

Entrepreneurship and the Youth Labour Market

Problem: A Report for the OECD

David G. Blanchflower,

Professor of Economics,
Dartmouth College, USA and NBER

Andrew J. Oswald,

Professor of Economics,
University of Warwick,
UK.

Revised, November 1998

Abstract

We document patterns in the data on entrepreneurship and young people in the OECD. For policy-makers, the primary findings of our paper are that satisfaction levels are noticeably higher among the young self-employed, that young people value independence in a job, and that potentially entrepreneurial young people appear principally to be held back by lack of capital.

1. Introduction

Many young people in OECD countries cannot find work. For reasons both of efficiency and equity, the problem of youth unemployment is one of the most pressing issues of modern public policy. In this paper, we discuss some of its characteristics, and focus particularly on whether there is a role for the fostering of entrepreneurship.

A rule of thumb is that youth unemployment rates tend to be approximately twice the adult rate (as noted in Blanchflower and Oswald 1998a, by fitting a multi-country regression line). The most recent 1997 figures from Tables B and C of OECD Employment Outlook, June 1998, for example, reveal an OECD Europe unemployment rate of 19% among those 15-24 years of age, compared to a rate of 10% among all adults. Therefore in countries with the most severe unemployment rates, a third of young people can be looking for work. It is widely accepted that this is not merely a short-run waste of human resources and a source of unhappiness among Europe's young people. It may have long-term scarring effects on the working adults of the next generation.

For many years, the OECD has had a large group of young people outside education and the workplace; the unemployment rate has been above 6% through the 1990s (Table B of OECD Employment Outlook, June, 1998)¹. The persistence of the problem seems to demonstrate that standard economic policies have been insufficient. OECD governments are searching for new alternatives. One is the idea that policy should attempt to create more entrepreneurship among the young.

¹ For a discussion of the rise in youth joblessness see Blanchflower and Freeman (1996, 1999).

There are a number of 'potential' benefits from the promotion of youth entrepreneurship that are commonly discussed by commentators, which have led many public and private agencies in OECD countries to pursue policies in this area.

1. Entrepreneurship may promote innovation and thus create new jobs.
2. There may be a direct effect on employment if new young entrepreneurs hire fellow youths from the dole queues.
3. New small firms may raise the degree of competition in the product market, bringing gains to consumers.
4. Young entrepreneurs may be particularly responsive to new economic opportunities and trends.
5. Greater self-employment among young people may go along with increased self-reliance and well-being.

Economists have little evidence, however, on whether these hypothetical benefits exist in practice.

The end of the twentieth century may mark a particularly appropriate time for young entrepreneurs. Some commentators argue that new opportunities abound – due to technological change, the fragmentation of markets, and increased deregulation across the OECD.

In this paper we address questions of the following kind.

- Do young people want to be entrepreneurial, but are somehow prevented?
- Are those who manage to become self-employed actually better off, in terms of wellbeing (not just income), than those who do not?
- How, in a general sense, do young people perceive work?
- What kind of work are they seeking?

- What are their major problems entering the job market?
- What is the perception, among the young, of entrepreneurship as a career choice?
- What are the factors that motivate young people to engage in self-employment and entrepreneurship?

Although international comparative data on these subjects is limited we have been able to draw on a number of sources of individual level micro data. The main source of data is the Eurobarometer Surveys conducted by EUROSTAT which provides information at the level of the individual for all of the member countries of the European union for the years 1975-1996. Countries are added to the survey series as they apply for membership of the EU, including Norway, which subsequently voted not to join. This survey series is conducted a number of times annually and for much of what follows we make use of a pooled data file that combines data from over fifty separate surveys. In addition, we draw upon two Eurobarometer surveys that focus on issues of relevance to the issues we consider here: the first (Eurobarometer #34.2) was conducted in 1990 and was directed specifically at those age 15-24; the second (Eurobarometer #44.2) was directed only at the employed, was conducted between November 1995 and January 1996 and relates specifically to Working Conditions in the EU. These data are supplemented with cross-country data from ten countries from the 1989 International Social Survey Programme series (Austria, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, the UK, the USA and West Germany) as well as the General Social Surveys for the United States for the years 1975-1996. For further details of these data files see Blanchflower (1998b).

In exploring these questions we have tried to focus on the role that public policy may have to play in the area of youth entrepreneurship. It is useful to recognise at the outset that it is not obvious even a large new supply of young entrepreneurs would solve the jobs crisis.

Relatively little is known about the macro-economic correlates of self-employment. There is an ongoing debate in the literature about whether the unemployment rate is positively or negatively correlated with the self-employment rate (variously defined); for a summary see Meager (1992). Some evidence suggests that (growth in) real GDP is negatively correlated with (changes in) self-employment (Blanchflower 1998b). The wealthiest countries tend to have low self-employment rates overall and especially low rates among the young who are more likely to be obtaining an education than to be in gainful employment – the main exceptions to this are the UK and New Zealand. As we note below, it is not clear that there is a direct role for intervention by government in this area, other than to free up the workings of the capital market. There is little available literature to help us in determining the optimal self-employment-rate. This makes it hard to give policy advice.

2. Background patterns in the data

The most commonly studied class of entrepreneurs is those who are self-employed. Table 1 provides background factors on the self-employed in OECD countries, covering all age groups, as a proportion of the population aged 18-64. It shows that the self-employment rate varies greatly from one country to another. Figures are given in the table for the ten-year intervals 1966 to 1996. Over that period the proportion of the population that is self-employed increased only in Iceland, New Zealand, Portugal and the United Kingdom. There is some evidence that the less developed economies have relatively high self-employment rates (i.e. Portugal, Greece and Turkey).

Some of the patterns in Table 1 are due to the differing importance of the agriculture sector, nation-by-nation. Less developed countries tend to have a large agricultural sector where a sizable proportion of total employment takes the form of self-employment. This is illustrated in

Table 2 which reports the proportion of self-employment working in agriculture. As countries develop both the size of agriculture and the proportion of agricultural employment accounted for by self-employment tends to decline. Indeed, in all OECD countries over the last three decades the relative size of agriculture has declined, which has produced downward pressure on the overall self-employment rate (Blanchflower, 1998). In 1995 the proportion of self-employment in agriculture was lowest in the UK (8.3%), Belgium (11.2%) and the USA (15.8%) and highest in Turkey (73.5%), Greece, 42.1%, Austria, (45.4%) and Ireland (44.3%). Excluding Turkey, the (unweighted) OECD average decreased from 48.6% in 1970 to 25.8% in 1995.

We now turn to examining some direct survey evidence with particular emphasis on the young. There is evidence from our surveys that many more people would like to run their own businesses across all age groups, but that this preference is particularly marked for youth. A crucial piece of evidence comes in Table 3, taken from survey data from the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP). The data come from 1989, but it is likely that attitudes change only slowly over time, and there are no more recent data.

In the data summarized in Table 3, people are asked

“Suppose you were working and could choose between different kinds of jobs. Which of the following would you choose: being an employee or being self-employed?”

Remarkably high numbers of individuals express a preference for self-employment. In most countries, large numbers of respondents said they would prefer being self-employed. The lowest proportion is Norway with 26%; the highest is Italy, where 66% of people express a preference for self-employment. A follow-up question is also asked in the ISSP survey. It says

“Would you choose working in a small firm compared to working in a large firm?”

Again, most said they would prefer a small firm. Here the proportions vary from a low of Israel at 24% to Netherlands with 74%.

Table 3 also provides information on a sub-sample of young people (defined as under 30 years of age). A noticeably higher proportion of the young people preferred self-employment. In most countries, the majority of the young did so. In contrast young people in a number of countries (e.g. Great Britain, Ireland, Italy and the United States) were less likely than their older counterparts to say they would like to work in a large. The Table appears to indicate – assuming questionnaire material can be viewed as reliable – that there is large latent demand for a kind of entrepreneurial behavior — self employment. People find self-employment intrinsically attractive.

Questions relating to the use of computers and word processors are reported in Table. The data are for 1990 from a special Eurobarometer Survey asked of 7,706 young people between the ages of 15 and 24, approximately one third of whom were employed at the time of the survey. In part A of the Table, which includes all of the respondents no matter what their labor market status, nearly a third of the individuals say they can use computers or word-processors very well or fairly well. Part B of the Table, which relates only to those who are working, indicates that the self-employed are less well informed than employees². This may suggest a case for public skills development programs.

An attempt to get at detailed differences between the self-employed and the employed is provided in Table 5 using the same data used in Table 4. The finding that the self-employed appear to be less well informed than others is corroborated by the evidence in Table 5, which

² A significant negative coefficient on a self-employment dummy ($t=2.11$) was observed when we ran an ordered logit where the dependent variable was set to 1 if the respondent said they could use a computer/word processor “not at all”, 2 if they said “a little”, and so on. Additional controls included 12 country dummies, gender, six education dummies, 9 age dummies and union status; the sample was restricted to workers only ($N=2951$).

shows that the self-employed are less likely to get training as part of their job. This result is confirmed when we ran a probit equation set to 1 if they received training, zero otherwise, with controls for age, education, gender and country and the self-employment dummy was statistically significant and negative ($t=3.60$). Table 5 also shows that the young self-employed tended to find their job through family and friends.

The self-employed young people in the survey were also noticeably more satisfied with their jobs. This result was further confirmed when we ran an ordered logit, with the same controls described above, and the self-employment dummy variable was significantly positive ($t=4.61$). This last finding seems of interest, and is consistent with the view that entrepreneurship may be an attractive option for young people.

Table 6 takes the issue further. It examines, for a range of countries, the difference in job satisfaction between the employed and the self-employed. Once more, there is a notable result. For the Euro 15, for example, 30% of employees say they are ‘Very Satisfied’ while a higher figure, 38%, among the self-employed do so. This finding of a significantly higher level of satisfaction is confirmed when we ran an ordered logit ($N=13,103$) with the dependent variable set to 1 if the respondent was “not at all satisfied”, 2 if they were “not very satisfied”, and so on. The equation also included controls for occupation, industry, age, gender, job tenure, commuting time, firm size, education plus 15 country controls; the self-employment dummy was significantly positive with a t-statistic of 4.61 (Blanchflower, 1998b, Table 13)³. Similarly, when the sample is restricted to those under the age of 30 ($N=2825$) with the same controls, the self-

³ This paper and Blanchflower (1998a) may be downloaded from Blanchflower’s web page at <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~blnchflr/>

employment dummy remains significantly positive ($t=3.85$) or even when a much smaller sample of those under 25 ($N=1,186$) is used ($t=2.47$).

Is a job 'just a way of earning a living' in the minds of young people? Answers to such a question are provided in Table 7. Most respondents say a job is more than just a source of money. There are not strong differences here between the attitudes of the young and the old.

Table 8 is interesting because it reveals what people say they really care about in a job, and allows comparison of the attitudes of young and old people. Again there is a breakdown by country, and again, regrettably, there are no data more recent than the late 1980s. Nevertheless, the key conclusion of Table 8 seems clear. Individuals – it is difficult to generalize about differences between young and old -- care especially about job security and interesting work. Also, consistent with people's interest in being self-employed, the ability to work independently also figures quite strongly in Table 8.

Evidence of a more formal kind is given in Table 9. It is an ordered logit for individuals' reported life-satisfaction levels. The data come from the Eurobarometer Surveys of 1975 to 1996. Four sub-samples are studied: people under 20 years old, under 30, over 30, and All. These are presented as separate columns in Table 9. Self-employment is the excluded or base category, which means that coefficients are to be thought of as measured relative to self-employment. The Table tests for the factors associated with high life satisfaction. Variables with a t statistic greater than 2 are statistically significant. It is noticeable that for the two sub-samples of young people (those under 20 in the first column, and those under 30 in the next column), the categories of Employee, Retired, Self-employed and Student/Military enter with negative signs. This leads to an important result. It is that young self-employed people have higher life-satisfaction, holding other things constant, than other young people with similar

characteristics. Once more, therefore, the direct advantages to entrepreneurship seem clear. For whatever exact psychological reasons, self-employed young men and women are unusually satisfied with their lives.

Who, then, becomes self-employed? Table 10 provides information from regressions on self-employment (the dependent variable is a one/zero, meaning 1 for those who are self-employed and zero otherwise). Here the equations have been estimated separately for each nation. They are testing for which factors are statistically associated with a greater probability of being self-employed. There are two clear findings. In all countries, age enters positively in a self-employment probability equation, meaning that older people are more likely to be self-employed, *ceteris paribus*. Second, in almost all countries, men are also more likely to be self-employed. Beyond these two, the pattern is mixed. The general factors making people more likely to be self-employed are similar for young and old people. While young people are more likely to have positive attitudes to self-employment (from the earlier evidence) they are less likely to be self-employed in practice. This may imply a barrier that policy could overcome.

Finally, Table 11 is a 'probability of self-employment' regression equation, which is a kind of probit equation⁴. The data file used here covers the years 1975-1996 and pools the Eurobarometer series described earlier and the General Social Survey Series data file for the United States that covers the same years. In total excluding missing values there are just over 600,000 usable observations. The coefficients can be interpreted as the effect on the probability of being self-employed of an infinitesimal change in each independent continuous variable and the discrete change in the probability for dummy variables. The variables that are significant are those with a *t* statistic greater than 2. The Table charts – pooling across the large number of countries listed -- how personal characteristics are related to the chance of running one's own

business. Separate results are reported for those under thirty years of age and those at least thirty years of age. The dependent variable is calculated in alternative ways across the columns. In all cases it is set to one if the individual is self-employed. In the first two columns the sample consists only of workers with the dependent variable set to zero if the respondent was an employee. In columns 3 and 4 the sample now adds in the unemployed who along with employees are set to zero. In the final two columns the dependent variable is now set to zero if the respondent was an employee, unemployed or out-of-the labor-force (OLF). Hence the sample size rises from 91,095 in column 1 to 107,949 in column 3 and to 132,480 in column 5 for those age under 30 and from 240,234 in column 2, to 260,023 in column 4 to 469,543 in column 6. Overall the determinants of self-employment for young and old seem to be very similar. Even when the sample is restricted to young people under the age of thirty, there is evidence that the probability of being self-employed rises with age and household size, is higher for men than women and, in contrast to the older age group, is higher for those who are married than for those who are single. There is also some evidence that self-employment is highest for those with the least and those with the most education. As a proportion of the total population (columns 5 & 6) self-employment rates for both age groups are highest, *ceteris paribus*, in Greece, Italy and Ireland. The rates are lowest in the Denmark, the Netherlands, and East Germany for the younger group and in East Germany, the Netherlands and the UK for the older age group.

3. Entrepreneurship and Capital Constraints

Economists have amassed considerable evidence that potential entrepreneurs are held back by lack of capital. Blanchflower and Oswald, 1998b, for example, look at three kinds of evidence. First, the receipt of an inheritance or gift seems to increase a typical individual's

⁴ See Blanchflower (1998a, 1998b) for earlier work estimating micro self-employment equations.

probability of being self-employed. This emerges from British data, the National Child Development Survey. NCDS traces from birth a cohort of children born in 1958. These individuals have been followed for the whole of their lives. Blanchflower and Oswald find a large association between self-employment and receiving money early on. The inheritance effect is found at age 23 and 33. It is especially large in the former and younger group. Second, Blanchflower and Oswald (1998b) report British Social Attitudes Survey data. Although this tells us only about one country, the survey responses were intriguing. Interviewing a sample of those who did not become self-employed but who considered it, the main explanation given by people to the survey team was that they could not raise the start-up capital. Third, consistent with the tenor of these, Blanchflower and Oswald use data from the UK National Survey of the Self-Employed to demonstrate that

- (i) most small businesses are begun with own or family money,
- (ii) individual entrepreneurs had needed most help with finance, and
- (iii) the single biggest concern of potential entrepreneurs was with where to obtain capital.

Earlier work by Evans and Jovanovic (1989) and Holtz-Eakin, Joulfaian and Rosen (1994) drew similar conclusions using different methods on US data. The work of Black et al (1996) for the UK discovers an apparently powerful role for housing prices (through its impact on equity withdrawal – meaning that those who have made capital gains by owning houses may use the capital to start their own firms) in affecting the supply of small new firms. Again this is suggestive of capital constraints. Finally, Lindh and Ohlsson (1994) adopts the Blanchflower-Oswald procedure and provides complementary evidence for Sweden.

It is worth emphasizing that this empirical work does not prove governments should be handing out capital to those who wish to go into business. Its findings are positive rather than normative.

4. Conclusions

Using international survey sources, this paper examines young people's employment, attitudes and entrepreneurial behavior. We believe there are two main policy-related conclusions to emerge from the empirical work. The first conclusion is that self-employed individuals – a special but well-defined entrepreneurial group -- report markedly greater well-being than equivalent employees. Their job satisfaction, life-satisfaction and reported happiness levels are all higher than workers of identical personal characteristics. While this finding does not tell us how to create more entrepreneurs in society, it does suggest that self-employment brings direct microeconomic benefits to people. It raises a puzzle, too. If self-employment does this, why are not more individuals running their own businesses? The second conclusion is that many individuals say they would like to be self-employed. There is, according to the survey data, a large pool of potentially entrepreneurial people. Across the OECD, many millions of employees would apparently prefer to be self-employed. Complementary evidence comes from the fact that people say a key concern is to find a job that gives them the ability to work independently. Questionnaire evidence, asking individuals about hypothetical outcomes, always needs to be treated with caution. Nevertheless, these answers are suggestive of an underlying interest in self-employment among large numbers of OECD citizens who are currently employees.

How the paper's findings can be exploited by the designers of economic policy is more complicated to judge. Econometric and questionnaire research suggests that the main constraint on new entrepreneurs is a lack of start-up and liquid capital (as summarized in the paper's

penultimate section). This does not mean that government cash ought to be handed out to those who wish to start a business. However, it indicates that plans to foster more entrepreneurship, if this is judged socially desirable, should begin by considering economists' evidence on the importance of capital constraints.

References

- Black, J., De Meza, D. and Jeffreys, D., 'House Prices, the Supply of Collateral, and the Enterprise Economy', Economic Journal, 106, January 1996, 60-75.
- Blanchflower, D.G., 'Youth labor markets in twenty three countries: a comparison using micro data'. In School to work transitions in OECD countries: a comparative analysis, edited by D. Stern, Hampton Press, 1998a.
- Blanchflower, D.G., 'Self-employment in OECD Countries', Working paper, Dartmouth College, 1998b.
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Freeman, R.B., 'Growing into work', Employment Outlook, OECD, July, 1996.
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Freeman, R.B. (editors), Youth employment and joblessness in advanced countries, University of Chicago Press and NBER, forthcoming, 1999.
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Oswald, A.J., 'Self-Employment and the Enterprise Culture', in British Social Attitudes: The 1990 Report, edited by R. Jowell, S. Witherspoon and L. Brook, Aldershot, Gower Press, 1990.
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Oswald, A.J., 'A study of labour markets and youth unemployment in Eastern Europe', a report to the ILO, 1998a.
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Oswald, A.J., 'What Makes an Entrepreneur?', Journal of Labor Economics, 16, January, 1998b, 26-60.
- Clark, A.E. and Oswald, A.J., 'Satisfaction and Comparison Income', Journal of Public Economics, 61, 1996, 359-381.
- Evans, D. and Jovanovic, B., 'An Estimated Model of Entrepreneurial Choice under Liquidity Constraints', Journal of Political Economy, 97, 1989, 808-927.
- Holtz-Eakin, D., Joulfaian, D., and Rosen, H.S., 'Entrepreneurial Decisions and Liquidity Constraints', Rand Journal of Economics, 25 (Summer), 1994, 334-347.
- Lindh, T. and Ohlsson, H., 'Self-Employment and Self-Financing', Economic Journal, 106 (November), 1994, pp. 1515-26.
- Meager, N., 'Does unemployment lead to self-employment?', Small Business Economics, 4, 1992, pp. 87-103.

Table 1. Self-employment as a % of population 18-64

| | 1966 | 1976 | 1986 | 1996 |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Australia | 10.5 | 10.0 | 10.9 | 10.3 |
| Austria | 18.2 ^a | 12.0 | 9.5 | 9.4 ⁱ |
| Belgium | 13.2 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 10.3 ^d |
| Canada | 8.9 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 7.6 |
| Denmark | 16.3 ^b | 12.0 | 8.9 | 6.9 |
| Finland | 21.3 | 14.4 | 10.8 | 8.8 |
| France | 16.1 | 11.3 | 9.0 | 6.5 |
| Germany | 13.1 | 8.7 | 7.1 | 6.7 ^c |
| Greece | n/a | 28.8 ^e | 27.8 | 25.0 ^e |
| Iceland | 12.4 | 11.0 | 10.8 | 14.8 |
| Ireland | 21.9 | 15.8 | 11.7 | 11.7 |
| Italy | 20.7 | 17.9 | 15.6 | 14.7 ⁱ |
| Japan | 27.0 | 20.3 | 17.5 | 13.5 ^c |
| Luxembourg | 13.6 | 9.9 | 7.2 | 5.8 ^c |
| Netherlands | 10.5 | 6.7 | 5.8 | 8.2 |
| New Zealand | 9.0 | 9.1 | 12.9 | 14.4 |
| Norway | 13.7 | 10.5 | 9.7 | 6.5 |
| Portugal | 14.8 | 22.1 | 19.6 | 19.1 |
| Spain | 22.3 | 17.5 | 13.0 | 11.6 |
| Sweden | 9.3 ^b | 6.4 | 5.2 | 7.6 |
| Turkey | n/a | n/a | 32.4 ^f | 30.6 |
| UK | 4.8 | 5.5 | 7.5 | 9.3 |
| USA | 7.8 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 |

Notes a= 1969; b=1967; c=1995; d=1992; e=1977; f=1988; g=1968; h=1979; i=1994

Source: OECD Labour Force Statistics.

Table 2. Agricultural Self-employment as a % of total self-employment

| | 1970 | 1995 |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Australia | 36.4 | 20.1 |
| Austria | 62.3 | 45.4 ⁱ |
| Belgium | 23.3 | 11.2 ^d |
| Canada | 44.4 | 19.5 |
| Denmark | 42.5 | 23.6 |
| Finland | 79.2 | 37.6 |
| France | 49.9 | 30.0 |
| Germany | 44.5 | 17.4 |
| Greece | 60.6 ^e | 42.1 |
| Iceland | 55.6 | 24.2 |
| Ireland | 75.0 | 44.3 |
| Italy | 41.2 | 16.4 |
| Japan | 47.1 | 27.3 |
| Luxembourg | 43.5 | 26.1 |
| Netherlands | 33.0 | 17.0 |
| New Zealand | 55.0 ^h | 27.6 |
| Norway | 62.2 | 37.2 |
| Portugal | 61.4 | 34.6 |
| Spain | 58.5 | 24.3 |
| Sweden | 47.7 | 17.9 |
| Turkey | n/a | 73.5 |
| UK | 16.7 | 8.3 |
| USA | 29.1 | 15.8 |
| OECD average | 48.6 | 28.5 |

Notes d=1992; e=1977; h=1979; i=1994. Average is unweighted and excludes Turkey.
Source: OECD Labour Force Statistics (various).

Table 3. Suppose you were working and could choose between different kinds of jobs. Which of the following would you choose?

a) Being an employee or being self-employed - % reporting self-employed

| | All ages | | <30 years of age | |
|------------------|----------|------|------------------|-----|
| | % | N | % | N |
| Austria | .6020 | 1779 | .6410 | 482 |
| Great Britain | .4775 | 1183 | .5178 | 245 |
| Hungary | .3803 | 894 | .5422 | 201 |
| Ireland | .5095 | 944 | .5044 | 226 |
| Israel | .4857 | 910 | .5902 | 327 |
| Italy | .6522 | 969 | .7276 | 246 |
| Netherlands | .3854 | 1489 | .4029 | 412 |
| Northern Ireland | .5152 | 705 | .5821 | 144 |
| Norway | .2605 | 1589 | .3168 | 464 |
| USA | .6297 | 1283 | .6631 | 285 |
| West Germany | .4904 | 1207 | .5960 | 251 |

b) working in a small firm compared to working in a large firm? - % saying small firm.

| | | | | |
|------------------|-------|------|-------|-----|
| Austria | .6567 | 1646 | .7120 | 455 |
| Great Britain | .7161 | 1102 | .6269 | 219 |
| Hungary | .5930 | 892 | .6551 | 203 |
| Ireland | .6569 | 892 | .5648 | 216 |
| Israel | .5248 | 806 | .5208 | 288 |
| Italy | .4657 | 904 | .4059 | 234 |
| Netherlands | .7376 | 1372 | .6851 | 378 |
| Northern Ireland | .6463 | 638 | .6005 | 138 |
| Norway | .7612 | 1470 | .7687 | 441 |
| USA | .6111 | 1219 | .5107 | 278 |
| West Germany | .5614 | 1214 | .5135 | 248 |

Source; International Social Survey Programme, 1989.

Table 4. Do you know how to use any sort of computer or word processor? Would you say you can use it? (%)

| | Not at all | A little | Fairly well | Very well | N (unweighted) |
|---------------------------|------------|----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|
| <u>A) All individuals</u> | | | | | |
| France | 31.2 | 33.4 | 22.9 | 12.5 | 603 |
| Belgium | 36.4 | 31.4 | 22.9 | 9.1 | 593 |
| Netherlands | 21.7 | 34.3 | 29.1 | 14.8 | 581 |
| West Germany | 36.4 | 29.1 | 22.5 | 11.9 | 613 |
| Italy | 50.6 | 30.9 | 14.5 | 3.9 | 608 |
| Luxembourg | 23.0 | 36.1 | 24.0 | 16.7 | 199 |
| Denmark | 15.4 | 37.9 | 26.0 | 20.6 | 615 |
| Ireland | 40.4 | 27.9 | 22.0 | 9.6 | 600 |
| Great Britain | 25.4 | 26.4 | 31.9 | 16.1 | 820 |
| Greece | 70.6 | 13.9 | 9.3 | 6.0 | 612 |
| Spain | 58.2 | 30.5 | 8.9 | 2.3 | 600 |
| Portugal | 77.2 | 15.2 | 5.6 | 1.7 | 600 |
| East Germany | 47.9 | 35.4 | 14.1 | 2.5 | 657 |
| EU (weighted) | 40.4 | 29.4 | 20.5 | 9.6 | 7701 |
| <u>B) Workers only</u> | | | | | |
| Employed | 41.7 | 25.6 | 20.7 | 12.0 | 3147 |
| Self-employed | 53.2 | 23.8 | 15.8 | 7.3 | 215 |
| EU (weighted) | 42.5 | 25.4 | 20.4 | 11.7 | 3362 |

Notes: sample consists of 15-24 year olds. All estimates are weighted. The final rows of each section are weighted to make the results representative of the European Union.

Source: Eurobarometer #34.2: European Youth Fall 1990

Table 5. Attitudes to work – employees versus self-employed.

| | | | | | |
|--|------------|----------|----------|------------|---------------|
| a) Are you getting training as part of your job? | | | | | |
| Employed | | | | | 40.24 |
| Self-employed | | | | | 29.23 |
| b) How did you find your present job | | | | | |
| | | | Employee | | Self-employed |
| Job centre/employment agency | | | 10.04 | | 3.36 |
| Parents, friends, family | | | 36.69 | | 56.90 |
| Advertisements | | | 14.23 | | 3.26 |
| Contacting employers directly | | | 24.88 | | 8.65 |
| Through school or training centre | | | 7.83 | | 1.57 |
| Other | | | 6.34 | | 26.25 |
| c) Are you completely satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with your current job? | | | | | |
| | not at all | not very | fairly | completely | N |
| Employed | 4.66 | 14.65 | 54.39 | 26.30 | 2781 |
| Self-employed | 4.06 | 10.43 | 47.74 | 37.76 | 197 |

Notes: sample consists of 15-24 year olds. All estimates are weighted.

Source: Eurobarometer #34.2: European Youth, Fall 1990.

Table 6. Job satisfaction of the employed and self-employed (%).

| | Not at all Satisfied | Not very satisfied | Fairly satisfied | Very satisfied | N |
|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------|
| a) Employees. | | | | | |
| Belgium | 0.97 | 5.97 | 51.58 | 41.48 | 775 |
| Denmark | 1.83 | 3.70 | 45.42 | 49.06 | 919 |
| West Germany | 4.68 | 10.97 | 52.40 | 31.95 | 889 |
| Greece | 6.37 | 25.22 | 55.59 | 12.82 | 526 |
| Italy | 5.12 | 18.31 | 56.95 | 19.62 | 727 |
| Spain | 4.04 | 16.76 | 56.65 | 22.55 | 757 |
| France | 4.69 | 13.81 | 61.01 | 20.49 | 862 |
| Ireland | 1.13 | 4.82 | 39.33 | 54.72 | 775 |
| Luxembourg | 2.41 | 5.75 | 56.62 | 35.22 | 418 |
| Netherlands | 1.42 | 7.24 | 46.92 | 44.41 | 962 |
| Portugal | 3.30 | 13.54 | 62.27 | 20.89 | 696 |
| Great Britain | 4.69 | 9.28 | 49.07 | 36.96 | 925 |
| East Germany | 2.05 | 8.57 | 56.61 | 32.77 | 927 |
| Finland | 1.55 | 5.18 | 62.75 | 30.52 | 903 |
| Sweden | 2.48 | 5.71 | 54.74 | 37.07 | 967 |
| Austria | 1.49 | 9.29 | 46.51 | 42.71 | 937 |
| Euro 15 | 4.04 | 11.75 | 54.04 | 30.17 | 12965 |
| b) self-employed | | | | | |
| Belgium | 0.39 | 4.56 | 40.92 | 54.13 | 233 |
| Denmark | 0.00 | 0.00 | 39.34 | 60.66 | 73 |
| West Germany | 1.69 | 10.81 | 38.90 | 48.60 | 135 |
| Greece | 13.09 | 33.64 | 43.55 | 9.73 | 476 |
| Italy | 1.76 | 6.81 | 52.81 | 38.62 | 301 |
| Spain | 3.02 | 13.65 | 57.55 | 25.78 | 239 |
| France | 8.03 | 11.80 | 51.96 | 28.21 | 126 |
| Ireland | 0.41 | 1.72 | 31.36 | 66.51 | 229 |
| Luxembourg | 1.49 | 1.92 | 34.23 | 62.36 | 71 |
| Netherlands | 1.13 | 0.79 | 39.48 | 58.60 | 101 |
| Portugal | 1.86 | 12.49 | 62.97 | 22.69 | 299 |
| Great Britain | 2.60 | 4.13 | 47.40 | 45.87 | 137 |
| East Germany | 2.02 | 8.17 | 48.50 | 41.31 | 119 |
| Finland | 2.24 | 10.10 | 55.81 | 31.84 | 150 |
| Sweden | 0.00 | 2.58 | 34.25 | 63.17 | 88 |
| Austria | 1.64 | 8.56 | 37.65 | 52.15 | 128 |
| Euro 15 | 3.27 | 10.14 | 48.32 | 38.27 | 2905 |

Notes: sample consists of the employed. All estimates are weighted.

Source: Eurobarometer #44.2. Working conditions in the European Union, November 1995-January 1996.

Table 7. A job is just a way of earning money – no more (%)

| | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| a) >=30 years of age | | | | | |
| Germany | 11.8 | 24.2 | 15.2 | 31.4 | 17.4 |
| Great Britain | 8.7 | 24.1 | 13.0 | 40.1 | 13.9 |
| USA | 7.1 | 15.0 | 17.0 | 41.4 | 19.3 |
| Austria | 8.1 | 23.2 | 11.1 | 43.8 | 13.6 |
| Hungary | 16.0 | 26.8 | 23.5 | 28.3 | 5.2 |
| Netherlands | 5.5 | 19.4 | 12.7 | 44.5 | 17.7 |
| Italy | 7.4 | 19.8 | 13.0 | 41.1 | 18.5 |
| Ireland | 5.9 | 30.3 | 7.8 | 43.6 | 12.1 |
| Northern Ireland | 10.0 | 26.7 | 12.6 | 39.1 | 11.3 |
| Norway | 7.9 | 12.5 | 17.2 | 42.9 | 19.1 |
| Israel | 10.1 | 23.8 | 13.3 | 33.0 | 19.6 |
| a) <30 years of age | | | | | |
| Germany | 12.8 | 20.9 | 18.0 | 33.2 | 15.0 |
| Great Britain | 3.4 | 19.7 | 16.0 | 46.6 | 14.2 |
| USA | 7.8 | 15.7 | 20.1 | 35.5 | 20.7 |
| Austria | 3.8 | 20.8 | 10.1 | 44.4 | 20.8 |
| Hungary | 11.2 | 19.1 | 39.7 | 25.7 | 4.2 |
| Netherlands | 3.3 | 12.0 | 16.7 | 45.8 | 22.0 |
| Italy | 5.3 | 8.7 | 16.3 | 50.9 | 18.6 |
| Ireland | 4.7 | 15.9 | 5.1 | 61.6 | 12.5 |
| Northern Ireland | 7.0 | 24.8 | 17.0 | 40.5 | 10.4 |
| Norway | 6.2 | 11.1 | 19.9 | 44.4 | 18.1 |
| Israel | 9.0 | 19.5 | 13.8 | 34.1 | 23.3 |

Notes: all results are weighted.

Source; International Social Survey Programme, 1989.

Table 8. How important is: a job that provides (% of those who respond “very important”)

| | job security | high income | advancement | leisure time | interesting | work independently | help others | useful to society |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| a) >=30 years of age | | | | | | | | |
| Germany | 58 | 23 | 24 | 14 | 50 | 41 | 18 | 21 |
| Great Britain | 59 | 17 | 30 | 7 | 50 | 22 | 18 | 22 |
| USA | 56 | 24 | 41 | 4 | 42 | 27 | 25 | 29 |
| Austria | 73 | 32 | 41 | 17 | 58 | 57 | 35 | 34 |
| Hungary | 57 | 45 | 21 | 17 | 28 | 24 | 20 | 37 |
| Netherlands | 39 | 11 | 26 | 6 | 38 | 34 | 25 | 26 |
| Italy | 74 | 30 | 34 | 14 | 49 | 32 | 24 | 28 |
| Ireland | 64 | 29 | 33 | 6 | 41 | 22 | 20 | 22 |
| Northern Ireland | 70 | 30 | 40 | 7 | 47 | 20 | 25 | 29 |
| Norway | 68 | 12 | 11 | 5 | 51 | 31 | 17 | 23 |
| Israel | 54 | 43 | 47 | 18 | 58 | 35 | 29 | 31 |
| b) <30 years of age | | | | | | | | |
| Germany | 51 | 32 | 36 | 30 | 64 | 48 | 26 | 25 |
| Great Britain | 58 | 23 | 33 | 10 | 49 | 19 | 19 | 18 |
| USA | 50 | 27 | 43 | 9 | 49 | 28 | 25 | 29 |
| Austria | 65 | 48 | 27 | 70 | 62 | 62 | 32 | 27 |
| Hungary | 56 | 46 | 14 | 22 | 32 | 18 | 16 | 25 |
| Netherlands | 32 | 14 | 33 | 8 | 46 | 26 | 17 | 12 |
| Italy | 64 | 30 | 34 | 20 | 57 | 37 | 23 | 32 |
| Ireland | 50 | 20 | 38 | 9 | 50 | 22 | 18 | 17 |
| Northern Ireland | 63 | 19 | 46 | 9 | 50 | 21 | 26 | 26 |
| Norway | 65 | 13 | 12 | 6 | 58 | 25 | 17 | 16 |
| Israel | 48 | 47 | 48 | 14 | 55 | 36 | 22 | 25 |

Notes: alternative responses are “very important”; “important”; “neither”; “not important”; “not important at all”.

Source; International Social Survey Programme, 1989.

Table 9. Life Satisfaction Ordered Logits – Europe 1975-1996. (T-statistics in parentheses).

| | Age <20 | | Age <30 | | Age 30 | | Overall | |
|------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--------|----------|---------|----------|
| Employee | -.1593 | (1.94) | -.1152 | (5.00) | .0607 | (5.61) | .0314 | (3.21) |
| Retired | -.1988 | (1.27) | -.2487 | (3.15) | .0167 | (1.24) | -.0248 | (1.93) |
| Housewife | -.3374 | (3.36) | -.1782 | (6.16) | .0185 | (1.43) | -.0066 | (0.57) |
| Student/Military | -.1007 | (1.16) | -.0788 | (2.33) | -.0634 | (0.96) | .1226 | (4.96) |
| Unemployed | -1.1773 | (13.61) | -1.1166 | (40.30) | -.9136 | (49.78) | -.9362 | (64.18) |
| Time trend | .0122 | (7.04) | .0080 | (8.57) | -.0050 | (8.67) | -.0017 | (3.56) |
| Austria | .6175 | (4.84) | 1.0432 | (15.86) | 1.0711 | (28.09) | 1.0668 | (32.35) |
| Belgium | .8154 | (17.00) | .9916 | (40.24) | .9122 | (58.49) | .9348 | (71.03) |
| Denmark | 1.4629 | (29.67) | 1.7318 | (68.95) | 1.7389 | (111.13) | 1.7365 | (131.00) |
| East Germany | -.3284 | (4.18) | -.0990 | (2.56) | -.0815 | (3.89) | -.0840 | (4.59) |
| Eire | .6119 | (13.99) | .9178 | (37.48) | 1.0819 | (66.21) | 1.0346 | (76.40) |
| Finland | .7690 | (6.79) | .9906 | (16.34) | .8010 | (22.41) | .8469 | (27.51) |
| Great Britain | .5980 | (12.48) | .8263 | (32.26) | .9695 | (61.28) | .9354 | (69.78) |
| Germany | .0213 | (0.45) | .3532 | (14.25) | .5752 | (37.38) | .5200 | (39.85) |
| Greece | -.2737 | (5.38) | -.1802 | (6.64) | -.2991 | (17.55) | -.2636 | (18.28) |
| Italy | -.2945 | (6.70) | -.0749 | (3.14) | -.1366 | (8.99) | -.1148 | (8.98) |
| Luxembourg | .6591 | (11.60) | .8795 | (28.00) | .9872 | (49.87) | .9628 | (57.58) |
| Netherlands | 1.1522 | (23.53) | 1.3711 | (255.58) | 1.3107 | (85.14) | 1.3245 | (101.64) |
| Northern Ireland | .5418 | (8.50) | .9113 | (25.92) | 1.1877 | (50.88) | 1.1033 | (56.85) |
| Norway | 1.1253 | (12.24) | 1.5408 | (33.28) | 1.5089 | (48.16) | 1.5137 | (58.46) |
| Portugal | -.2324 | (4.63) | -.0192 | (0.69) | -.0955 | (5.39) | -.0619 | (4.16) |
| Spain | .2313 | (4.52) | .3350 | (11.76) | .1877 | (9.99) | .2353 | (15.02) |
| Sweden | 1.0827 | (8.26) | 1.2518 | (19.07) | 1.3094 | (36.10) | 1.2883 | (40.65) |
| Age | -.1823 | (1.65) | -.2206 | (14.56) | -.0327 | (17.88) | -.0434 | (40.34) |
| Age ² | .0023 | (0.73) | .0039 | (11.62) | .0003 | (22.62) | .0004 | (42.43) |
| ALS 16 | .1450 | (3.32) | .1446 | (7.09) | .2213 | (19.77) | .2029 | (21.04) |
| ALS 17 | .1729 | (3.42) | .2469 | (10.87) | .3053 | (22.99) | .2929 | (25.97) |
| ALS 18 | .2743 | (5.21) | .2421 | (11.38) | .3331 | (27.77) | .3122 | (30.41) |
| ALS 19 | .3247 | (3.96) | .3109 | (11.78) | .4024 | (23.46) | .3790 | (26.84) |
| ALS 20 | .5425 | (2.76) | .3473 | (11.38) | .4778 | (25.92) | .4430 | (28.38) |
| ALS 21 | .4087 | (1.92) | .4118 | (12.38) | .5972 | (29.22) | .5434 | (31.56) |
| ALS >=22 | .3088 | (4.64) | .4130 | (18.33) | .5050 | (47.67) | .4843 | (51.12) |
| Still studying | .2321 | (4.97) | .3145 | (10.86) | .4229 | (7.84) | .4140 | (17.70) |
| ALS 16-19* | -.0003 | (0.00) | .2580 | (4.98) | .3219 | (10.91) | .3127 | (12.23) |
| ALS >=20* | -.0008 | (0.00) | .5538 | (7.62) | .5868 | (16.40) | .5753 | (17.95) |
| # children<15 | -.0084 | (0.95) | -.0444 | (7.75) | -.0195 | (5.42) | -.0243 | (8.45) |
| male | -.0390 | (2.05) | -.1166 | (10.70) | -.1312 | (16.97) | -.1254 | (20.00) |
| Married | .1959 | (3.71) | .4312 | (27.72) | .3426 | (28.92) | .3537 | (39.09) |
| Live together | .2400 | (3.27) | .2920 | (12.91) | .1586 | (6.89) | .1948 | (12.34) |
| Divorce | -1.0503 | (4.14) | -.4839 | (8.48) | -.4247 | (21.39) | -.4286 | (23.90) |
| Separated | -.9848 | (3.36) | -.6001 | (8.70) | -.6798 | (22.22) | -.6773 | (24.58) |
| Widowed | -.6800 | (3.69) | -.5217 | (5.08) | -.2317 | (14.67) | -.2358 | (16.70) |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| cut1 | -5.6178 | -5.6131 | -2.918 | -3.2081 |
| cut2 | -3.93167 | -3.9113 | -1.290 | -1.5637 |
| cut3 | -.97232 | -1.0064 | 1.461 | 1.2257 |
| N | 44714 | 149187 | 370010 | 519197 |
| Pseudo R ² | .0533 | .0642 | .0637 | .0631 |
| Chi ² | 4876.1 | 20308.2 | 52161.4 | 71703.7 |
| Log likelihood | -43287.1 | -148057.1 | 383621.1 | -532390.2 |

Notes: excluded categories are age left school <=15, single, France, self-employed
Source: Eurobarometer survey series (pooled data).

Table 10. Self-employment regressions by country (1=self-employed, zero =employed)

| | Age | Education | Male | H'hold size | # children | Time | N |
|------------------|-----|-----------|------|-------------|------------|------|--------|
| A) All ages | | | | | | | |
| All countries | + | - | + | + | - | 0 | 331824 |
| USA | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | 18600 |
| France | + | - | + | + | - | - | 27259 |
| Belgium | + | + | - | - | 0 | - | 25283 |
| Netherlands | + | + | + | + | 0 | - | 24121 |
| West Germany | + | + | + | + | - | + | 28135 |
| Italy | + | - | + | 0 | - | 0 | 26583 |
| Luxembourg | + | - | 0 | + | 0 | + | 12058 |
| Denmark | + | - | + | + | 0 | + | 31841 |
| Eire | + | 0 | + | - | - | - | 23582 |
| UK | + | + | + | - | + | 0 | 34577 |
| Greece | + | - | + | + | - | - | 19753 |
| Spain | + | - | - | 0 | + | - | 14493 |
| Portugal | + | - | + | + | 0 | - | 17806 |
| East Germany | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 11543 |
| Norway | + | - | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3920 |
| Finland | + | - | + | + | - | + | 3582 |
| Sweden | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | 4008 |
| Austria | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 4140 |
| B) Age <30 years | | | | | | | |
| All countries | + | + | + | + | - | 0 | 91283 |
| USA | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4818 |
| France | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 8051 |
| Belgium | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 7399 |
| Netherlands | + | 0 | + | + | + | - | 6359 |
| West Germany | + | + | + | + | - | + | 7783 |
| Italy | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 6675 |
| Luxembourg | + | - | + | - | 0 | - | 3545 |
| Denmark | + | - | + | 0 | 0 | + | 7676 |
| Eire | + | + | + | 0 | - | - | 7992 |
| UK | + | + | + | - | 0 | - | 9880 |
| Greece | + | - | + | + | 0 | - | 4840 |
| Spain | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | - | 4505 |
| Portugal | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5550 |
| East Germany | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2851 |
| Norway | 0 | - | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 838 |
| Finland | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 697 |
| Sweden | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 741 |
| Austria | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 1083 |

Notes; method of estimation OLS. Source: Eurobarometer surveys and General Social Survey (USA).

Table 11. Micro self-employment equations, 1975-1996

| | Self employed/ Employed+self-employed | | Self employed/ Labour force | | Self employed/ Population | |
|-------------------|--|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| | Age <30 | Age ≥30 | Age <30 | Age ≥30 | Age <30 | Age ≥30 |
| Age | .0076(22.24) | .0055(58.80) | .0074(26.19) | .0049 (56.90) | .0067(30.70) | -.0021 (52.33) |
| Male | .0421(20.70) | .0536 (29.43) | .0395 (23.11) | .0523 (30.95) | .0530(37.63) | .0992 (107.23) |
| # children <15 | -.0058 (4.19) | -.0057 (5.67) | -.0059 (5.08) | -.0061 (6.45) | -.0099 (10.66) | -.0137 (26.10) |
| Household size | .0071 (8.46) | .0148(17.38) | .0040 (5.74) | .0139 (17.70) | .0035 (6.27) | .0143(34.02) |
| Time | -.0017 (2.83) | -.0048 (8.78) | -.0020 (3.83) | -.0046 (9.14) | -.0021 (5.08) | -.0034 (12.55) |
| Time ² | .0001 (3.30) | .0002 (9.64) | .0001 (3.62) | .0001 (9.26) | .0001 (5.34) | .0001(12.37) |
| ALS 15 | -.0282 (6.69) | -.0542 (17.42) | -.0244 (7.01) | -.0471 (16.38) | -.0151 (5.44) | -.0154 (9.83) |
| ALS 16 | -.0377 (10.18) | -.0487 (16.02) | -.0319 (10.40) | -.0384 (13.60) | -.0198 (8.12) | -.0128 (8.28) |
| ALS 17 | -.0309 (7.88) | -.0534 (15.69) | -.0237 (7.21) | -.0397 (12.43) | -.0131 (4.97) | -.0131 (7.40) |
| ALS 18 | -.0218 (5.91) | -.0533 (18.09) | -.0166 (5.41) | -.0384 (13.86) | -.0059 (2.41) | -.0095 (6.23) |
| ALS 19 | -.0231 (5.49) | -.0542 (13.95) | -.0176 (5.00) | -.0391 (10.63) | -.0064 (2.22) | -.0068 (3.17) |
| ALS 20 | -.0203 (4.36) | -.0598 (14.85) | -.0147 (3.74) | -.0432 (11.29) | -.0030 (0.94) | -.0065 (2.86) |
| ALS 21 | -.0179 (3.54) | -.0586 (13.07) | -.0125 (2.91) | -.0407 (9.52) | -.0009 (0.27) | -.0037 (1.44) |
| ALS ≥22 | -.0054 (1.37) | -.0421 (16.10) | -.0045 (1.37) | -.0245 (9.96) | .0030 (1.16) | .0086 (6.07) |
| Married | .0096 (3.73) | -.0249 (8.27) | .0163 (7.42) | -.0073 (2.68) | .0025 (1.45) | -.0162 (10.29) |
| Living together | -.0110 (2.64) | -.0278 (5.21) | -.0051 (1.42) | -.0189 (3.80) | -.0054 (1.89) | -.0223 (8.08) |
| Divorced | .0144 (1.50) | -.0472 (10.35) | .0109 (1.36) | -.0425 (10.14) | .0081 (1.28) | -.0078 (3.10) |
| Separated | -.0067 (0.58) | -.0383 (5.37) | -.0092 (0.97) | -.0333 (5.07) | -.0090 (1.22) | -.0098 (2.56) |
| Widowed | .1001 (4.66) | -.0160 (2.96) | .0982 (5.17) | -.0051 (1.03) | .0328 (2.86) | -.0347 (16.21) |
| France | .0222 (3.49) | .0347 (6.49) | .0121 (2.29) | .0206 (4.17) | .0157 (3.64) | -.0140 (5.45) |
| Belgium | .0525 (7.82) | .0377 (7.00) | .0352 (6.26) | .0231 (4.66) | .0389 (8.34) | -.0172 (6.79) |
| Netherlands | -.0081 (1.28) | -.0164 (3.13) | -.0102 (1.92) | -.0266 (5.53) | -.0107 (2.64) | -.0467 (20.01) |
| West Germany | .0269 (4.13) | .0190 (3.59) | .0234 (4.15) | .0172 (3.48) | .0211 (4.68) | -.0134 (5.14) |
| Italy | .1620(20.09) | .1284(22.38) | .1126 (16.98) | .1263 (23.18) | .0992(18.19) | .0224 (7.90) |
| Luxembourg | .0443 (5.57) | .0291 (4.51) | .0366 (5.36) | .0277 (4.56) | .0327 (5.90) | -.0250 (8.59) |
| Denmark | -.0339 (5.73) | -.0164 (3.31) | -.0322 (6.49) | -.0181 (3.91) | -.0218 (5.45) | -.0197 (7.86) |
| Ireland | .1087(14.72) | .1678(27.94) | .0838 (13.37) | .1333 (24.08) | .0727(14.31) | .0351(11.98) |
| Great Britain | .0296 (4.40) | -.0342 (6.67) | .0224 (3.89) | -.0359 (7.55) | .0173 (3.85) | -.0309 (12.24) |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Northern Ireland | .0069 (0.81) | -.0265 (3.71) | -.0000 (0.01) | -.0385 (5.97) | .0039 (0.68) | -.0395 (12.19) |
| Greece | .2339(25.84) | .2597 (40.80) | .1932 (24.59) | .2510 (41.24) | .1475(23.69) | .0848(25.46) |
| Spain | .0854(10.68) | .1115(17.02) | .0634 (9.45) | .0968 (15.88) | .0550(10.16) | .0124 (4.01) |
| Portugal | .0536 (7.21) | .0819(13.23) | .0502 (7.72) | .0759 (13.08) | .0517 (9.58) | .0193 (6.18) |
| East Germany | -.0250 (3.14) | -.0750 (12.24) | -.0245 (3.71) | -.0892 (16.62) | -.0110 (1.96) | -.0560 (19.95) |
| Norway | -.0057 (0.47) | -.0215 (2.42) | -.0085 (0.83) | -.0246 (2.99) | -.0028 (0.33) | -.0303 (6.98) |
| Finland | .0395 (2.82) | .0757 (7.93) | .0187 (1.69) | .0520 (6.02) | .0205 (2.23) | .0025 (0.55) |
| Sweden | -.0003 (0.02) | -.0186 (2.15) | -.0103 (0.97) | -.0217 (2.71) | -.0041 (0.46) | -.0180 (4.06) |
| Austria | .0102 (0.89) | .0404 (4.38) | .0147 (1.45) | .0433 (4.95) | .0115 (1.42) | -.0035 (0.79) |
| N | 91095 | 240234 | 107949 | 260023 | 132480 | 469543 |
| Chi ² | 4693.9 | 18281.8 | 4781.2 | 18408.1 | 5909.3 | 27997.3 |
| R ² | .0726 | .0708 | .0699 | .0687 | .0811 | .0826 |
| Log likelihood | -29992.1 | -120019.1 | -31812.6 | -124866.1 | -33475.3 | -155448.5 |

Notes; excluded categories; USA, age left school<=14 years; single.

Sample consists of the self-employed plus employees (columns 1 & 2); the unemployed are also included in the zeroes in columns 3 & 4 and those who are Out of the Labour Force (OLF) are added in columns 5 & 6.

Method of estimation is dprobit in STATA.

Source: Eurobarometer surveys and General Social Survey (USA).