able to concentrate on whatever I do (<i>Phi=.034</i>)	67.0	74.8	66.6
I am able to face up to my problems (<i>Phi=.124***</i>)	89.2	92.5	93.3
I feel unhappy and distressed (<i>Phi=.360***</i>)	15.6	6.9	8.4
I have lost confidence in myself (<i>Phi=.266***</i>)	24.2	13.2	12.7
I think of myself as a worthless person (<i>Phi=.184***</i>)	9.4	4.9	4.1
I feel reasonably happy, all things considered (<i>Phi=.200***</i>)	96.3	95.5	93.0
I am able to enjoy my normal day-to-day activities (<i>Phi=.305***</i>)	91.0	95.2	95.3

The same pattern can be found for similar statements like “I feel capable of making decisions about things” and “I am able to face up my problems”, while 28% of the unemployed said they felt they could not overcome their difficulties. This is again a quite high figure that is significantly different compared to the precarious and the regularly employed.

The same tendency arises in three further indicators. Nearly 15% of the unemployed felt unhappy and distressed, while about 8% of the employed and 7% of the precarious did so. 24% of the unemployed said they had lost confidence in themselves, and almost 10% of them even said they thought of themselves as a worthless person. Nevertheless, the vast majority of the unemployed said they felt reasonably happy, all things considered, and their rate is higher than the percentage of the employed agreeing to this statement. However, a lower percentage of unemployed said they were able to enjoy their normal day-to-day activities, compared to both precarious and regular workers.

WP3: National Report Sweden

Birgitta Eriksson, Tuula Bergqvist and Jennifer Hobbins

1. Introduction

This report is produced within the project 'Youth, unemployment, and exclusion in Europe: A multidimensional approach to understanding the conditions and prospects for social and political integration of young unemployed' (YOUNEX). The project has a cross-national comparative design and the countries included in the study are France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland. This report is about Sweden and is based on work package 3 in the project, which is an individual survey aimed at three different groups of young people (18-34 years old); long-term unemployed, in a precarious work situation and permanently employed. The questionnaire that was used contains questions about social background, relations to work and unemployment, social and political inclusion/exclusion and well-being. The intention was that the investigation would be carried out by telephone interviews of 400 randomly selected people in each group. That was the case in two of the groups: those who were permanently employed and precarious youth respectively. In Sweden, we were not able to gain access to the names and contact information of the long-term unemployed. Instead, the public institution with which they are registered carried out the investigation, which was done in the form of a web survey. The respondents amount to a total of 428 long-term unemployed, 400 precarious and 399 regularly employed young people.

2. Social background

Initially we will make a presentation of those who responded to the questions. Table 1 shows that there is a slightly larger proportion of men than women among the unemployed and among those with a permanent job. However, women are over-represented in the group "precarious". We note that there is a strong correlation between age and labour market status. There is a considerably larger proportion belonging to the 18-24 age group among unemployed than among precarious and particularly larger than those who have a permanent job. Thus, it is not very often that young people get a permanent job in the Swedish labour market before they reach the age of 25.

Turning to levels of education, we can state that there is a significant correlation between how long people have studied and their labour market status. However, it is difficult in a cross-table study to see a clear pattern in this correlation. Somewhat surprisingly, the proportion with minimum compulsory education is not particularly high

among the unemployed; most have at least secondary education. However, there is a relatively small proportion who have higher education.

Table 1: Percentage of different categories who answered the questionnaire.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
<i>Gender</i>			
Men	50.7	39.0	50.6
Women	49.4	61.0	49.4
(Cramer's $V = .103^{**}$) ²³	(n=428)	(n=400)	(n=399)
<i>Age</i>			
18-24	40.8	16.2	2.6
25-34	59.2	83.8	97.4
(Cramer's $V = .23^{***}$)	(n=387)	(n=364)	(n=344)
<i>Education</i>			
Not completed compulsory school	1.2	.0	0.3
Completed compulsory school	10.5	2.8	23.4
Upper secondary school	59.6	35.8	36.5
Post secondary school	21.8	22.4	3.0
Tertiary education	6.9	39.1	36.7
(Cramer's $V = .352^{***}$)	(n=418)	(n=397)	(n=394)
<i>Native or immigrant</i>			
Native	77.7	72.5	80.2
Immigrant	22.3	27.5	19.8
(Cramer's $V = .075^*$)	(n=417)	(n=397)	(n=399)
<i>Marital status</i>			
Single	40.8	24.8	23.8
In partnership	59.2	75.2	76.2
(Cramer's $V = .17^{***}$)	(n=422)	(n=399)	(n=399)
<i>Living conditions</i>			
Living alone	10.0	24.3	33.0
Living with someone	90.0	75.7	67.0
(Cramer's $V = .23^{***}$)	(n=422)	(n=399)	(n=400)
<i>Parenthood</i>			
Living with children	26.4	48.4	58.8
Living without children	73.6	51.6	41.2
(Cramer's $V = .281^{***}$)	(n=402)	(n=312)	(n=313)
<i>Finance</i>			
Salary	2.0	84.2	96.5
Unemployment benefits	66.5	2.3	.0
Social aid	16.5	6.5	1.8
Family members	5.5	1.8	0.3
Other	9.5	5.3	1.5
(Cramer's $V = .609^{***}$)	(n=200)	(n=399)	(n=400)
<i>Personal income</i>			
Mean (€)	843.24	2042.21	2722.23
Median (€)	542.63	2061.99	2658.88
(Eta ² = .130 ^{***})	(n=129)	(n=355)	(n=385)
<i>If unemployed</i>			
Benefiting from an active measure/employment measures	79.4		
	(n=422)		
Never had a paid job	41.1		
	(n=321)		

²³ Significance levels: no star: the relationship is not significant, * = significant at the 0.05 level, ** = significant at the 0.01 level, *** = significant at the 0.001 level.

The largest proportion with post-secondary education is among the "precarious", and there are few with only compulsory education in this group. Among those with permanent jobs in the labour market, there is also a large group of highly educated people, but also a relatively large group with only compulsory education.

Concerning immigrants, we note a weak correlation between the different groups. At the same time we know that unemployment is higher among immigrants than among native Swedes. This means that we can expect a greater loss among the responses of immigrants in the group long-term unemployed. This is probably related to language difficulties associated with answering the web survey.

The table shows that there is a significant correlation between whether people live alone and labour market status. The stronger links you have to the labour market, the greater the probability that you have a partner. However, the correlation between labour market status and whether you live with someone is the opposite. The farther from the labour market people are, the more likely they are to live with someone. Since there were many more among the unemployed who were between 18 and 24, it is reasonable to assume that more people in this group still live with their parents. If people live together and have children, there is a significant correlation with labour market status. It is much more common among those who have a permanent job to have children at home than for those who are completely outside the labour market. The group precarious is between the two extremes. It appears that many people wait to have children until they have a permanent job.

How, then, do our respondents earn their living? Not surprisingly, unemployment benefit is the most common income when they are long-term unemployed, but there is also a relatively large group who receive social security payments. This is certainly related to the fact that many young people in this group have not had time to qualify for unemployment benefits. The question here was: 'What is your main source of income/means of support?' Probably there are many combinations of support. The precarious live to the greatest extent on their wages, even though social security and unemployment benefit also occur as a main source of income.

3. Relations to work and unemployment

This section deals with attitudes towards different aspects of life such as family, friends, leisure, politics, work and religious and voluntary organisations. It also looks at the significance of work and attitudes to work and unemployment. In addition, attitudes to employment are reported from a gender perspective.

To begin with, we note that in the categories who have work – the precarious and the permanently employed respectively – job satisfaction is relatively high on a scale of 0 to 10. Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, the highest is among precarious rather than permanently employed. One explanation could be that among the precarious there are many who found a job after being unemployed for a long time and therefore had lower demands on job satisfaction.

Table 2: Work satisfaction (average based on a scale of 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Work satisfaction in general during the last 12 months ($\eta^2=.019$)		7.43 (n=397)	7.36 (n=400)

Those in employment also answered questions regarding the extent to which they had low hopes of getting a better job and whether they were afraid of losing their jobs. Table 3 shows that about one-fifth had little hope of getting a better job and that there is a significant difference between the two groups; the proportion was higher among the precarious than that of the permanently employed. One explanation for this may be that there are many respondents in the latter category that simply do not want a better job. The responses in the table above indicate this. The responses to the question of whether people are afraid of losing their jobs, is more surprising. Here it transpires that it is primarily those who have a permanent job who are afraid of losing it, while the proportion is smaller among those with a temporary job. This may relate to the fact that among those with a permanent job there is a higher proportion of older people and a larger percentage who have children at home to provide for. It is not only they who are affected if they lose their jobs.

Table 3: Percentage of those who have low hopes of getting a job/a better job within one year and percentage of those who have high fears of losing their job (4-point scale, collapsed categories "low hopes" and "very low hopes"/"high fears" and "very high fears").

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Low hopes of getting a job	58.3 (n=408)		
Low hopes of getting a better job ($\Phi=.159^{***}$)		23.6 (n=355)	18.8 (n=377)
High fears of losing a job ($\Phi=.112^*$)		19.0 (n=399)	27.6 (n=396)

If we look at the long-term unemployed, it is clear from the above table that over half of the respondents had low or even very low hopes of finding a job.

The respondents were asked to evaluate the importance of various aspects of life on a scale of 0-10. From Table 4 we note that the family was ranked highest in all three categories. The next most valued aspect was friends. In third place there were a number of different categories; among the unemployed a job was more important than spare time, whereas for those who are employed leisure time was more often valued than work. Here one might have expected the opposite result. Politics, religion and voluntary organisations are considerably less important than other aspects.

With regard to attitudes towards work and unemployment, the respondents were to indicate the extent to which they agreed with a number of different statements. They had to choose one of the following answers: totally disagree, disagree, neither agree or disagree, agree, totally agree.

Table 4: The importance of different aspects of life (average based on a scale of 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family ($Eta^2=.003$)	9.32 (n=430)	9.13 (n=400)	9.30 (n=399)
Friends ($Eta^2=.008^{**}$)	8.55 (n=430)	8.84 (n=400)	8.64 (n=400)
Leisure time ($Eta^2=.004$)	8.37 (n=429)	8.17 (n=400)	8.39 (n=399)
Politics ($Eta^2=.029^{***}$)	4.13 (n=427)	5.06 (n=399)	5.00 (n=400)
Work ($Eta^2=.027^{***}$)	8.42 (n=425)	7.84 (n=400)	7.83 (n=400)
Religion ($Eta^2=.002$)	2.93 (n=430)	3.22 (n=399)	3.14 (n=400)
Voluntary organisations ($Eta^2=.006^*$)	4.32 (n=430)	4.70 (n=400)	4.76 (n=398)

Table 5 shows the respondents who answered agree or totally agree. We note that there is a significant correlation between social status and how important they consider it is to have a job. The stronger the ties with the labour market, the greater the proportion who think it is very important to have a job and vice versa; the weaker the ties with the labour market, the smaller the proportion who value employment highly. One observation in this context is that the numbers differ considerably between the long-term unemployed and other categories. Work is thus an important part of life.

Table 5: Percentage of those who agree with different statements about work and unemployment (5-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Having a paid job to go to is very important (Cramer's $V=.225^{***}$)	75.6 (n=345)	93.0 (n=399)	95.5 (n=400)
If I won a large sum of money I would immediately stop working (Cramer's $V=.153^{***}$)	30.4 (n=399)	17.3 (n=398)	18.0 (n=399)
Unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person (Cramer's $V=.192^{***}$)	73.8 (n=420)	50.0 (n=398)	54.6 (n=397)
I get bored quickly when I have no work to do (Cramer's $V=.052$)	79.4 (n=421)	73.8 (n=397)	73.3 (n=398)
The most important things that happen in life do not involve work (Cramer's $V=.170^{***}$)	36.8 (n=421)	46.2 (n=398)	45.1 (n=399)
Being without a job gives time to spend on other important things (Cramer's $V=.068$)	34.7 (n=420)	39.8 (n=389)	43.5 (n=372)
If unemployment benefit was very high I would not want a paid job to go to (Cramer's $V=.111^{***}$)		5.8 (n=394)	5.8 (n=399)

To some extent this result is reflected in the next statement, which concerns the extent to which they would stop working if they won a large sum of money. There are comparatively few who say that they would do this. This agrees well with results from a

recent Swedish study that examined how people who actually won money acted. In fact that did not stop working, take leave of absence or cut down their working hours to any significant extent. The third statement says that unemployment is one of the worst things a person can encounter. Among those who have a job, about half agree with this, while most unemployed people agree with it. The fourth statement was: 'I get bored quickly when I have no work to do'. Most agree with this and there is no significant correlation between the different categories. So far, the results suggest strong orientation to work among young adults in Sweden. In the fifth statement, however, work is put in relation to other things in life in the statement, 'The most important things that happen in life do not involve work.' Results show that between 35 and 46 per cent agree with this. Roughly equal proportions answered that they could spend time on other important things if they were out of work. However, very few would choose to refrain from work even if unemployment benefits were very high.

One conclusion that can be drawn from the results in the table above is that young adults in Sweden have a high degree of work orientation, although it wavers slightly when work is put in relation to other things in life. The question then is, what is it about work that is valued so highly? From the figures in Table 6, we note that all these aspects are important. Some of them have been chosen more often than others and those aspects valued highest in all categories are the opportunities for personal development that work provides. Among those who have jobs, social contacts and a salary then follow in that order. The long-term unemployed, however, value a salary above social contacts. In addition, there are more in that category, who appreciate that work encourages a life with regular hours. These findings are in line with Marie Jahoda's thesis on the latent functions of work (Jahoda 1982). She believes that in addition to a salary, work has five latent functions that few or no other institutions in society can provide. She believes that work first gives us a special sense of time. Second, it broadens our social horizons beyond the family, our circle of friends and the immediate neighbourhood. Third, we have an anchor in a community whose strength exceeds our own. Fourth, it provides us with work status and identity. Fifth and finally, we are forced by work to perform acts whose purpose lies beyond personal aims.

Table 6: Percentage of those who consider different functions of work as being important (4-point scale, collapsed categories "quite important" and "very important").

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The salary (Cramer's $V = .147^{***}$)	92.2 (n=425)	88.3 (n=400)	95.7 (n=398)
Regular activities (Cramer's $V = .135^{***}$)	84.2 (n=419)	72.5 (n=395)	71.7 (n=393)
Social contacts (Cramer's $V = .121^{***}$)	90.2 (n=421)	96.7 (n=396)	96.7 (n=396)
Gives an identity and status (Cramer's $V = .152^{***}$)	70.3 (n=414)	61.1 (n=396)	65.5 (n=397)
Personal development (Cramer's $V = .075^*$)	95.1 (n=420)	97.2 (n=396)	98.5 (n=399)

Attitudes to work and employment from a gender perspective are explored by two sets of questions: in the first, respondents were asked to mark on a scale of 0 to 10 how

important they think it is for a woman and a man to have a paid job in order to be considered as an adult. They were also asked to assess the importance of having a job even if people have children under 3 years old.

Table 7: Attitudes to the importance of having a full time job among men and women, with and without young children (average based on a scale of 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The importance for men ($Eta^2=.018^{***}$)	5.12 (n=182)	4.28 (n=393)	3.93 (n=390)
The importance for women ($Eta^2=.019^{***}$)	5.49 (n=169)	4.57 (n=393)	4.21 (n=392)
The importance for men with children under 3 ($Eta^2=.038^{***}$)	6.19 (n=175)	7.57 (n=388)	7.66 (n=393)
The importance for women with children under 3 ($Eta^2=.027^{***}$)	6.95 (n=170)	8.02 (n=387)	7.99 (n=394)

The table 7 shows that those who are unemployed feel it is important for both men and women to have a full-time job to a greater extent than those with jobs. Regarding whether it is important that men and women with children under three have a job, they agree with this less than those with work. It may of course be due to fewer unemployed people having children.

In the second set of questions about attitudes to work and unemployment from a gender perspective, respondents were asked whether or not they agreed with the following three statements: 'A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family', 'Men should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children' and 'When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to work than women'. The response alternatives were totally disagrees, disagree, agree and totally agree. The results are presented in Table 8. About one fifth of those asked say that women should be prepared to cut down on paid work to care for their families. Among the unemployed the proportion is significantly lower. Meanwhile, the vast majority agree that men should take as much responsibility as women for home and family.

Table 8: Percentages of those who agree with different statements regarding the roles of men and women (4-point scale, collapsed categories "agree" and "totally agree").

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family (Cramer's $V=.164^{***}$)	14.3 (n=399)	26.3 (n=399)	26.7 (n=393)
Men should take as much responsibility as women for there home and children (Cramer's $V=.159^{***}$)	95.2 (n=421)	97.5 (n=399)	98.3 (n=399)
When jobs are scarce, men should have jobs in the first place (Cramer's $V=.$)	(n=)	(n=)	(n=)

When asked who should have priority with jobs if there is a lack of work, there was a very small proportion who answered that men should. This applies to all three categories.

4. Social exclusion

To examine the extent to which long-term unemployment leads to social exclusion, we asked questions about social relations, participation in social activities and experience of being discriminated. Social exclusion was also examined by questions about giving and receiving help to and from different groups such as family members, friends, acquaintances, colleagues and neighbours as well as questions on whether people had borrowed money from anyone during the past 12 months.

Regarding the number of friends, respondents were asked: 'How many friends do you have – people with whom you feel good and feel you can talk with about private issues or ask for help if necessary?'. The answers possible were none, 1-2 people, 3-4 people and more than 7 people.

Table 9: Percentage of those who have differing numbers of friends (people they feel good with and can talk with about private issues or ask for help if necessary).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
None	5.9	0.3	0.3
1-2 people	41.3	7.8	8.3
3-7 people	39.9	55.5	58.9
More than 7 people	13.0	36.5	32.6
(Cramer's V=)	(n=424)	(n=400)	(n=399)

According to Table 9, there is a considerably larger proportion among the unemployed who have few friends, while a larger proportion of those with jobs have many friends. Roughly the same pattern applies to social contacts, as shown in Table 10. Although the largest percentage of respondents had met family members, friends and acquaintances in the past month, the proportion who had not done so was greater among the unemployed than among other groups. An interesting difference here is that it is more common among those with a stable job to have had no social contacts than it is for those in the precarious group. Perhaps this because work takes up so much time that those with permanent jobs find it difficult to cultivate their social lives, whereas those in the precarious group may not be so tied down to work.

Table 10: Percentage of those who have not met different categories of people during the last month.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family members not living in the household (Phi=.146***)	10.9 (n=412)	4.0 (n=399)	6.0 (n=399)
Friends not living in the household (Phi=.199***)	9.9 (n=406)	2.0 (n=399)	2.8 (n=400)
Acquaintances not living in the household (Phi=.158***)	18.0 (n=395)	5.5 (n=400)	7.5 (n=400)

Respondents were asked whether they had been helped by anybody during the past year, and if so by whom. Help included getting a lift with someone, help looking after children, with shopping or having something repaired at home. We can see that they primarily belong to the category of long-term unemployed. Table 11 first presents those who have not received help at all; next follow those who have not had help from various categories in their social networks. The results show that those who have jobs tend to have better social support than the long-term unemployed. We decline to draw any far-reaching conclusions from this since the need for assistance varies widely between different categories.

Table 11: *Percentage of those who did not receive help from different categories of people during the last 12 months.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Nobody (Cramer's $V = .213^{***}$)	39.6 (n=427)	20.5 (n=400)	21.5 (n=400)
Partner (Cramer's $V = .292^{**}$)	27.5 (n=204)	8.0 (n=263)	5.3 (n=263)
Family members (not in the same household) (Cramer's $V = .111^{**}$)	5.8 (n=223)	3.5 (n=315)	1.9 (n=312)
Friends (Cramer's $V = .126^{***}$)	9.4 (n=223)	5.4 (n=316)	5.1 (n=313)
Acquaintances (Cramer's $V = .055$)	25.7 (n=218)	22.1 (n=317)	19.7 (n=314)
Colleagues/former colleagues (Cramer's $V = .167^{***}$)	55.8 (n=208)	39.9 (n=316)	28.7 (n=314)
Neighbours (not friends or acquaintances) (Cramer's $V = .108$)	3.7 (n=216)	7.5 (n=314)	5.8 (n=311)

Table 12 shows the opposite of the above: social support is not just about receiving help but being able to stand up for others. It describes those who have not offered help to anyone else.

Table 12: *Percentage of those who did not offer help to different categories of people during the last 12 months.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Nobody (Cramer's $V = .190^{***}$)	26.5 (n=431)	12.0 (n=293)	9.0 (n=400)
Partner (Cramer's $V = .213^{***}$)	21.5 (n=256)	6.1 (n=293)	4.3 (n=303)
Family members (not in the same household) (Cramer's $V = .060$)	3.5 (n=285)	1.4 (n=351)	2.5 (n=362)
Friends (Cramer's $V = .094^{**}$)	3.8 (n=287)	1.4 (n=351)	1.9 (n=362)
Acquaintances (Cramer's $V = .064$)	13.3 (n=285)	14.2 (n=352)	16.0 (n=362)
Colleagues/former colleagues (Cramer's $V = .180^{***}$)	45.2 (n=270)	26.2 (n=351)	20.45 (n=363)
Neighbours (not friends or acquaintances) (Cramer's $V = .061$)	49.1 (n=277)	47.69 (n=351)	40.2 (n=361)

Firstly it takes up those who did not offer assistance to any category at all, then those who did not offer assistance to different categories. The same pattern is repeated here. The unemployed have more time to help others than those who work, yet they do so to a lesser extent. On the other hand, we have seen above that the unemployed have fewer social contacts so they do not have as many opportunities to offer their help to others.

There are many studies showing that a significant problem associated with unemployment is insufficient money. A major issue in this context is how easy or difficult it is to borrow money if people are in serious financial difficulties. According to Table 13, there is a strong correlation between social status and the chances of borrowing money. The unemployed find it significantly more difficult than those who have work, and those who have a permanent job find it very easy to borrow money.

Table 13: People sorted by how difficult or easy it would be to borrow money if they were in serious financial difficulties (percentage).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Very difficult	38.8	8.4	5.1
Quite difficult	35.2	20.5	12.3
Quite easy	17.9	40.4	53.0
Very easy	8.2	30.7	29.6
(Cramer's $V=.340^{***}$)	(n=196)	(n=391)	(n=389)

If we move on to Table 14, we note that those who have the hardest time borrowing money are those that need to borrow most. One possible explanation for this is that they have already borrowed so much money that other people do not want to lend them anymore. We also see that those who borrowed money did so mostly from family members outside their household. After that category it was partners and friends who helped out.

Table 14: Percentage of those who have borrowed money from someone during the past 12 months and from whom they borrowed the money.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Have borrowed money during the past 12 months (Cramer's $V=.325^{***}$)	65.3 (n=430)	30.0 (n=400)	14.3 (n=400)
From their partner (Cramer's $V=.103$)	45.2 (n=259)	42.7 (n=96)	39.5 (n=43)
From family members not living in the same household (Cramer's $V=.261^{***}$)	89.1 (n=276)	85.7 (n=119)	71.9 (n=57)
From their friends (Cramer's $V=.160^{*****}$)	46.4 (n=274)	33.3 (n=120)	28.1 (n=57)
From acquaintances (Cramer's $V=.105$)	18.5 (n=271)	9.2 (n=119)	8.8 (n=57)
From their colleagues or former colleagues (Cramer's $V=.150^{**}$)	6.2 (n=272)	5.0 (n=119)	.0 (n=57)
From their neighbours (not friends or acquaintances) (Cramer's $V=.065$)	4.8 (n=273)	4.2 (n=118)	.0 (n=57)

One might think that those who are unemployed have plenty of time to participate in various social activities. In fact the opposite is true. They say they are rarely active or much more rarely than most others in their age group are, while those who have work participate in recreational activities to a greater extent than others. If we compare the precarious and those with permanent jobs, the differences are not very great.

Table 15: *Taking part in social activities (percentage of the extent compared to other people of the same age).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Much more seldom than most people of their age	27.6	6.3	4.3
More seldom than most	34.2	28.9	32.0
About the same	30.5	48.1	49.7
More often than most	5.5	14.7	11.7
Much more often than most	2.1	2.0	2.3
(Cramer's $V=.245^{***}$)	(n=380)	(n=395)	(n=394)

In Table 16 we see the percentage who are not at all active in recreational activities such as a hobby or a sport and we also see the reasons for their inactivity. There is a clear correlation between not participating in leisure activities and employment status, which indicates that the stronger the connection with the labour market, the less likely it is that people are not active in their leisure time. The main reason why the unemployed do not participate in recreational activities is that they are not interested in their hobby or sport any longer, while those who work do not participate in leisure activities for other reasons.

Table 16: *People who are not active in any spare time activities such as hobbies or sports and reasons why they are not active in those kinds of activities (percentage).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not active	55.4	41.1	30.5
(Cramer's $V=.208^{***}$)	(n=329)	(n=411)	(n=407)
Because they have no hobby/sport	12.3	14.3	10.0
Because they are not interested in their hobbies/sports anymore	7.1	17.4	20.8
Because they cannot afford it anymore	56.2	12.4	3.3
Because of another reason	24.4	55.9	65.8
(Cramer's $V=.373^{***}$)	(n=324)	(n=161)	(n=120)

Another aspect of social inclusion/exclusion is the question of whether people have been subjected to any form of discrimination. Respondents were asked if they had been victims of discrimination based on skin colour, nationality, religion, language, ethnic group, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability or social status. As Table 17 shows, there is a relatively strong significant correlation between being discriminated and social status. The first row of the table shows, that there is significantly greater proportion of those who have a permanent job that have never felt discriminated compared with unemployed. In other respects, victims of the various types of discrimination are shown. There we can see that the correlation is significant with regard to discrimination based

on gender, sexual orientation and social status. However, it varies depending on the type of discrimination involved. An interesting observation is that gender discrimination is more common among those who are employed, and particularly among those who have a permanent job in the open labour market, than it is among the long-term unemployed. This could be interpreted as meaning that the Swedish labour market is an arena for gender discrimination. Being subjected to discrimination based on sexual orientation is also more common among those with a permanent job. We might ask what labour market organisations do with people? Discrimination based on labour market status, however, is more common among the long-term unemployed.

Table 17: Experiences of discrimination (percentage of those who consider themselves as belonging to a discriminated group).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No (Cramer's $V = .297^{***}$)	58.9 (n=365)	81.4 (n=398)	90.9 (n=397)
Colour or race (Cramer's $V = .013$)	9.4	6.8	8.3
Nationality (Cramer's $V = .043$)	14.1	10.8	2.8
Religion (Cramer's $V = .127$)	6.7	4.1	2.8
Language (Cramer's $V = .157$)	8.7	1.4	2.8
Ethnic group (Cramer's $V = .070$)	4.7	2.7	8.3
Age (Cramer's $V = .089$)	26.8	12.2	11.1
Gender (Cramer's $V = .258^{***}$)	18.8	29.7	55.6
Sexuality (Cramer's $V = .314^{***}$)	5.4	2.7	16.7
Disability (Cramer's $V = .069$)	18.8	14.9	11.1
Employment status (Cramer's $V = .439^{***}$)	49.7	14.9	13.9
Other (Cramer's $V = .096$)	26.8 (n=149)	25.7 (n=74)	8.3 (n=36)

Finally, with regard to social exclusion we will examine some statements about the unemployed and report on how young people think that others see them. The statements are that they are lazy, they try to take advantage of the system, they are passive/without initiative, they have bad luck, they have themselves to blame that they have no job because of alcohol or drug problems and they are people who have become victims of socio-economic development. Table 18 shows those who responded that many people or most people would agree with these statements. With regard to all the statements, there is a significant correlation between whether people believe that others agree with these statements and what connection people have to the labour market. It is also true that it is always the largest proportion of the unemployed who believe that others agree with the statements. An overwhelming proportion of the unemployed believe that others think that people like them are lazy, passive, without initiative and victims of social development. The finance/shame model, claims that one

characteristic of the unemployed is that they feel guilty for their situation and that others blame them for being in the situation (Starrin & Jönsson 2006). It is very probably this feeling that is reflected in the responses of long-term unemployed to the question of what others think about them.

Table 18: *Percentage of those who think that different kinds of attitudes to unemployed people occur among most or many people (4-point scale, collapsed categories “many people” and “most people”).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
They are lazy (Cramer's $V = .132^{***}$)	70.8 (n=417)	66.5 (n=397)	56.8 (n=398)
They try to take advantage of the system (Cramer's $V = .179^{***}$)	48.2 (n=409)	52.0 (n=398)	45.6 (n=399)
They are passive/without initiative (Cramer's $V = .196^{***}$)	71.1 (n=404)	51.9 (n=397)	48.9 (n=397)
They have bad luck (Cramer's $V = .165^{***}$)	52.8 (n=415)	42.4 (n=398)	45.9 (n=399)
They have themselves to blame (Cramer's $V = .237^{***}$)	50.6 (n=405)	25.1 (n=398)	19.5 (n=396)
They have no job because of alcohol or drug problems (Cramer's $V = .207^{***}$)	24.2 (n=393)	6.6 (n=398)	7.2 (n=393)
They are victims of socio-economic development (Cramer's $V = .144^{***}$)	61.7 (n=389)	54.9 (n=395)	55.3 (n=394)

Are young long-term unemployed people socially excluded? We have seen that many of them have fewer friends than the corresponding age group in the labour market; they meet family, friends and acquaintances to a lesser extent than those who work; they participate in social activities and recreational activities to a lesser extent; they are more vulnerable to discrimination of various kinds, and many of them are ashamed of the situation they are in. This does not apply to everybody, but one answer to the question would still be that young unemployed people find themselves in a vulnerable position with a high risk of social exclusion.

5. Political exclusion

In this section we will examine whether political inclusion/exclusion has anything to do with people's connections with the labour market. What we look at here are political interest, political activity, political efficacy, political trust, political satisfaction and membership in different organisations. Political interest is reflected here in the general question, 'How interested would you say you are in politics?' In the table below we see that there is a significant correlation with employment status in the sense that interest in politics is higher among the unemployed than among those with work. Meanwhile, there is widespread lack of interest in all categories. More than half in all categories are not very interested in politics at all.

Table 19: *Political interest (percentage).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not interested at all	36.8	21.1	20.0
Not very interested	38.7	32.8	36.0
Fairly interested	18.6	34.6	33.8
Very interested	5.9	11.5	10.3
(Cramer's $V = .158^{***}$)	(n=424)	(n=399)	(n=400)

There is a fairly large consensus in the answers on how to behave. The vast majority in all categories feel that people should have their own opinion regardless of what others think. They should also support those who are worse off than themselves. They must obey laws and regulations. An overwhelming proportion who have a job also think it is important that people vote. The majority of the unemployed think the same, but the proportion is lower. In all groups, however, most people think that it is not very important to be active in voluntary organisations, and particularly not in politics.

Table 20: *The importance of different political activities (percentages, 4-point scale, collapsed categories "very important" and "quite important").*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Supporting people who are worse off than themselves (Cramer's $V = .095^{**}$)	89.9 (n=416)	90.0 (n=400)	89.1 (n=397)
Voting in elections (Cramer's $V = .201^{***}$)	76.5 (n=413)	90.8 (n=400)	93.0 (n=397)
Obedying laws and regulations (Cramer's $V = .059$)	89.8 (n=421)	84.0 (n=399)	89.2 (n=398)
Forming own opinion independently of others (Cramer's $V = .112^{***}$)	96.6 (n=413)	95.9 (n=399)	97.8 (n=400)
Being active in voluntary organisations (Cramer's $V = .060$)	34.0 (n=397)	36.8 (n=400)	37.5 (n=397)
Being active in politics (Cramer's $V = .050$)	26.3 (n=403)	29.0 (n=376)	26.8 (n=399)

Table 21 shows the percentage who agree with various statements about political efficacy, and there is a clear correlation with labour market status. The long-term unemployed are much more sceptical about political efficacy. They feel to a greater extent that political parties are only interested in their votes and not in their views. They feel to a lesser extent that they can influence government policy. Moreover, they feel to a greater extent that politics is so complicated that people like themselves do not understand what is happening.

Table 21: Percentage who agree with different statements about political efficacy (4-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion (Cramer's $V = .261^{***}$)	83.7 (n=382)	45.5 (n=398)	47.3 (n=397)
People like me definitely have an influence on governmental politics (Cramer's $V = .110^{***}$)	19.7 (n=360)	30.4 (n=395)	30.8 (n=397)
Sometimes politics is so complicated that people like me do not understand what is going on anymore (Cramer's $V = .106^{***}$)	66.7 (n=390)	54.0 (n=400)	51.7 (n=399)

Political trust is about confidence in a number of different political institutions. It is measured on a scale of 0 to 10. Table 22 shows that for all institutions, there is a correlation between trust in them and labour market status, while the average trust is always lowest among the unemployed, and the other two groups are quite similar. The exceptions here are confidence in the media and trade unions. There is no correlation there.

Table 22: Trust in different parts of the political system (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Civil servants and employees in civil service (Eta ² = .035 ^{***})	4.78 (n=421)	5.65 (n=394)	5.64 (n=397)
The government of Karlstad (Eta ² = .034 ^{***})	4.83 (n=414)	5.49 (n=390)	5.43 (n=395)
The council of Karlstad (Eta ² = .026 ^{***})	4.67 (n=415)	5.47 (n=382)	5.33 (n=390)
The police (Eta ² = .048 ^{***})	6.18 (n=386)	7.16 (n=400)	7.35 (n=400)
The regional parliament (Eta ² = .002)		6.41 (n=385)	6.58 (n=386)
The regional government (Eta ² = .021 ^{***})			
Religious institutions (Eta ² = .015 ^{***})	3.26 (n=420)	3.90 (n=391)	3.92 (n=390)
The national government (Eta ² = .115 ^{***})	4.09 (n=419)	5.79 (n=396)	6.00 (n=397)
The courts (Eta ² = .111 ^{***})	5.46 (n=403)	7.07 (n=398)	7.25 (n=395)
The national parliament (Eta ² = .117 ^{***})	4.59 (n=417)	6.27 (n=394)	6.40 (n=393)
The institutions of the European Union (Eta ² = .028 ^{***})	4.27 (n=415)	5.06 (n=383)	5.10 (n=388)
Employers and enterprises (Eta ² = .022 ^{***})	5.86 (n=405)	6.31 (n=396)	6.61 (n=394)
The media (Eta ² = .004)	4.25 (n=419)	4.42 (n=9)	4.59 (n=400)
Trade unions (Eta ² = .003)	5.27 (n=409)	5.60 (n=398)	5.43 (n=400)

How satisfied are you with the way democracy works and in how the government handles the various areas of economy, poverty, unemployment and so on? This was assessed on a scale of 0 to 10. According to Table 22, there is clearly a significant correlation between these areas and people's connection to the labour market and the correlations are always in the same direction. The stronger the labour market connection, the higher is the average "satisfaction level", and vice versa: the weaker the connection to the labour market, the higher the degree of dissatisfaction. The strongest correlation is in the way government deals with unemployment, and this reveals the disappointment of many long-term unemployed people very clearly.

Table 23: Satisfaction with democracy and with government management of different issues (average based on a scale of 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The way democracy works ($Eta^2=.126^{***}$)	5.09 (n=378)	6.56 (n=398)	7.00 (n=399)
Economy ($Eta^2=.125^{***}$)	3.95 (n=423)	5.39 (n=390)	5.96 (n=391)
Poverty ($Eta^2=.058^{***}$)	3.54 (n=423)	4.38 (n=385)	4.89 (n=383)
Education ($Eta^2=.070^{***}$)	4.52 (n=412)	5.55 (n=394)	5.98 (n=391)
Unemployment ($Eta^2=.183^{***}$)	2.67 (n=424)	4.48 (n=392)	5.02 (n=393)
Health care ($Eta^2=.026^{***}$)	4.25 (n=417)	4.95 (n=394)	5.10 (n=393)
Precarious employment ($Eta^2=.066^{***}$)	3.60 (n=423)	4.53 (n=373)	5.01 (n=372)
Environment/sustainable development ($Eta^2=.043^{***}$)	4.67 (n=420)	5.49 (n=388)	5.73 (n=387)
Youth ($Eta^2=.065^{***}$)	3.73 (n=420)	4.63 (n=376)	5.03 (n=386)

There is no doubt that this disappointment is reflected in the voting turnout, which is significantly lower among the unemployed than among those belonging to the precarious and particularly among those with a permanent job on the open labour market. Within the first group not even half voted in the last local elections.

Table 24: Participation in elections (percentage of those who voted in the last elections).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The last national election ($Cramer's V=.218^{***}$)	62.1 (n=398)	84.0 (n=400)	91.5 (n=399)
The last local election ($Cramer's V=.211^{***}$)	42.2 (n=351)	66.5 (n=388)	76.7 (n=390)

Voting requires active behaviour. In addition, respondents were asked to what extent they participated in other types of political activities such as contacting a politician, government official, working in a political party or political action group, etc. There is no clear pattern. In some cases there is a correlation between political activity and

employment status, indicating greater activity among those who have jobs. This is true for the question about whether respondents had been in contact with a politician or a national or local official. It was also true for the question of whether they had signed an appeal or petition, or if they had boycotted any specific product or bought any particular product for political reasons. Regarding all these aspects, it was most common among those who have a permanent job on the open labour market and least common among the unemployed, while the precarious fell in between the two. The most common political activities were to boycott certain products, to sign a petition or to contact a government official at the municipal or national level. This applied to all three categories.

Table 25: Political activity (percentage of those who had taken part in different kinds of political activities).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Contacted a politician (Cramer's $V = .137^{***}$)	7.8 (n=411)	16.8 (n=399)	18.8 (n=400)
Contacted a national or local government official (Cramer's $V = .207^{***}$)	20.4 (n=329)	37.1 (n=396)	43.6 (n=397)
Worked for a political party (Cramer's $V = .037$)	4.1 (n=412)	2.8 (n=399)	2.8 (n=400)
Worked in a political action group (Cramer's $V = .041$)	4.6 (n=410)	5.8 (n=399)	7.0 (n=400)
Worn or displayed a badge, sticker or poster (Cramer's $V = .048$)	11.7 (n=409)	15.8 (n=400)	14.3 (n=400)
Signed a petition (Cramer's $V = .213^{***}$)	22.3 (n=404)	44.1 (n=392)	43.8 (n=395)
Taken part in a public demonstration (Cramer's $V = .052$)	6.6 (n=412)	10.0 (n=399)	8.0 (n=399)
Boycotted certain products (Cramer's $V = .239^{***}$)	25.4 (n=398)	53.8 (n=398)	43.8 (n=397)
Deliberately bought certain products for political reasons (Cramer's $V = .222^{***}$)	12.5 (n=410)	35.1 (n=399)	30.1 (n=399)
Donated money to a political organisation or group (Cramer's $V = .074^*$)	7.3 (n=410)	11.0 (n=399)	6.3 (n=400)
Taken part in a strike (Cramer's $V = .031$)	1.9 (n=412)	1.3 (n=400)	2.3 (n=399)
Contacted the media (Cramer's $V = .085^*$)	7.4 (n=408)	13.6 (n=398)	12.0 (n=400)
Contacted a solicitor or a judicial body for non-personal reasons (Cramer's $V = .071^*$)	4.2 (n=409)	8.3 (n=399)	7.3 (n=400)
Participated in an illegal action (Cramer's $V = .033$)	2.4 (n=404)	1.5 (n=400)	1.5 (n=400)
Participated in a violent action (Cramer's $V = .050$)		0.5 (n=400)	0.0 (n=399)

Another way to take part in political activity is through membership of various organisations. Here we examine membership of political parties, trade unions, religious organisations, cooperatives, social movements and other NGOs. We note that regardless of category, it is not that common being a member of a political party, although the proportion is greater among those who work than those who are unemployed. The correlation between membership and social status is not significant here. It is, however, in the case of other types of organisations and in line with previous

results; membership is more common among those who have a job compared to the unemployed. The most common is being a union member.

Table 26: *Earlier or present membership in different organisations (percentage of those who are or have been members of different kinds of organisations).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Political party (Cramer's $V = .053$)	14.2 (n=424)	17.8 (n=400)	17.1 (n=399)
Trade union (Cramer's $V = .238^{***}$)	49.8 (n=401)	68.6 (n=395)	86.5 (n=400)
Religious organisation (Cramer's $V = .229^{***}$)	7.9 (n=417)	33.0 (n=397)	41.0 (n=398)
Cooperative (Cramer's $V = .127^{***}$)	3.2 (n=376)	12.5 (n=392)	16.5 (n=393)
Social movement organisation (Cramer's $V = .122^{***}$)	3.4 (n=411)	15.7 (n=395)	9.3 (n=400)
Other civil society organisation (Cramer's $V = .190^{***}$)	8.4 (n=394)	30.5 (n=393)	33.1 (n=389)

In conclusion, we note that there are significant correlations between political interest, political activity, political efficacy, political trust, political satisfaction and membership of different organisations on the one hand and social status on the other hand. The correlation implies that the long-term unemployed are to a less extent interested in, active in, efficacious, trusting in and satisfied with policies pursued. However, the young are generally not very interested in politics. Regarding the question of whether long-term unemployed are politically excluded, we would prefer to answer that they are more uninterested than excluded. At the same time they are disappointed in politics and politicians.

6. Well-being

Welfare is examined from three different aspects: happiness, optimism about the future and the perception of health. Respondents had to assess the degree of perceived happiness on a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 was extremely unhappy and 10 extremely happy. In order to assess their optimism or pessimism about the future they had to answer the question 'Are you optimistic or pessimistic about your future?' Response options were very optimistic, quite optimistic, quite pessimistic and very pessimistic. Respondents described their health by answering if it was very bad, bad, good or very good. Table 27 indicates that all three aspects show a significant correlation with labour market status. The stronger the links with the labour market, the greater the happiness, the greater the proportion who are optimistic about the future and the greater the proportion who feel they have good health.

Table 27: Happiness (average based on a scale of 0 to 10), optimism (percentage, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very optimistic” and “quite optimistic”), and good health (percentage, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very good” and “good”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Happiness ($\eta^2=.209^{***}$)	5.76 (n=221)	7.66 (n=389)	8.00 (n=400)
Optimistic about the future (Cramer's $V=.301^{***}$)	61.7 (n=365)	90.2 (n=396)	93.7 (n=396)
Experience good health in general (Cramer's $V=.298^{***}$)	65.9 (n=416)	94.0 (n=399)	96.5 (n=399)

Another way of measuring well-being is by using the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ). This is an additive index based on different statements relating to stress, self-confidence and the ability to structure everyday life. The index was developed by Goldberg (1972). The number of statements varies between different studies, such as 30, 20 or 12. In this study, like Nordenmark (1999) we used 12 different statements. We can see in Table 28 that for each statement there are strong significant correlations with labour market status. Positive aspects are most common among those with a permanent job and negative aspects are most common among the long-term unemployed. An example of the former is 'I feel reasonably happy, all things considered' and an example of the latter is 'I think of myself as a worthless person'.

Table 28: General Health Questionnaire (percentage who agree with different statements concerning health, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
I have lost much sleep over worry (Cramer's $V=.238^{***}$)	43.5 (n=418)	31.3 (n=399)	19.3 (n=400)
I feel that I am playing a useful part in things (Cramer's $V=.308^{***}$)	41.0 (n=405)	86.6 (n=400)	89.6 (n=400)
I feel capable of making decisions about things (Cramer's $V=.250^{***}$)	69.5 (n=419)	89.6 (n=400)	94.0 (n=400)
I feel constantly under strain (Cramer's $V=.262^{***}$)	57.5 (n=421)	34.8 (n=399)	3.8 (n=398)
I feel that I cannot overcome my difficulties (Cramer's $V=.249^{***}$)	24.2 (n=416)	8.3 (n=400)	2.8 (n=400)
I am able to concentrate on whatever I do (Cramer's $V=.202^{***}$)	69.9 (n=422)	87.0 (n=399)	91.1 (n=400)
I am able to face up to my problems (Cramer's $V=.282^{***}$)	63.2 (n=416)	90.8 (n=399)	93.4 (n=399)
I feel unhappy and distressed (Cramer's $V=.391^{***}$)	42.2 (n=422)	8.6 (n=400)	5.0 (n=400)
I have lost confidence in myself (Cramer's $V=.377^{***}$)	52.8 (n=421)	15.6 (n=400)	8.1 (n=400)
I think of myself as a worthless person (Cramer's $V=.392^{***}$)	45.1 (n=418)	3.1 (n=399)	1.8 (n=400)
I feel reasonably happy, all things considered (Cramer's $V=.394^{***}$)	56.6 (n=408)	94.4 (n=396)	96.0 (n=399)
I am able to enjoy my normal day-to-day activities (Cramer's $V=.334^{***}$)	56.6 (n=408)	94.4 (n=396)	96.0 (n=399)

To find out the extent to which the unemployed are in contact with public services that can offer them help, we asked respondents to describe which services they had been in contact with at some time during the past 12 months. Those on the list were a doctor/hospital, social services, children's education, employment and housing. According to Table 29, almost all long-term unemployed had been in contact with employment services. Many of them, but no more than among those with permanent jobs, had visited a doctor's surgery and/or a hospital. They had to a greater extent than others visited a social service, housing agency or other municipal office. In contrast, there was a smaller proportion who had visited a children's school, which is not surprising given that there are fewer unemployed who have children. It does not seem to be more difficult for the long-term unemployed to make contact with various public institutions.

Table 29: *Percentage of those who have visited different public institutions.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital (Cramer's $V = .035$)	65.6 (n=422)	66.0 (n=400)	71.3 (n=400)
At the social service office, social worker (Cramer's $V = .376^{***}$)	34.1 (n=417)	8.3 (n=400)	3.3 (n=400)
At their child's school, training agency (Cramer's $V = .127^{***}$)	19.6 (n=414)	28.8 (n=400)	33.0 (n=400)
At the employment agency, job centre (Cramer's $V = .776^{***}$)	96.9 (n=425)	33.8 (n=400)	5.0 (n=400)
At the housing agency, landlord (Cramer's $V = .131^{***}$)	26.7 (n=412)	21.0 (n=400)	13.8 (n=400)
At any other community office (Cramer's $V = .116^{***}$)	41.1 (n=387)	27.8 (n=400)	32.5 (n=400)

The next question was how people were treated when they visited various public institutions. If we concentrate on the unemployed, we note that it is primarily in connection with visits to the employment office that they did not receive the services expected. Neither did visits to the doctor or hospital meet expectations.

Table 30: *Percentage of those who did not receive the service they felt they were entitled to when visiting the institutions below.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital (Cramer's $V = .089^*$)	35.6 (n=393)	27.0 (n=263)	27.6 (n=283)
At the social service office, social worker (Cramer's $V = .164^{**}$)	27.8 (n=363)	36.4 (n=33)	69.2 (n=13)
At their child's school, training agency (Cramer's $V = .112^*$)	9.2 (n=359)	16.7 (n=114)	16.7 (n=132)
At the employment agency, job centre (Cramer's $V = .248^{***}$)	57.4 (n=390)	35.1 (n=134)	10.0 (n=20)
At the housing agency, landlord (Cramer's $V = .113^*$)	11.5 (n=364)	20.2 (n=84)	20.4 (n=54)
At any other community office (Cramer's $V = .050$)	16.3 (n=337)	21.3 (n=108)	16.9 (n=130)

In conclusion, in terms of well-being we can see that there are significant differences between the various categories of young people. The difference between the long-term unemployed and other groups is especially large. This does not mean that all unemployed people are unhappy, pessimistic about the future and in poor health. Within this group most people are in fact happy, confident and healthy. However, it is clear that unemployment can lead to physical and mental illness.

6. Summary and conclusion

To extend the knowledge on social and political exclusion of young unemployed and precarious youth, we draw the following conclusions based on the results above:

If we summarize what has emerged relating to young people's attitudes to work and unemployment in general, we can say that most young adults value work highly regardless of their category. Young adults in Sweden have a high degree of work orientation, although it wavers slightly when work is compared to other things in life. At the same time there are differences connected with young people's labour market status, which means that work orientation is lower among young unemployed people than among those with work. Regarding the perception of work and unemployment from a gender perspective, it appears that a large proportion of young adults – especially among those who have jobs – still see work as more important for men than for women. The conclusion is that the stronger the connection with the labour market, the greater the proportion who thinks it is very important to have a job to go to and vice versa, the weaker the connection with the labour market, the smaller the proportion who value work highly.

Are then young unemployed socially excluded? We have seen that many of them have fewer friends than the same age group in the labour market; they meet family, friends and acquaintances less often than those who work, they participate less in social and recreational activities, they are more often victims of discrimination of various kinds, and many of them are ashamed of the situation they are in. This is not true of all, but to answer the question we would want to conclude: young unemployed people find themselves in a vulnerable position with a high risk of social exclusion.

In conclusion, we note that young adults are generally not very interested in politics. There are significant correlations between political interest, political activity, political efficacy, political trust, political satisfaction and membership of different organisations on the one hand and labour market status on the other hand. The correlation implies that the long-term unemployed are less interested in, active in, efficacious, have less confidence in and are less satisfied with policies implemented. As for the question of whether the long-term unemployed are politically excluded, we would probably say that they are more indifferent than excluded. However, they are disappointed with politics and politicians.

In terms of welfare, we can conclude that the unemployed young adults are at risk of poor individual well-being. There are significant differences between the various categories of young people. The difference between the long-term unemployed and other groups is particularly wide. This does not mean that all unemployed people are

unhappy, pessimistic about the future and in poor health. Most people within this group are happy, confident and healthy. However, it is undeniable that unemployment paves the road to physical and mental illness.

References

- Goldberg, D.P. (1972): *The Detecting of Psychiatric Illness by Questionnaire – A technique for the identification and assessment of Non-psychotic Psychiatric Disease*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hedenus, A. (2011): *At the End of the Rainbow – Post-winning life among Swedish lottery winners*. Göteborg Studies in Sociology No 45, Department of Sociology, University of Gothenburg.
- Jahoda, M. (1982): *Employment and unemployment. A social-psychological analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nordenmark, M. (1999): 'Employment Commitment and Psychological Well-Being among Unemployed Men and Women.' *Acta Sociologica* 42 (2): 135-149.
- Starrin, B. & Jönsson, I.R. (2006): 'The Finances-Shame Model and the Relation Between Unemployment and Health.' In Kieselbach, T. et al. (eds.) *Unemployment and Health, International and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Australian Academic Press.

WP3: National Report Poland

Slawomir Nowotny

1. Introduction

Kielce is a city situated in the middle of Poland between the capital city of Warsaw and other big cities like Cracow, Katowice, Lodz. As the capital of the Swietokrzyskie Province (voivodship) is economic, administrative, educational and cultural centre. Once an important centre of limestone mining, one of the oldest industrial zone, Kielce is now the second Polish trade fairs market, centre of construction industry and building materials production. Roman Catholic Diocese of Kielce is a part of the Archdiocese of Cracow, one of the most important in Polish Church (late Pope John Paul II was before Archbishop of Cracow). In 1816 the first Polish technical university was founded in Kielce (then moved to Warsaw became the Warsaw University of Technology). Today Kielce hosts more than ten academic schools and several high schools. Kielce is the 16th biggest Polish city with the population of 205.902 (2007, year before the YOUNEX project has started). The city is an administrative unit in terms of labour market policy (carried locally by the City Labour Office). In 2007 the unemployment rate in Kielce amounted at 9,8%, below the whole country's rate of 11,1%. During the time of the research it still remains significantly below the country level as show the following data for December 2010:

	Unemployed in 000	Unemployment rate in %
POLAND	1 954,7	12,3
Province (Voivorship)	82,1	14,7
City of Kielce	11,4	10,6

In January 2011 the unemployment register of the City Labour Office accounted:

- 12 118 unemployed persons, of what 5 821 were women (48,0%)
- 1 891 unemployed persons aged up to 25 years, of what 929 were women (49,1%)
- 6 079 long-term unemployed persons, of what 3 069 were women (50,4%)

The data analysed in this report were collected within the survey conducted between 30 January and 17 May 2010 by professional interviewers of the Center for Scientific Research, the research unit of PTS. The sampling frame was derived from the official census of the City of Kielce and contained all its residents born between 31 December 1974 and 1 January 1991. The data file contained 50.665 records including for each person: ID number (*PESEL*), surname and family name, date and place of birth and gender. From this frame the first tranche of the sample contained 4.725 persons has been drawn applying random numbers. The objective was to complete 400 valid interviews in each of three target groups: long-term unemployed, precarious and regularly employed people. Net size of these groups obtainable from the first tranche was insufficient (293 unemployed, 389 precarious and 402 regularly employed before check) thus the second tranche of 2.300 persons was drawn. It was exploited until required numbers of interviews in two first groups were achieved; 1.628 addresses from this tranche were contacted. After a careful control and check procedure some of interviews were rejected and finally the net sample of three groups contains:

- ⇒ 396 unemployed
- ⇒ 399 precarious
- ⇒ 400 regularly employed.

All interviews were conducted personally by interviewers using printed questionnaires.

2. Social background

Gender: There is no significant statistical dependence between gender and employment status. Slight overrepresentation of women in control group (regularly employed) doesn't make the dependency between gender and employment status significant.

Age: There is a significant statistical dependence between age and employment status: among long-term unemployed the younger group (18-24 years) is highly overrepresented (almost 32%) while almost all (>95%) regularly employed belong to the older cohort. It shows that unemployment is a problem affecting mostly younger people.

Education: Also statistical dependence between education and employment status is expectedly significant: those of regular employment are higher educated than long-term unemployed. Among the first group only 5% haven't secondary education and more than $\frac{3}{4}$ have first or second stage of tertiary education while among the long-term unemployed as much as 22,5% have no more than Lower level secondary or second stage of basic education and only 36,4% is educated on tertiary level.

Migration: Immigrants are very small group in Poland at all, and in the City of Kielce this group is so narrow that any kind of statistical dependence between this status and unemployment is immeasurable.

Table 1: Socio-demographic composition of the surveyed sample divided into three studied groups

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
<i>Gender</i>			
Men	47,2	48,9	42,8
Women	52,8	51,1	57,3
(Cramer's $V = ,052$) ²⁴	(n=396)	(n=399)	(n=400)
<i>Age</i>			
18-24	31,8	22,6	4,3
25-34	68,2	77,4	95,7
(Cramer's $V = ,289$ ***)	(n=396)	(n=399)	(n=400)
<i>Education</i>			
Not completed primary school	0,3	0	0
Completed primary school	3,5	1,8	0,3
Lower level secondary or second stage of basic education	18,7	11,1	4,8
Upper secondary school	32,4	25,2	12,9
Post secondary school	8,6	5,8	3,8
First stage of tertiary education	13,4	13,4	10,6
Second stage of tertiary	23	42,8	67,6
(Cramer's $V = ,273$ ***)	(n=395)	(n=397)	(n=395)
<i>Native or immigrant</i>			
Native	99	99,7	99
Immigrant	1	0,3	1
(Cramer's $V = ,041$)	(n=394)	(n=397)	(n=396)
<i>Marital status</i>			
Single	49,7	41,6	18,8
In partnership	50,3	58,4	81,2
(Cramer's $V = ,273$ ***)	(n=327)	(n=392)	(n=399)
<i>Living conditions</i>			
Living alone	2,4	2,8	4,1
Living together with someone	97,6	97,2	95,9
(Cramer's $V = ,042$)	(n=380)	(n=386)	(n=391)
<i>Parenthood</i>			
Living with children	35,4	33,8	58,3
Living without children	62,4	63,4	37,8
(Cramer's $V = ,169$ ***)	(n=396)	(n=399)	(n=400)
<i>Finances</i>			
Salary	9,2	97,7	98,7
Unemployment benefits	1,1	0	0
Social aid	7,5	1	0
Family member	64,2	0,8	0,5
Other	18,1	0,5	0,8
(Cramer's $V = ,640$ ***)	(n=371)	(n=394)	(n=397)
<i>Personal income</i>			
Mean (PLN)	773,18	1645,04	1929,39
Median (PLN)	675	1400	1700
(Eta ² = ,089***)	(n=56)	(n=244)	(n=231)
<i>If unemployed</i>			
Benefiting from an active measure/employment measure	9,3		
Have never had a paid job	27,5 (n=396)		

²⁴ Significance levels: no star: the relationship is not significant, *=significant on the 0,05 level, **=significant on the 0,01 level, ***=significant on the 0,001 level.

Marital status: There is very significant statistical dependence between employment status and living with a partner or single. In the group of regularly employed more than 4 in each 5 persons live with a partner, while only half of the unemployed are in this situation.

Living conditions: Almost all interviewees live with someone else, and this feature does not differ between groups of employment status. Combining this result with marital status it's easy to conclude that ca. 46% of long-term unemployed live with their parents or other members of family, being still singles.

Children: Living in a household with children is much more frequent (significant dependence) among regularly employed (more than 58%), less – in the group of unemployed (only 35%) and even less frequent in precarious group. A considerable part of long term unemployed live as singles with their parents, and in their not too big apartments there is no place for other nuclear families – let say of siblings – with children.

Finances: The strong significant dependence between employment status and financial situation is highly expectable: while almost all regularly employed and even those of precarious status cover their living expenses from more or less regular salaries, nearly $\frac{2}{3}$ of unemployed live on their family expense. On the other hand 9% of them claim to get salary which is at odds with their status. What is also noticeable is that even less of long term unemployed live on unemployment benefits or social aid.

Personal income: The most distinctive result is that only 56 out of 396 of all unemployed (14%) indicate any personal income. And these seldom declared incomes are much less than of two other groups – an average income of an unemployed equals 47% of an average in precarious group and only 40% of those having job. Pretty bad financial situation of long term unemployed in Kielce is deepened by fact that only less than 10% of them benefit from any kind of active or employment measures, and as much as 28% have never had a paid job.

3. Relation to work and unemployment

The general satisfaction with work during the last 12 months – between those who have had any work then – is moderately well: on the 11-point scale (0 – 10) it's average is over 7, with a slightly higher level in the group of regularly employed, however this relationship is statistically insignificant.

Table 2: Work satisfaction (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Work satisfaction in generally during the last 12 months <i>Eta²= NS</i>		7,03 (n=398)	7,24 (n=398)

In some correspondence to the above results are numbers of those among the both groups who have low hopes for of finding a better job (precarious are slightly more pessimistic) and – on the other hand – high fear of losing the current job (here the fear is slightly stronger among the regularly employed).

Long-term unemployed could have only hope to get any job, but for almost half of them this hope is quite low.

Table 3: *Percentage of those who have low hopes of getting a job/a better job within one year and percentage of those who have high fears of losing their job (4-point scale, collapsed categories “low hopes” and “very low hopes”/“high fears” and “very high fears”).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Low hopes of getting a job	44,8 (n=386)		
Low hopes of getting a better job <i>Cramer's V = -,167***</i>		11,7 (n=385)	8,3 (n=387)
High fears of losing the job <i>Cramer's V = ,117**</i>		76,9 (n=376)	85,6 (n=384)

As it can be seen in the next table, the most important aspect of life for interviewees is family, no matter the employment status. This is quite expectable in Polish society, where family is unconquerable value. Quite similar situation is in attitudes of young people to friends. What is less expectable is lack of significant statistical dependence between the three groups in their valuation of work, which is second most important aspect of life.

Table 4: *The importance of different aspects of life (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).*

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family	<i>Eta² = ,005*</i>	9,56 (n=395)	9,61 (n=398)	9,75 (n=400)
Friends	<i>Eta² = NS</i>	8,25 (n=395)	8,42 (n=398)	8,31 (n=398)
Leisure time	<i>Eta² = ,014***</i>	7,42 (n=395)	7,99 (n=397)	7,76 (n=400)
Politics	<i>Eta² = ,014***</i>	2,79 (n=391)	3,44 (n=395)	3,40 (n=399)
Work	<i>Eta² = NS</i>	8,45 (n=395)	8,41 (n=399)	8,32 (n=400)
Religion	<i>Eta² = NS</i>	6,08 (n=386)	6,25 (n=394)	6,43 (n=397)
Voluntary organizations	<i>Eta² = ,012**</i>	4,94 (n=387)	5,61 (n=392)	5,15 (n=396)

On the other side of the importance scale there are two aspects: voluntary organizations and politics, which is particularly low important for young interviewees. And despite of statistical significance of differences between the three groups in terms of their appraisal for “politics”, “voluntary organization” and “leisure time” (relatively less important for unemployed people who have it enough), all these statistical relationships are very weak.

The similar situation we can find in differentiation of attitudes toward work (see Table 5 below). The relatively strongest (and significant) is dependence between employment status and opinion that *unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person*: among three of four regularly employed accept this statement, while among unemployed do this less than 60%. The question remains open if (or how much) it is a psychological defence mechanism making unemployed people more reluctant to think about their own situation as something “worst that can happen to a person”, or – on the other hand – if (or how much) such more carefree attitude of some people makes their motivations to get and keep a job weaker?

More than 80% in each group refuse the idea to resign of work just because of the very high unemployment benefit or winning a large sum of money. On the other hand – for 76% of unemployed and 86% of those having regular job *having a paid job to go to is very important*. These results are quite coherent with those in Table 4 above.

Table 5: Percentage of those who agree to different statements about work and unemployment (5-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Having a paid job to go to is very important <i>Cramer's V = ,093**</i>	75,9 n=395	81,5 n=399	85,5 n=400
If I won a large sum of money I would immediately stop working <i>Cramer's V = ,093**</i>	19,6 n=388	18,3 n=393	13,4 n=395
Unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person <i>Cramer's V = ,105***</i>	58,6 n=394	66,9 n=399	72,8 n=400
I get bored quickly when I have no work to do <i>Cramer's V = ,079*</i>	57,7 n=395	59,8 n=398	67,3 n=397
The most important things that happen in life do not involve work <i>Cramer's V = ,067</i>	49,6 n=389	50,6 n=395	48,7 n=394
Being without a job gives time to spend on other important things <i>Cramer's V = ,093**</i>	58,1 n=396	57,5 n=398	46,9 n=399
If the unemployment benefit was very high I would not want a paid job to go to <i>Cramer's V = ,093**</i>	16,2 n=395	12,9 n=395	8,9 n=394

Work is an important value for surveyed young people, but what is particularly important in it? It looks (see Table 6) that almost everything: the salary, being regularly active, having social contacts, identity and status or opportunity for personal development. All of them are quite or very important for overwhelming majority of 90% up to almost 100% of interviewees. And as above – differentiation between groups in assessing importance of these functions of work is quite weak.

Table 6: Percentage of those who consider different functions of work as being important (4-point scale, collapsed categories “quite important” and “very important”).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The salary	<i>Cramer's V = ,057</i>	98,2 (n=394)	99,7 (n=396)	99,5 (n=399)
Regular activities	<i>Cramer's V = ,089***</i>	94,7 (n=394)	98,7 (n=397)	97,0 (n=399)
Social contacts	<i>Cramer's V = ,050</i>	97,5 (n=394)	98,5 (n=397)	99,7 (n=399)
Gives an identity and status	<i>Cramer's V = ,048</i>	89,4 (n=388)	91,3 (n=393)	89,4 (n=396)
Personal development	<i>Cramer's V = ,107***</i>	95,4 (n=394)	98,2 (n=397)	97,2 (n=399)

The results presented in the Table 7 show that opinions on the importance for men and women of having a fulltime job to be considered adults are almost evenly distributed in all three groups. And in general the average level of acceptance of this idea is not very high: for women the “average importance” is ca. 5,5 points on the 11-point scale from 0 to 10, and for men is higher by ca. 1,5 point. One can say that a man without a fulltime job is a bit “less adult” than a woman in the same situation. But sociological interpretation of these results should take into account that the very idea to define adulthood by having a paid job is rather strange and far from intuitiveness. Common sense is rather reverse: if you are adult you can/should have a job, and not – if you have a job you are adult.

Much more differentiated is acceptance for both sexes to have a full time job while having a child younger than 3 years: the average level of approval for working fathers is by half higher than for a working mother. That is coherent with pretty typical traditional Polish hierarchy of values in which maternity vocation – taking care of children, bringing them up – is higher than having a paid work.

Table 7: Attitudes to the importance of having a fulltime job among men and women to be considered adults and approval of those with and without small children having a full time job (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The importance a full time job to be considered an adult for a woman	<i>Eta² = ,002</i>	5,39 (n=355)	5,64 (n=332)	5,36 (n=330)
The importance a full time job to be considered an adult for a man	<i>Eta² = ,000</i>	6,89 (n=339)	6,90 (n=337)	6,99 (n=334)
Approval of a woman with children younger than 3 having a full time job	<i>Eta² = ,006</i>	5,06 (n=391)	5,68 (n=393)	5,50 (n=397)
Approval of a man with children younger than 3 having a full time job	<i>Eta² = ,000</i>	8,72 (n=396)	8,80 (n=394)	8,80 (n=399)

The mentioned Polish hierarchy of values seems to affect also the subsequent opinions (Table 8) on rights and duties of men and women toward work and family. The impact

is, however, not overwhelming: majority of 60-66% thinks that *a woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family*, but hardly all agree with this opinion. On the other hand almost all interviewees agree that *a man should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children*, and only minor part of each group support priority for men in access to jobs if there are insufficient work places. This opinion, however, differentiate significantly (even if not very strongly) the three groups. The most generous for men are long-term unemployed: more than 1/3 of them give men a priority, while among regularly employed less than 20% do the same. Of course much more stronger is differentiation in this opinion between sexes: Cramer's V amounts here at ,323 at the significance level 000.

Table 8: Percentages of those who agree to different statements regarding the roles of men and women (4-point scale, collapsed categories "agree" and "totally agree").

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family <i>Cramer's V = ,083**</i>	66,0 (n=382)	64,1 (n=393)	59,2 (n=387)
A man should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children <i>Cramer's V = ,084*</i>	96,2 (n=394)	98,0 (n=398)	96,0 (n=398)
When jobs are scarce, men should have jobs in the first place <i>Cramer's V = ,115***</i>	34,2 (n=374)	27,3 (n=384)	19,6 (n=387)

The above results of the survey don't give a basis to claim that the three interviewed groups: long-term unemployed, precarious and regularly employed differ significantly in their attitudes to work and roles of men and women on labour market.

4. Social exclusion

The present section summarises and discusses information collected from the interviewees on various elements and factors of their social capital. The first element is number of friends declared by them. As can be seen in Table 9 distributions of number of friends are quite similar in all three groups: most of them have from 3 to 7 friends, slightly less – only 1 to 2 people with whom they feel friendship. The total differentiation is statistically not significant, some differences are, however, apparent: the relatively biggest number of having no friends at all is among long-term unemployed people, while precarious most frequently declare to have more than 7 friends.

Table 9: Percentage of those who have different number of friends (people they feel well with and can talk with about private issues or ask for help if necessary).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
None	5,3	2,8	3,5
1-2 people	40,7	37,7	40,6
3-7 people	42,7	43,2	45,1
More than 7 people	11,4	16,3	10,8
<i>Cramer's V = ,065</i>	(n=396)	(n=398)	(n=399)

When behaviours are considered the picture seems consistent: precarious are the group in which there is the less people who during the last month have not met any family members, friends or acquaintances. In two other groups, however, numbers of those who have meet nobody last month don't exceed 8 percent points, except for regularly employed, 13% of whom have no gatherings with acquaintances during this time.

Table 10: Percentage of those who have not met different categories of people during the last month.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family members not living in the household <i>Cramer's V = ,054</i>	7,8 (n=395)	6,3 (n=397)	5,5 (n=397)
Friends not living in the household <i>Cramer's V = ,115***</i>	6,3 (n=394)	5,5 (n=398)	7,8 (n=397)
Acquaintances not living in the household <i>Cramer's V = ,184***</i>	6,1 (n=393)	4,8 (n=399)	13,1 (n=396)

Much more important component of social capital than declared number of friends and frequency of meeting with them and other close people is support – actual and possible – which one can get from other people. In the survey people were been asked about receiving such help as *getting a lift with someone, help in looking after children, having shopping done, having something repaired at your house*. Table 11 presents some data on negative side of this issue: 40% of employed and 32% of unemployed did not get such help from anybody during the last 12 months. If such help is received, however, the least common is getting it from neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances) and present or former workmates. The last is particularly uncommon among long-term unemployed – statistical dependence is significant and pretty strong. And even stronger is differentiation if we consider a help from a partner: among unemployed there is twice as much of those who didn't get it than among regularly employed.

Table 11: Percentage of those who did not receive help from different categories of people during the last 12 months.

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one	<i>Cramer's V = ,072**</i>	40,8 (n=392)	34,4 (n=395)	31,6 (n=399)
Partner	<i>Cramer's V = ,155***</i>	30,2 (n=222)	20,3 (n=246)	15,0 (n=267)
Family members (not in the same household)	<i>Cramer's V = ,075</i>	13,8 (n=232)	11,1 (n=252)	10,5 (n=266)
Friends	<i>Cramer's V = ,082</i>	16,9 (n=231)	14,2 (n=254)	17,5 (n=268)
Acquaintances	<i>Cramer's V = ,092*</i>	30,7 (n=231)	25,6 (n=254)	28,9 (n=266)
Colleagues/former colleagues	<i>Cramer's V = ,121***</i>	61,7 (n=230)	43,1 (n=253)	48,7 (n=265)
Neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances)	<i>Cramer's V = ,094*</i>	74,8 (n=230)	74,5 (n=255)	73,6 (n=265)

On the other hand reciprocity in offering help to others may be important source of social capital. When the same kind of help but given **by** interviewees **to** other people is considered the most apparent is the generally high level of reciprocity – most of figures in Table 12 are higher than in Table 11. It looks that young people feel obliged to help others and – if we take declarations as the reliable source of information about facts – do this. What is interesting when we compare both tables that is the relatively highest level of mutuality among unemployed: there is less of them who never offer a help to given category of others than those who never get it from the same category.

Table 12: Percentage of those who did not offer help to different categories of people during the last 12 months.

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one	<i>Cramer's V = ,078**</i>	38,4 (n=393)	29,8 (n=393)	28,4 (n=391)
Partner	<i>Cramer's V = ,155***</i>	27,1 (n=229)	22,6 (n=261)	16,3 (n=276)
Family members (not in the same household)	<i>Cramer's V = ,075</i>	6,2 (n=242)	6,3 (n=270)	6,8 (n=278)
Friends	<i>Cramer's V = ,082</i>	11,2 (n=241)	7,0 (n=270)	11,9 (n=277)
Acquaintances	<i>Cramer's V = ,092*</i>	18,8 (n=240)	18,5 (n=271)	21,9 (n=278)
Colleagues/former colleagues	<i>Cramer's V = ,121***</i>	50,6 (n=239)	34,9 (n=269)	38,6 (n=277)
Neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances)	<i>Cramer's V = ,094*</i>	65,4 (n=240)	61,7 (n=269)	67,6 (n=275)

One of the most practical problems of unemployed and precarious people is shortage in financial resources. Borrowing some money can help them when the situation gets

tough and easiness of receiving this kind of help is a good indicator of social capital. Table 13 shows that differentiation of the three investigated groups from this point of view is of moderate strength and statistically significant: borrowing money is most difficult for unemployed and easiest for regularly employed. Of course the crucial factor in this is assessment of solvency of potential receiver of a loan by creditor – unemployed people give the lowest chance to repay.

Table 13: People sorted by how difficult or easy it would be to borrow money if they were in serious financial difficulties (percentage).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Very difficult	18,1	8,5	7,7
Quite difficult	45,3	39,4	35,9
Quite easy	30,2	43,3	46,3
Very easy	6,5	8,8	10,1
<i>Cramer's V=,138***</i>	(n=371)	(n=363)	(n=365)

The next table gives some more insight into practice of borrowing money in the three investigated groups. The biggest demand for this kind of support have naturally unemployed people, the lowest – those of regular employment (the dependence is statistically significant and relatively strong). Similar differentiation – although not so strong and significant – can be observed in reference to borrowing money from friends, acquaintances and neighbours. In terms of frequency of borrowing from various categories of people in general, the main source is family – $\frac{3}{4}$ or more in each group during the past 12 months have borrowed money from their family members not living in the same household. The second common source is friends (more than half of unemployed have availed of their loans) and third is interviewee's partner.

Table 14: Percentage of those who have borrowed money from someone during the past 12 months and from whom they have borrowed the money.

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Have borrowed money during the past 12 months <i>Cramer's V = ,265***</i>	38,2 (n=390)	19,6 (n=398)	11,5 (n=399)
From their partner <i>Cramer's V = ,127</i>	22,0 (n=141)	16,4 (n=73)	25,0 (n=44)
From family members not living in the same household <i>Cramer's V = ,149*</i>	80,4 (n=148)	74,4 (n=78)	84,8 (n=46)
From their friends <i>Cramer's V = ,192***</i>	53,4 (n=148)	31,2 (n=77)	28,3 (n=46)
From acquaintances <i>Cramer's V = ,170*</i>	26,35 (n=147)	17,9 (n=78)	10,9 (n=46)
From their colleagues or former colleagues <i>Cramer's V = ,084</i>	10,2 (n=147)	9,0 (n=78)	10,9 (n=46)
From their neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances) <i>Cramer's V = ,108</i>	6,1 (n=147)	2,6 (n=78)	0,0 (n=46)

An attempt to grasp a kind of “projective” view of the interviewees on their social involvement in terms of taking part in social activities provided results shown in the Table 15. It looks that the three groups don’t differ significantly in this aspect: most of them feel “average” – their habits are *about the same compared to other people of the same age*. On the other hand, however, much more in each group feel that in this aspect they are below the “average” (combined responses “much more seldom” and “more seldom”) of majority then below (“more often” and “much more often”).

Table 15: *Taking part in social activities (percentage of the extent compared to other people of the same age).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Much more seldom than most people in their age	17,9	15,4	17,3
More seldom than most	27,2	31,6	33,1
About the same	45,6	41,3	43,0
More often than most	6,4	9,6	4,6
Much more often than most	2,6	2,0	1,8
<i>Cramer's V=,075</i>	(n=390)	(n=395)	(n=393)

Perhaps a bit unexpected is the finding (presented in Table 16) that there is no significant differences between the three groups in being active in any ‘spare time’ activities such as hobbies or sports. Around one fourth of each group declare to be “not active” in this field. When we want to explain the reasons of lack of spare time activities, we find however quite differentiated picture. While the majority of unemployed just have no hobby/sport, precarious and regularly employed more frequently claim that they cannot afford their hobby/sport activities anymore or suggest another reason for being inactive in spare time. The question rises if the status of unemployed affects negatively having hobbies or – rather – people of no special interest in active way of spending time are also more passive in seeking for a job. The survey results don’t allow answering this question.

Table 16: *People who are not active in any ‘spare time’ activities such as hobbies or sports and reasons why they are not active in that kind of activities (percentage).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not active	25,6	25,3	23,0
<i>Cramer's V = NS</i>	(n=395)	(n=399)	(n=400)
have no hobby/sport	52,0	29,3	38,5
not interested in their hobbies/sports anymore	6,0	11,1	6,6
cannot afford it anymore	27,0	31,3	34,1
another reason	15,0	27,3	19,8
<i>Cramer's V=,155*</i>	(n=100)	(n=99)	(n=91)

On the other side of the range of social integration/exclusion is an issue of experiencing various kind of discrimination. In Poland it is not very common that people feel *being a*

member of a group that is discriminated against. There is no here any strong ethnic, national or religious conflicts, especially with division for dominating majority and suppressed minority. As it is shown in Table 17 as much as 89% of unemployed and 98% of regularly employed don't count themselves to any of discriminated groups. The only significant exception is feeling of 8% of long-term unemployed belonging to the group discriminated *on the ground of ... employment status* which seems quite obvious in their situation.

Table 17: *Experiences of discrimination (percentage of those who consider themselves as belonging to a discriminated group).*

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No	<i>Cramer's V =,117***</i>	88,8	93,4	98,3
Colour or race	<i>Cramer's V =,157***</i>	0,0	0,0	0,0
Nationality	<i>Cramer's V =,111***</i>	0,5	0,3	0,0
Religion	<i>Cramer's V =,111***</i>	0,3	0,3	0,0
Language	<i>Cramer's V =,157***</i>	0,0	0,0	0,0
Ethnic group	<i>Cramer's V =,111***</i>	0,3	0,3	0,0
Age	<i>Cramer's V =,111***</i>	1,3	0,8	0,3
Gender	<i>Cramer's V =,131***</i>	0,5	1,0	1,3
Sexuality	<i>Cramer's V =,157***</i>	0,0	0,0	0,0
Disability	<i>Cramer's V =,112***</i>	0,8	0,3	0,0
Employment status	<i>Cramer's V =,142***</i>	7,8	2,0	0,3
Other	<i>Cramer's V =,123***</i>	1,0	2,0	0,0
		(n=396)	(n=399)	(n=400)

The next table presents distribution of answers for projective question what people think about unemployed. Generally, as in other issues, this question doesn't differentiate the three investigated groups as well. The biggest difference is in case of the opinion that "unemployed people are lazy" – among regularly employed there is 11 percent points more those who think that this opinion is prevalent "in our society" than among unemployed. Part of this difference may be ascribed to the very opinion of the interviewees themselves (on the basis of psychological mechanism of projection), but the survey results don't provide ground to verify this hypothesis or to measure the scope of this phenomenon.

What seems more evident is a kind of ranking of alleged popularity of opinions about unemployed people in the Polish society. While "laziness" is on top of this list, the next are opinions that unemployed people are passive and without initiative or just victims of the socio-economic development of the country. The fourth in a ranking is opinion going further in ascribing responsibility to unemployed people themselves, and even more – blaming them for bad intentions, namely opinion that unemployed intend to take advantage of the system. The least popular in the Polish society would be, according to our interviewees, opinion that lack of job is a result of "bad luck".

Table 18: Percentage of those who think that different kinds of attitudes to unemployed people occur among most or many people (4-point scale, collapsed categories “many people” and “most people”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
They are lazy <i>Cramer's V = ,078*</i>	49,9 (n=391)	54,9 (n=397)	61,1 (n=396)
They have intended to take advantage of the system <i>Cramer's V = ,033</i>	44,9 (n=390)	50,1 (n=393)	52,5 (n=396)
They are passive/without initiative <i>Cramer's V = ,085**</i>	48,7 (n=388)	51,8 (n=394)	60,0 (n=395)
They have had bad luck <i>Cramer's V = ,046</i>	40,0 (n=390)	36,6 (n=396)	39,8 (n=392)
They have themselves to blame <i>Cramer's V = ,047</i>	39,6 (n=389)	40,5 (n=390)	44,3 (n=393)
They have no job because of alcohol or drug problems <i>Cramer's V = ,080*</i>	45,2 (n=385)	45,5 (n=393)	49,4 (n=391)
They are people who have become victims of the socio-economic development <i>Cramer's V = ,058</i>	51,3 (n=382)	53,4 (n=384)	52,8 (n=386)

5. Political exclusion

Poles are far from being heavily interested in politics. Relatively low actual participation in elections has an equivalent in answers for the survey question. As it shown in Table 19 as much as 30% of regularly employed up to 46% of unemployed is not interested in politics at all. With next 34 – 40% of “not very interested” we have the majority of 70 – 80% of young people who doesn't care about politics. This attitude, however, differentiate significantly the three investigated groups: the less interested in politics are long-term unemployed while relatively most interested are those of regular employment status.

Table 19: Political interest (percentage).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not interested at all	45,8	36,7	30,3
Not very interested	34,0	39,9	40,2
Fairly interested	15,7	21,9	27,3
Very interested <i>Cramer's V = ,117***</i>	1,8 (n=394)	1,5 (n=398)	2,3 (n=396)

Interest in politics is far from being an obligatory element of the profile of “a good citizen”. Results presented in Table 20 are evident: “being active in politics” is important to be a good citizen for less than 20% of interviewees in each group (differentiation insignificant). For the vast majority “a good citizen” obeys laws and regulations, supports people who are worse off than him/herself and forms his/her own opinion independently of others. In other words citizenship consists in legality, charity and independent thinking. Much less important is not only being active in politics but also voting in elections and being active in voluntary organisations. And only the latter

differentiates significantly the three groups, being most important for regularly employed and least for long-term unemployed.

Table 20: *The importance of different political activities (percentages, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very important” and “quite important”).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Supporting people who are worse off than themselves <i>Cramer's V=,032</i>	82,6 (n=390)	82,0 (n=395)	83,1 (n=396)
Voting in elections <i>Cramer's V=,068</i>	54,8 (n=389)	62,4 (n=394)	65,8 (n=389)
Obedying laws and regulations <i>Cramer's V=,077</i>	84,2 (n=392)	86,1 (n=396)	89,2 (n=399)
Forming your own opinion independently of others <i>Cramer's V=,062</i>	75,9 (n=390)	79,2 (n=395)	81,8 (n=396)
Being active in voluntary organisations <i>Cramer's V=,100**</i>	50,0 (n=388)	55,6 (n=390)	58,7 (n=395)
Being active in politics <i>Cramer's V=,045</i>	17,3 (n=387)	19,6 (n=392)	19,6 (n=393)

Some explanation of lack of esteem for politics one can find in opinions on relationships between “we” (meaning “people like me”) and political sphere, presented in Table 21. For the overwhelming majority of all three groups parties need only people votes, and are not are interested in their opinion. Thus it's hard for a man in the street to feel that he/she has an influence on governmental politics. The more so because politics for majority of investigated young people *is so complicated* that people like them *do not understand anymore what is going on*. This opinion, however, differentiates the three groups significantly and pretty strongly: it is shared by 73% of unemployed and precarious, but only by less than 60% of those with regular job.

Table 21: *Percentage who agree in different statements about political efficacy (4-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion <i>Cramer's V=,043</i>	93,3 (n=375)	92,5 (n=388)	91,0 (n=388)
People like me definitely have an influence on governmental politics <i>Cramer's V=,064</i>	14,0 (n=379)	16,8 (n=386)	19,3 (n=389)
Sometimes politics is so complicated that people like me do not understand anymore what is going on <i>Cramer's V=,123***</i>	73,0 (n=378)	72,9 (n=391)	59,2 (n=390)

Trust – or rather lack of it – in political institutions is presented in Table 22. In general the most trusted is European Union, the least – Polish parliament (Sejm), and the difference is substantial: average of 5,90 compared to 3,68 on the 11-point scale 0-10,

and doesn't depend on belonging to one of the investigated groups. Similarly there is no considerable difference between the groups in their trust to other institutions except for the government of Kielce which is the least trusted by unemployed and the most by regularly employed. What is worth to mention is that the national institutions are less trusted than their equivalents on the regional or local level, e.g.: city government of Kielce has average 5,24 and national government 3,95; city council 5,08 and national parliament 3,68. The second and third most trusted by all interviewees are police (5,54) and the Church (5,44) while the second and third least trusted are national government (3,95) and trade unions (however trust for them is not so low: in average 5,04).

Table 22: Trust in different parts of the political system (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Civil servants and employees in civil service	$Eta^2 = ,015^{***}$	5,08 (n=381)	5,17 (n=372)	5,67 (n=385)
The government of Kielce	$Eta^2 = ,101^{**}$	5,05 (n=337)	5,11 (n=353)	5,54 (n=356)
The Kielce city council	$Eta^2 = ,010^{**}$	4,93 (n=328)	4,91 (n=340)	5,38 (n=345)
The police	$Eta^2 = ,028^{***}$	5,16 (n=384)	5,39 (n=389)	6,06 (n=392)
The regional parliament	$Eta^2 = ,019^{***}$	5,00 (n=251)	4,97 (n=266)	5,60 (n=291)
The regional government	$Eta^2 = ,022^{***}$	5,06 (n=252)	5,10 (n=277)	5,75 (n=291)
The Church	$Eta^2 = ,008^{**}$	5,14 (n=381)	5,44 (n=383)	5,73 (n=385)
The national government	$Eta^2 = ,018^{***}$	3,58 (n=372)	3,98 (n=377)	4,27 (n=380)
The courts	$Eta^2 = ,021^{***}$	4,81 (n=367)	5,09 (n=373)	5,62 (n=379)
The national parliament	$Eta^2 = ,007^{**}$	3,48 (n=357)	3,65 (n=367)	3,90 (n=363)
The institutions of the European Union	$Eta^2 = ,006^{*}$	5,77 (n=357)	5,81 (n=360)	6,11 (n=358)
Employers and enterprises	$Eta^2 = ,025^{***}$	4,91 (n=370)	5,42 (n=380)	5,60 (n=386)
The media	$Eta^2 = ,000$	5,21 (n=384)	5,25 (n=390)	5,22 (n=388)
Trade unions	$Eta^2 = ,004$	5,07 (n=255)	4,84 (n=289)	5,23 (n=291)

Even lower than trust to political institutions is satisfaction with democracy and with government management of different issues. The way democracy works in Poland is most satisfying for regularly employed people (an average of 5,70 on the 11-point scale 0-10), less for precarious (5,72) and the least for long-term unemployed (4,80). It looks that the sense of deprivation of need for job is generalised into the frustration with the whole democratic system.

As in the case of other questions in this survey no item differentiates apparently the three investigated groups even if dependence is statistically significant – the Eta^2

coefficients don't exceed 0,04 which means that differences between groups explain no more than 4% of variance of satisfaction. In other words It might suggest that satisfaction of the investigated youth people hardly depend on their employment status, and is influenced by other factors.

Thus what is worth of consideration are only differences between items. For all interviewees the most satisfying is government management in education (4,79) and very close are average scores for environment and economy. The least satisfying are government dealing with: unemployment (2,85), poverty (3,03) and precarious employment (3,17).

Table 23: Satisfaction with democracy and with government management of different issues (average based on a scale from 0 to 10).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The way democracy works	$Eta^2 = ,030^{***}$	4,80 (n=388)	5,27 (n=391)	5,70 (n=386)
Economy	$Eta^2 = ,023^{***}$	4,37 (n=379)	4,79 (n=386)	5,14 (n=389)
Poverty	$Eta^2 = ,015^{***}$	2,74 (n=389)	3,11 (n=389)	3,25 (n=392)
Education	$Eta^2 = ,011^{***}$	4,51 (n=388)	4,83 (n=391)	5,02 (n=392)
Unemployment	$Eta^2 = ,015^{***}$	2,56 (n=391)	2,91 (n=392)	3,09 (n=394)
Health care	$Eta^2 = ,003$	3,19 (n=391)	3,11 (n=390)	3,36 (n=395)
Precarious employment	$Eta^2 = ,034^{***}$	2,74 (n=379)	3,19 (n=380)	3,58 (n=390)
Environment/sustainable development	$Eta^2 = ,011^{**}$	4,59 (n=373)	4,69 (n=373)	5,05 (n=337)
Youth	$Eta^2 = ,017^{***}$	3,68 (n=383)	3,83 (n=383)	4,36 (n=388)

Low level of trust in political institutions and even lower satisfaction of government's performance are – most likely – among main factors of small interest in politics (Table 19 above) and its behavioural representation: participation in election. According to the pattern very common in democracies, post-electoral declarations of participation overestimate actual attendance. In 2007 national parliamentary elections in Poland the attendance in Kielce was 47,45% (of all eligible, not only people aged 18-34) while in the survey as much as 63,4% of respondents claim their participation in this election. In 2006 local election in Kielce attendance count 40,21% while survey declarations are at the level of 52,0%. If we assume that the mechanism that "memory" of voting rises with time works similarly in all groups than significant and moderately strong differentiation in levels of declared participation in elections we can take as evidence of actual differentiation (although at lower level). In the group of unemployed there is significantly less actual voters than in the group of precarious and regularly employed.

Table 24: Participation in elections (percentage of those who voted in the last elections, only among those eligible to vote).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The last national election	<i>Cramer's V=,190***</i>	52,4 (n=332)	69,1 (n=362)	77,3 (n=375)
The last local election	<i>Cramer's V=,195***</i>	42,2 (n=294)	59,9 (n=314)	67,9 (n=346)

The mentioned phenomenon of post-electoral memory of supposed voting is usually explained by sociologists with reference to the moral qualification of voting as a “citizen obligation”. That is why some respondents try to avoid disapproval for their actual electoral absence. This is not the case of other political behaviours which were subject of following questions on “different ways of trying to improve things in society or to help prevent things from going wrong”.

Table 25: Political activity (percentage of those who have taken part in different kinds of political activities).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Contacted a politician	<i>Cramer's V=NS</i>	1,0 (n=396)	3,3 (n=398)	3,3 (n=400)
Contacted a national or local government official	<i>Cramer's V=,105***</i>	2,3 (n=396)	6,0 (n=398)	8,0 (n=399)
Worked for a political party	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,8 (n=396)	1,5 (n=397)	0,8 (n=400)
Worked in a political action group	<i>Cramer's V=NS</i>	0,8 (n=396)	1,8 (n=397)	0,8 (n=400)
Worn or displayed a badge, sticker or poster	<i>Cramer's V=NS</i>	0,5 (n=396)	1,8 (n=398)	2,3 (n=399)
Signed a petition	<i>Cramer's V=,069*</i>	2,3 (n=396)	5,5 (n=398)	4,8 (n=400)
Taken part in a public demonstration	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,3 (n=396)	0,5 (n=398)	0,8 (n=400)
Boycotted certain products	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,3 (n=396)	1,8 (n=398)	1,8 (n=400)
Deliberately bought certain products for political reasons	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,5 (n=396)	1,3 (n=398)	10,6 (n=400)
Donated money to a political organisation or group	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,8 (n=393)	1,5 (n=398)	2,3 (n=400)
Taken part in a strike	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,0 (n=396)	0,8 (n=398)	1,0 (n=399)
Contacted the media	<i>Cramer's V=,061*</i>	1,3 (n=396)	4,3 (n=398)	2,5 (n=399)
Contacted a solicitor or a judicial body for non-personal reasons	<i>Cramer's V=NS</i>	0,5 (n=396)	2,5 (n=397)	2,3 (n=399)
Participated in an illegal action	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,0 (n=396)	0,5 (n=397)	0,0 (n=400)
Participated in a violent action	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,0 (n=399)	0,3 (n=397)	0,0 (n=400)

And without the moral sanction behind these kinds of political activities the level of declared adherence to them within the past 12 months is much lower.

The most “popular” are: contacting a national or local government official (8% of employed and 6% of precarious does this) and signing a petition, declared by 6% of precarious, 5% of employed and only 2% of unemployed. The former activity is also the only which differentiate groups significantly and relatively strongest. One of possible factors of this is the fact, that the term “contacting official” beyond of strictly political activity covers also several formal situation when a citizen is obliged to follow some procedures or tries to set his/her matters in administrative sphere.

Next step on the scale of citizen participation is membership of various organizations. In Poland – after decades of full control of the state over any kind of civic self-organization – the inclination to participate actively in civil society institutions remains still on the low level. For all but one kinds of organisations mentioned in the questionnaire no one has membership exceeding 2%. The only exception is membership in a cooperative which in Poland means mainly a housing cooperative, being in communism the easiest (and sometimes the only) way to get a flat, called “inhabitable local”. The form of cooperative enabled communist state to preclude ownership of apartments. This explains to some extend pretty strong, significant differences between the groups: the better employment status the more affordable an apartment, in some cases – within a housing cooperative.

Table 26: Earlier or present membership in different organizations (percentage of those who are or have been members of different kinds of organizations).

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Political party		1,0	1,5	2,0
	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	(n=396)	(n=398)	(n=399)
Trade union		0,0	0,8	0,8
	<i>Cramer's V=,150***</i>	(n=396)	(n=398)	(n=399)
Religious organisation		0,5	1,0	0,8
	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	(n=396)	(n=398)	(n=399)
Cooperative		2,8	6,0	13,0
	<i>Cramer's V=,120***</i>	(n=396)	(n=398)	(n=399)
Social movement organisation		0,0	0,0	0,5
	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	(n=396)	(n=398)	(n=400)
Other civil society organisation		1,0	4,3	1,3
	<i>Cramer's V=,083***</i>	(n=396)	(n=398)	(n=400)

6. Well-being

All above discussed problems: unemployment, financial shortages, distrust in politics and low satisfaction of government seem to have rather limited impact on feeling happy, optimistic and healthy (see Table 27). The average score on the 11-point (0-10) scale of feeling happy varies from 7,3 for unemployed to 7,96 for employed, and differences between the groups are considerably strong and statistically significant. Slightly weaker seems the dependence between employment status and optimism; however the general

level of optimism is also high. Almost all interviewees feel of good or very good health, no difference for employment status.

Table 27: Happiness (average based on a scale from 0 to 10), optimism (percentage, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very optimistic” and “quite optimistic”), and good health (percentage, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “very good” and “good”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Happiness <i>Eta² = ,024***</i>	7,30 (n=395)	7,68 (n=399)	7,96 (n=398)
Optimistic about the future <i>Cramer's V = ,104***</i>	86,1 (n=389)	90,8 (n=393)	95,5 (n=396)
Experience a good health in general <i>Cramer's V = ,074*</i>	95,4 (n=393)	98,5 (n=397)	98,2 (n=399)

Almost all items of the General Health Questionnaire used in the survey differentiate the three groups significantly, however not very strongly. On the other hand overall picture seems quite positive. Unemployed more than three times often than regularly employed to have lost much sleep over worry, but the numbers are not very big: 16,6% compared to 6,3%.

Table 28: General Health Questionnaire (percentage who agree to different statements concerning health, 4-point scale, collapsed categories “agree” and “totally agree”).

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
I have lost much sleep over worry <i>Cramer's V = ,126***</i>	16,6 (n=391)	10,1 (n=396)	6,3 (n=396)
I feel that I am playing a useful part in things <i>Cramer's V = ,113***</i>	96,4 (n=392)	97,5 (n=395)	99,0 (n=394)
I feel capable of making decisions about things <i>Cramer's V = ,074*</i>	94,1 (n=390)	99,5 (n=396)	98,7 (n=398)
I feel constantly under strain <i>Cramer's V = NS</i>	26,9 (n=390)	23,2 (n=393)	20,9 (n=392)
I feel that I cannot overcome my difficulties <i>Cramer's V = ,173***</i>	14,6 (n=390)	7,6 (n=396)	8,3 (n=396)
I am able to concentrate on whatever I do <i>Cramer's V = ,143***</i>	97,6 (n=392)	98,5 (n=396)	98,0 (n=398)
I am able to face up to my problems <i>Cramer's V = ,143***</i>	95,2 (n=373)	98,7 (n=386)	99,0 (n=387)
I feel unhappy and distressed <i>Cramer's V = ,140***</i>	7,7 (n=388)	3,0 (n=395)	1,8 (n=398)
I have lost confidence in myself <i>Cramer's V = ,176***</i>	8,2 (n=391)	1,3 (n=397)	1,5 (n=398)
I think of myself as a worthless person <i>Cramer's V = ,159***</i>	2,3 (n=394)	0,8 (n=396)	0,0 (n=397)
I feel reasonably happy, all things considered <i>Cramer's V = ,166***</i>	93,5 (n=386)	98,5 (n=393)	99,0 (n=397)
I am able to enjoy my normal day-to-day activities <i>Cramer's V = ,140***</i>	95,5 (n=377)	98,7 (n=393)	97,2 (n=396)

Overwhelming majority in each group feels *that is playing a useful part in things*, is *able to enjoy normal day-to-day activities* and generally *feels reasonably happy, all things considered*. And again – slightly less frequent are these feelings among unemployed than precarious and employed, but in any case a difference doesn't exceed 6 percent points. On the other hand, however, 21 - 27% in particular groups *feel constantly under strain*, 15% of unemployed feel that they *cannot overcome difficulties*. Since some of these statement seem to be contradictory or at least not convergent, and respective percentages for them sum up to more than 100%, it looks that the GHQ has limited validity in reference to some interviewees who are ready to accept at once two statements: "I feel capable of making decisions about things" and "I feel that I cannot overcome my difficulties"; in the Polish sample there were 107 such persons in total.

One of important dimensions of well-being being subject of this survey is experiencing any form of institutional discrimination. That's why we asked people if it happen that at some public institutions they did not get a service they feel you were entitled to? Table 30 presents percentages of answers only for those of interviewees who in the precedent question declare that they visited mentioned institutions during the past 12 months and these numbers are presented in Table 29. The most frequent in each group is visiting a doctor or hospital, with slight differences between groups: only 63% of unemployed did this in past 12 months, while employed in 74%. That doesn't mean that the unemployed are more healthy (from Table 27 we know that slightly less of them *experience a good health in general*) but rather they hardly can afford healthcare services which – even if officially free of charge – require some costs. And part of them has no social and healthcare security. Quite obvious, however, is the strong significant differentiation in numbers of those visiting an employment agency or job centre: almost $\frac{2}{3}$ of unemployed and nearly nobody of employed did it during past 12 months. Slightly less strong but still significant is dependence between employment status and visits at one's housing agency or landlord, however this relationship is reverse: the long-term unemployed much more often live in their families' (mainly parents')apartments and they are not in a position to fix any formalities concerning housing matters. Similar reason may explain slight differences between the three groups in visiting one's child's school (which seems, however, not enough to explain less contacts with a training agency by unemployed).

Table 29: *Percentage of those who have visited different public institutions.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital <i>Cramer's V= ,095*</i>	63,1 (n=396)	69,7 (n=399)	73,9 (n=398)
At the social service office, by social worker <i>Cramer's V= ,122***</i>	14,6 (n=396)	6,0 (n=399)	3,8 (n=399)
At their child's school, training agency <i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	20,7 (n=396)	23,6 (n=399)	25,1 (n=399)
At the employment agency, job centre <i>Cramer's V= ,421***</i>	63,4 (n=396)	16,0 (n=399)	2,0 (n=399)
At the housing agency, by their landlord <i>Cramer's V= ,151***</i>	15,2 (n=396)	20,8 (n=399)	36,1 (n=399)
At any other community office <i>Cramer's V= ,125***</i>	15,7 (n=396)	28,6 (n=398)	33,6 (n=399)

The level of suffering from institutional discrimination is generally similar for the groups and for types of institutions – it varies between 20 and 35% with the few exceptions. The most discriminating seem to be housing agencies and landlords – up to 43% of precarious experienced that they did not get there a service they feel you were entitled to. The unemployed, on the other hand, feel discriminated most frequently at the social service office or by social worker (but the differences are not significant) while employment agencies or job centres are on the last but one place in this ranking of institutions indicated as practically discriminating. What is interesting that is an almost even percentage of discriminated by healthcare system institutions in each group: ca. 30% of young People in Kielce, no matter their employment status, have felt in the past 12 months that their client rights have been disregarded.

Table 30: *Percentage of those who have not got a service they feel they were entitled to when they visited the institutions below.*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital <i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	30,4 (n=250)	30,7 (n=277)	30,6 (n=291)
At the social service office, by social worker <i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	37,9 (n=58)	29,2 (n=24)	26,7 (n=15)
At their child's school, training agency <i>Cramer's V= ,129*</i>	22,0 (n=82)	11,7 (n=94)	27,0 (n=100)
At the employment agency, job centre <i>Cramer's V=NS</i>	28,5 (n=249)	21,9 (n=64)	25,0 (n=8)
At the housing agency, by their landlord <i>Cramer's V= , NS</i>	35,0 (n=60)	43,4 (n=83)	36,4 (n=143)
At any other community office <i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	30,6 (n=62)	29,5 (n=112)	34,6 (n=133)

7. Summary and conclusion

The main hypothesis of this study – that the long-term unemployment reduces social capital of the unemployed individual – gets only limited evidence in the results of the survey in Poland. First of all rather small number of issues differentiates significantly the three investigated groups: long-term unemployed, precarious and regularly employed.

Long-term unemployed is negatively correlated with age – the younger group the more long-term unemployed persons; unemployment affects mostly younger people. There is also significant dependence between employment status and living with a partner or single. Vast majority of regularly employed live with a partner, while only half of the unemployed are in this situation. Almost half of long-term unemployed live with their parents or other members of family, being still singles. Very few unemployed indicate any personal income, and their incomes are much less than of two other groups. Pretty bad financial situation of long term unemployed in Kielce is deepened by fact that very few of them benefit from any kind of active or employment measures, and most have never had a paid job. The situation of long-term unemployed is objectively much worse than of those who have job at least on precarious basis. This worse situation is reflected also in some subjective aspects. For almost half of long-term unemployed their hope to get any job within one year is quite low, which is parallel to the high fear of losing the current job among the precarious and regularly employed. The latter are also quite satisfied with their work during the last 12 months.

On the other hand there are similarities between people of different employment status. They have similar number of friends, similarly assess their participation in social activities (most of them feel “average” when compared to other people of the same age, however, much more in each group feel that in this aspect they are below the “average”).

Discrimination is not a heavy problem in Poland and it is not very common that people feel being a member of a group that is discriminated against. There is no here any strong ethnic, national or religious conflicts, especially with division into the dominating majority and suppressed minority. As the survey results show the vast majority in each group don't count themselves to any of discriminated groups (except for a minor part of the long-term unemployed self-identifying as discriminated on the ground of employment status, of course). Institutional discriminating – as something directly and practically experienced by people – is bigger problem, however. Its level is generally similar for the groups and for types of institutions and varies between 20 and 35% with the few exceptions. The unemployed feel discriminated slightly more frequently at the social service office or by social worker, but not at employment agencies or job centres. Poles are far from being heavily interested in politics. For the vast majority of surveyed young people “a good citizen” should obey laws and regulations, support people who are worse off than him/herself and form his/her own opinion independently of others. In other words citizenship consists in legality, charity and independent thinking. Much less important is not only being active in politics but also voting in elections and being active in voluntary organisations. The trust in politics and politicians is generally pretty low,

with relatively the biggest to the European Union, police and the Church. On the bottom are national parliament and government. Even lower than trust in political institutions is satisfaction with democracy and with government management of different issues. But here we have a significant differentiation between the employment statuses – the least satisfied being long-term unemployed. It looks that the sense of deprivation of need for job is generalised into the frustration with the whole democratic system. Low trust and satisfaction result in very low political participation and membership in civil society organisations. It is evidently a part of heritage of communism – after decades of full control of the state over any kind of civic self-organization, the inclination to participate actively in civil society institutions remains still on the low level.

All these problems: unemployment, financial shortages, distrust in politics and low satisfaction of government seem to have rather limited impact on feeling happy, optimistic and healthy, and it is almost independent from the employment status. Overwhelming majority in each group feels that they are playing a useful part in things, are able to enjoy normal day-to-day activities and generally feel reasonably happy, all things considered.