Youth Labor Markets in Twenty Three Countries: A Comparison Using Micro Data

David G. Blanchflower

Department of Economics, Dartmouth College,
Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics and
National Bureau of Economic Research

Abstract

This paper examines the working lives of more than 110,000 individuals across twenty-three countries over an eight year period, 1985-1992. Both quantitative and qualitative data are examined. The data source is the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP). The paper finds that the young are distinguished from older age groups by the following traits: they are less well paid and have a relatively high probability of being unemployed. They also have a low probability of being a member of the labor force, being self-employed or a member of a trade union. In terms of their attitudes the young are more likely than older age groups to say a) they would like to be self-employed if they had the choice b) to be supportive of the role of trade unions c) to support government intervention in the labour market d) that they are very happy with their lives.

This paper is unashamedly empirical: it reports a series of stylized facts about young people today. The idea is to take a snapshot of the working lives of young people across a group of highly disparate countries. Are there systematic patterns in the data that distinguish young people from older cohorts? Are there common patterns in the data? What explains these patterns? Are there any big surprises?

This paper builds on work I have done over the last few years that has not specifically dealt with young people -- I think of them as a very important special case. My work over the next couple of years is going to concentrate on an analysis of the labor market performance of an important sub-group namely those young people who are hard-to-employ and what might be done to improve their lot[1]. That is later. This is a starting point that lays out how youths differ across countries in their labor market experience.

In this paper I examine the above questions using internationally comparable micro-data on individuals. I make use of a time-series of cross-sections that contain various kinds of information on the nature of labor markets. This information is available across twenty-three countries over an eight year period, 1985-1992. Information is available on an individuals' labor market status, their wages, whether they were self-employed or a member of a trade union. Individuals in the surveys also report their attitudes to a number of aspects of their daily lives, including how happy they are, how much they value work plus what they view to be the appropriate role of both trade unions and the government.

---

1. I am leading a project at The National Bureau of Economic Research in the United States, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, which involves researchers in six countries (Sweden, the USA, the UK, Canada, France and Germany). The aim of the project is to examine what can be done to improve the lot of those young people who are most likely to experience difficulties in making the transition from school to work. We really know very little about this group. How do different countries treat very hard-to-employ youths -- be they minorities, high school dropouts, illiterate, disabled or whatever? What, if anything, works for this group? What has been tried and shown to fail? What about institutional and residential programs, do they work? If so how well do they work? How high is the rate of return? What have other countries found? Why does non-employment of this group in the US eventually decline? What kinds of work do they get as they age? If one looks at a hard to employ nineteen year old in the US say and then followed him or her until the age of thirty, how different would his or her labor market experience have been if that same individual had been brought up under similar economic circumstances in, say, France, Britain, Germany, Sweden or Canada? How do youths in high unemployment environments survive economically? Why are American youths more likely to be involved in crime than is the case in other countries? Will, as many Europeans expect, youth joblessness diminish with demographic changes? What, if any, are the lessons from the experience of other countries for reducing youth unemployment in Sweden? We need answers to these questions.

The main findings of the paper are as follows. The young are distinguished from older age groups by the following traits, they

1. have a relatively high probability of being unemployed and a relatively low probability of being a member of the labor force. Youth unemployment rates are especially high in Bulgaria, Israel, Ireland, Slovenia and Poland,

2. have a relatively low probability of being either self-employed or a member of a trade union,

3. are particularly likely to say they would like to be self-employed if they had the choice

4. are less likely to report that trade unions in their country have too much power and more likely to say that trade unions are good for the country as a whole,

5. report being unusually happy with their lives,

6. especially likely to believe that the government has the responsibility for providing jobs for all those who want them, and to control both wages and prices,

7. if unemployed are especially likely to say how important they believe work is.

We also find evidence to suggest that the unemployed as a group are unhappy, and value work highly. This is another nail in the coffin for the view that unemployment is primarily voluntary in nature.

Characteristics of the ISSP samples

The paper uses the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) surveys for 1985-1992. The ISSP is a continuing program of cross-national collaboration, carried out by a group of national research institutes, each of which conducts an annual survey of social attitudes and values. They are not panels: separate cross-sections of individuals are interviewed each year. The topics in each year are: "role of government" (1985), "social networks" (1986), "social inequality" (1987); "work orientation" (1989); "the role of government" again (1990), "religion" (1991) and "social inequality" again (1992). It brings together pre-existing national social science surveys and coordinates their research to produce a common set of questions asked in identical form in the participating nations. As a condition of membership each country undertakes to run a short, annual self-completion survey containing an agreed set of questions asked of a probability-based, nation-

wide sample of adults. The topics change from year to year by agreement, with a view to replication every five years or so. The major advantage of the ISSP is that it produces a common set of questions asked in identical form in the participating countries. For a description of the technical details of the surveys see, for example, the Technical Appendix in Jowell, and Brook (1989).

At this time we have data available from twenty two member countries for the years 1985-1992 as well as from one other country that is not a member but ran one of the surveys (Switzerland in 1987). Our sample includes a number of formerly communist countries (i.e. Bulgaria, Slovenia, Poland, Hungary, Russia and East Germany), some major Western countries (USA, Great Britain and West Germany, for example) and one from the Far East (the Philippines). In total there are just under 120,000 individual responses. Details of the number of responses by country for each year from 1985 are presented in Table 1. In a number of cases the data were collected in a different year from that reported. For example, Great Britain did not conduct a survey in 1988: the reported data were collected in 1989. Half the 1989 respondents were asked the questions from the 1988 ISSP and the other half the 1989 component. In a few cases, e.g. Italy in 1988 and 1989 and 1990 and 1991 and Austria in 1987 and 1988, the same group of respondents were asked the two years of questions. Only in the cases of West Germany and the USA do we have data for every year from 1985-1992.

The sample used in this paper is restricted to individuals between the ages of 18 and 74. All other individuals are deleted from our sample. This leaves us with a sample size of 110,258 to work with. 'Young' is defined here as being between the ages of 18 and 24 at the time of interview. There are 14,117 individuals in this age group, or 13.1% of our sample. We will compare them primarily with a group of individuals aged 35-44 of whom there are 23,266, or 21.5% of our sample in our data file. We call this group the 'prime-age'.

Table 2 summarizes the main characteristics of our data, with all years pooled together. In all cases we report the overall mean. This is simply calculated as the (weighted) mean of all of the individuals in our data file. The sampling weights are imposed to overcome the differential sampling fractions used in some countries -- for example blacks are over-sampled in the US

surveys. The first column of the table reports the weighted proportions of young people in each of our twenty three countries. The weighted proportion of young people in the sample increases now to 13.5% compared to 13.1% unweighted reported above. The proportions of young people range from a low of 8.5% in East Germany to a high of 17.9% in Israel. The sample used in the remaining columns of the table is restricted to the young only. As an example of how to read the table, in column 2, 18.0% of those aged 18-24 in Australia had at least 14 years of schooling. Young people in our sample from the US had the highest amounts of schooling and those in East Germany, Italy and Poland had the least (column 2). Youth unemployment (column 3) is in double figures in twelve out of our twenty three countries and over 20% in eight (Bulgaria, Eire, Israel, Italy, Northern Ireland, Philippines, Poland and Slovenia). Apart from in Poland, the Philippines, Israel and Italy (column 4) self-employment is relatively uncommon among the young. Union membership among the young is very low in the USA and almost non-existent in the Philippines. It is relatively high in the formerly communist countries, Australia and New Zealand (column 5). In three of the former communist countries (Hungary, Russia and Slovenia) over half of young employees worked in the public sector (column 6) compared with 12% in the USA, 20% in West Germany and 24% in Great Britain. There is considerable variation in the proportion of the young who attend church (column 7) which varies from a high of 99% in the Philippines to 27% in Great Britain, 26% in Hungary, 21% in Norway and 13% in East Germany[2]. Finally the young appear to be particularly happy with their lives (column 8) and satisfied with their jobs (column 9) in the USA and to a lesser extent in Eire in contrast to individuals from Eastern Europe who are much less contented.

The estimates reported in Table 2 are drawn from samples of various sizes and from different years using a variety of sampling methods and weighting schemes. To what extent are the

---

2. Given the evidence in Katz and Case (1991) from their study of disadvantaged youth in Boston that attending church was negatively correlated with 'bad' activities (e.g drug taking, crime, gang membership etc) of inner city youth we estimated logit equations where the dependent variable was set to 1 if they said they ever attended church. We find small but significant differences in church attendance overall between the young and the prime age group -- the relationship is linearly and positively related to age. The young have a lower tendency to attend church in Great Britain and Norway but a higher tendency in Italy, but not elsewhere.

results explained by differing proportions of females, married workers, year of interview etc.? The appropriate way to draw comparisons across countries by groups is to adjust for these differences. The techniques used here involve estimating a series of regressions controlling for year of interview, country of residence, age, marital status, gender, schooling and labor market status. In the case of earnings an ordinary least squares regression is estimated. In certain other circumstances (e.g. if the individual is self-employed) the dependent variable is dichotomous: hence a logit is estimated. In other cases the dependent variable has more than two alternatives, (e.g. labor market status) which requires the use of a multinomial logit. If the outcome of interest is ordered (e.g. happiness) an ordered logit is the appropriate procedure. (For a discussion of these techniques see chapter 20 of Greene, 1990). The appropriate way to report the predicted values from these ordinary logits, multinomial and ordered logits are as probabilities. In what follows we estimate pooled cross-country time series equations, plus separate equations for each country. Care must be taken in interpreting these country-level equations because of the small numbers of observations sometimes used.

In what follows we examine a series of labor market outcomes for youth and compare them with other age cohorts, along with a series of attitudinal responses to labor market issues. We start with labor market status and then move on to look at wages and earnings, self-employment, trade unions, happiness and job satisfaction, attitudes to the role of government and individual attitudes towards the importance or otherwise of work.

Labor Market Status

Individuals in each of the surveys reported their labor market status. We classify them as being unemployed, employed or out-of-the-labor-force (OLF). In Table 3 we report the results of estimating multinomial logit equations to estimate the probability of being unemployed or OLF compared with the that of being employed. Excluding missing values there are just over 100,000 observations. The young are more likely to be unemployed. They are also more likely to be OLF -- sometimes because they were in full-time education and at other times because they were involved in family formation. Unfortunately we have little or no information on the extent to which the

respondents were participating in an ongoing spell of education. Married individuals were less likely to be unemployed and more likely to be OLF. The more educated were less likely to be unemployed or OLF. Unemployment was relatively high in Bulgaria, Eire, Israel, Britain and Northern Ireland and low in Switzerland[3]. The old were especially likely to be OLF, presumably through retirement. The Dutch had a high probability of being OLF.

In Table 4 we translate the equations estimated in Table 3 into predicted probabilities controlling for gender, marital status, schooling, country of origin, year of interview and age. We report separate probabilities for 18-24 year olds ('the young') and for 35-44 ('prime age adults') for purposes of comparison. Clearly there are other comparisons that one might draw but this comparison seems most appropriate. We do not have space or time to perform separate analyses for men and women, although we do control for gender in all of our regressions. These predicted probabilities are calculated in relation to being employed, which is the excluded category. The method used is called the "method of recycled predictions" in which we vary characteristics of interest across the whole data set and average the predictions. That is, we have data on both the young and prime age groups: we will first pretend that all the people in the data file are young holding their other characteristics constant. We then calculate the probability of each outcome. Next we pretend that all the people in the file are prime age, holding their characteristics constant. Again we calculate the probability of each outcome. The difference between the two sets of probabilities, then, is the difference due to age holding other characteristics constant.

Table 4 reports marginal predicted probabilities adjusting for gender, marital status, schooling, year of interview and country. In the case of the individual country results, where available region of residence is also controlled for (for details see part B of the Table for details). The probability of being unemployed is higher for youths overall than for prime age individuals -- it is .0677 for the young and .0447 for the prime age. The young have higher probabilities of being unemployed in all countries except Canada, East Germany, Hungary, Netherlands, Switzerland and

3. The result for Canada appears to be perverse given that canadian unemployment has tended to be relatively high. It should be noted that this result has probably arisen because we do not have information on schooling in Canada whereas we do in all other countries.

the USA. Analogously, the probability of being OLF is higher for youths than for prime age adults in every country except Eire, presumably due to college attendance. This is not the conventional way to classify the unemployment experience. It is more usual to express unemployment as a rate -- that is the number of unemployed divided by the labor force, which consists of the unemployed and the employed. It is important to do this for the young because of the high proportion who are OLF and not active participants in the labor market. This is what is done in column 7 of the Table, although once again somewhat unconventionally. The numbers reported here are adjusted for gender, schooling, marital status, year of interview and country. It is for this reason that the rates are generally lower than those reported in column 3 of table 2 above -- the main exceptions are Eire, Northern Ireland and Poland. Youth unemployment rates are generally high -- indeed they are in double digits in twelve countries -- Australia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Eire, Great Britain, Israel, Italy, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Poland and Slovenia. Finally, in column 8 of the table we report the (adjusted) relative unemployment rate of youths to prime age adults, where the unemployment rate is calculated by dividing unemployment by the workforce (unemployed + employed) for each the young and expressing it as a proportion of the rate for the prime-age group. Apart from in East Germany, Canada and Switzerland the youth rate is higher than the rate for prime age adults, and especially so in Russia (where adult rates are very low in the years under consideration), Czechoslovakia, Norway, Philippines, Italy, Slovenia and Poland. Overall adjusted youth unemployment rates are approximately double those of the prime-age group.

Wages and Earnings

Young people tend to earn less than older people. Schooling tends to convey a significantly positive rate of return. Tenure, union membership, possession of a skill, working in a large firm or plant, working in particular types of industries all convey a wage premia. To what extent do the young earn less? Sometimes this is institutionally determined, such as in the US via the existence of a minimum wage or by a wages council such as in the UK or under the auspices of an apprenticeship program such as in West Germany. In this section we use data on earnings,

variously defined, by country to determine how much lower youth wages are then those of prime-age individuals. In Table 5 we report earnings equations for twenty countries for whom we have suitable data -- it should be said with a good deal of variation in how that variable is defined[4]. It should also be noted that we do not have schooling data for Canada, union membership data for East Germany and Italy or self-employment data for the Netherlands or Norway. In some cases the variable is gross e.g. Great Britain and in others it is net e.g. West Germany and there is also variability in the period covered -- for West Germany it is monthly, for the US and Norway it is annual[5]. Clearly difficulties of comparability arise because of the possibility of variations in both hours worked per week and the number of weeks worked per year. There is little we can do about this because of lack of suitable data to adjust our wage series. Subject to these caveats it does appear that the earnings equations look sensible -- men earn more as do the more educated and union members. Age earnings profiles flatten and in some cases appear to have an inverted U-shape i.e. Australia, Great Britain, Hungary, Northern Ireland, Slovenia, the USA, West Germany and the Netherlands. As we have shown elsewhere, the wage determination process in all of these countries has a large number of similarities, even in the former communist countries, confirming early work by Phelps-Brown (1977). Wages are generally determined by age, gender, schooling, marital status, region, industry etc.. As one might expect the earnings of the young are below those of the prime age group. There are three main exceptions to this -- Bulgaria, Poland and Czechoslovakia -- where the earnings of the young are not significantly different from those of the prime-age group. Obviously the extent to which they are different varies considerably across countries: to determine the extent to which this is so from a semi-log earnings equation one simply

---

4. We have no earnings data for Israel. We do not report equations for the Philippines or Sweden because of missing data.

5. The wage variables are defined as follows. West Germany: net earnings per month after taxes and social insurance. Hungary: net earnings per month. Poland: average monthly earnings after taxes. Great Britain and Northern Ireland: annual earnings before income tax and national insurance. USA: annual earnings before taxes. Netherlands: earnings before taxes. Italy: net monthly income after taxes. Eire: average annual earnings before taxes. Norway: gross annual income before taxes and allowances. New Zealand: yearly income before tax. Slovenia: regular monthly income. In Germany, Hungary, Slovenia and Poland these earnings data are continuous. In the remaining countries they are grouped and open-ended: in these cases mid-points were allocated. The upper open ends were closed by doubling the next to last band and allocating the midpoint.

takes anti-logs and deducts one. The extent to which the prime age groups wages are higher, holding constant year of interview, gender, marital status, self-employment and union membership can be calculated as follows. One needs to make a logarithmic transformation. The coefficient in the semi-log earnings equations in Table 5 are anti-logged and one is deducted: this gives the extent to which the prime age group's earnings are higher than those of the young. The results are given below.

USA	125.2%
Canada	104.2%
Switzerland	69.9%
West Germany	51.6%
Norway	45.2%
Australia	42.3%
Northern Ireland	40.0%
Austria	37.2%
Italy	29.8%
East Germany	27.4%
New Zealand	26.7%
Netherlands	25.7%
Hungary	23.5%
Eire	23.1%
Great Britain	22.1%
Russia	21.3%
Slovenia	19.6%
Bulgaria	9.2%
Czechoslovakia	8.3%
Poland 6.3%	

The gap is greatest in the US and Switzerland and least in the former communist economies and especially low in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland. The amount of variability in the gap across countries is very large.

An obvious thing to look at is whether there is a relationship between the relative unemployment rates reported in Table 4 above and the relative wage rates reported here. It is probably sensible to omit the East European countries from such an analysis. There is evidence of a weak negative relationship between the two series for the remaining thirteen countries (R^2=.151)[6]. Low youth wages compared with those of the prime-age group are associated (weakly) with

6. The relationship is negative because of the way the two series are defined. The wage series expresses how much higher the wage of the prime-age group is compared to that of the young. The relative unemployment series reports the size of the youth rate compared to the prime age rate.

comparatively low unemployment rates. As we noted above there are many differences in the way the wage is defined across countries, which could account for much of the patterns we observe. However, it does appear that something other than simple market explanations account for differences in youth unemployment across countries.

Self-employment

There is a good deal of diversity in the level and the time-series pattern across countries in the proportion of workers who are self-employed (for a discussion see Acs et al, 1992 and Blanchflower and Oswald, 1989 using these data). This is especially true in regard to non-agricultural self-employment. Relatively little is known about the reasons for this diversity: even less is known about the pattern of self-employment among the young. What we do know is that the young have a relatively low probability of being self-employed, in part because of the difficulty of overcoming capital constraints (for some recent work on this see Blanchflower and Oswald, 1990b). It is of value then to examine the probability of a young person being self-employed across countries using comparable data adjusting for marital status, schooling, year of interview, gender and country along with age. Table 6 reports the results of estimating a logit equation with the dependent variable set to one if the individual was self-employed at the date of interview in his or her main activity, zero if he or she was an employee. The equation is estimated across seven years and all eighteen countries in our sample, with approximately 58,000 observations. The young are much less likely to be self-employed than any other age group. Men have a higher probability than women and overall those with less schooling have a higher probability[7]. In part a) of Table 7 we report the predicted probabilities using the method of recycled predictions. The predicted probability of a young person being self-employed from equation 1 in Table 7 is only 0.07 compared with .15 for individuals with the same characteristics but aged 35-44. With the exception of Russia and Israel, where there was no significant difference between the two age groups, the probability of a young person being self-employed is lower than is the case for the prime age.

---

[7]. Schooling was found to have a positive coefficient in the self-employment logits estimated for West Germany.

Similar differences are observed across countries when separate equations are estimated: in a number of cases (e.g. Austria, the Netherlands and Switzerland) there is at least a fourfold difference in probabilities.

To explore the possibility that there is a potential welfare loss here i.e. individuals would like to be self-employed but are unable to do so, perhaps because of capital constraints or something else, we examined responses given in the 1989 survey about whether or not an individual would choose to be self-employed if they could. Respondents were asked the following.

> "Suppose you were working, and could choose between different kinds of jobs, which of the following would you choose? 1. Being an employee 2. Being self-employed".

The weighted responses by country across all age groups are remarkably high for all age groups:

	All	Ages 18-24
All	.48	.55
Austria	.60	.64
Eire	.51	.46
Great Britain	.48	.52
Hungary	.39	.58
Israel	.49	.61
Italy	.65	.74
Netherlands	.38	.45
Northern Ireland	.51	.61
Norway	.26	.34
USA	.63	.64
West Germany	.50	.62

Overall, 48% of individuals responded that they would prefer to be self-employed. 55% of the young people in the sample said this, with a high of 74% in Italy, 64% in the US and Austria and a low of 34% in Norway. In column 2 of Table 6 we estimated a logit equation to model the probability of saying one would prefer to be self-employed -- the dependent variable is set to one if the respondent said they would like to be self-employed, zero if not. The young had a relatively high probability of saying this. Females and the unemployed were less likely to answer this way. In the second part of Table 7 we show that the adjusted probability of wanting to be self-employed was .54 for the young compared with .50 for the prime age group. Probabilities would be even lower for older age groups. From the country equations the difference in the desire to be self-employed among the young is especially marked in Hungary, Eire and Norway. There appear to be

possibilities here for helping the young to move to self-employment, perhaps through help in obtaining finance to overcome the difficulty that the young appear to experience in obtaining collateral (see Blanchflower and Oswald, 1990b for a discussion). Here is an example where both subjective and quantitative data can both be used to inform a problem. We now turn to performing a similar exercise using data on trade unions.

Trade Unions

Trade union membership has generally been on the decline in the OECD in the 1980s, although this was not true everywhere[8]. To what extent are these declines due to compositional factors? It is reasonably well known that the young tend to have lower probabilities of union membership, although it is unclear how much lower they are across countries. The numbers in our data file are presented below. We express the numbers of union members as a proportion of all workers including both the employed and the self-employed.

	All	Ages 18-24
All	.41	.31
Australia	.48	.47
Austria	.43	.38
Bulgaria	.46	.30
Canada	.27	.12
Czechoslovakia	.57	.38
East Germany	.47	.45
Eire	.36	.30
Great Britain	.43	.33
Hungary	.63	.57
Italy	.40	.09
Netherlands	.30	.16
New Zealand	.44	.47
Northern Ireland	.51	.26
Norway	.58	.37
Philippines	.06	.01
Poland	.26	.10
Russia	.92	.86
Slovenia	.67	.44
Switzerland	.38	.27
USA	.16	.07
West Germany	.27	.20

8. Union density rose in the 1980s in Denmark, Sweden and Finland. It remained roughly constant in Belgium, Ireland, West Germany, Australia, Canada, Switzerland and Norway. It declined in Italy, the UK, New Zealand, Austria, the Netherlands, France, Japan and the USA. The greatest declines were experienced in the US, the Netherlands and the UK (see Table 1, Blanchflower and Freeman, 1992).

Apart from in New Zealand union membership among the young is lower than average: in Australia it is only slightly different. Table 8 examines the determinants of union membership. In column 1 a union membership logit is estimated with the sample restricted to just under 47,000 working individuals with the sample restricted to employees only, in contrast to the numbers presented above which included the self-employed in the numerator and the denominator. The sample excludes Israel and Sweden, for which we have no information on union membership. As expected, young people were less likely than any other age group to be members of unions. Men, married individuals and the most educated were more likely to be union members. In Table 9 we report the relevant adjusted probabilities overall and separately by country, calculated in the, hopefully by now, familiar way. As union membership among the self-employed are usually lower than for employees, the observed (weighted) proportions presented in this Table tend to be higher than those given in the text above for all workers. There is strong evidence that the young are less inclined to join unions, this is especially apparent in the US, which does not augur well for the future of unions there - which is down in the private sector at around 9% at the time of writing (January, 1995).

In both the 1985 and 1990 surveys respondents were asked whether they believed that trade unions in their country had too much power. The answers were classified into five categories -- Strongly disagree, disagree, neither, agree, strongly agree. The responses are reported in Appendix Table A1. There is a little evidence here that the young are less likely to say that unions have too much power -- 49% of the young agreed or strongly agree with that statement compared with 54% overall. Respondents in Australia were especially likely to say this. Respondents from Hungary felt that unions had too little power (se Blanchflower and Freeman, 1994 on this). In column 2 of Table 8 we report the results of estimating an ordered logit on these data controlling for age, gender, marital status, year of interview, country etc.. We code the data from strongly disagree to strongly agree so that a positive coefficient generates a higher probability of agreeing with the statement and vice versa. We follow the same approach with all subsequent ordered logits estimated in this paper. The young enter negatively compared to the excluded category of 35-44 years. The most educated were more likely to say that unions were too powerful, as were the self-employed and employees.

Union members, not surprisingly, and the unemployed said the reverse. In Table 9 part b) we report the predicted probabilities. There is some evidence overall, and especially in Australia, Great Britain, Italy and Norway of some sympathy of the young toward the position of unions. Young people have a lower probability of saying that they strongly agree that unions have too much power -- .17 compared with .23 for those in the prime-age group. A similar story applies if one examines the other four possible outcomes to that question.

In 1990 respondents were asked a slightly different question "How good are trade unions for the country?". Responses were classified as very bad, quite bad, fairly good, very good and excellent. The proportion of individuals in each category by country are reported in Appendix Table A2. Once again there is only a little difference between the responses of the young and overall -- there is a slight tendency for the young to support unions; Australians and Hungarians didn't appear to believe their unions were good for the country as a whole. In column 3 of Table 8 we estimate an ordered logit for the above variable with the usual controls. The young are more likely to say the unions are good for the country, or to put it the other way are less likely to say they are bad. The patterns are much like those described above in that the self-employed dislike unions whereas the unemployed and union members themselves think the reverse. The probabilities are reported in Table 9 part c), which support the view, albeit weakly, that the young favor unions at least in a few countries -- especially Israel, Italy and West Germany. These results should provide some succor to the union movement in those countries.

Happiness and Job Satisfaction

There is a growing economics literature on happiness (see Blanchflower, Oswald and Warr, 1993 and Clark and Oswald, 1994) and especially on job satisfaction (see Hamermesh, 1974; Freeman, 1978; Borjas, 1979; Clark and Oswald, 1994; Blanchflower and Oswald, 1990b, 1995b). The ISSP surveys contain data on both. First we will look at happiness.

a) Happiness

The 1991 ISSP survey contained the following question

> "If you were to consider your life in general these days, how happy or unhappy would you say you are on the whole -- very happy, fairly happy, not very happy or not at all happy?".

Responses are reported in Appendix Table A3. In general people the majority of people report that they are 'fairly' or 'very' happy. This is true for every country and every age group, and hardly anyone says they are not at all happy. This pattern seems to be true across countries and through time also (see Blanchflower, Oswald and Warr, 1994). There seems to be little in this table of means to suggest the young are very different from everyone else in terms of their happiness. Individuals in the former communist countries of East Germany, Slovenia, Hungary and Poland appear to have lower levels of happiness. We now proceed to estimate an ordered logit on happiness. The estimated happiness equation is reported in column 1 of Table 10. Happiness appears to be U-shaped in age. This illustrates the importance of running the regressions rather than simply examining the means: composition matters. The young and the old (>65) are especially happy. Women are happier than men. Married individuals are happier than single people, who are in their turn happier than divorced or widowed individuals. The unemployed are unhappy, which is consistent with results in Oswald (1994) and Winkelmann and Winkelmann (1995). Confirming the unadjusted means above, individuals in Great Britain, the US and Eire seem to be particularly happy. In Table 11 adjusted probabilities of being 'very happy' are reported, estimated in the usual way for three age groups (65-75, 35-44 and 18-24) along with the weighted mean. The young have a probability of .28 of being very happy compared with .20 for prime aged. *The young are happier than prime-age adults in every country except Poland.*

b) Job satisfaction

Now we turn to job satisfaction. The 1989 ISSP asked the following question.

> "How satisfied are you in your main job -- completely satisfied, very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, fairly dissatisfied, very dissatisfied or completely dissatisfied?"

Responses are reported in part C of Table 11. As in the case of overall happiness the vast majority of individuals report that they are (fairly, very or completely) satisfied with their jobs. As was found for happiness, job satisfaction was particularly low in Hungary with only 6% of workers reporting

they were very satisfied with their jobs compared with approximately one third of workers in the US and West Germany, for example. This remains true even holding constant wages and the quality of working conditions, which workers in Hungary report as being particularly unpleasant (see Blanchflower and Freeman, 1994). Job satisfaction is higher for the self-employed confirming results in Blanchflower and Oswald (1990b, 1995b), is lower for union members (see Freeman, 1979) and for men. Divorced, widowed and married individuals all have higher levels of job satisfaction than single people. When one includes the series of age dummies in column 2 of Table 10 job satisfaction appears to be upward sloping in age. Fortunately, for that year we do have continuous age data, which when included in column 3 as a quadratic in age suggests that job satisfaction, like happiness is U-shaped. Differentiating and setting the age coefficients to zero implies that the function minimizes at age 33.9, which is not obvious from the raw tabulations in Table 11. We then proceed to determine the extent to which the probability of reporting being completely satisfied at work differs between an individual age 18 and one age 35. There is only a small difference -- .13 compared with .11, which is confirmed when the equation is run separately across countries, unlike with happiness discussed above where the differences were pronounced. In part B of the Table we also report predicted probabilities by country using the method of recycled predictions setting the age variable (and its square) to 18, 35 and 70 in turn. The oldest age group are particularly satisfied with their jobs: this is true overall and in each of the individual country equations. this is especially apparent in Austria and Northern Ireland. The young (age 18) are more satisfied with their jobs than the prime-age (age 35) overall as well as in Austria, Eire, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, USA and West Germany. The evidence of age differences in job satisfaction between the young and the prime-age is less than it is for happiness. However, the gap between the young and the oldest age group is more pronounced.

Role of Government in the Labor Market

In a number of the ISSP surveys respondents were asked to discuss their views on what they considered to be the appropriate degree of involvement of the government in the labor market.

We concentrate here on their responses relating to the provision of jobs, the distribution of income and the control of wages and prices.

a) Jobs

In 1985, 1989, 1990 and 1991 respondents were asked the following question

> "On the whole do you think it should or should not be the government's responsibility to provide a job for everyone who wants one -- definitely should be, probably should be, probably should not be and definitely should not be?".

Just under 50,000 responses are available when we pool the four years together. The weighted answers are presented in Appendix Table A4. In every country the majority support government intervention, with the lowest support, not surprisingly, in the USA. Once again the young don't look very different in their views -- they have a slightly higher percentage who report 'probably should' than overall but the proportion saying 'definitely should' is identical. In column 1 of Table 12 we run an ordered logit controlling for year of interview etc.. The young are now found to be more likely overall to want the government to provide jobs than prime age individuals. The predicted probabilities are presented in Table 13. As was apparent from the sample of means presented above the probabilities are not terribly different (.43 and .41 respectively). Only in Australia, Great Britain and Israel are youths more likely to want jobs to be provided. Interestingly enough in comparison with the employed the unemployed are very likely to want jobs, as are those individuals who are OLF, but to a somewhat lesser extent. As might be expected in the free market US where unemployment is low the probability of wanting the government to provide jobs is low: more surprising is the low overall probability in Australia.

b) Wages

In both 1985 and 1990 respondents to the ISSP were asked directly their views on whether they believed that the government should control wages by law. The question asked was as follows

> "Here are some things the government might do for the economy. Please show which actions you are in favor of and which you are against. Government action for economy: Control of wages by law -- Strongly in favor of, In favor of, Neither in favor of nor against, Against, Strongly against".

The answers are reported in Appendix Table A5. As we have so frequently found in the distributions there is little difference between the young and everyone else. Individuals in West Germany and the US appear most strongly opposed to controls, and those in East Germany particularly in favor and with quite strong support in Austria, Israel and Italy. In column 2 of Table 12 we report the results of estimating an ordered logit with the dependent variable set to one if the respondent said they were strongly against, up to five if they were strongly in favor and including the normal set of controls. Once we control for these various influences we find a positive and significant coefficient on the age 18-24 dummy implying a higher probability of supporting government intervention than the prime age group. Clearly composition effects are important. Once again males are less likely to be in favor, as are those in employment and those with higher levels of education, presumably for the obvious reason that they are the ones with the highest wages. The difference in probabilities of giving a particular answer is relatively small, however -- .16 for the young of saying they were strongly for compared with .13 for the prime age group, calculated in the usual way. When the equations are estimated separately by country, with regional controls added the age 18-24 coefficient was significantly positive only in West Germany, the USA and Italy. The probabilities of being strongly in favor were .26 for the young and .07 for the prime age in West Germany, .10 and .07 in the USA and .30 and .23 respectively in Italy. There is a little evidence then, although it is by no means overwhelming, that the young are more in favor of wage controls than the prime age group.

c) Prices

At the same time as asking individuals about their views on the desirability of controlling wages individuals in the 1985 and 1990 surveys were also asked for their views on the desirability of governments controlling prices. The question was as follows

> "Here are some things the government might do for the economy. Please show which actions you are in favor of and which you are against. Government action for economy: Control of process by legislation -- Strongly in favor of, In favor of, Neither in favor of nor against, Against, Strongly against".

The answers are reported in Appendix Table A6. As we have so frequently found there is relatively little difference in aggregate between the views of the young and overall. Individuals in the same

four countries that showed strong support for wage controls -- Austria, Italy, Israel and East Germany also favored price controls. In the final column of Table 12 we once again run an ordered logit with the usual controls using nearly 19,000 data points. We find evidence that the young favor price controls. The pattern of response is the same as in the case of wage controls -- they are favored by men, the employed and the educated. The probability of reporting being strongly in favor was .28 for the young and .26 for the prime age group. When we ran separate country level equations the age 18-24 coefficient was significant only in West Germany where the probabilities were .32 and .21 respectively of being strongly in favor. As in the case of wage controls there is only a little evidence that the young favor price controls more than older age groups.

Attitudes to Work

It is not without interest to examine the attitudes to work of the young in general and the young unemployed in particular. How motivated or lazy are they? Is unemployment a voluntary activity for people who don't want jobs and despise work? This is what we examine in this section. We find evidence that the young value work less than older age cohorts. However, we do find strong evidence to suggest that the young unemployed are unhappy with their lot and would like jobs. In 1989 respondents were asked the following question

> "Do you agree or disagree....work is a person's most important activity -- strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree?".

Responses are reported in Appendix Table A7. The young are more likely to say they disagreed with this statement: Norwegians are especially likely to agree. Once again we move to estimating an ordered logit which is reported in column 1 of Table 14. Men like work! The young are less likely than other age groups to support the above statement. The unemployed indicate their support for this statement: even more strongly than the employed. The predicted probabilities are reported in Table 15, The probability of the young agreeing or strongly agreeing was .36 compared with .42 for the older age group. These probabilities were approximately ten percentage points higher if the individual was unemployed than if they were employed or OLF. We re-estimated these equations separately by country (results not reported) and found evidence in Italy that the young had a higher probability than the prime age of agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement. In Norway the

young had a lower probability of saying this: in no other countries was the coefficient on the youngest age dummy significantly different from zero.

In 1989 respondents were asked a further question about their attitudes to work

> "Do you agree or disagree..I would enjoy having a paid job even if I did not need the money -- strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree?".

Responses are reported in Appendix Table A8. There is a little evidence that the young are more supportive of this view than other wage groups. Individuals in Austria, Norway and Israel are especially likely to agree or strongly agree with this statement. Those from Italy and West Germany are most likely to disagree. To examine the differences in responses across age groups we estimate an ordered logit, with the results reported in column 2 of Table 14. The coefficient on the young variable is significantly positive, as it is on the years of schooling, unemployment and employment variables. The unemployed appear to value work as highly as the employed. When we re-estimated this equation by country the 18-24 age dummy was significantly positive in the USA, the Netherlands and Italy and the unemployment dummy was significantly positive in the USA, Great Britain, Eire and Israel. The difference in probabilities between age groups are relatively small in this equation. Overall the young had a probability of strongly agreeing or agreeing of .64 compared with .61 for 35-44 year olds. The responses of the employed look much like those of the unemployed -- they are both much more likely to agree or strongly agree than those individuals who were OLF, once again by approximately ten percentage points.

It certainly appears from these two attitudinal responses that the young value work. The unemployed -- whether they were young or old -- give responses which suggest that they value work. There is little here to support the view that they are a volunteer army -- rather they seem to be conscripts.

Conclusions

We have used a unique set of internationally comparable data at the level of the individual across eight years and twenty three countries. The main findings of the paper are as follows. The young are distinguished from older age groups by the following traits, they

1. have a relatively high probability of being unemployed and a relatively low probability of being a member of the labor force. Youth unemployment rates are especially high in Bulgaria, Israel, Ireland, Poland and Slovenia,

2. have a relatively low probability of being either self-employed or a member of a trade union,

3. are particularly likely to say they would like to be self-employed if they had the choice,

4. are less likely to report that trade unions in their country have too much power and more likely to say that trade unions are good for the country as a whole,

5. report being unusually happy with their lives,

6. especially likely to believe that the government has the responsibility for providing jobs for all those who want them, and to control both wages and prices,

7. if unemployed are especially likely to say how important they believe work is.

We also find evidence to suggest that the unemployed overall are unhappy, and value work highly. This is another nail in the coffin for the view that unemployment should be viewed as voluntary.

Table 1. Responses to the ISSP, 1985-1992

	1985	**1986**	**1987**	**1988**	**1989**	**1990**	**1991**	**1992**	**All**
Australia	1528	1250	1574		2398			2203	8953
Austria	987	1027	972	972	1997			1027	6982
Bulgaria								1198	1198
Canada								1004	1004
Czechoslovakia								1101	1101
East Germany						1028	1486	1094	3608
Eire				1005	972	1005	1005		3987
Great Britain	1530	1416	1212	1307	1297	1197	1257	1066	10282
Hungary		1747	2606	1737	1000	977	1000	1250	10317
Israel					1133	991	991		3115
Italy	1580	1033	1027	1028	1028	983	983	996	8658
Netherlands			1638	1737	1690		1635		6700
New Zealand							1070	1239	2309
Northern Ireland					780	772	838		2390
Norway					1848	1517	1506	1538	6409
Philippines							1200	1200	2400
Poland			3943				1063	1636	6642
Russia								1983	1983
Slovenia							2080	1049	3129
Sweden								749	749
Switzerland			987						987
USA	677	1470	1564	1414	1453	1217	1359	1273	10427
West Germany	1048	2809	1397	2994	1575	2812	1346	2297	16278
Total	7350	10752	16920	12194	14773	14897	18819	23903	119608

Table 2. Summary Statistics for Young People Ages 18-24: 1985-1992.

	(1) % age 18-24	(2) % >=14 years school	(3) Unemployment rate (%)	(4) % Self-employed	(5) % Trade union members	(6) % Public sector	(7) % who go to church	(8) % very happy	(9) % very satisfied
All	13.5	18.0	13.1	6.7	32.2	34.2	57.8	24.6	37.0
Australia	10.2	14.1	9.2	3.0	45.6	31.6	60.3	n/a	n/a
Austria	15.3	16.4	4.9	5.2	38.6	16.6	79.9	n/a	47.1
Bulgaria	11.7	16.4	42.1	7.5	31.7	23.1	45.7	n/a	n/a
Canada	16.9	n/a	8.2	8.5	12.2	12.6	67.1	n/a	n/a
Czechoslovakia	13.3	23.3	7.8	7.4	40.7	12.8	38.0	n/a	n/a
East Germany	8.5	13.5	9.9	3.9	43.9	35.3	13.0	8.3	n/a
Eire	15.9	19.2	23.7	6.1	31.0	23.1	94.6	40.2	47.3
Great Britain	13.1	13.0	16.3	5.3	33.9	24.4	26.6	24.7	32.2
Hungary	12.4	18.2	2.7	1.6	54.3	90.5	25.9	9.7	11.0
Israel	17.9	32.3	23.9	12.6	n/a	49.5	n/a	23.2	31.3
Italy	15.4	12.1	20.1	25.3	10.5	9.6	80.3	21.7	29.4
Netherlands	14.0	31.2	11.2	1.4	16.6	21.4	23.3	27.6	40.2
New Zealand	12.0	26.6	8.8	5.4	41.7	24.8	42.5	30.6	n/a
Northern Ireland	16.0	11.4	22.8	8.6	26.7	26.6	76.9	33.2	41.6
Norway	16.5	16.1	13.1	4.6	37.7	31.2	20.6	26.9	34.2
Philippines	16.4	17.3	25.5	41.0	1.1	10.1	99.2	30.7	n/a
Poland	13.3	12.2	40.5	11.9	16.1	46.6	95.6	18.1	n/a
Russia	12.7	23.1	5.0	5.9	91.0	62.3	n/a	n/a	n/a
Slovenia	14.3	13.1	24.3	0.5	44.2	53.8	n/a	11.3	n/a
Sweden	11.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Switzerland	14.3	16.6	4.4	6.0	28.6	23.4	59.4	n/a	n/a
USA	11.2	37.2	6.9	4.8	7.8	12.1	80.2	44.3	50.0
West Germany	13.4	11.7	7.8	3.3	21.0	20.0	56.1	15.7	35.9

Notes: Unemployment rate is the numbers unemployed expressed as a proportion of the labor force (unemployed+employed). The self-employment rate is the proportion of those working who are employed. The proportion in the public sector relates only to employees. Trade union membership refers to employees only. Happiness relates to all individuals whereas job satisfaction relates only to the employed (self-employed or employees). 'Very satisfied' includes 'very satisfied' and 'completely satisfied'. All estimates are weighted. Base: apart from column 1 all estimates relate to individuals age 18-24.

Table 3. Labor Market Status - Multinomial logit

	(1) Unemployment		(2) OLF	
	Coefficient	S. Error	Coefficient	S. Error
Personal controls				
18-24	.7653	.0581	1.1164	.0329
25-34	.3386	.0475	.2386	.0255
45-54	-.2074	.0564	.2761	.0268
55-64	.1255	.0661	2.0731	.0275
65-74	-.5106	.1831	4.2799	.0425
Male	-.0030	.0339	-1.5406	.0182
Married	-.6975	.0451	.1744	.0262
Divorced	-.3743	.1214	.2266	.0488
Widowed	.1232	.0672	-.1300	.0410
Years of schooling	-.1448	.0067	-.0810	.0030
Year dummies				
1986	-.0190	.0875	.0250	.0407
1987	-.1632	.0850	-.0580	.0397
1988	-.3331	.1034	-.1274	.0458
1989	-.4985	.0867	-.1671	.0401
1990	-.2820	.0840	-.1319	.0400
1991	-.0766	.0813	-.0423	.0403
1992	.2724	.0823	-.0276	.0405
Country dummies				
Austria	.2331	.1158	.4257	.0442
Bulgaria	1.8441	.1314	.0279	.0936
Canada	-1.3396	.1932	-1.1120	.1035
Czechoslovakia	.3240	.1856	-.2467	.0915
East Germany	1.3463	.1025	-.5166	.0595
Eire	1.7489	.1039	.4276	.0535
Great Britain	1.2939	.0892	.0182	.0405
Hungary	-.8478	.1324	-.1734	.0412
Israel	1.7611	.1108	.1891	.0600
Italy	.6180	.1029	.5149	.0422
N. Ireland	1.9777	.1143	.4455	.0648
Netherlands	1.0449	.1134	1.2632	.0460
New Zealand	.5006	.1438	-.0423	.0679
Norway	.4554	.1115	-.1171	.0483

Phillipines	.4500	.1319	.2967	.0623
Poland	1.2528	.1136	.2517	.0614
Russia	-.8091	.2246	-.3446	.0746
Slovenia	.8112	.1153	.1100	.0582
Switzerland	-1.3750	.4214	-.4439	.1064
USA	.3182	.1032	-.1234	.0423
West Germany	.2999	.0962	.4289	.0379
Constant	-1.4946	.1344	-.2334	.0618
N	101160			
Chi^2	41976.68			
Pseudo R^2	0.2564			
Log Likelihood	-60878.735			

Table 4. Labor Market Status

a) Marginal Labor Market Probabilities (multiplied by 100)

	Unemployed		Employed		OLF		Youth	Relative youth
	35-44	18-24	35-44	18-24	35-44	18-24	unemployment rate	unemployment rate
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Total	4.47	6.77	76.33	56.04	19.20	37.19	10.78	1.95
Australia	2.80	4.35	77.72	70.21	19.47	25.43	5.83	1.68
Austria	2.47	2.85	72.87	58.53	24.66	38.62	4.64	1.42
Bulgaria	20.90	33.41	75.26	47.07	3.84	19.53	41.51	1.91
Canada*	6.15	2.96	80.77	80.05	13.09	16.99	3.57	0.50
Czechoslovakia	2.56	6.96	91.78	62.14	5.66	30.89	10.07	3.71
East Germany	12.49	8.35	82.61	76.08	4.90	15.57	9.89	0.75
Eire	11.19	28.65	59.54	45.21	29.27	26.14	38.79	2.45
Great Britain	5.83	11.72	74.99	67.88	19.17	20.39	14.72	2.04
Hungary	1.88	1.77	88.80	66.00	9.32	32.23	2.61	1.26
Israel	7.97	11.23	74.88	49.67	17.14	39.10	18.44	1.92
Italy	3.19	6.01	72.81	37.07	24.00	56.92	13.95	3.32
Netherlands	3.48	2.70	57.35	36.80	39.17	60.51	6.84	1.19
New Zealand	4.41	4.72	80.09	71.43	15.5	23.85	6.20	1.19
Northern Ireland	11.01	18.25	65.61	57.64	23.38	24.10	24.05	1.67
Norway	2.45	7.66	84.05	54.15	13.49	38.20	12.39	4.38
Philippines	2.89	7.65	71.93	41.81	25.19	50.54	15.47	4.00
Poland	9.61	20.38	74.36	37.64	16.03	41.98	35.13	3.07
Russia	0.09	3.66	91.67	72.43	7.39	23.91	4.81	49.04
Slovenia	5.91	14.86	85.90	56.64	8.17	28.50	20.78	3.23
Switzerland	0.81	0.16	81.86	76.19	17.33	22.19	0.21	0.21
USA	3.74	3.29	80.30	65.26	15.95	31.45	4.80	1.08
West Germany	3.56	3.05	71.54	54.29	24.88	42.65	5.32	1.12

Continued

Table 4 Continued

b) Notes

Probabilities obtained from a multinomial logit equation for each country. All remaining coefficients are set to their means. Except where stated to the contrary predictors included regional dummies (# varies by country), year dummies (6), marital status dummies(3) and age dummies (6), gender and years of schooling. The relative youth unemployment rate in column 7 is obtained as follows: (column 2/(column 2 + column 4)) divided by (column 1/(column 1 + column 3)). * years of schooling not available.

Country	Years	# regions	Country	Years	# regions
Australia	1985-87, 90, 92	9	New Zealand	1991-92	22
Austria	1985, 86, 89, 92	9	Northern Ireland	1989-91	-
Bulgaria	1992	9	Norway	1989-91	20
Canada	1992	8	Philippines	1991-92	4
Czechoslovakia	1992	12	Poland	1991-92	8
East Germany	1990-92	6	Russia	1992	
Eire	1989-91	9	Slovenia	1991-92	12
Great Britain	1985-7, 89-92	11	Sweden	n/a	
Hungary	1985-92	-	Switzerland	1987	25
Israel	1989-92	-	USA	1985-92	9
Italy	1985-92	-	West Germany	1985-92	11
Netherlands	1988, 89, 91	12			

Table 5. Wage equations

	Australia	Austria	Bulgaria	Canada	Czechos-lovakia	East Germany	Eire	Great Britain	Hungary	Italy
18-24	-.3529	-.3166	-.0882	-.7137	-.0797	-.2423	-.2082	-.2054	-.2107	-.2611
	(6.13)	(7.67)	(0.88)	(7.66)	(1.31)	(6.00)	(3.66)	(6.10)	(10.19)	(3.92)
25-34	-.1295	-.1037	-.0351	-.2206	-.1196	-.0334	-.0445	-.0142	-.0969	-.1297
	(3.61)	(3.36)	(0.61)	(3.35)	(3.00)	(1.32)	(0.99)	(0.57)	(7.27)	(2.87)
45-54	.0774	.0424	-.0189	.0293	-.1068	-.0632	.0138	.0320	.0380	.1536
	(2.09)	(1.33)	(0.34)	(0.36)	(2.65)	(2.38)	(0.27)	(1.28)	(2.53)	(3.41)
55-64	-.1114	-.0058	-.1806	.2503	-.0917	-.1009	-.0443	-.0550	.1119	
	(2.55)	(0.13)	(1.68)	(2.09)	(2.20)	(1.71)	(1.42)	(2.36)	(1.92)	
65-74	-.3696	.1657	-.7746	-.2189	-.0173	-.0255	-.0853	-.5366	-.1508	.2832
	(6.31)	(1.02)	(2.07)	(0.97)	(0.08)	(0.14)	(0.68)	(6.09)	(1.78)	(1.63)
Male	.6945	.4214	.3153	.3076	.3913	.2996	.4797	.8347	.3991	.3376
	(26.31)	(18.56)	(7.02)	(5.99)	(12.86)	(15.50)	(13.63)	(46.69)	(37.75)	(10.11)
Married	.0115	.0232	.0592	.2736	.2011	.0358	.1504	.0643	.0930	.1411
	(0.28)	(0.76)	(0.66)	(4.00)	(3.93)	(1.16)	(3.83)	(2.31)	(5.32)	(3.11)
Divorced	.2467	.0372	.2133	.3190	.2300	.1433	.6147	.1854	.1777	.2794
	(2.48)	(0.44)	(1.15)	(1.58)	(2.06)	(1.69)	(4.67)	(2.59)	(4.25)	(2.02)
Widowed	.1725	.1071	.1295	.2582	.3119	.0902	.2868	.1800	.0923	.2646
	(2.67)	(2.12)	(0.99)	(2.48)	(4.01)	(2.14)	(2.49)	(3.95)	(3.61)	(2.75)
School	.0649	.0644	.0520	-	.0445	.0412	.0858	.1389	.0459	.0559
	(13.87)	(13.10)	(6.54)		(8.34)	(11.59)	(14.15)	(22.08)	(26.53)	(12.52)
Self-employed	.2507	-.3157	.0298	-.1187	.2837	.0461	.1323	.0634	-.0499	.0533
	(6.26)	(8.65)	(0.43)	(1.75)	(4.49)	(1.20)	(2.91)	(2.13)	(1.97)	(1.50)
Trade union member	.2555	.1403	.0052	.0490	-.0232	-	.3553	.1771	.0454	-
	(9.42)	(6.03)	(0.11)	(0.84)	(0.72)		(9.95)	(9.49)	(4.01)	
Years	86,90/2	85/6/9,92	92	92	92	90/1/2	89,90/1	85/6/7/9, 90/1	86/7/8/9, 91/2	85/6/7/8/9
Region dummies	-	8	8	9	11	5	8	10	19	
Constant	8.1358	8.3593	7.1319	9.9386	7.5751	6.4276	7.4348	6.4950	8.0511	3.6865
N	3525	1949	490	606	661	1535	1392	4620	5605	2549
F	143.03	47.92	6.19	13.35	17.25	35.71	39.30	134.10	154.34	50.70
Adjusted R^2	.3607	.4745	.4713	.2900	.3755	.3701	.5856	.5875	.3816	.2599

Table 5. Wage equations (continued)

	Neths.	New Zealand	Northern Ireland	Norway	Poland	Russia	Slovenia	Switz-erland	USA	West Germany
18-24	-.2284	-.2368	-.3363	-.3733	-.0614	-.1927	-.1786	-.5298	-.8120	-.4161
	(4.59)	(3.41)	(4.78)	(11.02)	(0.67)	(3.04)	(3.73)	(5.84)	(15.87)	(13.33)
25-34	-.0529	-.0360	-.0768	-.1347	-.0600	-.1047	-.1088	-.1038	-.1630	-.0849
	(1.56)	(0.72)	(1.57)	(5.50)	(1.23)	(2.58)	(3.63)	(1.58)	(4.96)	(3.79)
45-54	.1202	.0407	-.0252	.0179	.0005	-.0081	.0566	.1236	.1010	.0284
	(3.07)	(0.82)	(0.47)	(0.68)	(0.01)	(0.17)	(1.66)	(1.98)	(2.62)	(1.21)
55-64	.0985	-.1476	.0442	-.0528	-.1745	-.1862	-.0224	.0294	.0995	.0117
	(1.52)	(2.09)	(0.65)	(1.60)	(2.06)	(3.13)	(0.35)	(0.37)	(2.16)	(0.37)
65-74	-.1082	-.4548	-.5085	-.1126	-.8253	-.5494	.3237	.0715	-.2653	-.0198
	(0.72)	(2.47)	(3.08)	(1.60)	(4.02)	(4.19)	(0.95)	(0.50)	(3.46)	(0.19)
Male	.2000	.5559	.6437	.4921	.4213	.3654	.1192	.4602	.6399	.5237
	(7.21)	(15.08)	(16.79)	(26.36)	(10.68)	(11.02)	(4.86)	(8.50)	(24.78)	(30.97)
Married	.1461	.0948	.0265	.0626	.1063	.0813	.0553	.1366	.1414	.0547
	(4.24)	(1.67)	(0.52)	(2.23)	(1.79)	(1.41)	(1.60)	(2.14)	(3.96)	(2.46)
Divorced	-.1569	.0689	-.1166	.2686	.2427	.0087	-.0476	.1077	-.0736	.2981
	(0.80)	(0.45)	(1.04)	(2.98)	(2.11)	(0.09)	(0.42)	(0.54)	(0.93)	(5.03)
Widowed	.0347	.1087	.0378	.1337	.1896	.1340	.0037	.0654	.1739	.1794
	(0.53)	(1.18)	(0.40)	(2.76)	(1.70)	(1.85)	(0.05)	(0.62)	(3.92)	(5.57)
School	.0332	.0484	.1966	.0410	.0757	.0273	.0648	.0479	.0957	.0422
	(10.37)	(8.05)	(14.78)	(12.21)	(10.13)	(5.26)	(16.15)	(8.11)	(20.73)	(14.91)
Self-employed	-	.0247	-.0479	-	-.0558	.2512	.1004	-.0037	-.1153	.1126
		(0.49)	(0.87)		(1.09)	(3.03)	(1.38)	(0.07)	(3.09)	(3.64)
Trade union member	.0500	.0821	.2339	.0909	-.0110	-.3592	-.0301	.0582	.2285	.0792
	(1.74)	(2.10)	(5.87)	(4.80)	(0.24)	(5.85)	(1.09)	(1.27)	(6.59)	(4.46)
Years	89/91	91/2	89,90/1	89,90/1/2	91/2	92	91/2	-	85-92	86/7/9,
									90/1/2	
Region dummies	11	22	-	18	7	15	11	24	8	10
Constant	9.1775	9.0048	6.1988	10.6277	5.9134	6.9190	8.9746	7.3940	7.9444	6.6651
N	1236	1188	1025	2639	1372	1237	1580	597	4860	3335
F	31.94	11.72	43.61	64.53	17.86	22.59	26.19	12.90	71.32	74.51
Adjusted R^2	.3656	.2350	.3681	.4352	.1974	.3205	.2769	.4178	.2810	.3732

Table 6. Self-employment logits

	Self-employment (1985-1992)		Prefer self-employment (1989)	
	Coefficient	S. Error	Coefficient	S. Error
18-24	-.8592	.0608	.1928	.0804
25-34	-.1708	.0346	-.0325	.0597
45-54	.0933	.0351	-.1063	.0634
55-64	.3194	.0433	-.3114	.0703
65-74	1.2167	.0815	-.1358	.0811
Male	.5032	.0271	.6204	.0417
Married	.1406	.0388	-.0434	.0607
Divorced	-.0228	.0928	-.0727	.1068
Widowed	-.0330	.0625	-.0322	.0934
Unemployed	n/a		-.2522	.1121
Employed	n/a		-.1110	.0495
Years of schooling	-.0277	.0043	.0471	.0070
1986	.0175	.0615	n/a	
1987	-.0774	.0609	n/a	
1988	.0207	.0676	n/a	
1989	-.0836	.0600	n/a	
1990	.0592	.0591	n/a	
1991	.0554	.0599	n/a	
1992	-.0130	.0606	n/a	
West Germany	-.1954	.0620	.1516	.0968
Great Britain	-.0268	.0623	.0542	.0951
USA	.2244	.0602	.6216	.0953
Austria	.4429	.0674	.6015	.0907
Hungary	-.9853	.0765	-.2929	.1022
Netherlands	-.2513	.0959	-.4488	.0924
Italy	1.1269	.0586	.8029	.1009
Eire	.9005	.0732	.1657	.1003
Northern Ireland	.3843	.0964	.2107	.1084
Switzerland	.7956	.1133		
Poland	.7581	.0824		
Slovenia	- 1.0142	.1238		
Philippines	2 .1561	.0767		
New Zealand	.6842	.0869		
Norway	-.2182	.0738	-.9820	.0965
Israel	.4963	.0968		

East Germany	-.4485	.0926		
Czechoslovakia	-.4371	.1500		
Bulgaria	.0155	.1490		
Russia	-.9642	.1449		
Canada	.2874	.1301		
Constant	-2.0392	.0857	-.7778	.1410
N	57769		11793	
Chi^2	4894.4		1095.02	
Pseudo R^2	.1033		0.0670	

Note: sample in column 1 consists of those in employment at date of interview. Excluded categories are Australia, age 35-44, single, 1985. Data on Sweden excluded as no data on years of schooling. Column 2 includes all, whatever their labor market status - excluded category in column 2 is Israel.

Table 7. Self-employment Marginal Probabilities.

a) Self-employment

	Observed (weighted) proportion	Age 35-44	Age 18-24
All	.15	.15	.07
Australia	.12	.13	.04
Austria	.15	.19	.04
Bulgaria	.15	.12	.08
Canada	.18	.24	.09
Czechoslovakia	.07	.09	.08
East Germany	.08	.10	.04
Eire	.24	.22	.09
Great Britain	.09	.12	.06
Hungary	.04	.06	.02
Israel	.16	.16	.16
Italy	.29	.28	.26
Netherlands	.09	.11	.02
New Zealand	.21	.22	.10
Northern Ireland	.12	.14	.04
Norway	.10	.11	.05
Philippines	.56	.58	.44
Poland	.24	.23	.16
Russia	.04	.06	.08
Slovenia	.05	.05	.01
Switzerland	.24	.23	.05
USA	.14	.14	.05
West Germany	.11	.11	.04

Notes: each logit equation includes the same set of controls as used in Table 2 above.

b) Prefer self-employment

	Observed (weighted) proportion	18-22	35-44
All	.48	.54	.50
Hungary	.39	.61	.42
Eire	.39	.40	.55
Norway	.26	.34	.23

Note: all other countries coefficient on ages 18-24 insignificantly different from coefficient on age 35-44 variable.

Table 8. Trade union logits/ordered logits

	(1) Union membership		(2) Do you think unions have too much power?		(3) How good are trade unions for the country?	
	Coeff.	S. Error	Coeff.	S. Error	Coeff.	S. Error
18-24	-.6542	.0395	-.4567	.0720	.2396	.0920
25-34	-.2178	.0269	-.2582	.0494	.1240	.0639
45-54	.0833	.0288	.1730	.0525	-.0984	.0679
55-64	.0244	.0394	.1759	.0601	.0598	.0772
65-74	-.6711	.1099	.4345	.0809	.0422	.0997
Years of schooling	.0111	.0035	.0255	.0069	.0084	.0085
Male	.2426	.0205	-.0556	.0366	-.0216	.0468
Married	.1580	.0294	.0631	.0515	-.0860	.0657
Divorced	.0492	.0795	.2724	.1008	-.3562	.1260
Widowed	.1070	.0468	-.0008	.0815	-.0236	.1050
Self-employed	n/a	.	.4918	.0534	-.3904	.0706
Union member	n/a		-.9355	.0409	.8789	.0527
Unemployed			-.4407	.1117	.1614	.1358
Employed			.1648	.0521	-.2668	.0629
West Germany	-.8053	.0432	-1.7824	.0558	1.3621	.0687
Great Britain	-.1944	.0433	-1.2872	.0574	.5721	.0781
USA	-1.6262	.0517	-1.2382	.0697	.8604	.0946
Austria	.0657	.0518	-1.7309	.1068	-.3259	.1127
Hungary	.3667	.0446				
Netherlands	-.9238	.0578				
Italy	-.3177	.0568	-1.1817	.0747	-.3259	.1127
Eire	.0439	.0642	-1.4640	.0790	.8503	.0843
Northern Ireland	.5351	.0778	-1.4742	.0887	.6766	.0935
Norway	.5857	.0500	-.9682	.0741	.8718	.0809
Poland	-.6619	.0746				
Slovenia	.8243	.0657				
Switzerland	-.8032	.1050				
Philippines	-2.4780	.1569	.			
New Zealand	-.2037	.0734				
East Germany	-.0262	.0670				
Czechoslovakia	.6005	.0888				
Bulgaria	.0887	.1024				
Russia	2.7478	.1202				
Canada	-.4672	.1130				

1986	.0899	.0497				
1987	.1760	.0481				
1988	.0563	.0562				
1989	-.2672	.0488				
1990	.2280	.0488	-.6165	.0412		
1991	-.0227	.0489				
1992	-.2216	.0475				
constant/cut1	-.1562	.0710	-5.5748	.1380	-2.1956	.1507
cut2			-3.6618	.1246	-.3895	.1458
cut3			-1.2739	.1208	2.2505	.1483
cut4			.2325	.1201	4.5368	.1616
Number of obs	46923		12103		7813	
Chi^2	6766.84		265.24		864.25	
Pseudo R^2	.1045		0.0696		.0452	
Year	1985-1992		1985 & 1990		1990	

Column 1 sample includes employees only.
Excluded category Australia. Hungary and Israel omitted from column 3 as no information on union in 1990.
Column 1 is a logit, while columns 2 and 3 are ordered logits.

Table 9. Union Membership and Views Towards Unions

a) Union membership -- marginal probabilities.

	Observed (weighted) proportion	Age 35-44	Age 18-24
All	.45	.49	.35
Australia	.47	.51	.44
Austria	.50	.56	.47
Bulgaria	.50	.54	.35
Canada	.29	.41	.11
Czechoslovakia	.61	.67	.42
East Germany	.49	.52	.46
Eire	.47	.54	.35
Great Britain	.47	.48	.34
Hungary	.62	.65	.63*
Italy	.43	.50	.17
Netherlands	.30	.36	.16
New Zealand	.44	.44	.43*
Northern Ireland	.58	.68	.31
Norway	.61	.64	.41
Phillippines	.06	.08	.02*
Poland	.33	.36	.22*
Russia	.93	.91	.93*
Slovenia	.69	.72	.47
Switzerland	.37	.36	.33
USA	.17	.21	.08
West Germany	.31	.33	.24

Notes: * implies the dummy variable for ages 18-24 was not significantly different, at the 5% level, from the omitted category 35-44 years in the union membership probit. Each probit equation includes the same set of controls as used in Table 2 above.

Table 9. Continued

b) Do you think unions have too much power?

% who strongly agreed

c) How good are unions for the country?

% saying "Excellent" or "Very good"

	Observed (weighted) proportion	Age 35-44	Age 18-24	Observed (weighted) proportion	Age 35-44	Age 18-24
All	.20	.23	.17	.21	.20	.24
Australia	.41	.40	.28	.12	.11	.15*
Austria	.11	.09	.05*	n/a		
Eire	.13	.13	.11*	.21	.20	.23*
Great Britain	.17	.17	.10	.18	.16	.18*
Hungary	.06	.05	.07*	.33	.30	.33*
Israel	.08	.08	.06*	.18	.15	.30
Italy	.29	.33	.22	.10	.06	.13
Northern Ireland	.09	.10	.08*	.18	.20	.20*
Norway	.13	.11	.09	.26	.27	.28 *
USA	.19	.20	.14*	.20	.21	.22*
West Germany	.09	.08	.06	. .31	.33	.40

* = coefficient on age 18-24 dummy variable not significantly different from age 35-44 dummy (excluded category)

Table 10. Ordered logits - Overall Happiness and Job Satisfaction.

	Happiness		**Job Satisfaction**			
	Coeff.	S. Error	Coeff.	S. Error	Coeff.	S. Error
18-24	.5328	.0646	-.0531	.0919		
25-34	.1577	.0464	-.0058	.0651		
45-54	.0014	.0506	.2637	.0695		
55-64	.0149	.0574	.6228	.0936		
65-74	.2920	.0695	1.2667	.2240		
Age					-.0610	.0139
Age^2					.0009	.0001
Years of schooling	.0407	.0053	.0123	.0087	.0136	.0086
Male	-.1770	.0332	-.1958	.0492	-.2053	.0490
Married	.6333	.0490	.1385	.0681	.1680	.0688
Divorced	-.4523	.0850	.0317	.2038	.0408	.2028
Widowed	-.4748	.0794	.0969	.1113	.1289	.1120
Unemployed	-.7388	.0780				
Employed	.0658	.0402				
Self-employed	n/a		.4606	.0847	.4606	.0845
Union member	n/a		-.1814	.0513	-.1817	.0511
Great Britain	.5263	.0839	-.1184	.1043	-.1197	.1042
USA	.6872	.0823	.2067	.1130	.2056	.1129
Austria	n/a		.2713	.1004	.2911	.0994
Hungary	-1.3607	.0883	-.9298	.1087	-.9389	.1085
Netherlands	.3100	.0789	-.0677	.1071	-.0474	.1068
Italy	-.7551	.0906	-.3661	.1233	-.3630	.1232
Eire	.9009	.0870	.3978	.1158	.3977	.1156
Northern Ireland	.6934	.0932	.0826	.1278	.0726	.1276
Poland	-.9535	.0919				
Slovenia	-1.6047	.0760				
Philippines	-.0651	.0864				
New Zealand	.1937	.0884				
Norway	-.1206	.0818	.0589	.0969	.0580	.0967
Israel	-.6619	.0940				
East Germany	-.7798	.0804				
cut1	-3.3568	.1137	-5.0531	.2213	-5.9326	.3175
cut2	-1.0912	.1048	-4.1042	.1791	-4.9839	.2897
cut3	2.1452	.1057	-2.7537	.1553	-3.6341	.2757
cut4			-1.5960	.1491	-2.4736	.2723

cut5		.5957	.1475	-.2817	.2707
cut6		2.1684	.1506	1.2976	.2711
Number of obs	16529	6094		6094	
Pseudo R^2	0.0884	0.0231		.0231	

Table 11. Happiness and Job Satisfaction

	A) Predicted Happiness (1991) -- Predicted probability of reporting being very happy					B) Job satisfaction (1989) Predicted probability of being completely satisfied			
	Observed (weighted) proportion	Age 65-74	Age 35-44	Age 18-24		Observed (weighted) proportion	Age 70	Age 35	Age 18
All	.22	.24	.20	.28	.13	.33	.11	.13	
Austria	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		.17	.55	.13	.20
East Germany	.09	.08	.08	.10					
Eire	.40	.39	.43	.48	.18	.37	.15	.17	
Great Britain	.33	.38	.25	.36	.11	.32	.10	.08	
Hungary	.08	.08	.07	.11	.06	.28	.04	.03	
Israel	.17	.18	.15	.26	.11	.15	.10	.07	
Italy	.13	.11	.12	.21	.17	.33	.15	.14	
Netherlands	.28	.29	.26	.40	.10	.34	.08	.13	
New Zealand	.29	.35	.26	.35					
Northern Ireland	.36	.53	.31	.35	.15	.51	.12	.20	
Norway	.21	.29	.17	.30	.16	.30	.12	.11	
Phillippines	.26	.22	.23	.28					
Poland	.12	.05	.12	.12					
Slovenia	.09	.08	.07	.16					
USA	.37	.46	.32	.43	.16	.25	.13	.14	
West Germany	.20	.22	.20	.28	.10	.14	.10	.12	

Notes: * implies the coefficient on the dummy variable age 18-24 years was not significantly different from that of the excluded category, ages 35-44 years. In all cases the specification in column 1 of Table 8 which included a set of age dummies was used to calculate these probabilities. In each of the country's ordered probits a set of regional dummies were also included. The number of regional dummies used varied from country to country (see Table 4).

Table 11. Continued

C) Job satisfaction

	Completely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Completely Satisfied
All	1	1	4	10	44	27	13
Young	1	1	6	11	43	26	11
Great Britain	1	2	5	8	45	27	11
USA	1	1	5	6	37	34	16
Austria	(0)	(0)	3	10	39	30	17
Hungary	1	1	4	18	63	7	6
Netherlands	(0)	(0)	6	10	47	17	17
Italy	2	2	6	10	47	17	16
Eire	(0)	(0)	3	5	41	32	18
Northern Ireland	(0)	1	5	5	47	25	16
Norway	1	1	2	12	42	29	14
Israel	(0)	2	4	10	48	26	11
West Germany	(0)	(0)	3	11	41	33	10

Notes (0)= less than 0.5%

Table 12. Attitudes to the role of Government

	(1) Jobs		(2) Wages		(3) Prices	
	Coefficient	S. Error	Coefficient	S. Error	Coefficient	S. Error
18-24	.1078	.0359	.2449	.0550	.1147	.0559
25-34	.1021	.0262	.1648	.0401	.1213	.0407
45-54	.0271	.0283	.0995	.0429	.0412	.0437
55-64	-.0217	.0314	.2807	.0471	.1935	.0484
65-74	-.1126	.0378	.3260	.0571	.2508	.0587
Male	-.2125	.0185	-.2799	.0282	-.3111	.0287
Married	-.0896	.0271	-.1135	.0415	-.0440	.0422
Divorced	.0272	.0480	-.0639	.0724	-.0329	.0744
Widowed	.0985	.0429	-.1066	.0724	.0645	.0649
Years of schooling	-.1029	.0031	-.0826	.0052	-.1154	.0053
Unemployed	.4423	.0492	.2026	.0746	.2914	.0769
Employed	-.1241	.0223	-.0887	.0339	-.0672	.0347
1989	-.0249	.0312				
1990	-.2118	.0302	-.0334	.0327	-.2042	.0335
1991	.0523	.0331				
Austria	1.2049	.0507	.4501	.0731	1.4211	.0776
East Germany	2.4180	.0559	1.6273	.0726	1.8221	.0752
Eire	.9978	.0556				
Great Britain	.8116	.0426	-.8041	.0459	-.2502	.0479
Hungary	2.0772	.0516	-.6345	.0701	-.6427	.0711
Israel	1.9261	.0514	.4654	.0717	1.2643	.0728
Italy	1.8274	.0442	.8035	.0472	1.2328	.0504
Netherlands	1.6648	.0513				
New Zealand	.2976	.0743				
Northern Ireland	1.1393	.0535	-.7250	.0752	-.0692	.0778
Norway			-.1229	.0589	.1555	.0583
Norway	1.9878	.0462				
Philippines	1.7924	.0740				
Poland	2.0502	.0777				
Slovenia	1.9357	.0599				
USA	-.0897	.0443	-.7851	.0539	-.6931	.0537
West Germany	1.0788	.0400	-1.0088	.0424	-.4476	.0457
Cut1	-2.8771	.0642	-3.4761	.0917	-4.2355	.0954
Cut2	-1.4340	.0629	-1.8691	.0887	-2.7543	.0912
Cut3	.3353	.0627	-.9914	.0879	-2.0045	.0900
Cut4			.7359	.0885	-.1288	.0892

N	47948	18797	18858
Pseudo R^2	.0835	.0602	.0741

Excluded category is 1985 and Australia.

Table 13. Attitudes towards the role of Government - predicted probabilities

a) Predicted probabilities of saying that the government definitely should provide jobs for all.

	Weighted mean	35-44	18-24
All	.42	.41	.43
Australia	.14	.12	.19
Great Britain	.34	.30	.39
Israel	.54	.49	.61

b) Predicted probabilities of saying that the government definitely should control wages

	Weighted mean	35-44	18-24
All	.15	.13	.16
West Germany	.09	.07	.26
USA	.08	.07	.10
Italy	.27	.23	.30

c) Predicted probabilities of saying that the government definitely should control prices

	Weighted mean	35-44	18-24
All	.26	.24	.26
West Germany	.22	.18	.29

Table 14. Individual attitudes to work

	"Work is a person's most important activity"		"I would enjoy a paid job even without the money"	
	Coefficient	S. Error	Coefficient	S. Error
18-24	-.2220	.0654	.1375	.0683
25-34	-.1712	.0490	.0518	.0511
45-54	.3450	.0523	-.0354	.0548
55-64	.7621	.0586	-.0602	.0611
65-74	1.0313	.0680	-.0307	.0713
Male	.2214	.0341	-.0858	.0357
Married	-.0615	.0494	-.0012	.0522
Divorced	.0043	.0876	.0252	.0940
Widowed	-.1441	.0769	-.0766	.0812
Schooling	-.0763	.0057	.0670	.0061
Unemployed	.4080	.1095	.4832	.0993
Employed	.0926	.0408	.4240	.0428
Austria	-.1943	.0833	.1812	.0881
Eire	-.3020	.0924	.0798	.0950
Great Britain	-.5245	.0879	-.2264	.0902
Hungary	.5672	.0909	-.1148	.0952
Israel	.1084	.0908	.1098	.0943
Italy	.0051	.0913	-.5235	.0936
Netherlands	-.3407	.0839	-.5489	.0887
Norway	.7522	.0850	.4480	.0884
USA	-.3518	.0866	-.1364	.0889
West Germany	-.6646	.0866	-.4281	.0910
Cut1	-3.1939	.1221	-1.6283	.1263
Cut2	-1.3524	.1186	-.1900	.1241
Cut3	-.4715	.1180	.4156	.1240
Cut4	1.2661	.1188	2.8245	.1270
N	12937		12387	
chi^2	1823.93		743.16	
Pseudo R^2	0.0462		0.0215	
Log Likelihood	-18806.6			

Northern Ireland is omitted.

Table 15. Individual attitudes to work -- predicted probabilities

a) Predicted probabilities of strongly agreeing or agreeing that work is a person's most important activity.

	Weighted mean	35-44	18-24
All	.47	.42	.36
Unemployed	.58	.52	.48
Employed	.48	.42	.37
OLF	.45	.40	.35
Italy	.51	.37	.49
Norway	.63	.62	.46

b) Predicted probabilities of strongly agreeing or agreeing that the person would enjoy work even without pay.

	Weighted mean	35-44	18-24
All	.62	.61	.64
Unemployed	.69	.66	.68
Employed	.67	.64	.67
OLF	.52	.54	.58
USA	.64	.62	.74
Netherlands	.49	.49	.59
Italy	.51	.45	.67