### ΠΑΝΤΕΙΟΝ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΚΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΩΝ ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΩΝ

### PANTEION UNIVERSITY OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES



# SCHOOL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL POLICY

## The impact of definitions to the measurement of unemployment: Evidence from the EU-LFS 2008-2015

## DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Aggeliki Yfanti

Athens, 2019

Supervising committee

Catherine Michalopoulou, Professor, Panteion University (Supervisor) Constantine Dimoulas, Assistant Professor, Panteion University Agelos Mimis, Assistant Professor, Panteion University

### 靜

Copyright © Αγγελική Υφαντή, 2019

All rights reserved. Με επιφύλαξη παντός δικαιώματος.

Απαγορεύεται η αντιγραφή, αποθήκευση και διανομή της παρούσας διδακτορικής διατριβής εξ ολοκλήρου ή τμήματος αυτής, για εμπορικό σκοπό. Επιτρέπεται η ανατύπωση, αποθήκευση και διανομή για σκοπό μη κερδοσκοπικό, εκπαιδευτικής ή ερευνητικής φύσης, υπό την προϋπόθεση να αναφέρεται η πηγή προέλευσης και να διατηρείται το παρόν μήνυμα. Ερωτήματα που αφορούν τη χρήση της διδακτορικής διατριβής για κερδοσκοπικό σκοπό πρέπει να απευθύνονται προς τον συγγραφέα.

Η έγκριση της διδακτορικής διατριβής από το Πάντειον Πανεπιστήμιο Κοινωνικών και Πολιτικών Επιστημών δεν δηλώνει αποδοχή των γνωμών του συγγραφέα.

To my mother

Abstract1
Περίληψη3
Introduction
The ILO conventional definition of the employment status8
The self-perceived measurement of the employment status10
Alternative measures of unemployment12
Method19
Participants19
Measures
The ILO conventional measurement of the employment status24
The EU-LFS self-perceived measurement of the employment status26
Two alternative measures of the employment status27
Statistical analysis
Results
Europeans' perceptions of their employment status as they compare to the ILO conventional definitions
Alternative measures of unemployment as they compare to the self-perceived and the ILO conventional measurements
The impact of applying different definitions of unemployment to the measurement of the unemployment rate
Discussion and conclusions
References
Appendix

### Contents

### Tables

Table 1 The Shiskin unemployment measures based on varying definitions of	
unemployment and the labour force	14
Table 2 Bureau of Labour Statistics: alternative measures of unemployment and	
other forms of labour resource underutilization	15
Table 3 Participants' aged 15-74 demographic and social characteristics:	
European Union Labour Force Survey, 2008-2015	20
Table 4 The EU-LFS self-perceived employment status during the reference	
week	27
Table 5 Europeans' (aged 15-74) perceptions of their employment status as	
they agree or disagree to the ILO conventional definitions (%)	34
Table 6 Europeans' (aged 15-74) perceptions coinciding with the ILO	
conventional definitions of the employed, unemployed and inactive (%)	36
Table 7 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Austria (%)	39
Table 8 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Belgium (%)	40
Table 9 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Bulgaria (%)	41
Table 10 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Denmark (%)	42
Table 11 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Finland (%)	43
Table 12 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: France (%)	44
Table 13 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Greece (%)	45
Table 14 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Hungary (%)	46
Table 15 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Ireland (%)	47
Table 16 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Italy (%)	48

Table 17 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Netherlands (%)	49
Table 18 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Poland (%)	50
Table 19 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Portugal (%)	51
Table 20 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Romania (%)	52
Table 21 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Spain (%)	53
Table 22 The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting	
perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Sweden (%)	54
Table 23.1 Europeans (aged 15-74) employment status (%) according to the	
ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to	
the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey, 2008-	
2012	57
Table 23.2 Europeans (aged 15-74) employment status (%) according to the	
ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to	
the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey, 2013-	
2015	59
Table 24.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Austria, 2008-2011	67
Table 24.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Austria, 2012-2015	68
Table 25.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Belgium, 2008-2011	69
Table 25.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	

according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Belgium, 2012-2015	70
Table 26.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Bulgaria, 2008-2011	71
Table 26.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Bulgaria, 2012-2015	72
Table 27.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Denmark, 2008-2011	73
Table 27.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Denmark, 2012-2015	74
Table 28.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Finland, 2008-2011	75
Table 28.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Finland, 2012-2015	76
Table 29.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of France, 2008-2011	77
Table 29.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	

two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of France, 2012-2015	78
Table 30.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Greece, 2008-2011	79
Table 30.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Greece, 2012-2015	80
Table 31.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Hungary, 2008-2011	81
Table 31.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Hungary, 2012-2015	82
Table 32.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Ireland, 2008-2011	83
Table 32.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Ireland, 2012-2015	84
Table 33.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Italy, 2008-2011	85
Table 33.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	

Force Survey of Italy, 2012-2015	86
Table 34.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Netherlands, 2008-2011	87
Table 34.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Netherlands, 2012-2015	88
Table 35.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Poland, 2008-2011	89
Table 35.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Poland, 2012-2015	90
Table 36.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Portugal, 2008-2011	91
Table 36.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Portugal, 2012-2015	92
Table 37.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Romania, 2008-2011	93
Table 37.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Romania, 2012-2015	94

Table 38.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Spain, 2008-2011	95
Table 38.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Spain, 2012-2015	96
Table 39.1 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Sweden, 2008-2011	97
Table 39.2 The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%)	
according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and	
two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour	
Force Survey of Sweden, 2012-2015	98
Table A1 The EU-LFS variables according to the Eurostat definitions	135
Table A2 SPSS syntax for the computation of the employment status based on	
alternative definition 1: European Union Labour Force Survey	140
Table A3 SPSS syntax for the computation of the employment status based on	
alternative definition 2: European Union Labour Force Survey	141
Table A4 Individuals in compulsory military service: European Union Labour	
Force Survey	144
Table A5 SPSS syntax for creating an overtime comparable measurement of the	
highest level of educational attainment: European Union Labour Force Survey	145
Table A6 Missing values of the self-perceived measurement of the employment	
status: European Union Labour Force Survey	146
Table A7 Missing values of both alternative measurements of the employment	
status: European Union Labour Force Survey	147
Table A8 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey, 2008-2015	148

# Figures

Figure 1 The ILO conventional measurement of the employment status used in	
the EU-LFS. Reproduced from EU Labour Force Survey database user guide,	
by Eurostat, 2016, Luxembourg: Office for official publications of the	
European Communities, p. 55	25
Figure 2 The measurement of the employment status according to the	
alternative definition 1	28
Figure 3 The formalization of the coinciding and conflicting perceptions'	
groups of the employment status measurement as they compare to the ILO	
conventional definitions	29
Figure 4 The coinciding and conflicting perceptions' groups as they compare to	
the ILO conventional definitions of the employed, unemployed and inactive	30
Figure 5 The analysis of the demographic and social "profile" of the	
unemployed based on the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived	
measurement and the two alternative definitions of the employment status	32
Figure 6 The analysis of the unemployment rate based on the ILO conventional	
measurement, the self-perceived measurement and the two measurement	
alternative to the ILO conventional definitions	33
Figure 7 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Austria, 2008-	
2015	106
Figure 8 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Belgium, 2008-	
2015	106
Figure 9 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Bulgaria, 2008-	
2015	107
Figure 10 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Denmark, 2008-	

2015	107
Figure 11 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Finland, 2008-	
2015	108
Figure 12 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of France, 2008-	
2015	108
Figure 13 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Greece, 2008-	
2015	109
Figure 14 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Hungary, 2008-	
2015	109
Figure 15 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Ireland, 2008-	
2015	110
Figure 16 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Italy, 2008-	
2015	110
Figure 17 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Netherlands, 2008-	
2015	111
Figure 18 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional	
definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO	
definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Poland, 2008-	
2015	111

xiii

Figure 19 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Portugal, 2008-2015..... 112 Figure 20 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Romania, 2008-2015..... 112 Figure 21 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Spain, 2008-2015..... 113 Figure 22 The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Sweden, 2008-2015..... 113

#### Abstract

The unemployment rate is an important indicator with both social and economic dimensions considered to signify a country's social and economic wellbeing. For its measurement the European Union Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) is using a synthesized economic construct according to the International Labour Organization (ILO) conventional definitions of the employed, unemployed and inactive. In this dissertation, people's perceptions of their employment status as they compared to the ILO conventional definitions were investigated in order to decide whether or not conflicting and coinciding perceptions differed overtime within-nations and crossnationally. The analysis was based on the 2008-2015 annual datasets for sixteen European countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Sweden. The detailed examination of the demographic and social "profile" of Europeans' coinciding and conflicting perceptions to the ILO conventional definitions revealed that the pattern of the demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions within each country was in the main systematic overtime. But the surprisingly high percentages of Europeans' perceptions of their employment status in agreement with the ILO conventional definitions indicated that this question should precede and not follow the questions on the labour status according to the ILO conventional definitions or the questions on the registration at the public employment office as is the Eurostat instruction to participating countries. Also, two alternative definitions of the employment status were formulated as variations of the ILO conventional definitions. Comparison of these alternative measurements to the ILO conventional measure and the self-perceived measurement resulted in different distributions of the employment status. The investigation of the demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed resulting from the application of the self-perceived measurement and the two alternative measurements to the ILO conventional definitions of the employment status showed that they did differ. The more changes were identified overtime and at the national level for the demographic variables gender and age than the social variables marital status and level of educational attainment. Furthermore, the application of the two alternative measurements to the EU-LFS data resulted in an increase of the official unemployment rate in all countries. More remarked was the

increase in the cases of Belgium, Hungary, Ireland, Italy and especially that of Romania. In all countries, the unemployment rate as defined by the ILO increased when the self-perceived measurement was applied except in the case of the Netherlands. The resulting increase was higher in the cases of Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Portugal. The results are reported for the age group 15-74 so as to allow for comparability with the ILO conventional definition of unemployment. This methodological study contributes to the growing research on the measurement of unemployment by demonstrating the importance of the measurements' definitions and the complexity of classifying key variables used in social research.

Keywords: Employment status, ILO, EU-LFS, alternative measures of unemployment

### Η επίδραση των ορισμών κατά τη μέτρηση της ανεργίας: Δεδομένα από την Έρευνα Εργατικού Δυναμικού, 2008-2015

Αγγελική Υφαντή

#### Περίληψη

Το ποσοστό ανεργίας είναι ένας σημαντικός δείκτης τόσο με κοινωνικές όσο και με οικονομικές διαστάσεις, που θεωρείται ότι υποδεικνύει την κοινωνική και οικονομική ευζωία μιας χώρας. Η μέτρησή του στην Έρευνα Εργατικού Δυναμικού (EU-LFS) βασίζεται σε μία σύνθετη οικονομική έννοια, η οποία είναι σύμφωνη με τους ορισμούς του Διεθνούς Οργανισμού Εργασίας (ILO) και κατατάσσει τον πληθυσμό σε εργαζομένους, ανέργους και οικονομικά μη ενεργούς. Στην παρούσα διατριβή, ερευνήθηκε η αντίληψη των ατόμων για τη κατάσταση απασχόλησής τους σε σύγκριση με την κατάταξη απασχόλησης σύμφωνα με τους ορισμούς του ILO, με σκοπό να διαπιστωθεί εάν οι αντιφατικές αντιλήψεις και οι αντιλήψεις που συμπίπτουν με τον ορισμό διαφέρουν διαχρονικά σε επίπεδο εθνικό αλλά και μεταξύ των χωρών σε διεθνές επίπεδο. Η ανάλυση βασίστηκε στα ετήσια δεδομένα της EU-LFS για τα έτη 2008-2015 για δεκαέξι Ευρωπαϊκές χώρες: Αυστρία, Βέλγιο, Βουλγαρία, Δανία, Φινλανδία, Γαλλία, Ελλάδα, Ουγγαρία, Ιρλανδία, Ιταλία, Ολλανδία, Πολωνία, Πορτογαλία, Ρουμανία, Ισπανία και Σουηδία. Η λεπτομερής εξέταση του δημογραφικού και του κοινωνικού «προφίλ» των Ευρωπαίων που συμφωνούν ή διαφωνούν με τον συμβατικό ορισμό του ILO αποκάλυψε ότι το μοτίβο του δημογραφικού και κοινωνικού «προφίλ» παρέμενε συστηματικό διαχρονικά σε εθνικό επίπεδο. Όμως, τα απροσδόκητα υψηλά ποσοστά των αντιλήψεων των Ευρωπαίων για την κατάσταση απασχόλησής τους που συμφωνούν με τον συμβατικό ορισμό του ILO έδειξαν ότι το ερώτημα του αυτοπροσδιορισμού πρέπει να προηγείται και όχι να ακολουθεί τα ερωτήματα για την κατάσταση απασχόλησης του συμβατικού ορισμού του ILO, ή τα ερωτήματα σχετικά με την εγγραφή στα μητρώα των δημοσίων γραφείων απασχόλησης όπως ρητά προσδιορίζεται από τις οδηγίες της Eurostat στις συμμετέχουσες χώρες. Επίσης, δομήθηκαν δύο εναλλακτικοί ορισμοί της κατάστασης απασχόλησης ως παραλλαγές των συμβατικών ορισμών του ILO. Η σύγκριση αυτών των εναλλακτικών ορισμών με τον συμβατικό ορισμό του ΙLO και τη μέτρηση του αυτοπροσδιορισμού είχε ως αποτέλεσμα διαφορετικές κατανομές της κατάστασης απασχόλησης. Η διερεύνηση του δημογραφικού και κοινωνικού «προφίλ» των ανέργων που προέκυψε από την εφαρμογή της μέτρησης του αυτοπροσδιορισμού και των δύο εναλλακτικών μετρήσεων της κατάστασης απασχόλησης έδειξε ότι διαφέρουν. Οι περισσότερες αλλαγές εντοπίστηκαν ανάμεσα στα έτη και σε εθνικό επίπεδο για τις δημογραφικές μεταβλητές του φύλου και της ηλικίας κυρίως από ό,τι στις κοινωνικές μεταβλητές της οικογενειακής κατάστασης και του εκπαιδευτικού επιπέδου. Επιπλέον, η εφαρμογή των δύο εναλλακτικών ορισμών στα δεδομένα της EU-LFS είχε ως αποτέλεσμα την αύξηση του επίσημου ποσοστού ανεργίας σε όλες τις χώρες. Αξιοσημείωτη ήταν η αύξηση στο Βέλγιο, την Ουγγαρία, την Ιρλανδία, την Ιταλία αλλά ιδιαίτερα την Ρουμανία. Σε όλες τις χώρες, αυξήθηκε όταν ποσοστό ανεργίας εφαρμόστηκε η μέτρηση το του αυτοπροσδιορισμού, εκτός από την περίπτωση της Ολλανδίας. Η αύξηση που προέκυψε ήταν υψηλότερη στις περιπτώσεις της Βουλγαρίας, της Ουγγαρίας, της Ιταλίας και της Πορτογαλίας. Τα αποτελέσματα αναφέρονται για την ηλικιακή ομάδα 15-74 ετών, ώστε να θεμελιώνεται η συγκρισιμότητά τους με τον συμβατικό ορισμό του ILO. Αυτή η μεθοδολογική μελέτη συμβάλλει στην έρευνα για τη μέτρηση της ανεργίας, αναδεικνύοντας τη σημασία των ορισμών των μετρήσεων και την πολυπλοκότητα της ταξινόμησης βασικών μεταβλητών που χρησιμοποιούνται στην κοινωνική έρευνα.

Λέξεις κλειδιά: Κατάσταση απασχόλησης, Έρευνα Εργατικού Δυναμικού (EU-LFS), εναλλακτικοί ορισμοί της ανεργίας

#### Introduction

The unemployment rate is an important indicator with both social and economic dimensions, considered to signify a country's social and economic well-being. For its measurement well-defined concepts of the labour force, the employed and unemployed, are required. A precise set of such concepts for measurement purposes was first developed in the late 1930s for the USA national survey of households, the Monthly Report of Unemployment, initiated in 1940 by the Works Projects Administration (WPA, known before 1939 as Works Progress Administration). In August 1942, the Bureau of the Census conducted the household survey that was renamed as the Monthly Report of the Labor Force (Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2003; Bregger, 1984; Kostanich, 1996). In 1943, Morris Hansen and William Hurwitz redesigned the survey introducing probability sampling and their pioneering work and contribution in sample survey theory and practice is of worldwide acclaim. In 1948, the name of the survey changed to the present Current Population Survey (CPS). In 1959, the Bureau of Labour Statistics undertook the responsibility for the analysis and publication of the CPS data (Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2003; Bregger, 1984; Kostanich, 1996). The Bureau of the Census continues to design, execute and collect the CPS data, maintaining the high standards of theory and practice that the series of survey samples is famous for.<sup>1</sup>

In Europe, the use of labour force surveys (LFS) was delayed not only because of the war but also due to the existence of comprehensive unemployment registers for dispensing compensation in most countries. In 1950, France was the first European country to conduct a LFS that evolved in the early 1960s into a regular series. The Federal Republic of Germany initiated an annual series (Mikrozensus) in 1957. Sweden conducted the first LFS in 1959 and initiated a quarterly series in 1963 (Eurostat, 2003).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The extraordinary work of Morris Hansen (1910-1990) and William Hurwitz (d. 1969) for CPS at the Bureau of the Census and their contribution to survey sample theory and practice is presented in many papers and historical reviews: Hansen and Hurwitz (1943); Stephan (1948); Hansen, Hurwitz and Madow (1953); Hansen, Hurwitz, Nisselson and Steinberg (1955); Kish (1965); Hansen and Madow (1976); Kruskal and Mosteller (1980); O' Muircheartaigh and Wong (1981); Hansen, Dalenius and Tepping (1985); Hansen (1987); Olkin (1987); Bellhouse (1988); Duncan and Shelton (1992); Waksberg and Goldfield (1996). See also Michalopoulou (2004). For a detailed, summary description of the major changes in the CPS see: Kostanich (1996).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Note that, the National Statistical Service of Greece (renamed since 2010 as the Hellenic Statistical Authority, ELSTAT) conducted during the 1960s five pilot surveys of employment. The second sample survey of 1962 was designed by Des Raj and his major contribution to sample survey theory and

The European Union Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) is a set of independent national multipurpose surveys conducted by the respective statistical offices of the member countries under the auspices of Eurostat complying with all regulations.<sup>3</sup> For the measurement of the unemployment rate, in order to satisfy one of the essential requirements permitting the comparability of the EU–LFS data between countries and successive surveys,<sup>4</sup> all EU–LFSs use the definition adopted by the International Labour Organization (ILO), as agreed at the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) in 1982 and 1987, respectively (Hussmanns, Mehran, & Verma, 1990). Although this definition is internationally used, considered by many to be the most objective measure, being by definition a single measure for an otherwise complex social phenomenon, it has been sharply criticized mainly in that it under estimates unemployment, raising public concern especially in recessionary times. Also, in the early 1940s, its theoretical conception, or the lack of it, was criticized by Long (1942, pp. 28-29) who noted that:

The single, all-use measure of the WPA is not unemployment at all, but some magnitude of illegitimate conception with the courtesy title. The father of the magnitude is more likely to be statistical expediency than economic theory, social philosophy, or even government policy. The magnitude, forced to serve all purposes, cannot safely be used to serve any important purpose.

In February 2011, Professor David Card (2011, p. 10), reviewing the conceptual history of the unemployment rate, considered its origins as "atheoretical", i.e. as

practice was published in 1964 (Raj, 1964). The 1962 survey was briefly presented by Des Raj in his 1964 well known paper and in great detail in his book published in 1968 (Raj, 1964 and 1968). Robert Pearl (Bureau of the Census) designed the employment survey of 1966 that initiated a regular series (Michalopoulou, 2004). The first LFS was conducted in 1974, but until 1980, the survey population covered only urban and semi-urban areas. In 1981, the annual national series of household surveys was initiated. In 1998, the survey was redesigned in the present quarterly series (National Statistical Service of Greece, 2006; Michalopoulou, 2004; Yfanti, 2010).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> According to the information provided by Eurostat, the EU-LFS is currently conducted in the 28 Member States of the European Union, three countries of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA; Iceland, Norway and Switzerland) and three EU candidate countries (Montenegro, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey): http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/microdata/european-union-labour-force-survey and http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/lfs/overview and.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> In 1994, Leslie Kish defined seven major aspects of the design of national sample surveys that should be considered for comparability, the first being the definition of concepts, variables and population. According to Kish (1994, p. 167), "similarity and standardization of the survey aspects [definitions, methods and measurements] are essential to avoid biases in comparisons, though admittedly difficult". See also: Kish (1994, pp. 167-168, 171-175 and 179); Michalopoulou (2004, pp. 437-438, 453-461); Michalopoulou (2008) and Karanikoli (2009). Vijay Verma has published extensively on the comparability of the Eurostat surveys; for the EU–LFS see, for instance: Verma (1995, 1999, 2002) and Gagliardi, Verma and Ciampalini (2009). For a detailed discussion on the comparability of CPS and EU–LFS definitions and concepts for the measurement of unemployment see: Sorrentino (2000, 2002).

another case of measurement without theory.<sup>5</sup> Long (1942, p. 5), emphasizing the multiplicity of the concept, pointed out that "the really fundamental defect of all statistical definitions is the same as that of the theoretical definitions of the scientific group: the failure to recognize that there is more than one definition and estimate of unemployment".

In addition, Long (1942) clarified further in a footnote to "some magnitude of illegitimate conception with the courtesy title" that "the census has usually, and commendably, avoided the term" (p. 28). Indeed, the measurement of the employment status as one of the occupational background variables included in the census and all social large-scale sample surveys is defined on the basis of how people perceive it (Yfanti, Michalopoulou, Mimis, & Zachariou, 2017, 2018).

In 1994, the UK unemployment figures were intensely debated as worthless and manipulated by the government, claims that led the *Royal Statistical Society* to set up a working party, presided by Professor David Bartholomew, to investigate the matter. In their report, Bartholomew, Moore, Smith, & Allin (1995, p. 364) noted that:

It has been the failure to define a precise classification which has often caused so much ambiguity and uncertainty in the discussions about the level of unemployment. The employment situation is a complex process in which people move in and out at different 'states' over time. A full description must reflect that complexity and any expectation that its essence can be expressed in a single number, however skillfully constructed, must be dispelled.

Bartholomew et al (1995, pp. 377 and 389) emphasizing that, "the decision as to what to be counted as 'unemployment' in any particular context is a political, and not a statistical, question" concluded that "a battery of indicators, rather than one single indicator, is essential if the complex labour market is to be better understood than at present".

In this dissertation, we first investigated how people's perceptions of their employment status would differ from the ILO definitions, henceforth referred to, following Sorrentino (1993), as the ILO conventional definitions of the employed, unemployed and inactive by obtaining a demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting perceptions. In recognition of the multiplicity of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> In 1947, Tjalling Koopmans (1910-1985) coined the phrase "measurement without theory" in which: "The various choices as to what to 'look for', what economic phenomena to observe, and what measures to define and compute, are made with a minimum of assistance from theoretical conceptions or hypotheses regarding the nature of the economic processes by which the variables studied are generated" (Koopmans 1947, p. 161).

concept and the requirement for precise definitions when measurement is under consideration, two alternative definitions in the context of the EU–LFS measurement of the unemployment were formulated as variations of the ILO conventional definitions. Applying these broader alternative definitions to the data, the demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed as defined by the ILO conventional definition, people's perceptions and the two alternative measures was compared. In this respect, although Steven Haugen (2009, p. 11) showed that the six alternative measures of unemployment applied to the CPS data for January 1994-2009 "follow a nearly identical track", the implications of applying different definitions of unemployment to subpopulations of interest for social policy purposes are investigated. Finally, the impact of applying these four different measures to the unemployment rate was assessed.

#### The ILO conventional definition of the employment status

The EU–LFS classifies the population of working age (15+ years) into three mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories: employed, unemployed and economically inactive. The EU–LFS definitions of the employed and unemployed, as mentioned before, were adopted by the ILO as agreed at the 13<sup>th</sup> (October 1982) and with the minor changes agreed at the 14<sup>th</sup> (October-November 1987) ICLS, are briefly as follows (Eurostat, 2003, pp.12-14):

*Employed* are all persons aged 15 years and over who, during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or who were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of something like illness, holiday, industrial dispute or education and training.

Unemployed are persons aged 15 to 74 who were:

(a) without work during the reference week, i.e. neither had a job nor were at work (for one hour or more) in paid employment or self-employment;

(b) currently available for work, i.e. were available for paid employment or self- employment before the end of the two weeks following the reference week;

(c) actively seeking work, i.e. had taken specific steps in the four weeks period ending with the reference week to seek paid employment or self-employment or who found a job to start later, i.e. within a period of at most three months. *Inactive* are those classified as neither employed nor unemployed.

This decision of the ICLS on the unemployment measurement is in line with Bartholomew et al. (1995, p. 377) comment that is a political and not a statistical question. Furthermore, Garrido and Toharia (2004), analysing the effects of the European Commission regulation 1897/2000 on the definition of the unemployment, questioned the nature of the regulation in deleting passive job seekers from the unemployed and concluded that the adopted decision is a political and not a technical one.

It should be noted that, according to the conventional definition of the employed, the one hour's work a week criterion is sufficient to classify a person as employed and consequently, as unemployed a person who did no paid work at all during the reference week.

Eurostat (2003, p. 13) clarifies that, for the unemployed who are actively seeking work (c), the following are considered as specific steps:

- having been in contact with a public employment office to find work, whoever took the initiative (renewing registration for administrative reasons only is not an active step),
- having been in contact with a private agency (temporary work agency, firm specialising in recruitment, etc.) to find work,
- applying to employers directly,
- asking among friends, relatives, unions, etc., to find work,
- placing or answering job advertisements,
- studying job advertisements,
- taking a recruitment test or examination or being interviewed,
- looking for land, premises or equipment,
- applying for permits, licences or financial resources.

Eurostat (2003, pp. 13-14) clarifies further, that:

Education and training are considered as ways of improving employability but not as methods of seeking work. Persons without work and in education or training will only be classified as unemployed if they are 'currently available for work' and 'seeking work', as defined in points (b) and (c).

Lay-offs are classified as unemployed if they do not receive any significant wage or salary (significant is set at = 50%) from their employer and if they are 'currently available for work' and 'seeking work'. Lay-offs are treated as a case of unpaid leave initiated by the employer — including leave paid out of government budget or by funds ( $16^{th}$  ICLS).<sup>6</sup> In this case, lay-offs are classified as employed if they have an agreed date of return to work and if this date falls within a period of three months.

During the off-season, seasonal workers cannot be considered as having a formal attachment to their high-season job because they do not continue to receive a wage or salary from their employer although they may have an assurance of return to work. If they are not at work during the off-season, they are classified as unemployed only if they are 'currently available for work' and 'seeking work', as defined in points (b) and (c).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See: The 16<sup>th</sup> International Conference of Labour Statisticians (1998).

Finally, the official unemployment rate published by the statistical offices is the unemployed as a percent of the labour force (the sum of the employed and unemployed). For its calculation a combination of answers to several questions of the EU-LFS questionnaire is required.

#### The self-perceived measurement of the employment status

As, mentioned in previous work, (Yfanti, Michalopoulou, & Zachariou, 2018; Yfanti, Michalopoulou, Mimis, & Zachariou, 2017, 2018), in all social large-scale sample surveys and the census, demographic and socio-economic variables are included as background variables to provide information necessary for defining subpopulations and "contexts in which respondents' opinions, attitudes, and behavior are socioeconomically embedded" (Braun & Mohler, 2003, p. 115; see also Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, 2008; Wolf & Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, 2003). Background variables are considered "to provide the backbone of statistical analyses" (Braun & Mohler, 2003, p. 114) in national and cross-national sample surveys. Furthermore, background variables, "in addition to providing general contextual/collateral information, they are used as independent variables, as socio-economic covariates of attitudes, behavior, or test scores, etc. and in all sorts of statistical models, in particular, as exogenous factors in causal analysis" (Braun & Mohler, 2003, p. 101). Moreover, background variables have been and will continue to be used in order to assess the quality of the realized sample by carrying out detailed comparisons of their distributions to the more recent available respective census data (Braun & Mohler, 2003), since "it is only sound practice to test a theoretical result empirically" (Stephan & McCarthy, 1958). In the case of the employment status, i.e. one of the occupational background variables, because of its great overtime variability, the census data available for such comparisons is most of the time outdated. Recognition of this fact "leads us to consider alternatives, especially the possibility of comparing the results obtained by one sample survey on such ... [a variable] with the results obtained by other sample surveys" (Stephan & McCarthy, p. 156). In this respect, the more appropriate "other [such] sample survey" that provides updated information is the Labour Force Survey (LFS) and, in this instance, the European Union Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). However, the measurement of the employment status as a background variable

included in all large-scale sample survey and the census is defined on the basis of how people perceive it, whereas the EU-LFS measurement of the employment status is based, as mentioned before, on a synthesized economic construct computed using a number of variables according to the ILO conventional definitions that classify the population of working age (15 years or more) into three mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories: employed, unemployed and inactive. These two measurements are not comparable and their results will differ since a composite economic construct would normally deviate from people's perceptions.

In the literature, the debate on the definition or concept especially of unemployment is of long standing (see for a review Yfanti, Michalopoulou, & Zachariou, 2017). As Gauckler and Körner (2011, p. 186) pointed out, "measuring the ILO employment status in household surveys and censuses is challenging in several respects... The ILO defines employment in the broadest term, whereby one hour per work counts as being employed. A small job of one hour per week is enough. Such a definition will sometimes be in conflict with the respondent's everyday life perception." Eurostat (2009, p. 58), presenting an extensive analysis on whether the ILO definitions capture all unemployment and meet current and potential user needs, concluded that "there is no need for a revision of the ILO labour force concept when it is looked at from an economic perspective or when it is considered for international comparability... However, there is a point to make concerning the ILO definition of unemployment. It intends to capture only a restricted part of the whole labour reserve, i.e. the one showing a strong attachment to the labour market. It is not meant to measure the entire labour reserve. Jones and Riddell (1999), based on their results that indicated a substantial heterogeneity within the non-employed and a distribution of degrees of labour force attachment to be separated into distinct groups that displayed different behaviour, proposed that additional information appears necessary to identify activities such as "wait unemployment." Furthermore, Brandolini, Cipollone and Viviano (2004), discussing the heterogeneity of the labour market groups and the difficulty of a single definition of unemployment, pointed out the existence of large differences not only among countries, but also among socio-demographic groups within the same country.

All these "grey areas" of labour force attachment make the analysis difficult as the ILO conventional definitions do not reflect individuals' situation in the labour market as they perceive it. It is in this respect that Eurostat decided in 2006 to include the self-perceived employment status in the annual datasets as a supplementary indicator to the ILO concepts intended to capture all these complexities. However, in 2008, Eurostat changed the reference period for this measurement (Eurostat, 2008a) and consequently comparability is attained for the 2008 and subsequent surveys. In 2011, de la Fuente briefly discussed the coverage problems of self-perceived unemployment and the three new Eurostat indicators that were introduced as supplementary to the unemployment rate based on the results of EU-LFS for 2010. Gauckler and Körner (2011) investigated the comparability of the employment status measurement in the German LFS and Census of 2011.

In this dissertation, by obtaining a demographic and social "profile" of agreement and disagreement between Europeans' declared self-perceptions of their employment status and the ILO conventional definitions, we were to investigate whether or not conflicting and coinciding perceptions would differ overtime withinnations and cross-nationally. The analysis was based on the 2008-2015 EU-LFS annual datasets for sixteen European countries.

#### Alternative measures of unemployment

In the literature, as mentioned before, the debate on the definition or concept especially of unemployment is of long standing. The debate on early measurement was presented analytically by Long (1942), Frankel and Stock (1942) and Card (2011). For the continuing, more recent debate see, among others, Purcell (1986) presents a critical review of concepts and current research. Cohany, Polivka and Rothgeb (1994) discuss the effects of the redesigned CPS on definitions and estimates. Bartholomew et al. (1995) present a detailed, critical evaluation of the definitions and measurement for UK. Murphy and Topel (1997) evaluated the recent histories of unemployment and nonemployment among American men. Polivka and Miller (1998) assessed the changes in the measurement of the redesigned CPS. Papell, Murray and Ghiblawi (2000) investigated multiple structural changes on a comparative basis. Bradbury (2006) presented a concise review of the current debate focusing on the dividing line between the unemployed and "marginally attached" of those out of the labour force. Hussmanns (2007) reviewed the basic concepts and definitions in an international standards context. Recktenwald (2008) discussed the measurement of employment and unemployment in the EU-LFS context. The analysis

presented by Jones and Riddell (1998, 1999) for Canada, Brandolini et al. (2004) for Italy, Garrido and Toharia (2004) for Spain and Schweitzer (2003) for the UK was based on the transition to employment probabilities and focuses on the line dividing the unemployed and those out of the labour force.

The debate on the definition or concept of unemployment for measurement purposes has mainly concentrated on the criteria for classifying persons to be counted as unemployed and is best summarized by Long (1942, p. 2) who noted that:

Many economists, it is true, concede the multiplicity of any economic idea; but even when such a concession is made the current attitude implies that, for practical purposes, unemployment can be roughly approximated by a single definition and a single statistical magnitude. Of course, no statistical magnitude, when finally approximated, is more vigorously challenged than is an estimate of unemployment. Yet the challenge is usually made on charges of statistical inaccuracy. *It is not often fully realized that conceptual limits of unemployment are not definite boundaries, but rather wide battlefields over which economic and social philosophies are still fighting.* 

Also, Long (1942, p. 2) pointed out that "the practical variability in measures of unemployment due to the concept used is large and unstable, and that single-definition estimates of unemployment, even when made with care as to statistical method, are apt to be unsafe for many, if not all uses". Long, throughout his paper, emphasized the multiplicity of the concept and the need for using more than one definition especially when "in time of deep depression it is possible that half of the real unemployment would be outside the current concept of superficial unemployment" (Long 1942, p. 29). In this respect, Shiskin (1976, p. 4) pointing out that "no single way of measuring unemployment can satisfy all analytical or ideological interests", developed for CPS seven alternative unemployment measures based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labour force presented in Table 1.

Shiskin (1976, pp. 4-5) noted that the alternative measures U-1 to U-7 "were chosen because they are representative of differing bodies of opinion about the meaning and measurement of unemployment; because they are meaningful and useful measures in their own right; and because they can generally be ranked along a scale from low to high". Shiskin's measures, known as the alternative unemployment indicators, provided the possibility of "capturing different characteristics of unemployment... [and] were presented simply as a variety of unemployment indicators that recognized varying views on who should be classified as unemployed"

(Bregger and Haugen 1995, p. 20). Shiskin's alternative measures were regularly published until the end of 1993.<sup>7</sup>

Table 1 The Shiskin uner	nployment measure	es based on	varying	definitions	of unemplo	oyment
and the labour force						

Measure	Definition
U-1	Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer, as a percent of the civilian labour force
U-2 U-3	Job losers, as a percent of the civilian labour force Unemployed persons aged 25 and older, as a percent of the civilian labour force aged 25 and older (the unemployment rate for persons aged 25 and older)
U4	Unemployed persons seeking full-time jobs, as a percent of the civilian labour force (the unemployment rate for full-time workers)
U–5	Total unemployed persons, as a percent of the civilian labour force (the official unemployment rate)
U-6	Total persons seeking full-time jobs, plus one-half of persons seeking part-time jobs, plus one-half of persons employed part-time for economic reasons, as a percent of the civilian labour force less one-half of the part-time labour force
U–7	Total persons seeking full-time jobs, plus one-half of persons seeking part-time jobs, plus one-half of persons employed part-time for economic reasons, plus discouraged workers, as a percent of the civilian labour force plus discouraged workers less one-half of the part-time labour force

Adapted from 'Employment and unemployment: the doughnut or the hole?', by J. Shiskin, 1976, *Monthly Labour Review*, 99(2), Table 1, p. 4.

In 1994, the CPS was redesigned and a new set of six alternative measures of unemployment was introduced, presented in Table 2.<sup>8</sup> The new range of measures is published regularly since February 1996 in the Employment Situation news release (Haugen 2009, p. 8).

These alternative measures are all expressed as rates, presented from lowest to highest, including the official unemployment rate, and by definition they either subtract from the official unemployment rate or add to it. Note that, the Current Population Survey defines the civilian labour force as the total of all civilians classified as employed plus and unemployed (aged 16 years or older not in institutions). The employed are all persons who, during the reference week, a) did any work at all as paid employees, worked in their own business, profession, or on their own farm, or worked 15 hours or more as unpaid workers in an enterprise operated by

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> For a detailed discussion of Shiskin's alternative unemployment indicators see: Bregger and Haugen (1995) and Haugen (2009, pp. 4-8).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> For a detailed discussion of the CPS U–1 to U–6 alternative measures of unemployment see: Bregger and Haugen (1995); Bradbury (2006, pp. 3 and 10) and Haugen (2009, pp. 8-11).

Table 2 Bureau of Labour Statistics: al	Iternative measure	s of unemployment	and other forms of
labour resource underutilization			

Measure	Definition
U-1	Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer, as a percent of the civilian labour force
U–2	Job losers and persons who completed temporary jobs, as a percent of the civilian labour force
U-3	Total unemployed persons, as a percent of the civilian labour force (the official unemployment rate)
U-4	Total unemployed persons plus discouraged workers, as a percent of the civilian labour force plus discouraged workers
U–5	Total unemployed persons, plus discouraged workers, plus all other 'marginally attached' workers, as a percent of the civilian labour force plus all 'marginally attached' workers
U–6	Total unemployed persons, plus all 'marginally attached' workers, plus all persons employed part time for economic reasons, as a percent of the civilian labour force plus all 'marginally attached' workers

Adapted from 'BLS introduces new range of alternative unemployment measures', by J.E. Bregger and S.E. Haugen, 1995, *Monthly Labour Review*, *118*(10), Exhibit 2, p. 23.

a member of their family, and b) all those who were not working but who had jobs or businesses from which they were temporarily absent. The unemployed are a) persons who had no employment during the reference week, were available for work, except for temporary illness, and had made specific efforts to find work sometime during the 4-week period ending with the reference week, and b) persons who were waiting to be recalled to the job from which they had been laid off, regardless of whether they have been looking for work. "Marginally attached" workers are persons who want a job, are explicitly available for work, and have looked for work sometime in the prior year, but are not currently looking. This subcategory of persons classified as not in the labour force includes discouraged workers (persons who have given a job-marketrelated reason for not currently looking. Persons employed part time for economic reasons are those who want and are available for full-time work but have had to settle for a part-time schedule (Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2003).

Also, Statistics Canada publish a range of nine alternative measures of the unemployment rate that are, as Bregger and Haugen (1995, p. 23) noted "roughly comparable" to the CPS measures. The National Institute of Statistics, Geography and Informatics of Mexico has developed a range of ten measures as complementary rates

of unemployment and labour underutilization, "perhaps the broadest range of indicators" (Bregger & Haugen, 1995, p. 23).<sup>9</sup>

Sorrentino (1993) investigated the international comparability of the CPS Shiskin's U–1 to U–7 alternative unemployment indicators. Her first study was based on data from the 1989 surveys of USA, Canada, Japan, Sweden, France, West Germany, Italy, Netherlands and UK. Her second study covered 1983-1993 for the same countries including Australia and Unified Germany (Sorrentino, 1995). But, as Haugen (2009, p. 11) noted, there are no international comparisons based on the CPS new range of alternative measures U–1 to U–6, "mainly because discouraged workers are not defined in other countries according to the U.S. definition", with the exception of Japan, where Yamagami (2002) published comparable estimates for the U–4 to U–6 measures.

Bartholomew et al. (1995), not favouring the CPS set of alternative measures because they are based on variations of the ILO definition, pointed out the need for the UK–LFS to implement alternative measures designed to reveal specific aspects of the unemployment process, and proposed four additional measures. They proposed the following alternative measures of unemployment:

(1) A measure of attachment to the labour force based on hours. This would capture some aspects of labour as a factor of production, including measures of under- and over-employment. It would also measure unsatisfied demand for work.

(2) A measure of long-term unemployment based on the failure to find 'real' work. Training courses while unemployed would not count as work. This should be a genuine measure of long-term distress.

(3) A social measure of the number wishing to work. This might, perhaps, use a version of the Netherland's approach. It should include discouraged workers who fail to meet the ILO definition because they have given up looking for work, for whatever reason.

(4) Separate measures of the 'young' unemployed and of the remainder. The ED [Employment Department] already produces some of these measures; our proposal is that they should be given greater prominence." (Bartholomew et al., 1995, p. 388)

However, although they considered these alternative measures suitable in the UK context, they questioned their international comparability. According to the Eurostat

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> For a detailed discussion of Statistics Canada alternative measures of the unemployment rate see: Devereaux (1992). For Canada's LFS definitions see: Statistics Canada (2010). For a detailed discussion of Mexico's complementary rates of unemployment and labour underutilization see: Martin (2000); Fleck and Sorrentino (1994).

(2008) representative at the ILO seminar on "Employment and unemployment: Revisiting the relevance and conceptual basis of the statistics", the development of alternative measures of unemployment for the EU–LFS is under consideration.

In this dissertation, given the limitations imposed by measurement, i.e. the questionnaire, the following two alternative definitions were formulated as variations of the ILO definition (see also, Yfanti 2010; Yfanti, Michalopoulou, Charalampi, 2017; Yfanti, Michalopoulou, Zachariou, 2017):

Alternative definition 1: Unemployed are all persons as defined by the conventional definition, plus the persons who were not actively seeking work, plus the persons who were not currently available for work, i.e. were not available for paid employment or self-employment before the end of the two weeks following the reference week but wanted work, plus the persons who were at work during the reference week working at most for four hours or usually worked for four hours.

Alternative definition 2: Unemployed are all persons as defined by alternative definition 1, plus the persons who were at work during the reference week working at most for eight hours or usually worked for eight hours.

Note that, for both alternative definitions, the usual hours of work a week were used instead of the conventional one hour of work during the reference week, because otherwise those on leave, sickness or other reason for absence from work would have been included in the definitions.

The one hour's work a week criterion was addressed at the 14<sup>th</sup> ICLS (1987). But, while the Conference agreed to retain the criterion on the basis of its international comparability, it was emphasized that the employment data should be classified by hours of work, making thus possible to apply different criteria. The one hour's work a week criterion is considered by many as clear and unambiguous in an international context. Hussmanns (2007) and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs-International Labour Office (2009) presented a detailed account for the reasons of using the one hour's work a week criterion in the international definition. But, as Bartholomew et al. (1995, p. 368) pointed out, although this definition is relatively easily applied on a cross-national basis, "it does not correspond closely to what the typical person would see as the dividing line between employment and unemployment". Statistics Netherlands and Mexico use also a 12 and 15 hours of work criterion, respectively, as more suitable.<sup>10</sup> Bartholomew et al. (1995) and Broersma, van Dijk and van Wissen (2004) discussed the Statistics Netherlands use of the 12 hours of work a week criterion. Statistics Mexico define the alternative measure R–6 as the conventional definition of the unemployed, plus the employed working less than 15 hours a week, as a percent of the labour force and measures R–7 and R–8 use a less than 35 hours a week criterion (Fleck & Sorrentino, 1994; Martin, 2000).

Initially, for the purposes of this dissertation, extensive tests were carried out using four, eight, 12 and 16 hours of work a week. Based on the results of these tests, it was decided to use four and eight hours of work a week, as more meaningful and specific, to best illustrate the differences of applying different definitions for the measurement of unemployment.

Stewart (1955, p.11) noted that "definition or concept is important because of the desirability of a measurement as suitable as possible for policy purposes and for an informed public opinion on current economic developments". In this respect, by applying these broader alternative definitions to the data, the demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed as defined by the ILO conventional definition, people's perceptions and the two alternative measures would be compared. Finally, the impact of applying all these different measurements to the unemployment rate would be demonstrated and assessed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> For the Statistics Netherlands international definition of unemployment, see: http://www.cbs.nl.en-GB/menu/methoden/toelichtingen/alfabet/i/international+definition+unemployment.htm.

#### Method

#### **Participants**

The analysis was based on the 2008-2015 European Union Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) annual datasets for the following 16 countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Sweden. These countries were selected from the 34 participating ones (see note 3) because the self-perceived measurement of the employment status was included in the datasets and also, in order to allow for possible cross-national comparisons between geographical regions as classified by the United Nations Statistics Division (n.d.): Eastern (Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania), Northern (Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Sweden), Southern (Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain) and Western (Austria, Belgium, France, Netherlands) Europe.

The EU-LFS, as mentioned before, is a set of independent national multipurpose social sample surveys conducted every year. Free access is provided to harmonised data by "the creation of a desired degree of comparability between statistics of different countries" (Ehling 2003, p. 17; see also, Recktenwald, 2008) for cross-national and overtime research from 1983 onwards (for the comparability issues of EU-LFS see, Eurostat (2003), Gagliardi et al.. 2009, and Verma (1995, 1999, 2002).

The EU-LFS survey population is defined as all persons aged 15 and over residing within private households in each country. Persons carrying out obligatory military or community service as well as persons in collective households (institutions, hospitals, etc.) are not included in the survey population (Eurostat, 2008a, 2009, 2013) as is the case in all large-scale sample surveys. More analytically, the EU-LFS survey population is defined as follows:

- A person belongs to the resident population of a given country if he is staying, or intends to stay, on the economic territory of that country for a period of one year or more.
- All individuals who belong to the same household are resident where the household has a centre of economic interest: this is where the household maintains a dwelling, or succession of dwellings, which members of the household treat, and use, as their principal residence. A member of a resident household continues to be a resident even if that individual makes frequent journeys outside the economic territory, because its centre of economic interest remains in the economy in which the household is resident.
- A person is regarded as temporarily absent from his/her household (respectively his/her country of residence) if he or she is staying, or intends to stay outside his household (respectively his/her country of residence) for a

period of less than one year. In this case he or she has to be considered as a member of his household (respectively his/her country of residence.

Special cases (people working away from home - students):

- (a) **Persons who work away from home during the week and who return to the family home at week-ends** should consider the **family home** as their place of usual residence regardless of whether their place of work is elsewhere in the country or abroad;
- (b) **Primary and secondary students who are away from home during the school term** should consider their **family home** as their place of usual residence regardless of whether they are pursuing their education elsewhere in the country or abroad;
- (c) Third level students who are away from home while at college or university should consider their term-time address as their place of usual residence regardless of whether this is an institution (such as a boarding school) or a private residence and regardless of whether they are pursuing their education elsewhere in the country or abroad. As an exceptional measure, where the place of education is within the country, the place of usual residence may be considered to be the family home. (Eurostat, 2013, p. 4)

For the purposes of this dissertation, the individuals aged 15-74 were considered so as to allow for comparability with the ILO conventional definition of unemployment (de la Fuente, 2011; Eurostat, 2016a). In Table 3, the realized sample sizes and a summary of the participants' aged 15-74 demographic and social characteristics are presented. Note that, Eurostat (2016) does not provide the raw age variable but a recoded one in years (15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, 65-69 and 70-74). Therefore, the mean from grouped data was computed.

				Age		Secondary	In paid
		Men	Women	(in years)	Married	education or	work
Country	Ν	(%)	(%)	Mean	(%)	lower (%)	(%)
Austria							
2008	6,362	49.5	50.5	43.0	52.2	85.3	45.8
2009	6,396	49.5	50.5	43.1	51.9	84.3	45.4
2010	6,427	49.5	50.5	43.3	51.4	84.1	58.6
2011	6,466	49.5	50.5	43.5	51.2	84.0	58.8
2012	6,508	49.5	50.5	43.6	50.8	83.5	59.1
2013	6,506	49.5	50.5	43.8	50.2	82.9	57.9
2014	6,548	49.5	50.5	43.9	49.8	73.9	57.4
2015	6,576	49.6	50.4	43.9	49.5	73.2	57.9
Belgium							
2008	7,970	49.9	50.1	43.1	52.7	73.0	54.6
2009	8,028	49.9	50.1	43.1	51.6	72.1	53.9
2010	8,081	49.9	50.1	43.2	51.0	70.7	54.3
2011	8,144	49.9	50.1	43.3	50.6	71.0	53.8

**Table 3** Participants' aged 15-74 demographic and social characteristics: European UnionLabour Force Survey, 2008-2015

				Age		Secondary	In paid
		Men	Women	(in years)	Married	education or	work
Country	N	(%)	(%)	Mean	(%)	lower (%)	(%)
Dalaina							
Belgium	Q 10 <i>4</i>	40.0	50.1	12 1	40.5	70.1	52 C
2012	0,194 0.024	49.9	50.1	43.4	49.3	70.1	55.0 52.6
2013	8,234	49.9	50.1	43.4	48.5	/0.0	53.6
2014	8,259	49.9	50.1	43.6	48.3	68.8	53.5
2015	8,299	49.9	50.1	43.7	47.2	68./	53.2
Bulgaria	C 007	40.0	<b>51 0</b>	42.7	(0.2	01.0	<i></i>
2008	5,987	48.8	51.2	43.7	60.3	81.8	55.3
2009	5,935	48.8	51.2	43.9	59.1	81.3	54.3
2010	5,819	49.3	50.7	43.9	58.2	80.9	52.4
2011	5,761	49.3	50.7	44.1	56.8	80.4	51.1
2012	5,682	49.3	50.7	44.4	55.6	80.0	51.4
2013	5,647	49.3	50.7	44.6	57.2	79.3	51.6
2014	5,611	49.3	50.7	44.8	57.3	77.1	52.7
2015	5,547	49.4	50.6	45.0	53.4	76.7	54.2
Denmark							
2008	4,093	50.2	49.8	43.7	53.5	74.6	63.0
2009	4,125	50.2	49.8	43.7	54.9	74.1	60.4
2010	4,150	50.1	49.9	43.8	52.7	73.5	58.5
2011	4,177	50.1	49.9	43.9	50.6	73.2	57.9
2012	4,199	50.2	49.8	44.0	49.9	72.6	57.3
2013	4,226	50.1	49.9	44.1	49.1	72.0	57.0
2014	4,254	50.1	49.9	44.1	48.5	71.3	56.8
2015	4,285	50.2	49.8	44.1	48.2	70.4	57.2
Finland	·						
2008	4,003	50.0	50.0	43.7	47.5	70.5	57.6
2009	4.023	50.0	50.0	43.8	46.9	69.9	55.7
2010	4.043	50.1	49.9	44.0	46.2	70.0	55.4
2011	4.057	50.1	49.9	44.1	46.8	68.5	55.7
2012	4 073	50.1	49.9	44.2	46.0	67.8	55 5
2013	4.085	50.1	49.9	44.3	46.5	68.1	54.9
2014	4 094	50.1	49.9	44 5	46.4	66.3	54.2
2015	4 102	50.1	49.9	44.6	47.0	65.4	53.9
France	1,102	2011		1110	1710	0011	0017
2008	44 606	48.8	51.2	42.9	<i>4</i> 9 1	767	56.9
2000	44 737	40.0	51.2	43.0	48.9	75.8	56.8
2007	<u>14 880</u>	-0.0 48 8	51.2	43.0	483	75.0	57 1
2010	45 000	-0.0 18 0	51.2	43.3	40.5 47 A	74.5	56.8
2011	45,070	40.7 18 0	51.1	43.3	47.4 16.6	73.9	567
2012	45,250	40.7 19 9	51.1	43.4	40.0	13.0 707	56.7
2013	45,554	40.0	51.2	43.0	43.0	/∠./ 71.7	50.2
2014	40,843	40.0	51.2	43.7	43.2	/1./	JJ.1 55.2
2015	4/,11/	48.8	51.2	43.9	44.9	/1.5	55.5

### Table 3 (continued)

				Age		Secondary	In paid
		Men	Women	(in years)	Married	education or	work
Country	N	(%)	(%)	Mean	(%)	lower (%)	(%)
Greece							
2008	8,328	49.4	50.6	43.7	60.7	81.7	53.8
2009	8,303	49.4	50.6	43.8	61.0	81.6	53.2
2010	8,305	49.5	50.5	43.9	60.9	80.6	51.8
2011	8,303	49.5	50.5	44.1	60.3	79.4	48.3
2012	8,313	49.6	50.4	44.2	59.7	78.8	44.2
2013	8,184	49.0	51.0	44.1	58.5	77.8	41.8
2014	8,135	49.1	50.9	44.3	58.4	77.0	42.3
2015	8,086	49.1	50.9	44.5	58.2	76.3	43.4
Hungary							
2008	7,710	47.8	52.2	42.9	51.6	84.2	49.6
2009	7,690	47.9	52.1	43.0	50.8	83.7	48.6
2010	7.686	47.9	52.1	43.2	50.2	83.4	48.5
2011	7 676	48.0	52.0	43.3	49.6	82.5	49.1
2012	7,677	48.1	51.9	43.5	48.9	81.5	50.0
2012	7,610	48.2	51.8	43.9	46.2	81.0	50.6
2013	7,573	48.3	51.0	44 1	46.4	80.2	53.7
2014	7 538	48.3	51.7	44.3	46.4	79.8	55.6
Ireland	7,550	-0.J	51.7			77.0	55.0
2008	3 208	50.2	10.8	40.0	50.1	717	61.3
2000	3,270	50.2	49.0 50.0	40.2	50.1	70.1	55.8
2009	3,379	30.0 40.8	50.0	40.2	50.5	70.1 68 8	53.6
2010	2 269	49.0	50.2	40.3	51.2	00.0 69.2	53.0
2011	2,200	49.0	50.2	40.9	51.5	00.5	55.2 52.7
2012	3,338 2,251	49.0	50.4	41.5	51.4	00.9 65 5	52.7
2013	3,331	49.0	50.4	41.7	51.0	05.5	54.0
2014	3,349	49.6	50.4	42.0	51.4	00.1	55.1
2015	3,355	49.4	50.6	42.3	51.8	64.6	56.5
Italy	15 005	10 5			<b>-</b> 0 <b>-</b>	00.4	50.0
2008	45,337	49.5	50.5	44.1	58.5	88.4	50.3
2009	45,563	49.4	50.6	44.2	58.2	88.2	49.4
2010	45,685	49.4	50.6	44.3	57.9	88.0	49.0
2011	45,800	49.4	50.6	44.5	57.4	87.8	49.1
2012	45,866	49.4	50.6	44.6	56.4	87.1	48.8
2013	45,556	49.3	50.7	44.9	55.6	86.6	47.7
2014	45,626	49.3	50.7	45.0	56.0	86.1	47.9
2015	45,520	49.4	50.6	45.1	55.8	85.5	48.5
Netherlands							
2008	12,285	50.1	49.9	43.2	52.0	73.3	57.4
2009	12,322	50.0	50.0	43.3	51.5	72.8	57.1
2010	12,412	50.0	50.0	43.5	53.9	72.7	57.4
2011	12,452	50.0	50.0	43.6	53.0	72.9	58.3
2012	12,541	50.0	50.0	43.8	53.2	72.1	58.2
2013	12,638	50.1	49.9	43.9	52.9	71.7	56.6
2014	12,665	50.0	50.0	44.0	51.6	71.1	56.8
2015	12,655	50.0	50.0	44.2	52.1	69.9	58.1

### Table 3 (continued)
				Age		Secondary	In paid
		Men	Women	(in years)	Married	education or	work
Country	Ν	(%)	(%)	Mean	(%)	lower (%)	(%)
<b></b>							
Poland	<b>2</b> 0.001	10.1	-1 -	44.5	<i>c</i> 0 <i>c</i>	0.4.1	
2008	29,091	48.4	51.6	41.7	60.6	84.1	52.5
2009	29,105	48.4	51.6	41.8	60.8	82.6	52.8
2010	28,609	49.0	51.0	42.2	60.6	81.4	52.4
2011	28,605	49.1	50.9	42.4	60.4	80.5	52.8
2012	28,577	49.0	51.0	42.7	60.4	79.4	53.0
2013	28,527	49.0	51.0	43.0	60.8	78.4	53.0
2014	28,452	49.0	51.0	43.3	61.3	77.3	54.1
2015	28,410	49.0	51.0	43.5	61.5	76.7	55.1
Portugal							
2008	8,140	48.9	51.1	43.0	65.2	88.4	60.1
2009	8,141	48.9	51.1	43.2	64.8	88.0	58.0
2010	8,123	48.9	51.1	43.4	64.8	87.3	57.2
2011	8,116	49.0	51.0	43.6	57.2	85.5	54.5
2012	8,060	49.0	51.0	43.8	55.7	84.4	51.6
2013	7,907	48.1	51.9	44.3	55.3	83.7	50.1
2014	7,860	47.9	52.1	44.5	55.7	82.0	52.0
2015	7,825	47.9	52.1	44.6	55.1	81.1	53.3
Romania	,						
2008	16.934	49.1	50.1	41.6	62.4	90.0	55.3
2009	16.885	49.1	50.9	41.8	62.7	89.5	54.7
2010	16,486	49.1	50.9	42.0	60.5	88.8	54.3
2011	16,749	49.1	50.9	42.1	59.8	87.8	53.3
2012	16 688	49.1	50.9	42.3	59.7	87.3	54.2
2012	15 370	49.4	50.6	43.3	59.3	87.1	54.3
2013	15,304	49.5	50.5	43.4	59.0	867	54.8
2015	15,226	49.6	50.5	43.6	59.8	86.0	54 7
Spain	15,220	47.0	50.4	45.0	57.0	00.0	54.7
2008	34 650	50.0	50.0	42.3	57.0	74.3	577
2000	34,050	50.0	50.0	42.5	567	73.0	53.6
2007	34,673	70.0	50.0	42.5	56.6	73.8	52.6
2010	34,673	49.9 70 8	50.2	42.7	56.3	73.8	51.7
2011	34,003	40.7	50.2	43.0	557	72.5	40.6
2012	24,494	49.7	50.3	43.5	52.2	71.0	49.0
2013	24,002 24,477	49.0	50.2	43.0	52.5	70.8	49.2
2014	54,477 24,512	49.7	50.5	45.9	52.8	09.7 60.0	49.9
2015 Sweden	54,512	49.7	50.5	44.2	52.0	69.0	51.2
Sweden	6 970	50 C	40.4	42.0	40.0	72.0	(1.)
2008	6,879	50.6	49.4	43.2	42.2	/3.8	61.2 50.2
2009	6,956	50.6	49.4	43.2	42.3	73.2	59.2
2010	7,022	50.6	49.4	43.3	42.5	72.5	58.7
2011	7,074	50.6	49.4	43.4	42.7	/1.6	59.7
2012	7,115	50.6	49.4	43.5	42.6	/0.8	59.6
2013	7,156	50.6	49.4	43.7	42.6	69.6	59.7
2014	7,205	50.6	49.4	43.8	42.5	68.1	59.8
2015	7,237	50.7	49.3	43.9	43.0	67.1	60.2

## Table 3 (continued)

Also, note that, the reference period for the respondent's self-declared employment status was defined as during the last week. As shown, gender was almost equally distributed in most countries with the exception of France, Hungary, Poland and Portugal - and to a lesser extent Bulgaria — where the samples included more women than men. The mean age was from 42.3 to 45.1 years in every country with the exception of Ireland where the participants were younger (40.0 to 42.3 years) and the same but to a lesser extent applied to the samples of Poland (41.7 to 43.5 years) and Romania (41.6 to 43.6 years). More than 46.0% of the participants were married, the majority had completed secondary education or lower and at least 45.4% were in paid work.

#### Measures

The ILO conventional measurement of the employment status. In Figure 1, the detailed EU-LFS measurement of the employment status based on a number of variables according to the ILO conventional definitions is presented. Note that, the definition of the unemployed applies only to respondents aged 15-74 years. As shown, a number of variables is used that define the labour status (WSTATOR), whether respondents were seeking employment (SEEKWORK), the methods for doing so (METHOD) and their availability to start work immediately within two weeks (AVAILABLE).

The variable WSTATOR measures the labour status during the reference week for all respondents aged 15 years or more according to the ILO conventional definitions. This variable takes the value one (1) when respondents did any work for pay or profit for one hour or more, including family work during the reference week. The second value (2) refers to respondents who despite of having a job or business did not work during the reference week because they were temporarily absent. The third value (3) is assigned to respondents who were not working because of lay-off. The fourth value (4) indicates the respondent who was a conscript on compulsory military service or community service. The fifth value (5) designates respondents who did not work nor had a job or business during the reference week (Eurostat, 2016).

The variable SEEKWORK is defined as seeking employment during previous four weeks. This variable takes the value one (1) when respondents have already found a job which will start within a period of at most three months. The second value (2) refers to respondents who have already found a job which will start in more than three months. The third value (3) is assigned to respondents who are not seeking employment and have not found any job to start later. The fourth value (4) indicates the respondent who is seeking employment. The variables METHODA to METHODM which are briefly presented in Figure 1 record the specific steps (methods) taken by respondents to find work (Eurostat, 2016).



**Figure 1** The ILO conventional measurement of the employment status used in the EU-LFS. Reproduced from *EU Labour Force Survey database user guide*, by Eurostat, 2016, Luxembourg: Office for official publications of the European Communities, p. 55.

The variable AVAILABLE is defined as the availability to start working within two weeks, if work were to be found. This variable takes the value one (1) when respondents could start to work immediately, i.e. within two weeks. The second value (2) indicates respondents who could not start to work immediately, i.e. within two weeks (Eurostat, 2016).

The EU-LFS self-perceived measurement of the employment status. The self-perceived employment status included in the EU-LFS is an optional variable for the participating countries, provided only in the annual datasets. It is available for most countries with the exception of Germany, Norway and the UK. This variable was first introduced in the EU-LFS questionnaire by Eurostat in 2006 as main status activity (MAINSTAT) and was defined as follows: "The 'main activity status' gives each person's self-perception regarding his/her activity status; for instance, students with small jobs will in general be classified as students. The reference period for this variable should be at least 3 months including the reference week" (Eurostat, 2006, p. 22). For the placement of this measurement in the questionnaire, Eurostat recommended that "this question shouldn't in any case precede the questions on the labour status according to the ILO definition or the questions on the registration at the public employment office" (Eurostat, 2006, p. 22). In 2008, this variable's definition underwent certain changes which are indicated in bold face: "The 'main activity status' gives each person's self-perception regarding his/her activity status; for instance, students with small jobs will in general **present themselves** as students. The reference period for this variable is the reference week" (Eurostat, 2008a, p. 109). Although, Eurostat (2008a, p. 109) the same recommendation for the placement of this variable in the questionnaire were repeated, Eurostat (2008a, p. 109) suggested, in the context of "good practices", to "put this question at the very end of the core questionnaire (together with the main status one year before), before the ad hoc module questions". The instruction for the deliverance of this question according to the Eurostat good practices rules is that the interviewers have to read out the question and all the response categories.

The change in the reference period of the self-perceived measurement of the employment status is essential for ensuring the cross-national and overtime comparability of the measurement (Carey, 2000; Verma & Gabilondo, 1993). In this respect, it was decided to base the analysis on the annual datasets from 2008 onwards when the same reference period was applied to the self-perceived measurement of the

employment status. Furthermore, because this measurement is a perception question, i.e. sensitive to its placement in the questionnaire (Stephan and McCarthy, 1958), a check of the questionnaires of all participating in the analysis countries was required in order to assess its cross-national and overtime comparability. Unfortunately, not all countries provide translated versions of their questionnaires into English, rendering suck a check difficult. Based on the available information, the questionnaires of Austria, France, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Spain and Sweden have adopted the Eurostat recommendation. However, in the case of the Irish questionnaire, the perception question precedes all other questions described by the Eurostat instruction. In Table 4, the self-perceived employment status as used in the EU-LFS questionnaire is presented (Eurostat, 2016).

 Table 4 The EU-LFS self-perceived employment status during the reference week

Carries out a job or profession, including unpaid work for a family	
business or holding, including an apprenticeship or paid traineeship, etc.	1
Unemployed	2
Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience	3
In retirement or early retirement or has given up business	4
Permanently disabled	5
In compulsory military service	6
Fulfilling domestic tasks	7
Other inactive person*	8
Not applicable (child less than 15 years)	9
No answer	^

\* Eurostat (2008a, p. 109) specifies that "code 8 should be also used to classify persons who cannot say they are 'carrying out a job or profession' nor fit into other groups but [are] on an extended leave from such a job".

As shown, this measurement is a perception question that gives the respondents the chance to identify their employment status as they perceive it.

Two alternative measures of the employment status. In Figure 2, the detailed measurement of the employment status as defined by alternative definition 1 (ALT1) is presented. As shown, a number of variables is used that define the employment status according to the ILO conventional definitions (ILOSTAT), the hours of usual work (HWUSUAL), the labour status (WSTATOR), whether respondents were seeking employment (SEEKWORK), the methods for doing so (METHOD) and for those not seeking work their willingness to work (WANTWORK). The values of this latter variable are defined as the individuals not

seeking employment but would nevertheless like to have work (value 1) or do not want to have work (value 2).



Figure 2 The measurement of the employment status according to the alternative definition 1

As shown, the usual hours of work during the reference week were used instead of the actual hours of work applied to the ILO conventional definitions, because otherwise those on leave, sickness or other reason for absence from work would have been included in the definitions. The second alternative definition was defined as the first alternative definition but with eight usual hours of work during the reference week.

The full description of all the EU-LFS variables used is presented in the Appendix as Table A1. The SPSS syntax for the creation of the alternative measures 1 and 2 is presented in the Appendix as Tables A2 and A3, respectively.

#### **Statistical analysis**

Eurostat updates all datasets each time it provides the data. In the dissertation the following releases of the datasets were used: for the years 2008- 2012 the data release of 2013 was used, for the years 2013-2014 the data release of 2016 was used and for the years 2015 the data release of 2017 was used. Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 20. All the results presented are based on the weighted datasets. All the datasets contain one set of weight.

In order to ensure measurement overtime within-nations and cross-national comparability, all measures (variables) have to be standardized (Kish, 1994; Carey, 2000; Verma & Gabilondo, 1993). In this respect, the variable measuring the self-perceived employment status was first recoded into the three categories of the employed, unemployed and inactive according to the ILO conventional definitions. Note that, individuals who were recorded as in military compulsory service (ILOSTAT = 4) in the datasets of Austria, Denmark, Finland and Sweden (Table A4) were excluded from the analysis since this category had no relevance in the formulation of the research questions.

Then, the recoded self-perceived measurement was cross-tabulated with the ILO conventional measurement (ILOSTAT) that was computed as presented in Figure 1. The diagonal defined the "agreement" group, i.e. people's perceptions coinciding with the ILO conventional definitions (Figure 3). The off diagonal cases defined the "disagreement" group, i.e., people's perceptions in conflict with the ILO conventional definitions (Figure 3).

	Self-pe	erceived measur	ement	
ILO	Employed	Unemployed	Inactive	
Employed	1	2	2	$1 \rightarrow \text{agreement}$
Unemployed	2	1	2	$2 \rightarrow \text{disagreement}$
Inactive	2	2	1	

**Figure 3** The formalization of the coinciding and conflicting perceptions' groups of the employment status measurement as they compare to the ILO conventional definitions

In the first step of the analysis, the frequency distributions of coinciding and conflicting perceptions to the ILO conventional definitions were inspected and assessed. The next step in the analysis was to obtain the demographic and social "profile" of both groups based on their demographic and social characteristics: gender (male, female), age (15-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64 and 65-74), marital status (single, married, and other, i.e. widowed, divorced or legally separated) and highest level of educational attainment (primary, secondary and tertiary). This methodology is summarized in Figure 4.



**Figure 4** The coinciding and conflicting perceptions' groups as they compare to the ILO conventional definitions of the employed, unemployed and inactive

Note that, initially, extensive checks were carried out for each category and based on these results it was decided to combine coinciding and conflicting perceptions into the before mentioned two groups. Also, several regression analyses were performed in order to find an interpretation for the conflicting perceptions to the ILO conventional definitions. However, these analyses did not result in anything worth mentioning mainly due to the limitations imposed by measurement, i.e. the EU-LFS questionnaire

For the measurement of the highest level of educational attainment, as mentioned before, a recoded version of the variable HATLEVEL was used (Eurostat, 2016). In The EU-LFS datasets, the definition of this variable is based on the International Standard Classification of Education 1997 (ISCED 97) up to 2013 and according to ISCED 2011 from 2014 onwards. The SPSS syntax for the creation of the recoded variables so as to ensure overtime comparability is presented in the Appendix as Table A5.

In the next step of the analysis, the frequency distributions of the ILO conventional measurement of the employment status, the self-perceived measurement and the two alternative measurements to the ILO definitions were investigated in great detail.

Inspection of the frequency distributions of the self-perceived measurement of the employment status showed that there were no missing values in the datasets of Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland and Portugal over all years. The number of missing values of this variable in most remaining countries was negligible (Table A6): Belgium (0.2% over all years, i.e. 13,000-19,000 individuals); Bulgaria (0.0% for 2008-2009, i.e. 1,000-2,000 individuals); Denmark (0.0% for 2008-2010, i.e. 1,000-2,000 individuals); Finland (0.0-0.1% for 2008-2014, i.e. 1,000-2,000 individuals); France (0.0% for 2009-2012, i.e. 11,000-14,000 individuals); Ireland (0.0% over all years, i.e. 1,000-2,000 individuals); Netherlands (0.1-0.2% for 2008-2009 and 2011-2015, i.e. 10,000-30,000 individuals); Sweden (0.1-0.3% for 2008-2013 and 2015, i.e. 10,000-22,000 individuals). Higher missing values were identified in the following datasets: France (1.6% for 2008, amounting to 693,000 individuals); Netherlands (2.4% for 2010, amounting to 296,000 individuals); Spain (1.2-1.3% over all years, i.e. 417,000-466,000 individuals); Sweden (1.1% for 2014, amounting to 81,000 individuals). In the case of Romania, the number of missing values for 2008-2010 ranged from 2.0-7.3% (336,000-1,238,000) and it was found that all missing values were from the inactive. It should be noted, that in the datasets of Denmark, Finland, France, Poland and Spain, on at least one case, the value of the weight variable was zero, negative or missing. Such cases are invisible to statistical procedures and graphs which require positively weighted cases, but they do remain on the data file.

Inspection of the frequency distributions of both alternative measurements of the employment status showed that there were no missing values in the datasets of Austria, Denmark, Greece, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania and Spain over all years. The number of missing values of both these measurements in most countries was negligible (Table A7): Belgium (0.3-1.0% over all years, i.e. 25,000-82,000 individuals); Finland (0.1-0.2% over all years, i.e. 6,000-10,000 individuals); Ireland (0.1-0.2% over all years, i.e. 4,000-9,000 individuals); Italy (0.1-0.3% for 2010-2015, i.e. 31,000-61,000 individuals); Sweden (0.1-0.2% over all years, i.e. 7,000-15,000 individuals). Higher missing values were identified in the following datasets: Bulgaria (2.5-3.7% over all years, i.e. 144,000-219,000 individuals); France (0.7-1.5% over all years, i.e. 314,000-687,000 individuals); Hungary (3.1-3.2% for 2014-2015, i.e. 235,000-245,000 individuals); Italy (0.4-0.5% for 2008-2009, i.e. 178,000-218,000 individuals); Portugal (1.1-3.2% over all years, i.e. 92,000-253,000 individuals). All missing cases were excluded from the analysis.

Then the analysis focused on obtaining the social and demographic "profile" of the unemployed defined by the self-perceived measurement and the two alternative

measurements to the ILO conventional definitions as they compared to the ILO conventional measurement. The "profiling" of the unemployed was based on the same social and demographic characteristics as before: gender (male-female); age (15-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64 and 65-74); marital status (single, married, and other, i.e. widowed, divorced or legally separated); and highest level of educational attainment (primary, secondary and tertiary). This methodology is summarized in Figure 5.



**Figure 5** The analysis of the demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed based on the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived measurement and the two alternative definitions of the employment status

In the final step of the analysis, the unemployment rate was computed based on the ILO conventional measurement of the employment status, the self-perceived measurement and the two alternative measurements to the ILO definitions. Then these four frequency distributions were compared to assess the impact of applying different definitions to the unemployment rate (Figure 6).



**Figure 6** The analysis of the unemployment rate based on the ILO conventional measurement, the self-perceived measurement and the two measurement alternative to the ILO conventional definitions

#### Results

# Europeans' perceptions of their employment status as they compare to the ILO conventional definitions

In Table 5, Europeans' overall perceptions of their employment status as they compare to the ILO conventional definitions are presented for sixteen European countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Sweden.

Country		2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		2000		2010	2011	2012	2010	-011	2010
Austria		02.2	00.1	01.0	01.0	01.0	01.0	01.5	01 7
	Agree	92.3	92.1	91.9	91.8	91.8	91.8	91.5	91.7
D.1.	Disagree	1.1	7.9	8.1	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.5	8.3
Belgium	1 <b>A</b>	04.0	016	047	04.2	04.1	045	04.6	047
	Agree	94.9	94.6	94.7	94.2	94.1	94.5	94.6	94.7
D-1	Disagree	5.1	5.4	5.5	5.8	5.9	5.5	5.4	5.5
Bulgaria	1 A	04.4	016	027	02.0	04.0	015	04.1	05 1
	Agree	94.4	94.6	93.7	93.8	94.0	94.5	94.1	95.1
D	Disagree	5.6	5.4	6.3	6.2	6.0	5.5	5.9	4.9
Denmar	K	01.7	01.2	01.0	00.5	00 6	00.7	00 5	00.5
	Agree	91./	91.3	91.0	90.5	90.6	90.7	90.5	90.5
<b>F</b> : 1 1	Disagree	8.3	8.7	9.0	9.5	9.4	9.3	9.5	9.5
Finland	A	01.2	00.9	01.0	00.9	007	00.4	90 C	00.0
	Agree	91.2	90.8	91.0	90.8	90.7	90.4	89.6	90.0
-	Disagree	8.8	9.2	9.0	9.2	9.3	9.6	10.4	10.0
France		0.6.1	05.6		05.6	~ <b>- -</b>	05.0	04.0	04.0
	Agree	96.1	95.6	95.7	95.6	95.5	95.3	94.9	94.8
~	Disagree	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7	5.1	5.2
Greece		07.6	07.0	07.0	067	0.6.0	0 < 1	0.5.1	00.1
	Agree	97.6	97.3	97.3	96.7	96.2	96.1	96.1	99.1
	Disagree	2.4	2.7	2.7	3.3	3.8	3.9	3.9	0.9
Hungary	7	0.6.1	05.6	054	050	054	05.0	055	064
	Agree	96.1	95.6	95.4	95.0	95.4	95.3	95.7	96.4
<b>.</b>	Disagree	3.9	4.4	4.6	5.0	4.6	4.7	4.3	3.6
Ireland		050	000		000		000		000
	Agree	95.0	93.9	93.7	92.8	92.7	92.9	93.3	93.9
<b>T</b> . 1	Disagree	5.0	6.1	6.3	7.2	7.3	7.1	6.7	6.1
Italy		02.0	02.7	02.4	02.2	02.1	02.5	00.0	02.2
	Agree	93.9	93.7	93.4	93.2	93.1	92.5	92.3	92.3
NT /1 1	Disagree	6.1	6.3	6.6	6.8	6.9	7.5	1.1	1.1
Netherla	inas	045	04.2	055	96.2	057	055	02.0	02 C
	Agree	84.5	84.3	85.5	86.3	85.7	85.5	85.8	85.5
	Disagree	15.5	15.7	14.5	13.7	14.3	14.5	16.2	16.5

**Table 5** Europeans' (aged 15-74) perceptions of their employment status as they agree or disagree to the ILO conventional definitions (%)

Country		2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Poland									
	Agree	95.2	95.2	95.1	95.2	95.2	95.1	95.2	95.5
	Disagree	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.5
Portugal	-								
-	Agree	95.0	94.7	94.8	91.7	90.6	90.0	90.9	91.3
	Disagree	5.0	5.3	5.2	8.3	9.4	10.0	9.1	8.7
Romania	Ļ								
	Agree	100.0	100.0	97.3	96.6	96.5	96.5	96.4	96.2
	Disagree			2.7	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.8
Spain	-								
-	Agree	97.8	97.6	97.6	97.1	97.6	97.5	97.7	97.6
	Disagree	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.9	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.4
Sweden	-								
	Agree	92.8	92.5	91.6	91.9	91.6	91.2	91.2	91.1
	Disagree	7.2	7.5	8.4	8.1	8.4	8.8	8.8	8.9

Table 5 (continued)

As shown, more than 90% of Europeans' perceptions coincide overall with the ILO conventional definitions: 91.5- 92.3% (Austria); 94.1-94.9% (Belgium); 93.7-95.1% (Bulgaria); 90.5-91.7% (Denmark); 89.6-91.2% (Finland); 94.8-96.1% (France); 96.1-99.1% (Greece); 95.0-96.4% (Hungary); 92.7-95.0% (Ireland); 92.3-93.9% (Italy); 83.5-86.3% (Netherlands); 95.1-95.5% (Poland); 90.0-95.0% (Portugal); 96.2-100.0% (Romania); 97.1-97.8% (Spain); 91.1-92.8% (Sweden).

However, the number of Europeans with conflicting perceptions amounts to a considerable total ranging from 12,246,000 to 15,598,000: 490,000-560,000 (Austria); 405,000-479,000 (Belgium); 270,000-356,000 (Bulgaria); 340,000-406,000 (Denmark); 352,000-426,000 (Finland); 1,699,000-2,449,000 (France); 202,000-335,000 (Greece): 274,000-387,000 (Hungary); 166,000-246,000 (Ireland): 2,759,000-3,499,000 (Italy); 1,705,000-2,090,000 (Netherlands); 1,374,000-1,408,000 (Poland); 407,000-791,000 (Portugal); 533,000-587,000 (Romania); 775,000-934,000 (Spain); 495,000-645,000 (Sweden). Italians with conflicting perceptions rank highest among Europeans, followed by the Dutch and the Polish people. Moreover, a steady increase of conflicting perceptions overtime is evident in eleven countries: Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania and Sweden.

In Table 6, Europeans' perceptions of their employment status coinciding with the ILO conventional definitions of the employed, unemployed and inactive are presented for Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Sweden.

Country	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Austria								
Employed	99.2	99.2	99.2	99.1	99.0	99.1	99.2	99.2
Unemployed	51.9	58.5	53.6	53.5	55.0	58.3	57.0	57.3
Inactive	85.2	84.6	84.7	84.2	84.1	84.5	84.3	84.8
Belgium								
Employed	99.5	99.4	99.3	99.3	99.4	99.2	99.2	99.2
Unemployed	53.4	55.5	57.9	51.6	53.4	59.9	62.1	63.0
Inactive	95.0	94.8	94.6	94.0	93.6	93.7	93.6	93.6
Bulgaria								
Employed	99.4	99.7	99.6	99.3	99.5	99.5	99.6	99.7
Unemployed	42.2	45.6	52.3	55.0	57.7	62.3	57.6	56.6
Inactive	97.3	97.9	97.7	97.7	98.0	97.5	97.6	98.0
Denmark								
Employed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unemployed	65.7	77.3	77.8	74.5	73.8	70.6	70.6	68.7
Inactive	78.5	78.3	78.4	77.9	78.6	79.6	79.1	79.0
Finland							.,	
Employed	99.9	99.8	99.9	99.8	99.8	99.7	99.7	99.8
Unemployed	59.5	62.4	61.6	59.4	59.6	56.7	55.2	59.2
Inactive	81.8	82.1	83.1	82.5	82.2	82.7	81.9	82.5
France	0110	02.11	0011	02.0	02.2	020	0117	0210
Employed	98.8	98.6	98.5	98.5	98.5	98.8	98.7	98.8
Unemployed	67.5	70.6	70.5	70.5	71.2	68.2	65.9	65.0
Inactive	96.4	96.1	96.3	96.2	96.0	95.9	96.0	96.0
Greece	,	2011	2010	/ 0.1	2010	,	2010	2010
Employed	994	99 3	99.2	99.0	98 9	99 1	99.2	99 1
Unemployed	81.5	82.7	85.7	85.4	87.1	87.5	86.6	85.3
Inactive	97.3	96.9	97.4	97.4	96.9	96.8	97.0	96.8
Hungary	71.5	<i>J</i> 0. <i>J</i>	77.4	77.4	)0.)	20.0	71.0	20.0
Employed	99.6	993	99 4	99.0	99.6	99.5	99.1	99.2
Unemployed	60.5	63.7	64 5	61.5	63.1	60.6	58.0	60.7
Inactive	97.2	97.2	97.3	97.3	97.5	97.6	97.8	97.9
Ireland	)1.2	11.2	71.5	71.5	71.5	77.0	77.0	)1.)
Employed	99.5	99.5	99.6	98.6	99.0	98.9	98.9	98.8
Unemployed	66.2	72.4	72.3	70.0	70.4	60.8	67.7	66.8
Inactive	00.2 00.5	00.8	01.3	00.0	00.7	00.0	00.0	00.0
Italy	90.5	90.8	91.5	90.9	90.2	90.0	90.9	91.7
Employed	00.8	00.8	00 7	00.8	00.8	00.8	00.8	00 0
Unemployed	10.8	13.0	137	12.6	/0.0	77.0 70.7	/0.8	/7.0
Inactivo	40.8	43.2	43.7	42.0	49.0	47.4	49.0	47.9
Netherlands	20.9	71.2	7/.4	71.1	7/.4	71.1	71.1	90.0
Employed	08 5	08 5	08 2	07.9	07.9	07.0	05 5	04 5
Unomployed	70.J 55 1	70.J	70.2 67.7	7/.0 50.0	77.0 50 /	71.7 66 0	7J.J 56.6	52 E
Inactivo	55.1	02.9 65 5	677	57.7 70 7	J7.4 60.6	00.0 60.6	70.0	JJ.0 70.2
macuve	03.9	03.3	07.7	/0./	09.0	09.0	10.2	70.5

**Table 6** Europeans' (aged 15-74) perceptions coinciding with the ILO conventional<br/>definitions of the employed, unemployed and inactive (%)

Table	6	(continued)
-------	---	-------------

Country	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Poland								
Employed	99.8	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.8
Unemployed	58.5	62.5	66.7	66.3	67.1	67.0	65.2	61.8
Inactive	94.6	94.5	94.2	94.5	94.6	94.6	94.4	95.1
Portugal								
Employed	99.9	100.0	99.9	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.8	99.8
Unemployed	67.0	70.6	74.1	66.0	67.3	65.4	62.5	60.2
Inactive	92.1	91.8	91.8	88.0	86.5	86.6	88.3	89.3
Romania								
Employed	100.0	100.0	99.4	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.8
Unemployed	100.0	100.0	76.5	70.0	68.2	68.8	67.1	65.2
Inactive	100.0	100.0	97.2	95.8	95.6	95.6	95.4	95.8
Spain								
Employed	99.3	99.2	99.2	98.9	98.9	98.8	99.0	99.0
Unemployed	87.6	90.6	91.8	91.3	93.8	93.6	93.8	92.3
Inactive	97.5	97.7	97.6	97.5	97.7	97.7	97.8	97.8
Sweden								
Employed	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7
Unemployed	75.5	77.4	74.9	73.8	73.3	72.8	74.0	73.9
Inactive	82.5	82.8	80.9	81.1	80.5	79.5	79.1	78.6

As shown, more than 94.5% of Europeans agree with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as employed: 99.0- 99.2% (Austria); 99.2-99.5% (Belgium); 99.3-99.7% (Bulgaria); 100.0% (Denmark); 99.7-99.9% (Finland); 98.5-98.8% (France); 98.9-99.4% (Greece); 99.0-99.6% (Hungary); 98.6-99.50% (Ireland); 99.7-99.9% (Italy); 94.5-98.5% (Netherlands); 99.7-99.8% (Poland); 99.7-100.0% (Portugal); 99.4-100.0% (Romania); 98.8-99.3% (Spain); 99.7% (Sweden).

Still, the pattern of Europeans' agreement in perceiving themselves as inactive differs from the almost complete agreement among all countries in perceiving themselves as employed since, although more than 90.0% of the Europeans from ten countries agree in perceiving themselves as inactive the percentages drop to 77.9% for five countries and 65.5% for one country. Analytically, more that 90.0% of Europeans from ten countries agree with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as inactive: 93.6-95.0% (Belgium); 97.3-98.0% (Bulgaria); 95.9-96.4% (France); 96.8-97.4% (Greece); 97.2-97.9% (Hungary); 90.0-91.7% (Ireland); 96.9-98.0% (Italy); 94.2-95.1% (Poland); 95.4-100.0% (Romania); 97.5-97.8% (Spain). Furthermore, more than 77.9% of the Europeans from five countries agree with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as inactive: 84.1-85.2% (Austria); 77.9-79.6% (Denmark); 81.8-83.1% (Finland); 86.5-92.1% (Portugal);

78.6-82.8% (Sweden). The Dutch, although they agreed 100% in perceiving themselves as employed, they rank the lowest among Europeans in perceiving themselves as inactive (65.5-70.7%).

The pattern of Europeans' agreement with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as unemployed deteriorates further as only in two countries coinciding perceptions exceeded 81.5%: 81.5-87.5% (Greece); 87.6-93.8% (Spain). More than 60.2% of the Europeans from six countries agree with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as unemployed: 65.7-77.8% (Denmark); 65.0-71.2% (France); 66.2-72.4% (Ireland); 60.2-74.1% (Portugal); 65.2-100.0% (Romania); 72.8-77.4% (Sweden). Furthermore, more than 51.9% of the Europeans from six countries agree with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as unemployed: 51.9-58.5% (Austria); 51.6-63.0% (Belgium); 55.2-62.4% (Finland); 58.0-64.5% (Hungary); 53.6-66.8% (Netherlands); 58.5-67.1% (Poland). Italians rank the lowest among Europeans in perceiving themselves as unemployed (40.8-49.8%), followed by the Bulgarians (42.2-62.3%).

However, these results do not indicate any clear, similar pattern based on geographical region. Europeans' agreement with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as unemployed coincide at more than 60.2% and 51.9% only three countries from Northern Europe (Denmark, Ireland, Sweden) and three countries from Western Europe (Austria, Belgium, Netherlands), respectively. For Eastern Europe, Romania is in the moderate category (more than 65.2% and the only country with complete agreement for 2008 and 2009), Hungary and Poland at the even more moderate category (more than 60.2%) and Bulgaria at the low end (more than 42.2%). Southern Europe is in the extremes with Greece and Spain at the high end (more than 81.5%), Portugal at the more moderate category (more than 60.2%) and Italy at the low end (more than 40.8%). Moreover, these results do not indicate any clear pattern overtime.

These findings indicate that a thorough investigation of the demographic and social characteristics of the "agreement" and "disagreement" groups is necessary in order to assess whether or not their distributions differ. In Tables 7 to 22, the demographic and social "profile" of Europeans' coinciding and conflicting perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions is presented for Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Sweden, respectively.

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender*								
Agree								
Male	50.5	50.6	50.5	50.6	50.7	50.4	50.4	50.5
Female	49.5	49.4	49.5	49.4	49.3	49.6	49.6	49.5
Disagree								
Male	38.0	37.5	38.5	37.4	37.0	39.2	39.5	40.1
Female	62.0	62.5	61.5	62.6	63.0	60.8	60.5	59.9
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	15.3	15.2	15.1	15.0	14.8	14.6	14.4	14.4
25-34	16.3	16.1	15.9	16.0	16.0	16.1	16.3	16.5
35-44	21.6	21.1	20.4	19.8	19.1	18.4	18.0	17.6
45-54	19.9	20.3	20.9	21.3	21.5	21.8	22.0	22.0
55-64	14.6	14.7	14.8	15.3	15.4	15.6	15.9	16.3
65-74	12.4	12.6	12.8	12.7	13.1	13.4	13.5	13.1
Disagree								
15-24	23.5	23.9	23.1	23.4	23.7	23.9	24.1	22.9
25-34	25.3	25.5	27.1	25.7	26.3	27.1	27.1	28.0
35-44	16.9	16.6	16.0	16.2	15.8	15.7	14.6	15.0
45-54	11.4	12.6	11.9	11.7	12.0	11.2	11.6	12.1
55-64	14.9	13.0	13.8	14.9	14.7	14.4	14.5	13.9
65-74	8.0	8.3	8.1	8.1	7.5	7.8	8.0	8.2
Marital status*								
Agree								
Single	35.0	35.1	35.6	35.9	36.3	36.5	37.0	37.2
Married	52.5	52.3	51.8	51.6	51.2	50.7	50.4	50.1
Other	12.5	12.6	12.6	12.5	12.5	12.8	12.6	12.7
Disagree								
Single	43.1	43.9	45.0	43.7	44.6	46.3	46.9	47.0
Married	47.8	46.4	45.9	46.7	46.3	44.4	43.6	42.6
Other	9.2	9.7	9.1	9.6	9.0	9.3	9.5	10.4
Education								
Agree								
Primary	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.1
Secondary	83.8	82.7	82.6	82.6	82.2	81.6	72.7	72.2
Tertiary	14.9	16.0	16.2	16.2	16.7	17.2	26.1	26.7
Disagree	-	-						
Primarv	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.4	1.3
Secondarv	86.3	86.8	85.3	85.3	83.8	83.4	72.5	70.3
Tertiary	12.0	11.8	13.3	13.4	15.0	15.5	26.1	28.4

**Table 7** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Austria (%)

					-			
Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	50.2	50.2	50.2	50.3	50.1	50.0	50.1	50.1
Female	49.8	49.8	49.8	49.7	49.9	50.0	49.9	49.9
Disagree								
Male	43.2	44.0	43.8	43.8	46.9	47.0	45.5	47.7
Female	56.8	56.0	56.3	56.2	53.1	53.0	54.5	52.3
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	16.1	16.1	16.1	16.0	16.0	16.0	15.8	15.7
25-34	17.1	17.2	17.2	17.2	17.2	17.2	17.2	17.1
35-44	19.8	19.4	19.0	18.7	18.5	18.3	18.2	17.9
45-54	19.5	19.7	19.8	19.9	19.9	19.7	19.6	19.5
55-64	15.5	15.6	15.9	16.2	16.1	16.3	16.5	16.8
65-74	11.9	11.9	11.9	12.1	12.4	12.5	12.7	13.0
Disagree								
15-24	17.8	17.6	16.9	18.7	17.1	16.7	17.5	16.6
25-34	18.6	17.8	18.5	19.4	20.0	20.0	20.4	22.0
35-44	16.1	16.2	16.2	16.8	16.3	16.4	15.7	16.6
45-54	18.3	17.8	18.3	17.7	16.9	18.2	17.3	16.6
55-64	27.0	28.2	27.5	25.1	26.3	25.4	25.3	24.3
65-74	2.2	2.5	2.5	2.3	3.3	3.3	3.8	3.9
Marital status								
Agree								
Single	34.1	34.9	35.2	35.4	36.5	37.5	38.1	38.7
Married	53.0	51.9	51.3	51.1	49.9	48.9	48.7	47.7
Other	12.9	13.2	13.5	13.5	13.5	13.6	13.2	13.6
Disagree								
Single	35.8	36.1	36.4	39.4	39.2	41.6	42.2	43.8
Married	47.7	47.0	46.4	43.6	44.0	42.2	42.2	40.4
Other	16.5	16.9	17.2	17.1	16.9	16.2	15.7	15.9
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	15.7	15.1	15.1	15.0	14.7	13.6	11.8	10.8
Secondary	56.8	56.4	55.0	55.4	54.8	55.8	56.4	57.3
Tertiary	27.6	28.5	29.9	29.6	30.5	30.5	31.8	31.9
Disagree								
Primary	24.0	22.2	22.7	20.0	20.8	20.1	17.7	15.2
Secondary	60.7	60.9	59.5	61.1	59.8	59.3	61.9	64.1
Tertiary	15.3	16.9	17.8	18.9	19.4	20.6	20.4	20.7

**Table 8** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Belgium (%)

					-			
Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	49.0	48.9	49.2	49.2	49.2	49.2	49.2	49.4
Female	51.0	51.1	50.8	50.8	50.8	50.8	50.8	50.6
Disagree								
Male	45.3	46.7	50.7	51.0	50.6	50.3	50.2	50.2
Female	54.7	53.3	49.3	49.0	49.4	49.7	49.8	49.8
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	16.2	15.9	15.2	14.7	14.1	13.4	12.8	12.4
25-34	15.5	15.3	17.6	17.3	17.2	17.0	16.9	17.2
35-44	19.0	19.5	17.9	18.2	18.9	19.2	19.3	19.2
45-54	18.4	18.1	17.6	17.4	17.2	17.3	17.5	17.7
55-64	16.5	16.7	18.2	18.5	18.3	18.3	18.5	17.8
65-74	14.4	14.5	13.6	13.8	14.3	14.8	15.0	15.8
Disagree								
15-24	24.3	23.8	19.7	19.3	18.5	18.9	17.9	17.8
25-34	19.5	18.4	23.0	24.4	24.7	26.3	26.4	23.0
35-44	20.7	22.5	18.4	19.3	19.1	18.9	17.6	20.8
45-54	18.3	20.9	20.3	19.0	18.8	17.3	17.0	19.0
55-64	13.5	13.1	17.0	16.0	17.1	16.3	18.8	17.1
65-74	3.6	1.3	1.6	2.0	1.8	2.2	2.1	2.2
Marital status								
Agree								
Single	28.0	28.5	30.1	30.7	31.5	30.5	30.4	32.1
Married	60.5	59.5	58.4	57.0	55.9	57.7	57.8	53.7
Other	11.5	12.0	11.6	12.3	12.6	11.8	11.8	14.2
Disagree								
Single	35.5	38.0	36.1	38.2	40.6	42.8	41.5	43.3
Married	56.3	53.0	55.7	53.4	49.7	48.2	50.0	48.1
Other	8.1	9.0	8.2	8.4	9.7	8.9	8.5	8.5
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	5.0	5.3	4.2	4.3	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9
Secondary	76.2	75.4	76.0	75.4	75.5	74.9	72.5	72.2
Tertiary	18.8	19.4	19.8	20.3	20.6	21.3	23.5	23.9
Disagree								
Primary	13.3	16.2	9.6	9.0	11.7	10.6	13.9	10.0
Secondarv	78.9	76.0	81.4	81.8	78.9	77.6	73.6	79.6
Tertiary	7.8	7.8	9.0	9.2	9.4	11.9	12.4	10.4

**Table 9** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Bulgaria (%)

Variable         2008         2009         2010         2011         2012         2013         2014         2015           Gender         Agree                 2013         2014         2015           Male         50.7         50.7         50.7         50.6         50.6         50.7         50.8           Female         49.3         49.3         49.3         49.3         49.4         49.4         49.3         49.2           Disagree                44.5         44.0         44.8         46.1         45.3         44.4         44.6           Female         55.5         56.0         56.0         55.2         53.9         54.7         55.6         55.4
Gender       Agree         Male       50.7       50.7       50.7       50.6       50.6       50.7       50.8         Female       49.3       49.3       49.3       49.3       49.4       49.4       49.3       49.2         Disagree       Male       44.5       44.0       44.8       46.1       45.3       44.4       44.6         Female       55.5       56.0       56.0       55.2       53.9       54.7       55.6       55.4
Agree       Male       50.7       50.7       50.7       50.6       50.6       50.7       50.8         Female       49.3       49.3       49.3       49.3       49.4       49.4       49.3       49.2         Disagree       Male       44.5       44.0       44.8       46.1       45.3       44.4       44.6         Female       55.5       56.0       56.0       55.2       53.9       54.7       55.6       55.4
Male         50.7         50.7         50.7         50.6         50.6         50.7         50.8           Female         49.3         49.3         49.3         49.3         49.4         49.4         49.3         49.2           Disagree         Male         44.5         44.0         44.8         46.1         45.3         44.4         44.6           Female         55.5         56.0         56.0         55.2         53.9         54.7         55.6         55.4
Female         49.3         49.3         49.3         49.3         49.4         49.4         49.3         49.2           Disagree         Male         44.5         44.0         44.8         46.1         45.3         44.4         44.6           Female         55.5         56.0         56.0         55.2         53.9         54.7         55.6         55.4
Disagree         Male         44.5         44.0         44.8         46.1         45.3         44.4         44.6           Female         55.5         56.0         56.0         55.2         53.9         54.7         55.6         55.4
Male         44.5         44.0         44.8         46.1         45.3         44.4         44.6           Female         55.5         56.0         56.0         55.2         53.9         54.7         55.6         55.4
Female         55.5         56.0         56.0         55.2         53.9         54.7         55.6         55.4
A ~~ *
Age
Agree
15-24 10.9 11.1 11.3 11.4 11.6 11.9 11.9 12.0
25-34 16.9 16.5 15.9 15.5 15.3 15.2 15.3 15.4
35-44 21.1 20.8 20.5 20.2 19.7 19.2 18.9 18.6
45-54 19.6 19.8 20.0 20.4 20.5 20.5 20.5 20.4
55-64 19.0 18.8 18.7 18.2 18.0 17.7 17.6 17.5
65-74 12.4 13.0 13.6 14.3 14.8 15.5 15.8 16.1
Disagree
15-24 67.6 68.1 66.5 65.3 65.7 65.1 64.4 63.9
25-34 13.4 12.9 14.7 15.4 16.5 17.7 17.7 18.2
35-44 5.4 5.6 5.9 5.3 5.1 5.1 5.2 5.7
45-54 3.6 3.6 3.5 3.8 3.6 4.4 4.2 4.4
55-64 5.1 4.8 4.3 5.1 3.8 3.8 3.7 3.9
65-74 5.1 5.0 5.1 5.1 5.3 3.8 4.7 3.9
Marital status*
Agree
Single 32.6 32.4 32.3 32.8 33.5 34.0 34.6 34.9
Married 57.0 58.7 56.4 54.4 53.5 52.7 52.2 51.8
Other 10.4 9.0 11.3 12.8 12.9 13.3 13.2 13.3
Disagree
Single 81.6 82.3 81.5 80.8 81.8 82.9 82.6 82.5
Married 14.2 14.9 15.0 15.2 14.4 13.3 13.7 14.0
Other $42$ $28$ $35$ $40$ $38$ $38$ $37$ $34$
Education*
Agree
Primary 08 08 08 08 09 10 93 89
Secondary 72.5 71.8 71.3 71.0 70.2 69.7 60.6 60.3
Tertiary 26.6 27.4 27.9 28.1 28.9 29.3 30.0 30.8
Disagree
Primary 52 52 47 34 32 35 117 116
Secondary $830$ $840$ $831$ $830$ $826$ $816$ $710$ $702$
Tertiary 11.8 10.9 12.2 13.6 13.2 14.9 16.3 18.2

**Table 10** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Denmark (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	50.7	50.4	50.3	50.4	50.4	50.5	50.5	50.4
Female	49.3	49.6	49.7	49.6	49.6	49.5	49.5	49.6
Disagree								
Male	43.1	46.5	47.5	46.9	47.5	45.9	46.2	47.7
Female	56.9	53.5	52.5	53.1	52.5	54.1	53.8	52.3
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	13.9	13.8	14.0	13.8	13.8	13.7	13.4	13.5
25-34	16.7	16.7	16.8	16.8	16.7	16.8	16.8	16.8
35-44	18.0	17.6	17.2	17.0	17.0	16.9	16.8	16.9
45-54	20.1	19.8	19.6	19.5	19.3	19.1	19.3	18.8
55-64	19.2	19.7	20.0	19.5	19.4	18.7	18.5	18.5
65-74	12.1	12.4	12.4	13.3	13.8	14.8	15.2	15.5
Disagree								
15-24	43.3	41.5	39.8	40.6	39.3	38.7	37.6	36.1
25-34	15.9	18.1	18.0	17.5	18.2	17.0	17.1	18.0
35-44	8.8	8.4	9.4	9.1	7.7	7.9	9.4	9.3
45-54	7.6	9.4	9.4	7.8	8.4	9.7	7.7	8.8
55-64	17.6	16.7	17.1	18.3	17.4	18.1	19.5	17.8
65-74	6.8	5.9	6.4	6.7	9.0	8.7	8.7	10.0
Marital status*								
Agree								
Single	36.8	37.4	37.7	37.4	38.2	38.0	38.0	38.0
Married	49.3	48.6	48.0	48.6	47.6	48.0	48.3	48.6
Other	13.9	13.9	14.3	14.0	14.2	14.0	13.7	13.3
Disagree								
Single	60.2	61.0	61.6	60.9	59.0	58.4	59.4	57.4
Married	29.8	30.1	29.0	29.4	30.7	32.5	29.5	32.1
Other	9.9	8.9	9.4	9.7	10.3	9.1	11.1	10.5
Education*								
Agree								
Primarv	13.9	13.5	12.3	11.2	10.0	9.6	8.5	8.2
Secondary	55.4	55.1	56.4	55.9	56.4	57.0	56.4	55.6
Tertiarv	30.7	31.4	31.3	32.9	33.6	33.4	35.1	36.2
Disagree	2011	01.1	01.0		22.5	22.1		00.2
Primarv	10.2	11.1	9.4	8.6	8.9	8.1	7.3	7.5
Secondary	72.7	71.7	73.8	73.9	71.8	73.9	71.6	71.8
Tertiary	17.0	17.3	16.9	17.5	19.2	18.0	21.1	20.7

**Table 11** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Finland (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	49.2	49.1	49.1	49.2	49.0	48.9	49.0	48.9
Female	50.8	50.9	50.9	50.8	51.0	51.1	51.0	51.1
Disagree								
Male	41.4	42.6	43.2	42.3	45.2	47.7	45.2	46.4
Female	58.6	57.4	56.8	57.7	54.8	52.3	54.8	53.6
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	16.1	16.1	16.0	16.0	15.8	15.6	15.5	15.5
25-34	16.8	16.8	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.6	16.5
35-44	19.7	19.5	19.2	18.8	18.6	18.5	18.3	18.0
45-54	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.1	19.1	19.0	18.9
55-64	16.8	17.1	17.5	17.7	17.7	17.6	17.5	17.4
65-74	11.4	11.3	11.3	11.6	12.0	12.6	13.1	13.7
Disagree								
15-24	28.2	28.9	29.3	28.0	28.6	24.7	23.9	22.3
25-34	21.4	22.3	21.0	22.4	23.1	22.4	22.6	22.1
35-44	14.7	15.7	16.0	16.4	15.2	16.6	16.5	17.3
45-54	11.7	10.7	11.6	12.8	13.3	15.0	15.9	16.4
55-64	22.6	19.9	19.9	18.4	17.2	18.4	17.3	18.9
65-74	1.5	2.5	2.1	2.0	2.6	2.9	3.7	3.0
Marital status*								
Agree								
Single	38.8	39.3	39.9	40.7	41.4	41.7	42.5	42.9
Married	49.8	49.5	48.9	48.0	47.2	46.5	46.0	45.6
Other	11.4	11.2	11.2	11.3	11.4	11.8	11.5	11.5
Disagree								
Single	50.9	53.8	54.2	55.4	56.9	56.6	57.9	56.7
Married	38.0	35.9	34.8	34.3	33.4	31.8	30.1	31.9
Other	11.1	10.3	11.0	10.3	9.6	11.5	12.0	11.3
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	14.5	13.9	13.2	12.6	11.9	11.7	10.9	10.2
Secondary	62.0	61.8	61.7	61.7	61.6	60.8	60.5	60.6
Tertiary	23.5	24.3	25.0	25.7	26.4	27.5	28.6	29.2
Disagree		=			_ • · · ·			
Primarv	13.5	12.2	11.4	10.6	11.0	10.0	10.6	12.5
Secondary	67.9	66.0	68.0	68.4	67.9	66.9	67.2	67.3
Tertiary	18.6	21.9	20.6	21.0	21.1	23.1	22.2	20.1

**Table 12** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: France (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	49.6	49.6	49.6	49.6	49.7	49.2	49.3	49.3
Female	50.4	50.4	50.4	50.4	50.3	50.8	50.7	50.7
Disagree								
Male	41.6	42.9	43.2	46.9	45.9	43.9	43.8	42.7
Female	58.4	57.1	56.8	53.1	54.1	56.1	56.2	57.3
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	13.6	13.2	13.1	13.0	12.8	13.5	13.4	13.2
25-34	19.3	18.8	18.5	18.2	17.7	17.6	17.1	16.6
35-44	20.2	20.4	20.6	20.7	20.6	20.1	20.1	20.1
45-54	18.1	18.4	18.5	18.7	19.0	18.9	19.2	19.5
55-64	15.6	16.0	16.2	16.3	16.4	16.3	16.4	16.6
65-74	13.3	13.2	13.1	13.2	13.4	13.7	13.8	14.0
Disagree								
15-24	22.1	22.3	19.4	16.9	15.5	16.3	14.3	15.5
25-34	25.0	28.1	26.6	25.4	23.1	23.4	24.2	25.4
35-44	19.1	17.9	19.4	21.3	23.1	23.4	22.6	20.9
45-54	14.7	14.3	16.7	17.6	19.0	18.8	18.8	18.2
55-64	11.3	10.7	11.3	12.5	13.6	13.4	15.0	16.1
65-74	7.8	6.7	6.8	6.3	5.7	4.7	5.1	3.9
Marital status		017	0.0	0.12	017		011	015
Agree								
Single	31.5	30.8	30.7	31.3	31.8	32.9	33.2	33.0
Married	60.9	61.3	61.2	60.5	59.8	58.7	58.5	58.4
Other	7.6	79	81	83	83	84	83	86
Disagree	7.0	1.7	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.0
Single	/3 1	15 5	<i>4</i> 1.0	30.3	38.0	30 /	38.1	30 /
Married	43.1 51.0	48.2	51.4	53.7	56.6	57. <del>4</del> 54.4	54.9	53.1
Other	5 9	63	77	7.0	5.0	63	7.0	75
Education	5.7	0.5	/./	7.0	5.4	0.5	7.0	1.5
Agree								
Drimory	200	28 /	27.6	26.0	24.6	23.6	22.4	20.0
Secondary	20.0 52.0	20.4 53 1	27.0 52.0	20.0 53.2	24.0 54.0	23.0 54.1	22.4 54.4	20.9 55 3
Tertiory	10.2	19.1	10.5	20.8	04.0 01.2	34.1	24.4 22.1	22.5
Disagree	10.3	10.4	19.3	20.0	21.3	22.3	23.1	23.0
Disagree	07.0	24.1	757	766	22.4	21.0	21.0	10 5
Primary	21.2 55.0	24.1 57.6	23.1 59.6	20.0 57.2	22.4 50.0	21.0 50.6	21.0 50.7	10.3
Tertion	JJ.9 16 0	J/.0	Jð.0 15 0	$\frac{31.2}{162}$	אינ. 17 ס	39.0 10.4	39.1 10.4	00.0
Tertiary	16.8	18.3	15.8	16.2	1/./	19.4	19.4	21.5

**Table 13** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Greece (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	47.8	47.8	47.8	47.9	48.0	48.1	48.3	48.3
Female	52.2	52.2	52.2	52.1	52.0	51.9	51.7	51.7
Disagree								
Male	48.8	50.4	50.4	50.1	48.7	49.9	47.9	48.5
Female	51.2	49.6	49.6	49.9	51.3	50.1	52.1	51.5
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	16.0	15.8	15.6	15.6	15.2	14.9	14.7	14.5
25-34	20.0	19.7	19.2	18.9	18.7	16.9	16.5	16.3
35-44	17.2	17.6	18.3	18.9	19.3	20.4	20.8	20.9
45-54	18.4	17.7	17.1	16.3	16.2	16.0	16.3	16.7
55-64	16.2	16.8	17.4	18.0	17.8	18.6	18.3	18.1
65-74	12.2	12.3	12.4	12.3	12.7	13.1	13.3	13.6
Disagree								
15-24	14.1	15.0	13.8	14.5	15.1	18.5	16.9	17.9
25-34	23.7	23.7	23.5	22.0	20.8	18.5	17.8	17.2
35-44	21.4	21.0	21.2	22.0	20.5	21.3	19.0	19.0
45-54	21.1	21.3	21.8	21.7	20.8	20.7	19.0	16.4
55-64	16.1	15.9	16.6	17.6	19.9	17.9	21.5	22.3
65-74	3.6	3.3	3.2	2.3	2.8	3.1	5.8	7.3
Marital status								
Agree								
Single	32.4	33.1	33.7	34.4	35.1	34.9	35.1	35.1
Married	51.8	51.1	50.4	50.0	49.2	46.6	46.8	46.8
Other	15.8	15.8	15.8	15.6	15.7	18.5	18.1	18.1
Disagree								
Single	36.8	39.1	39.4	40.8	40.9	44.3	41.8	43.8
Married	46.4	44.2	44.3	42.4	42.0	38.7	39.1	37.2
Other	16.9	16.7	16.3	16.8	17.0	17.1	19.1	19.0
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	2.6	2.3	2.1	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.6
Secondary	81.4	81.0	81.0	80.2	79.4	79.0	78.3	77.8
Tertiary	16.0	16.6	16.9	17.9	18.9	19.4	20.1	20.6
Disagree								
Primary	5.0	4.5	3.7	4.4	5.1	5.0	4.3	3.6
Secondary	85.5	86.0	84.8	85.0	84.6	85.2	84.4	85.8
Tertiary	9.6	9.5	11.5	10.6	10.3	9.8	11.3	10.6

**Table 14** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Hungary (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	50.4	49.8	49.7	49.8	49.7	49.7	49.6	49.5
Female	49.6	50.2	50.3	50.2	50.3	50.3	50.4	50.5
Disagree								
Male	47.6	52.4	52.1	49.6	48.8	48.3	48.4	47.8
Female	52.4	47.6	47.9	50.4	51.2	51.7	51.6	52.2
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	17.5	17.6	16.8	15.9	15.2	14.7	14.5	14.3
25-34	23.8	23.0	22.8	22.4	21.9	21.2	20.2	19.4
35-44	20.2	20.3	20.6	20.8	21.2	21.4	21.7	21.9
45-54	16.8	16.9	17.2	17.4	17.7	18.0	18.3	18.5
55-64	13.3	13.4	13.6	13.9	14.1	14.3	14.6	14.9
65-74	8.5	8.8	9.1	9.5	9.9	10.4	10.7	11.0
Disagree								
15-24	42.8	40.1	36.7	32.6	32.4	32.6	31.8	32.2
25-34	22.3	20.3	20.5	21.1	20.6	19.7	20.6	19.0
35-44	12.0	15.0	15.8	17.4	17.4	17.2	16.1	16.6
45-54	10.2	11.6	13.0	14.5	14.6	14.6	15.7	16.1
55-64	9.6	10.6	11.2	12.0	12.1	12.6	12.6	12.2
65-74	3.0	2.4	2.8	2.5	2.8	3.3	3.1	3.9
Marital status*								
Agree								
Single	41.9	41.2	40.6	40.0	39.7	39.8	39.8	39.4
Married	51.2	51.8	52.2	52.5	52,8	52.9	52.7	53.1
Other	6.9	7.0	7.2	7.5	7.5	7.3	7.5	7.5
Disagree								
Single	65.1	63.6	61.7	57.4	58.9	59.0	60.3	60.0
Married	29.5	30.6	32.2	36.0	33.7	33.9	33.9	33.2
Other	5.4	5.8	6.1	6.6	7.3	7.1	5.8	6.8
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	16.8	15.6	14.8	14.1	13.7	12.9	12.7	12.1
Secondary	54.4	53.8	53.3	53.3	52.3	51.7	52.6	51.8
Tertiary	28.8	30.6	31.9	32.6	33.9	35.4	34.7	36.2
Disagree								
Primary	13.8	14.4	13.5	14.9	14.1	12.9	12.0	12.0
Secondary	66.3	66.2	66.2	65.1	63.9	64.4	64.8	64.5
Tertiary	20.0	19.4	20.3	20.0	22.0	22.7	23.1	23.5

**Table 15** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Ireland (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	49.7	49.5	49.4	49.3	49.4	49.2	49.2	49.3
Female	50.3	50.5	50.6	50.7	50.6	50.8	50.8	50.7
Disagree								
Male	46.4	48.2	49.5	50.3	49.4	50.2	50.5	50.3
Female	53.6	51.8	50.5	49.7	50.6	49.8	49.5	49.7
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	12.8	12.8	12,8	12.7	12.7	12.7	12.7	12.8
25-34	17.0	16.4	16.0	15.5	15.3	14.5	14.3	14.2
35-44	21.2	21.2	21.1	21.0	20.7	20.2	19.9	19.5
45-54	18.3	18.7	19.2	19.6	20.0	20.4	20.8	21.0
55-64	16.3	16.5	16.7	16.9	16.8	17.0	17.0	17.2
65-74	14.4	14.4	14.3	14.3	14.6	15.1	15.3	15.3
Disagree								
15-24	21.7	21.0	20.5	20.2	19.5	18.3	17.3	16.3
25-34	28.6	29.6	28.1	27.6	25.4	25.4	24.9	25.2
35-44	24.2	24.3	24.7	23.9	24.4	24.2	23.9	23.3
45-54	15.4	16.0	17.0	17.6	19.1	20.0	20.9	21.8
55-64	8.4	7.9	8.7	9.4	10.5	11.0	11.8	12.4
65-74	1.7	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Marital status*								
Agree								
Single	31.0	31.2	31.3	31.6	32.3	32.5	32.9	33.3
Married	59.4	59.1	58.8	58.4	57.3	56.6	57.0	56.8
Other	9.6	9.7	9.8	10.0	10.4	10.8	10.1	9.9
Disagree								
Single	48.5	49.2	49.0	49.7	48.2	48.9	48.4	48.8
Married	45.1	44.8	44.3	43.5	44.1	43.0	44.1	43.4
Other	6.5	6.1	6.7	6.9	7.7	8.1	7.5	7.8
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	18.9	17.9	16.9	15.8	14.9	14.2	13.0	12.1
Secondary	69.3	70.2	71.0	71.8	72.0	72.1	72.8	73.2
Tertiarv	11.7	11.9	12.2	12.4	13.1	13.7	14.2	14.7
Disagree								
Primarv	13.1	11.8	11.6	11.1	10.6	9.8	8.9	8.8
Secondarv	76.8	78.7	78.4	79.3	79.2	80.0	80.6	79.9
Tertiary	10.2	9.6	10.1	9.6	10.2	10.2	10.4	11.3

**Table 16** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Italy (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender*								
Agree								
Male	52.7	52.4	51.7	51.2	51.0	50.9	51.1	50.9
Female	47.3	47.6	48.3	48.8	49.0	49.1	48.9	49.1
Disagree								
Male	35.9	37.4	41.8	42.8	44.5	44.9	44.9	45.4
Female	64.1	62.6	58.2	57.2	55.5	55.1	55.1	54.6
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	11.3	11.0	11.2	10.9	10.7	10.9	10.7	10.5
25-34	17.2	16.8	17.3	16.8	17.1	16.9	17.1	17.3
35-44	21.6	21.2	21.5	20.5	19.9	19.4	19.1	18.5
45-54	20.7	21.1	21.9	21.5	21.6	21.4	21.7	21.9
55-64	17.7	18.0	18.4	18.0	17.7	17.8	17.9	18.0
65-74	11.6	11.8	9.8	12.3	12.9	13.5	13.5	13.7
Disagree								
15-24	42.2	43.7	48.2	49.0	48.6	47.0	44.5	44.5
25-34	10.6	11.1	10.6	10.3	9.4	11.4	11.2	10.4
35-44	15.0	14.0	11.1	9.4	9.6	9.1	8.5	8.0
45-54	12.9	11.6	10.5	9.9	9.7	10.8	10.9	10.3
55-64	13.2	12.7	13.8	13.7	13.6	12.4	12.8	13.2
65-74	6.0	6.8	5.8	7.9	9.1	9.3	12.0	13.6
Marital status*								
Agree								
Single	33.9	34.0	32.9	32.9	32.5	32.7	34.1	33.5
Married	54.0	53.9	56.8	56.2	56.6	56.2	55.3	56.2
Other	12.2	12.1	10.3	10.9	10.9	11.0	10.6	10.4
Disagree								
Single	51.7	54.1	59.3	59.7	60.4	60.4	58.1	58.6
Married	41.4	38.4	34.7	33.4	32.9	32.9	32.9	31.9
Other	6.9	7.4	6.0	6.9	6.7	6.7	9.0	9.5
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	9.6	9.3	8.7	9.2	8.2	8.9	9.0	9.0
Secondary	62.0	61.5	61.7	62.1	62.0	60.9	59.9	58.5
Tertiary	28.5	29.2	29.7	28.8	29.8	30.2	31.1	32.5
Disagree								
Primarv	9.7	9.1	10.5	9.5	9.9	11.4	11.6	11.0
Secondary	73.4	74.6	73.8	74.1	73.5	71.7	70.4	70.8
Tertiary	16.9	16.3	15.7	16.4	16.6	16.9	17.9	18.2

**Table 17** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Netherlands (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender*								
Agree								
Male	48.6	48.6	49.2	49.3	49.3	49.2	49.4	49.4
Female	51.4	51.4	50.8	50.7	50.7	50.8	50.6	50.6
Disagree								
Male	43.7	44.5	44.9	44.7	44.0	44.8	42.1	41.5
Female	56.3	55.5	55.1	55.3	56.0	55.2	57.9	58.5
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	18.4	17.7	17.4	16.8	16.1	15.6	15.0	14.7
25-34	20.3	20.7	20.1	20.1	20.0	19.8	19.4	19.2
35-44	16.6	16.7	16.8	17.2	17.7	18.2	18.7	19.0
45-54	19.3	18.8	18.4	17.9	17.3	16.7	16.3	16.1
55-64	15.5	16.3	17.4	18.1	18.5	18.8	19.1	19.1
65-74	9.9	9.7	9.9	10.0	10.3	10.8	11.5	11.9
Disagree								
15-24	21.8	20.8	21.1	19.1	19.5	17.8	16.8	15.9
25-34	21.0	20.9	21.2	22.0	22.3	22.1	23.6	24.6
35-44	13.3	14.3	14.0	14.9	14.6	15.8	16.8	17.8
45-54	21.5	21.0	19.5	18.6	18.1	17.6	16.4	15.6
55-64	17.0	17.9	19.2	20.0	20.5	21.8	21.4	21.8
65-74	5.3	5.1	4.9	5.3	5.1	4.9	4.9	4.3
Marital status								
Agree								
Single	29.4	29.0	29.0	29.2	29.1	28.8	28.3	28.1
Married	60.7	61.0	60.8	60.6	60.6	61.0	61.4	61.6
Other	9.9	10.0	10.1	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.3	10.2
Disagree								
Single	33.0	33.0	33.8	33.3	34.7	33.0	31.7	31.8
Married	57.4	57.4	56.8	57.0	55.8	57.1	58.7	59.5
Other	9.6	9.6	9.4	9.8	9.5	9.9	9.6	8.7
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.3	2.2
Secondary	81.0	79.6	78.2	77.5	76.5	75.7	74.8	74.3
Tertiary	16.3	17.7	19.0	19.8	20.9	21.9	23.0	23.5
Disagree								
Primary	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.2	1.2
Secondary	88.8	87.7	86.2	84.7	83.3	82.1	80.4	79.7
Tertiary	9.9	11.1	12.4	13.8	15.0	16.3	18.3	19.1

**Table 18** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Poland (%)

					-			
Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	49.9	49.3	49.3	49.1	49.1	48.1	47.9	47.9
Female	50.6	50.7	50.7	50.9	50.9	51.9	52.1	52.1
Disagree								
Male	40.0	42.7	42.1	47.3	48.4	48.2	48.3	47.8
Female	60.0	57.3	57.9	52.7	51.6	51.8	51.7	52.2
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	15.2	14.9	14.5	14.2	14.1	14.2	14.1	14.1
25-34	20.3	20.0	19.7	19.4	18.6	16.8	16.2	15.8
35-44	19.7	19.9	20.0	20.6	21.0	20.9	20.9	20.7
45-54	18.0	18.2	18.5	18.7	19.0	19.4	19.4	19.4
55-64	15.1	15.3	15.4	15.3	15.4	16.1	16.4	16.5
65-74	11.7	11.6	11.9	11.9	12.0	12.7	13.1	13.5
Disagree								
15-24	11.0	10.0	10.2	12.6	13.0	13.1	13.2	13.4
25-34	15.0	15.0	14.0	13.7	13.3	12.8	12.2	11.8
35-44	13.7	14.6	14.9	13.1	14.0	14.8	14.0	13.7
45-54	15.9	15.7	16.8	17.7	17.2	17.4	18.2	18.7
55-64	21.3	21.3	21.3	22.6	23.1	23.5	23.8	24.6
65-74	23.0	23.4	22.7	20.2	19.4	18.3	18.5	17.7
Marital status								
Agree								
Single	27.3	27.4	27.4	32.7	33.8	34.1	33.6	34.1
Married	65.0	64.6	64.5	57.0	55.5	55.1	55.7	55.1
Other	7.7	8.0	8.1	10.3	10.7	10.8	10.7	10.8
Disagree								
Single	21.4	20.1	19.4	28.4	30.5	31.5	32.0	33.4
Married	69.0	69.3	69.7	59.8	57.7	56.6	56.0	54.8
Other	9.6	10.6	10.9	11.8	11.8	11.9	12.0	11.8
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	52.0	49.6	47.7	42.9	40.7	39.0	36.7	35.1
Secondary	36.0	38.0	39.2	42.0	42.8	43.9	44.4	45.2
Tertiary	11.9	12.4	13.2	15.1	16.7	17.2	18.9	19.7
Disagree								
Primarv	71.5	70.4	70.9	63.2	59.8	56.6	53.8	53.3
Secondary	22.9	24.9	23.9	29.3	32.4	35.1	36.6	36.5
Tertiary	5.7	4.6	5.2	7.6	7.7	8.2	9.6	10.2

**Table 19** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Portugal (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	52.8	52.9	49.9	48.9	48.9	49.2	49.3	49.3
Female	47.2	47.1	50.1	51.1	51.1	50.8	50.7	50.7
Disagree								
Male			54.9	53.7	54.0	54.2	54.1	56.7
Female			45.1	46.3	46.0	45.8	45.9	43.3
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	19.1	18.6	17.6	16.9	16.1	15.1	14.7	14.2
25-34	19.8	19.7	20.0	20.1	20.2	18.2	18.0	18.0
35-44	18.4	18.9	20.1	21.1	21.8	21.0	20.7	20.5
45-54	16.6	16.3	16.1	15.7	15.3	16.5	17.2	17.7
55-64	14.5	15.0	15.3	15.9	16.3	17.9	18.0	17.8
65-74	11.7	11.5	10.8	10.4	10.4	11.3	11.4	11.7
Disagree								
15-24			20.4	20.3	19.9	18.8	17.3	18.2
25-34			18.4	20.3	20.4	18.8	20.0	18.6
35-44			13.0	13.9	14.8	15.2	14.2	14.1
45-54			13.5	13.0	11.2	12.2	11.9	12.7
55-64			17.9	16.3	17.7	18.9	19.2	18.8
65-74			16.8	16.0	15.8	16.1	17.4	17.7
Marital status*								
Agree								
Single	28.2	27.9	27.9	28.4	28.6	27.3	27.2	26.7
Married	60.6	60.9	60.3	60.0	60.0	59.7	59.4	60.3
Other	11.2	11.3	11.8	11.6	11.4	13.0	13.4	13.1
Disagree								
Single			33.9	33.7	36.3	35.3	35.8	35.8
Married			52.8	52.5	49.7	48.7	47.1	47.8
Other			13.3	13.7	14.0	16.0	17.1	16.3
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	8.9	8.4	7.8	7.1	6.4	6.2	6.1	6.1
Secondary	80.5	80.4	80.6	80.5	80.6	80.6	80.4	79.6
Tertiary	10.7	11.3	11.6	12.4	13.0	13.2	13.6	14.3
Disagree	1017				10.0	10.2	10.0	
Primarv			19.8	15.3	13.8	13.1	13.9	12.7
Secondary			76.2	79.8	80.1	81.2	80.7	81.7
Tertiary			4.0	4.9	6.1	5.6	5.4	5.6

**Table 20** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Romania (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender								
Agree								
Male	50.2	50.1	50.0	49.9	49.7	49.9	49.8	49.7
Female	49.8	49.9	50.0	50.1	50.3	50.1	50.2	50.3
Disagree								
Male	43.2	45.3	45.2	45.8	46.2	45.5	44.2	45.7
Female	56.8	54.7	54.8	54.2	53.8	54.5	55.8	54.3
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	13.0	12.8	12.4	12.1	11.9	11.7	11.5	11.5
25-34	22.0	21.5	20.9	20.0	19.2	18.3	17.4	16.6
35-44	21.6	21.8	22.1	22.3	22.5	22.7	22.7	22.5
45-54	17.9	18.3	18.7	19.2	19.6	20.1	20.4	20.6
55-64	14.5	14.5	14.7	14.9	15.3	15.2	15.5	15.8
65-74	11.0	11.2	11.2	11.4	11.6	11.9	12.4	13.0
Disagree								
15-24	22.7	17.9	20.0	18.7	18.7	19.2	19.6	17.9
25-34	25.7	25.7	23.5	25.2	21.9	20.6	19.3	22.2
35-44	21.4	23.3	22.5	22.6	22.5	22.8	20.8	21.1
45-54	15.7	17.5	18.3	17.0	18.5	18.8	20.5	19.2
55-64	12.8	13.7	13.6	14.6	16.5	16.5	17.2	17.4
65-74	1.7	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.8	2.2	2.6	2.2
Marital status*								
Agree								
Single	33.7	33.9	33.9	34.0	34.4	35.7	36.1	36.0
Married	57.9	57.6	57.4	57.2	56.5	54.1	53.7	53.5
Other	8.4	8.5	8.7	8.8	9.0	10.1	10.3	10.5
Disagree								
Single	46.5	41.6	43.1	43.1	43.6	45.1	46.0	46.4
Married	47.5	49.3	49.3	48.8	49.9	47.6	44.4	44.6
Other	6.1	9.1	7.6	8.0	6.5	7.3	9.6	9.1
Education*								
Agree								
Primary	25.2	24.7	23.8	22.3	20.7	19.7	16.4	15.1
Secondary	49.0	49.1	49.9	49.9	50.8	50.9	53.1	53.8
Tertiary	25.8	26.2	26.3	27.8	28.5	29.3	30.5	31.1
Disagree								
Primary	20.0	23.6	21.6	21.6	20.2	18.3	15.3	16.7
Secondary	57.9	54.7	57.4	56.1	56.3	57.4	60.3	58.7
Tertiary	22.1	21.7	21.0	22.3	23.5	24.3	24.5	24.6

**Table 21** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflictingperceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Spain (%)

Variable	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender*								
Agree								
Male	51.4	51.4	51.4	51.4	51.4	51.3	51.4	51.4
Female	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.7	48.6	48.6
Disagree								
Male	40.1	40.5	41.3	41.5	42.5	43.6	43.7	42.9
Female	59.9	59.5	58.7	58.5	57.5	56.4	56.3	57.1
Age*								
Agree								
15-24	15.3	15.6	15.6	15.6	15.3	14.9	14.2	14.2
25-34	16.3	16.1	16.0	16.1	16.2	16.4	16.7	17.1
35-44	19.5	19.3	19.0	18.7	18.4	18.2	18.1	18.0
45-54	18.0	18.0	18.3	18.4	18.6	18.8	19.0	19.0
55-64	18.5	18.2	17.8	17.4	17.1	16.9	16.9	16.5
65-74	12.4	12.8	13.4	13.9	14.4	14.8	15.1	15.3
Disagree		1210	1011	1019		1	1011	1010
15-24	47 8	44 9	417	40.8	40 1	40.3	39.0	39.0
25-34	20.6	21.6	21.8	22.3	22.6	23.2	22.3	23.4
35-44	10.3	10.8	11.9	11.5	10.9	10.7	10.9	11.2
45-54	57	67	71	71	79	7.2	77	7 1
55-64	75	75	8.8	85	8.0	77	75	7.8
65-74	8.1	85	87	9.8	10.5	10.9	12.5	11.5
Marital status*	0.1	0.0	0.7	2.0	10.0	10.9	12.0	11.0
A gree								
Single	42.6	427	47.0	47.0	47 1	469	467	467
Married	43.5	43.6	47.0	47.0	47.1	44.0	40.7	AAA
Other	13.8	13.7	9.0	89	9.0	91	92	 8 9
Disagree	15.0	15.7	7.0	0.7	7.0	7.1	1.2	0.7
Single	68 3	66.8	66 7	66 5	66.0	65.9	64 5	64 9
Married	24.4	25.9	27.6	27.6	28.6	28.2	28.8	28.7
Other	2 <del>4</del> .4 7 3	23.7	5.8	5 9	20.0 5 /	20.2 5 9	20.0 6.8	20.7 6.4
Education	1.5	7.5	5.8	5.9	5.4	5.9	0.8	0.4
Agraa								
Drimory	0.5	0.0	<b>8</b> /	7.0	77	74	6.0	65
Filliary Secondary	9.J 64 1	9.0 63.0	63 0	63.3	62.8	61.0	60.8	60.2
Tortiory	26.4	27.1	27.8	287	20.5	20.8	22.2	22.2
Disagraa	20.4	21.1	21.0	20.1	27.3	50.0	32.2	55.5
Disagiee	77	61	60	56	65	61	60	61
r i liliäi y Secondorry	/./ 60.0	0.4 60 5	0.0 60 1	5.0 60.2	0.J 67 2	0.4	65 2	0.4 64 0
Tertiory	07.0 72 7	09.J 24 1	2/ Q	25.2	26.2	26 Q	05.2 27 0	04.2 20 1
i ci tiai y	2 <b>3.</b> 2	∠4.1	∠+.フ	4J.4	20.2	20.7	41.7	<i>ム</i> フ.4

**Table 22** The demographic and social "profile" of coinciding and conflicting perceptions with the ILO conventional definitions: Sweden (%)

The investigation of the "agreement" and "disagreement" groups for 2008-2015 shows that they do differ in terms of their demographic and social "profile": Austrians (Table 7) with conflicting perceptions are women (59.9-63.0%), aged 25-34 years (25.3-28.0%), married (42.6-47.8%) with secondary education (70.3-86.8%); Belgians (Table 8) with conflicting perceptions are mainly women (52.3-56.8%), aged

55-64 years (24.3-28.2%), married (40.4-47.7%) with secondary education (59.3-64.1%); Bulgarians (Table 9) with conflicting perceptions are men and women (men: 45.3-51.0%; women: 49.3-54.7%), aged 25-34 years (19.5-26.4%), married (48.2-56.3%) with secondary education (73.6-81.8%); Danes (Table 10) with conflicting perceptions are mainly women (53.9-56.6%), aged 15-24 (63.9-68.1%), single (80.8-82.9%) with secondary education (70.2-84.0%); Finns (Table 11) with conflicting perceptions are mainly women (52.3-56.9%), aged 15-24 years (36.1-43.3%), single (57.4-61.6%) with secondary education (71.6-73.9%); the French (Table 12) with conflicting perceptions are women (52.3-58.6%), aged 15-24 years (22.3-29.3%), single (50.9-57.9%) with secondary education (66.0-68.4%); Greeks (Table 13) with conflicting perceptions are mainly women (53.1-58.4%), aged 25-34 years (23.1-28.1%), married (48.2-56.6%) with secondary education (55.9-60.0%); Magyars or Hungarians (Table 14) with conflicting perceptions are mainly women (49.6-52.1%), aged 25-44 years (25-34: 17.2-23.7%; 35-44: 19.0-22.0%), married (37.2-46.4%) with secondary education (84.4-86.0%); the Irish (Table 15) with conflicting perceptions are women (47.6-52.4%), aged 15-24 years (31.8-42.8%), single (57.4-65.1%) with secondary education (63.9-66.3%); Italians (Table 16) with conflicting perceptions are mainly men and women (men: 46.4-50.5%; women: 49.5-51.8%), aged 25-34 years (24.9-29.6%), single (48.2-49.7%) with secondary education (76.8-80.6%); the Dutch (Table 17) with conflicting perceptions are women (55.1-64.1%), aged 15-24 years (42.2-49.0%), single (51.7-60.4%) with secondary education (70.4-74.6%); Polish people (Table 18) with conflicting perceptions are mainly women (55.1-58.5%), aged 25-34 (20.9-24.6%), married (55.8-59.5%) with secondary education (79.7-88.8%); Portuguese people (Table 19) with conflicting perceptions are women (51.6-60.0%), aged 65-74 years (20.2-23.4%) in 2008-2011 and 55-64 years (23.1-24.6%) in 2012-2015, married (54.8-69.7%) with primary education (53.3-71.5%); Romanians (Table 20) with conflicting perceptions are mainly men from 2010-2015 (53.7-56.7%), aged 15-24 years (17.3-20.4%), married (47.1-52.8%), with secondary education (76.2-81.7%); Spaniards (Table 21) with conflicting perceptions are mainly women (54.2-56.8%), aged 25-34 years (19.3-25.7%), married (47.5-49.9%) from 2008 to 2013 and single (46.0-46.4%) from 2014-2015 with secondary education (54.7-60.3%); Swedes (Table 22) with conflicting perceptions are mainly women (56.3-59.9%), aged 15-24 years (39.0-47.8%), single (64.5-68.3%) with secondary education (64.2-69.5%).

The demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions for two Eastern European countries (Hungary, Poland) is quite similar: young (25+ years) married women with secondary education. In the cases of Bulgaria and Romania, it differs as it is young (25-34 years) married men and women with secondary education and young (15-24 years) married women with secondary education, respectively.

The demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions for all four Northern European countries (Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Sweden) is uniform: young (15-24 years) single women with secondary education.

The demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions for two Southern European countries (Greece, Spain) is much the same: young (25-34 years) married women with secondary education. In the cases of Italy and Portugal, it varies as it is young (25-34 years) single men and women with secondary education and older (55+ years) married women with primary education, respectively.

The demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions for two Western European countries (France, Netherlands) is largely the same: young (15-24 years) single women with secondary education. In the cases of Austria and Belgium, it diverges as it is young (25-34 years) married women with secondary education and older (55-64 years) married women with secondary education, respectively.

In all cases, the pattern of the demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions within each country is in the main systematic overtime with only one exception: age (Portugal).

### Alternative measures of unemployment as they compare to the self-perceived and the ILO conventional measurements

In Tables 23.1 and 23.2, Europeans' employment status according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions are presented for Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Sweden for 2008-2012 and 2013-2015, respectively.

		200	8		2009					20	010			20	11		2012			
Country	ILO	Per.	A1	A2																
Austria																				
Employed	64.1	59.3	63.1	61.9	63.5	58.6	62.7	61.5	63.5	58.6	62.6	61.3	63.9	58.8	63.1	61.7	64.1	59.1	63.2	61.9
Unemployed	2.6	3.7	10.3	11.5	3.2	4.3	10.8	12.0	2.9	4.3	10.9	12.2	2.8	3.9	10.2	11.6	2.9	4.0	10.8	12.1
Inactive	33.0	36.7	26.6	26.6	32.9	36.8	26.5	26.5	33.2	36.7	26.5	26.5	33.0	36.9	26.7	26.7	32.7	36.6	25.9	25.9
Belgium																				
Employed	55.6	54.7	49.6	49.3	54.9	54.0	48.1	47.8	55.3	54.4	49.4	49.1	55.1	53.9	50.3	49.9	55.0	53.7	50.4	50.1
Unemployed	4.2	6.0	11.5	11.9	4.7	6.7	12.9	13.2	5.0	6.8	12.5	12.7	4.2	6.4	12.0	12.3	4.5	6.4	12.0	12.3
Inactive	40.3	39.3	38.9	38.9	40.4	39.2	39.0	39.0	39.7	38.7	38.2	38.2	40.6	39.7	37.8	37.8	40.5	40.0	37.6	37.6
Bulgaria																				
Employed	56.0	55.3	53.6	53.5	54.7	54.3	52.3	52.3	52.8	52.4	50.8	50.8	51.4	51.1	49.9	49.9	51.6	51.4	50.0	50.0
Unemployed	3.3	7.3	8.4	8.4	4.0	8.1	9.3	9.3	6.1	10.8	12.1	12.1	6.5	11.0	12.6	12.6	7.2	11.7	13.1	13.1
Inactive	40.7	37.4	38.0	38.0	41.2	37.6	38.4	38.4	41.1	36.7	37.1	37.1	42.1	37.9	37.5	37.5	41.2	36.9	36.9	36.9
Denmark																				
Employed	69.7	63.1	68.4	65.9	67.2	60.4	65.6	63.1	65.2	58.5	63.7	60.9	64.7	57.9	63.1	60.5	64.0	57.3	62.5	59.9
Unemployed	2.5	2.6	7.2	9.7	4.3	4.3	9.5	12.0	5.3	5.1	10.7	13.5	5.3	5.3	11.6	14.2	5.2	5.3	11.1	13.7
Inactive	27.7	34.3	24.4	24.4	28.5	35.3	24.9	24.9	29.5	36.3	25.6	25.6	29.9	36.8	25.3	25.3	30.7	37.4	26.4	26.4
Finland																				
Employed	63.2	57.6	62.5	61.6	61.1	55.7	60.4	59.5	60.5	55.4	59.9	59.1	60.9	55.7	60.2	59.3	60.9	55.5	60.2	59.4
Unemployed	4.3	5.1	8.8	9.7	5.5	6.5	10.1	11.0	5.5	6.7	10.6	11.3	5.1	6.1	10.5	11.4	5.1	6.2	10.6	11.4
Inactive	31.9	36.7	28.7	28.7	33.0	37.3	29.5	29.5	33.5	37.5	29.6	29.6	33.4	37.7	29.2	29.2	33.5	37.9	29.2	29.2
France																				
Employed	58.1	57.8	57.2	56.8	57.1	56.8	56.1	55.6	57.3	57.1	56.4	55.9	57.1	56.9	56.2	55.6	57.0	56.7	56.0	55.5
Unemployed	4.8	5.7	7.5	7.9	6.0	7.5	9.0	9.5	5.8	7.3	8.7	9.2	5.9	7.4	8.9	9.5	6.3	7.8	9.3	9.8
Inactive	37.2	36.5	35.3	35.3	36.9	35.8	34.9	34.9	36.8	35.6	34.9	34.9	37.0	35.7	34.9	34.9	36.7	35.5	34.7	34.7
Greece																				
Employed	54.6	53.8	54.4	54.3	54.2	53.2	53.9	53.8	52.7	51.8	52.4	52.3	49.1	48.3	48.8	48.7	45.2	44.2	45.0	44.8
Unemployed	4.5	5.1	5.9	6.0	5.7	6.3	7.3	7.4	7.6	8.3	9.1	9.3	10.6	11.6	12.3	12.4	14.5	15.6	16.6	16.8
Inactive	40.8	41.1	39.7	39.7	40.2	40.6	38.8	38.8	39.7	39.9	38.4	38.4	40.3	40.1	38.9	38.9	40.3	40.1	38.4	38.4
Hungary																				
Employed	50.3	49.6	46.4	46.4	49.2	48.6	45.4	45.4	49.2	48.5	45.1	45.1	49.7	49.1	45.5	45.4	50.6	50.0	46.8	46.8
Unemployed	4.3	6.2	12.5	12.5	5.5	7.7	13.7	13.8	6.2	8.8	14.8	14.9	6.1	8.8	15.3	15.4	6.2	9.1	14.9	14.9
Inactive	45.4	44.2	41.1	41.1	45.3	43.7	40.9	40.9	44.6	42.7	40.0	40.0	44.2	42.0	39.2	39.2	43.1	40.9	38.3	38.3

**Table 23.1** Europeans' (aged 15-74) employment status (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey, 2008-2012

Table 23.1 (continued)

	2008				2009				2010					20	11		2012			
Country	ILO	Per.	A1	A2																
Ireland																				
Employed	63.7	61.3	56.6	55.7	57.8	55.8	51.0	50.2	55.6	53.6	49.0	48.2	54.7	53.2	49.0	48.1	54.5	52.7	47.9	47.1
Unemployed	3.5	4.1	13.3	14.1	7.9	9.5	17.9	18.7	9.0	10.7	19.2	20.0	9.4	11.0	18.6	19.5	9.4	11.0	19.8	20.6
Inactive	32.8	34.5	30.2	30.2	34.2	34.8	31.1	31.1	35.5	35.7	31.8	31.8	35.9	35.7	32.4	32.4	36.1	36.3	32.3	32.3
Italy																				
Employed	51.5	50.3	51.0	50.7	50.4	49.4	50.0	49.8	49.9	49.0	49.7	49.4	50.0	49.1	49.8	49.5	49.8	48.8	49.5	49.2
Unemployed	3.7	7.9	12.9	13.3	4.3	8.9	12.8	13.0	4.6	9.6	13.2	13.5	4.6	10.0	13.2	13.5	6.0	11.3	15.0	15.4
Inactive	44.8	41.7	36.0	36.0	45.3	41.7	37.2	37.2	45.5	41.4	37.1	37.1	45.4	40.9	37.0	37.0	44.2	39.8	35.5	35.5
Netherlands																				
Employed	69.3	57.4	67.2	63.6	68.9	57.2	66.7	63.0	67.3	58.8	64.9	61.5	67.1	58.3	64.6	61.1	67.1	58.3	64.4	60.9
Unemployed	2.2	1.2	8.9	12.6	2.8	1.6	9.5	13.2	3.1	2.2	10.2	13.6	3.1	2.3	9.8	13.3	3.7	2.8	10.9	14.5
Inactive	28.5	41.4	23.8	23.8	28.3	41.2	23.7	23.7	29.5	39.0	25.0	25.0	29.8	39.4	25.6	25.6	29.2	38.9	24.7	24.7
Poland																				
Employed	54.2	52.5	54.1	53.9	54.4	52.8	54.3	54.1	53.9	52.4	53.9	53.7	54.3	52.8	54.2	54.0	54.4	53.0	54.4	54.2
Unemployed	4.2	5.9	10.6	10.8	4.8	6.5	11.0	11.2	5.8	7.3	12.0	12.2	5.8	7.4	11.7	11.9	6.1	7.8	12.1	12.3
Inactive	41.7	41.7	35.3	35.3	40.8	40.7	34.6	34.6	40.3	40.4	34.2	34.2	39.9	39.8	34.1	34.1	39.5	39.2	33.5	33.5
Portugal																				
Employed	62.7	60.1	62.1	61.6	60.9	58.0	60.2	59.7	60.1	57.2	59.3	58.9	58.6	54.5	57.2	56.4	56.4	51.6	54.5	53.7
Unemployed	5.2	7.3	6.7	7.2	6.5	8.7	8.0	8.5	7.4	9.6	8.9	9.4	8.7	12.0	13.0	13.8	10.7	14.3	16.1	17.0
Inactive	32.1	32.6	31.2	31.2	32.6	33.2	31.8	31.8	32.5	33.2	31.8	31.8	32.7	33.6	29.8	29.8	32.9	34.1	29.4	29.4
Romania																				
Employed	55.3	59.6	46.1	46.1	54.7	59.1	45.5	45.5	54.9	55.5	45.3	45.3	54.6	53.3	45.3	45.3	55.5	54.2	46.6	46.6
Unemployed	3.4	3.7	16.2	16.2	4.0	4.4	17.5	17.5	4.3	5.4	18.6	18.6	4.4	5.4	19.4	19.4	4.2	5.3	18.2	18.3
Inactive	41.3	36.8	37.7	37.7	41.2	36.6	36.9	36.9	40.8	39.1	36.1	36.1	41.1	41.3	35.3	35.3	40.3	40.5	35.2	35.2
Spain																				
Employed	57.7	58.5	55.0	54.5	53.5	54.3	51.1	50.6	52.6	53.3	50.6	50.1	51.6	52.3	49.2	48.8	49.4	50.3	46.6	46.1
Unemployed	7.4	7.8	14.1	14.6	11.8	12.4	18.6	19.0	13.2	13.8	20.0	20.5	14.3	14.9	21.0	21.5	16.5	17.0	24.2	24.8
Inactive	35.0	33.8	30.9	30.9	34.7	33.3	30.3	30.3	34.2	33.0	29.4	29.4	34.1	32.7	29.7	29.7	34.0	32.7	29.1	29.1
Sweden																				
Employed	66.8	61.4	65.9	64.7	64.7	59.3	63.7	62.6	64.4	58.8	63.4	62.3	65.4	59.8	64.4	63.2	65.5	59.7	64.5	63.3
Unemployed	4.4	4.3	8.8	9.9	5.9	6.1	10.7	11.8	6.1	5.8	11.0	12.1	5.5	5.4	10.2	11.4	5.7	5.5	10.4	11.6
Inactive	28.7	34.2	25.4	25.4	29.4	34.5	25.6	25.6	29.5	35.3	25.6	25.6	29.1	34.8	25.4	25.4	28.9	34.8	25.1	25.1
		201	3			20	)14				2015									
-------------	---------------------------	-------------	---------------------	--------------	-------------	---------------------	--------------	-------------	---------------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------								
Country	ILO	Per.	A1	A2	ILO	Per.	A1	A2	ILO	Per.	A1	A2								
Austria																				
Employed	62.9	57.9	62.0	60.7	62.6	57.4	61.7	60.2	62.9	57.9	61.9	60.5								
Unemployed	3.6	4.8	11.6	13.0	3.7	5.3	12.1	13.5	3.8	5.5	12.3	13.8								
Inactive	33.2	37.0	26.3	26.3	33.4	37.0	26.2	26.2	33.0	36.3	25.7	25.7								
Belgium																				
Employed	54.8	53.7	50.7	50.4	54.8	53.6	50.6	50.2	54.6	53.4	50.2	49.9								
Unemployed	5.1	6.6	12.3	12.6	5.1	6.4	12.4	12.8	5.1	6.2	12.3	12.6								
Inactive	40.2	39.8	37.0	37.0	40.1	40.0	37.0	37.0	40.3	40.4	37.5	37.5								
Bulgaria																				
Employed	51.9	51.6	50.3	50.3	53.1	52.7	51.3	51.3	54.6	54.2	52.6	52.6								
Unemployed	7.7	11.6	13.3	13.3	6.9	11.2	12.5	12.5	5.5	9.2	10.6	10.7								
Inactive	40.4	36.8	36.3	36.3	40.1	36.1	36.2	36.2	39.9	36.6	36.7	36.7								
Denmark	10.1	20.0	2012	2012	10.1	2011	20.2	50.2	57.7	20.0	2011	2017								
Employed	63.6	57.0	62.2	59 5	63.8	56.8	62.2	59 5	64 2	572	62.6	597								
Unemployed	48	51	10.6	13.3	4 5	47	10.9	13.6	42	47	10.0	12.9								
Inactive	31.6	38.0	27.2	27.2	31.7	38.4	26.9	26.9	31.5	38.1	27.4	27.4								
Finland	51.0	50.0	27.2	27.2	51.7	50.1	20.7	20.7	51.5	50.1	27.1	27.1								
Employed	60.1	55.0	594	584	59.8	54 2	58.8	57.9	594	53.9	58 5	574								
Unemployed	54	69	11.2	12.2	57	77	12.3	13.2	61	81	12.8	13.9								
Inactive	34.0	377	29.4	12.2 29.4	34.2	377	28.9	28.9	33.9	37.5	12.0 28.8	28.8								
France	54.0	51.1	27.4	27.4	54.2	51.1	20.7	20.7	55.7	57.5	20.0	20.0								
Employed	56.8	56.2	55 9	55 3	56.2	557	55 3	547	56.0	55 3	55.0	54 5								
Unemployed	62	8.0	93	99	65	86	10.0	10.5	65	89	10.1	10.6								
Inactive	37.0	35.8	34.8	34.8	37.3	35.7	34.7	34.7	37.5	35.8	34.9	34.9								
Greece	57.0	55.0	54.0	54.0	57.5	55.7	54.7	54.7	57.5	55.0	54.7	54.7								
Employed	12 9	11.8	127	12.5	13 /	123	13 2	43.0	116	13 1	11 I	11 2								
Unemployed	$\frac{163}{163}$	17.6	18.6	18.8	15 7	$\frac{42.3}{17.2}$	18.0	18.2	1/ 8	43.4 16 /	17.2	17.3								
Inactive	10.5	17.0	38.7	38.7	13.7	17.2	38.8	38.8	14.0	10.4	38.5	38.5								
Hungary	40.7	40.5	50.7	50.7	41.0	40.5	50.0	50.0	40.0	40.2	50.5	50.5								
Employed	51.2	50.6	17.8	17.8	5/1 1	537	52.6	52.5	55.9	55 6	54 4	54 4								
Unamployed	58	88	$\frac{47.0}{14.2}$	1/3	J4.1 1 5	70	0.3	03	<i>JJ.J</i> <i>A</i> 1	61	94.4 85	94.4 85								
Inactive	J.0 /3 0	40.7	37.0	37.0	41.3	30.1	28 1	38.1	40.1	38.3	37.1	37.1								
Ireland	45.0	40.7	51.9	51.9	41.5	59.1	56.1	56.1	40.1	56.5	57.1	57.1								
Employed	55.0	54.0	18.6	17 0	56.0	55 1	50.5	10.8	58 2	56.6	52.6	51.0								
Unemployed	<i>SS.9</i> <i>8 1</i>	07	40.0	20.5	73	87	17.1	49.0	50.2 6 1	73	14.6	15 /								
Inactive	35 7	363	31.6	20.5	35.0	36.7	32 /	32.4	35.8	36.1	32.8	32.8								
Italy	55.7	50.5	51.0	51.0	55.9	50.2	52.4	52.4	55.0	50.1	52.0	52.0								
Employed	196	177	10 2	17 0	197	47.0	10 2	47.0	40.2	19 5	197	19.2								
Unamployed	40.0	4/./	40.2	47.0	40./	47.9	40.5	47.9	49.2	40.5	40./	40.5								
Inactivo	0.7	12.0	25.0	25.0	1.1	15.4	24.9	2/ 9	0.7	15.2	10.0	24.5								
Notherlanda	44./	37.3	55.9	55.9	44.2	30.1	34.8	34.0	44.1	30.4	34.3	34.3								
Employed	65 1	567	62.4	500	610	560	61.0	50 2	65 1	50 2	67 5	50.0								
	03.4 5 1	20.1	02.4 12.4	JO.Y	04.9 5 0	50.9	01.9 12.0	JO.J 174	03.4 1 0	50.3 56	02.3 12.4	JY.U 16.0								
Institut	J.1 20 5	5.8 20.5	13.0	1/.1	3.2	5.7 27 0	13.0	1/.4	4.0 20.0	3.0	13.4	10.9 04 1								
Inactive	29.5	39.5	24.0	24.0	29.9	51.2	24.3	24.3	29.8	36.2	24.1	24.1								

**Table 23.2** Europeans' (aged 15-74) employment status (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey, 2013-2015

		201	3			20	14				2015	
Country	ILO	Per.	A1	A2	ILO	Per.	A1	A2	ILO	Per.	A1	A2
Poland												
Employed	54.4	53.0	54.4	54.2	55.6	54.1	55.6	55.4	56.5	55.1	56.4	56.3
Unemployed	6.3	8.2	12.5	12.7	5.5	7.4	11.6	11.8	4.6	6.5	10.2	10.3
Inactive	39.3	38.8	33.1	33.1	38.9	38.5	32.8	32.8	38.9	38.4	33.4	33.4
Portugal												
Employed	55.0	50.1	52.9	52.0	56.3	52.0	54.3	53.5	57.3	53.3	55.3	54.5
Unemployed	10.8	14.9	17.1	18.0	9.2	13.2	15.6	16.4	8.3	12.3	14.2	15.0
Inactive	34.2	35.0	30.0	30.0	34.4	34.7	30.1	30.1	34.5	34.4	30.5	30.5
Romania												
Employed	55.6	54.3	47.2	47.2	56.3	54.8	48.1	48.1	56.1	54.7	48.2	48.2
Unemployed	4.2	5.4	17.5	17.5	4.1	5.4	16.7	16.7	4.1	5.7	14.9	14.9
Inactive	40.1	40.3	35.3	35.3	39.6	39.8	35.2	35.2	39.8	39.6	36.9	36.9
Spain												
Employed	48.9	49.8	46.3	45.7	49.7	50.5	46.9	46.3	51.0	51.9	48.0	47.4
Unemployed	17.3	17.8	25.1	25.7	16.1	16.5	23.8	24.3	14.5	15.1	21.7	22.3
Inactive	33.8	32.4	28.7	28.7	34.2	33.0	29.4	29.4	34.5	33.0	30.3	30.3
Sweden												
Employed	65.7	59.8	64.7	63.5	66.2	60.5	65.2	64.0	66.6	60.4	65.7	64.5
Unemployed	5.8	5.5	10.8	12.0	5.7	5.4	10.6	11.8	5.4	5.1	10.0	11.2
Inactive	28.5	34.7	24.5	24.5	28.0	34.1	24.2	24.2	28.0	34.6	24.3	24.3

Table 23.2 (continued)

As shown, the percentages of Austrians classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 62.6-64.1%, 2.6-3.8% and 32.7-33.4%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Austrians allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 57.4-59.3%, 3.7-5.5% and 36.3-37.0%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Austrians distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 61.7-63.2%, 10.2-12.3% and 25.7-26.7%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Austrians distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 61.7-63.2%, 10.2-12.3% and 25.7-26.7%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Austrians classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 60.2-61.9%, 11.5-13.8% and 25.7-26.7%, respectively.

The percentages of Belgians classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 54.6-55.6%, 4.2-5.1% and 39.7-40.6%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Belgians allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 53.4-54.7%, 6.0-6.8% and 39.3-40.4%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Belgians distributed as employed,

unemployed and inactive range from 48.1-50.7%, 11.5-12.9% and 37.0-39.0%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Belgians classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 47.8-50.4%, 11.9-13.2% and 37.0-39.0%, respectively.

The percentages of Bulgarians classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 51.4-56.0%, 3.3-7.7% and 39.9-42.1%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Bulgarians allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 51.1-55.3%, 7.3-11.7% and 36.1-37.9%, respectively. When the two alternative to the ILO definitions measurement are applied, the percentages of Bulgarians classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 51.3-55.3%, 7.3-11.7% and 36.1-37.9%, respectively. When the two alternative to the ILO definitions measurement are applied, the percentages of Bulgarians classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 49.9-53.6%, 8.4-13.3% and 36.2-38.4%, respectively.

The percentages of Danes classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 63.6-69.7%, 2.5-5.3% and 27.7-31.7%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Danes allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 56.8-57.3%, 2.6-5.3% and 34.3-38.4%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Danes distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 62.2-68.4%, 7.2-11.6% and 24.4-27.4%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 59.5-65.9%, 9.7-13.6% and 24.4-27.4%, respectively.

The percentages of Finns classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 59.4-63.2%, 4.3-6.1% and 31.9-34.2%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Finns allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 53.9-57.6%, 5.1-8.1% and 36.7-37.5%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Finns distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 58.5-62.5%, 8.8-12.8% and 28.7-29.6%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Finns

classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 57.4-61.6%, 9.7-13.9% and 28.7-29.6%, respectively.

The percentages of the French classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 56.0-58.1%, 4.8-6.5% and 36.8-37.5%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of the French allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 55.3-57.8%, 5.7-8.9% and 35.5-36.5%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the French distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 55.0-57.2%, 7.5-10.13% and 34.7-35.3%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the French distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 55.0-57.2%, 7.5-10.13% and 34.7-35.3%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the French classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 54.5-56.8%, 7.9-10.6% and 34.7-35.3%, respectively.

The percentages of Greeks classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 42.9-54.6%, 4.5-16.3% and 39.7-41.0%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Greeks allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 41.8-53.8%, 5.1-17.6% and 39.9-41.1%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Greeks distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 42.7-54.4%, 5.9-18.6% and 38.4-39.7%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Greeks distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 42.7-54.4%, 5.9-18.6% and 38.4-39.7%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Greeks classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 42.5-54.3%, 6.0-18.8% and 38.4-39.7%, respectively.

The percentages of Magyars or Hungarians classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 49.2-55.9%, 4.1-6.2% and 40.1-45.4%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Magyars or Hungarians allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 48.5-55.6%, 6.1-9.1% and 38.3-43.7%, respectively. When the two alternative to the ILO definitions measurement are applied, the percentages of Magyars or Hungarians classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 45.1-54.4%, 8.5-15.3% and 37.1-41.1%, respectively.

The percentages of the Irish classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 54.5-63.7%, 3.5-9.4% and 32.8-36.1%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of the Irish allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 52.7-61.3%, 4.1-11.0% and 34.5-36.3%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the Irish distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 47.9-56.6%, 13.3-19.8% and 30.2-32.8%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the IILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the Irish classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 47.1-55.7%, 14.1-20.6% and 30.2-32.8%, respectively.

The percentages of Italians classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 48.6-51.5%, 3.7-7.1% and 44.1-45.5%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Italians allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 47.7-50.3%, 7.9-13.4% and 38.4-41.7%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Italians distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 48.2-51.0%, 12.8-16.9% and 34.5-37.2%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Italians distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 48.2-51.0%, 12.8-16.9% and 34.5-37.2%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Italians classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 47.8-50.7%, 13.0-17.3% and 34.5-37.2%, respectively.

The percentages of the Dutch classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 64.9-69.3%, 2.2-5.2% and 28.3-29.9%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of the Dutch allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 56.9-58.8%, 1.2-5.9% and 36.2-41.1%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the Dutch distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 61.9-67.2%, 8.9-13.8% and 23.7-25.6%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the Dutch distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 61.9-67.2%, 8.9-13.8% and 23.7-25.6%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of the Dutch classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 58.3-63.6%, 12.6-17.4% and 23.7-25.6%, respectively.

The percentages of Polish people classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 53.9-56.5%, 4.2-6.3% and 38.9-41.9%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Polish people allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 52.4-55.1%, 5.9-8.2% and 38.4-41.7%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Polish people distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 53.9-56.4%, 10.2-12.5% and 32.8-35.3%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Polish people distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 53.9-56.4%, 10.2-12.5% and 32.8-35.3%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Polish people classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 53.7-56.3%, 10.3-12.7% and 32.8-35.3%, respectively.

The percentages of Portuguese people classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 55.0-62.7%, 5.2-10.8% and 32.1-34.5%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Portuguese people allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 50.1-60.1%, 7.3-14.9% and 32.6-35.0%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Portuguese people distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 52.9-62.1%, 6.7-17.1% and 29.4-31.8%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Portuguese people classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 52.9-62.1%, 6.7-17.1% and 29.4-31.8%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Portuguese people classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 52.0-61.6%, 7.2-18.0% and 29.4-31.8%, respectively.

The percentages of Romanians classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 54.6-56.3%, 3.4-4.4% and 39.6-41.3%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Romanians allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 53.3-59.6%, 3.7-5.7% and 36.6-41.3%, respectively. When the two alternative to the ILO definitions measurement are applied, the percentages of Romanians classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 53.3-59.6%, 3.7-5.7% negocitively.

The percentages of Spaniards classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 48.9-57.7%, 7.4-17.3%

and 33.8-35.0%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Spaniards allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 49.8-58.5%, 7.8-17.8% and 32.4-34.5%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Spaniards distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 46.3-55.0%, 14.1-25.1% and 28.7-30.9%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Spaniards distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 46.3-55.0%, 14.1-25.1% and 28.7-30.9%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Spaniards classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 45.7-54.5%, 14.6-25.7% and 28.7-30.9%, respectively.

The percentages of Swedes classified according to the ILO conventional definitions as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 64.4-66.8%, 4.4-6.1% and 28.0-29.5%, respectively. When the measurement of the employment status according to the self-perceived question is applied, the percentages of Swedes allocated as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 58.8-61.4%, 4.3-6.1% and 34.1-35.3%, respectively. When the first alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Swedes distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 63.4-65.9%, 8.8-11.0% and 24.2-25.6%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Swedes distributed as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 63.4-65.9%, 8.8-11.0% and 24.2-25.6%, respectively. When the second alternative to the ILO definitions measurement is applied, the percentages of Swedes classified as employed, unemployed and inactive range from 62.3-64.7%, 9.9-12.1% and 24.2-25.6%, respectively.

The application of the two alternative to the ILO conventional definitions resulted in different distributions of the employment status for all countries under consideration. For three Eastern European countries (Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland), the difference between the percentages of the unemployed based on the first alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional definition exceeded 4.4% and in the case of Romania 11.1%. In three Northern European countries (Denmark, Finland and Sweden), the difference between the percentages of the unemployed based on the first alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional definition exceeded 4.4% and in the case of the unemployed based on the first alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional definition exceeded 4.4% and in the case of Ireland 9.8%. In two Southern European countries (Greece and Portugal), the difference between the percentages of the unemployed based on the first alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional definition was more than 1.4% and in the cases of Italy and Spain, more than 9.1% and 6.7%, respectively. In two Western European countries, the difference between the percentages of the unemployed based on the first

alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional definition exceed 7.3% and in the cases of France and the Netherlands, more than 2.7% and 5.7%, respectively. The difference between the percentages of the unemployed based on the second alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional definition differences were more increased than those of the first alternative measurement except for Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania where there was no difference between these two alternative measurements. The differences between the percentages of the unemployed based on the first (and second) alternative measurement as compared to the self-perceived measurement were slightly less than those reported before.

In Tables 24.1 and 24.2 to 39.1 and 39.2, the demographic and "social" profile of the unemployed according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions is presented for Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Sweden, respectively.

As shown, the demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed resulting from the application of the self-perceived measurement and the two alternative definitions to the ILO conventional definitions of the employment status differs. More specifically, in the case of Austria (Tables 24.1-24.2), the unemployed defined according to the ILO conventional definition are mainly men (50.6-56.3%), mainly 15-24 years old (27.4-29.6%) in 2008; 2009; 2011 and 2012 and mainly 25-34 years old (25.2-27.8%) in 2010 and 2013 to 2015, single (54.3-57.1%) with secondary education (75.4-90.2%). According to the self-perceived question, the unemployed are mainly men (56.1-59.1%), 15-24 years old in 2009 (24.5%), 25-34 years old in 2010 and 2013 to 2015 (24.4%-25.7%), 35-44 years old in 2008 and 2011 (23.1-23.6%) and 45-54 years old in 2012 (23.6%), single (47.7-51.6%) with secondary education (79.2-89.5%). In accordance with the first alternative measurement, the unemployed are mainly women (50.7-55.4%), 15-24 years old (24.4-28.9%), single (47.0-49.5%) with secondary education (77.3-87.8%). In accordance with the second alternative measurement, the unemployed are mainly women (52.6-57.3%), 15-24 years old (24.6-28.3%), single (46.0-48.8%) with secondary education (76.2-87.7%).

**Table 24.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Austria, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	010			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	50.6	56.1	44.6	42.7	55.9	59.1	46.9	44.9	55.9	59.1	46.6	44.4	52.0	56.7	46.2	43.9
Female	49.4	43.9	55.4	57.3	44.1	40.9	53.1	55.1	44.1	40.9	53.4	55.6	48.0	43.3	53.8	56.1
Age																
15-24	29.6	22.3	28.9	28.3	29.4	24.5	28.7	27.8	27.3	21.4	27.7	27.2	27.5	21.6	26.7	26.1
25-34	24.1	22.7	18.5	18.7	24.0	23.0	18.3	18.3	27.8	25.7	19.6	19.5	24.2	22.4	18.1	18.4
35-44	22.2	23.1	16.7	16.8	22.5	22.3	17.1	17.2	20.3	20.7	16.1	16.2	21.9	22.7	16.3	16.1
45-54	19.1	21.8	17.2	16.8	19.6	22.3	18.1	17.9	19.8	22.8	17.6	17.2	19.1	22.0	17.9	17.6
55-64	4.9	9.7	13.0	13.4	4.4	8.0	12.3	12.7	4.8	9.1	12.6	13.0	7.3	11.0	14.3	14.8
65-74	0.0	0.4	5.7	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	6.0	0.0	0.4	6.4	6.8	0.0	0.4	6.8	7.1
Marital status																
Single	54.3	47.7	47.2	46.4	54.4	49.8	47.2	46.0	54.3	48.2	47.4	46.7	55.1	49.4	47.0	46.1
Married	32.7	37.6	40.2	41.3	33.3	35.6	40.1	41.7	34.0	38.4	40.1	41.1	32.6	35.7	39.4	40.8
Other	13.0	14.8	12.5	12.3	12.3	14.5	12.6	12.4	11.7	13.4	12.4	12.2	12.4	14.9	13.6	13.1
Education																
Primary	1.8	3.0	2.7	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.9	2.6	1.6	2.2	2.6	2.4	1.7	2.8	2.9	2.5
Secondary	90.2	89.5	87.8	87.7	88.8	89.1	87.0	87.1	87.8	89.1	86.3	86.1	87.2	88.2	86.4	86.4
Tertiary	8.0	7.6	9.5	9.8	9.3	8.4	10.1	10.3	10.6	8.7	11.1	11.5	11.2	9.1	10.7	11.1

**Table 24.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Austria, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13			20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	53.4	57.4	46.2	44.3	53.4	56.7	47.5	45.6	55.1	56.5	48.9	47.2	56.3	58.0	49.3	47.4
Female	46.6	42.6	53.8	55.7	46.6	43.3	52.5	54.4	44.9	43.5	51.1	52.8	43.7	42.0	50.7	52.6
Age																
15-24	27.4	20.9	27.3	26.8	24.2	19.5	26.6	26.6	23.8	18.9	25.3	25.2	23.6	18.0	24.4	24.6
25-34	24.7	22.5	17.3	17.3	27.3	24.6	19.2	18.9	27.5	24.7	19.1	19.2	25.2	24.4	18.8	18.7
35-44	20.5	22.1	15.4	15.6	20.3	21.4	15.5	15.2	20.1	21.2	15.7	15.5	20.4	20.8	15.8	15.7
45-54	20.0	23.6	17.8	17.3	20.8	22.7	18.0	17.6	20.9	23.8	18.7	18.3	21.2	24.1	19.5	18.9
55-64	7.4	10.9	14.9	15.3	7.4	11.5	14.9	15.3	7.4	11.0	14.5	14.8	9.6	12.7	14.9	15.1
65-74	0.0	0.0	7.2	7.6	0.0	0.3	5.9	6.4	0.4	0.3	6.7	7.1	0	0.0	6.5	7.0
Marital status																
Single	54.7	48.6	47.6	46.6	56.7	50.3	49.5	48.8	57.1	51.6	49.1	48.6	54.6	48.8	48.5	48.1
Married	34.2	37.4	39.5	40.8	30.3	35.3	37.0	38.0	31.4	34.2	37.3	38.2	32.3	36.0	37.3	38.1
Other	11.1	14.0	12.9	12.7	13.0	14.4	13.5	13.2	11.4	14.2	13.7	13.2	13.1	15.2	14.2	13.8
Education																
Primary	1.6	2.3	2.4	2.2	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.0	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.2
Secondary	88.4	89.1	87.0	86.7	84.8	87.5	85.8	85.4	75.4	79.4	77.7	76.7	76.2	79.2	77.3	76.2
Tertiary	10.1	8.5	10.6	11.2	13.4	10.5	12.0	12.6	22.1	18.0	19.6	20.7	21.8	18.6	20.3	21.5

**Table 25.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Belgium, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	)10			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	51.1	45.7	55.7	54.9	53.7	48.5	56.8	56.2	53.4	49.0	53.4	55.4	54.3	48.8	54.8	54.1
Female	48.9	54.3	44.3	45.1	46.3	51.5	43.2	43.8	46.6	51.0	46.6	44.6	45.7	51.2	45.2	45.9
Age																
15-24	23.5	14.9	17.2	17.4	24.5	15.7	17.1	17.3	23.6	16.6	23.6	18.0	22.8	15.9	19.5	19.9
25-34	29.5	23.4	24.8	24.3	30.3	24.5	25.9	25.5	29.8	24.1	29.8	23.9	30.6	24.4	25.2	24.7
35-44	22.9	19.7	25.1	24.8	21.9	19.2	24.2	24.0	22.2	19.5	22.2	24.3	22.0	18.8	23.1	22.7
45-54	18.1	20.3	22.1	22.1	16.6	18.6	22.0	21.9	18.5	19.0	18.5	22.7	18.2	19.4	21.2	21.2
55-64	6.0	21.4	10.1	10.4	6.6	21.9	9.9	10.2	5.9	20.6	5.9	10.0	6.4	21.3	9.9	10.3
65-74	0.0	0.2	0.8	1.0	0.0	0.2	1.0	1.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.2	1.0	1.3
Marital status																
Single	52.0	40.7	42.3	42.0	53.7	42.1	42.7	42.5	53.7	43.4	53.7	43.1	53.9	43.0	46.0	45.8
Married	34.5	42.0	45.4	45.6	33.4	40.5	45.4	45.6	33.7	40.0	33.7	44.5	31.7	38.2	41.4	41.5
Other	13.5	17.3	12.3	12.4	12.9	17.4	11.8	11.9	12.6	16.6	12.6	12.4	14.4	18.8	12.6	12.8
Education																
Primary	16.5	22.2	12.2	12.2	15.3	20.7	10.9	11.0	17.2	21.2	17.2	12.5	16.7	20.3	13.5	13.5
Secondary	64.6	63.5	58.8	58.9	63.3	64.0	58.3	58.5	61.8	62.2	61.8	56.9	62.5	63.1	59.2	59.3
Tertiary	18.9	14.3	29.1	28.9	21.4	15.3	30.8	30.5	20.9	16.6	20.9	30.6	20.7	16.5	27.3	27.2

**Table 25.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Belgium, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13			20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	55.3	49.4	54.8	54.2	55.6	52.5	54.9	54.2	57.0	52.8	54.7	54.2	57.7	55.4	56.3	55.8
Female	44.7	50.6	45.2	45.8	44.4	47.5	45.1	45.8	43.0	47.2	45.3	45.8	42.3	44.6	43.7	44.2
Age																
15-24	22.3	15.5	19.7	19.9	23.3	16.7	20.9	21.0	21.9	16.4	19.7	19.8	20.7	15.7	19.2	19.5
25-34	31.8	26.1	26.2	25.7	29.1	25.4	25.1	25.0	30.2	25.9	26.3	26.0	29.9	26.0	26.2	25.7
35-44	21.7	18.8	23.2	23.0	22.4	19.4	22.2	21.9	22.6	19.4	22.0	21.7	21.9	19.2	22.2	22.0
45-54	17.1	17.2	20.1	20.0	17.3	17.6	19.8	19.7	17.2	18.2	20.4	20.3	18.8	18.2	20.6	20.5
55-64	6.8	22.0	9.8	10.1	7.9	20.7	11.0	11.2	8.0	19.9	10.6	10.9	8.8	20.7	10.7	11.0
65-74	0.3	0.4	1.0	1.3	0.0	0.2	1.0	1.3	0.0	0.2	1.0	1.2	0.0	0.2	1.1	1.3
Marital status																
Single	57.2	46.2	49.6	49.5	57.6	48.5	50.2	50.0	57.2	49.2	50.9	50.7	57.7	49.8	51.2	51.0
Married	31.7	37.0	38.7	39.0	30.0	35.0	37.6	37.8	30.5	35.0	37.1	37.3	29.9	33.9	36.6	36.8
Other	11.1	16.9	11.6	11.5	12.5	16.5	12.2	12.2	12.3	15.8	12.0	12.0	12.4	16.3	12.2	12.2
Education																
Primary	15.2	20.7	12.7	12.6	13.4	18.1	12.4	12.2	13.2	16.4	10.9	10.9	12.8	15.1	10.2	10.2
Secondary	64.0	62.6	58.7	58.6	63.3	63.0	59.6	59.8	64.1	64.9	59.4	59.4	64.7	65.2	60.9	60.8
Tertiary	20.9	16.7	28.7	28.8	23.3	18.9	28.0	28.1	22.7	18.7	29.7	29.6	22.5	19.6	28.9	28.9

**Table 26.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Bulgaria, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	010			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	52.0	49.5	52.3	52.3	54.6	52.0	53.2	53.2	56.7	55.6	55.9	55.9	58.2	56.9	56.8	56.8
Female	48.0	50.5	47.7	47.7	45.4	48.0	46.8	46.8	43.3	44.4	44.1	44.1	41.8	43.1	43.2	43.2
Age																
15-24	19.2	20.6	17.8	17.8	19.3	21.0	20.6	20.6	17.4	18.4	18.3	18.3	16.8	18.0	18.3	18.3
25-34	22.2	20.4	20.3	20.3	21.4	19.3	19.5	19.6	27.1	23.8	23.6	23.6	28.5	25.7	24.4	24.4
35-44	21.7	22.2	22.7	22.7	23.9	24.3	24.4	24.3	20.8	20.8	20.4	20.4	21.8	21.8	21.9	21.8
45-54	23.2	22.2	22.3	22.3	21.8	22.6	21.4	21.3	20.8	21.6	21.5	21.5	20.5	20.8	20.3	20.3
55-64	13.1	14.0	14.8	14.8	13.0	12.7	12.9	12.8	13.1	15.1	15.2	15.2	12.2	13.4	14.4	14.5
65-74	0.5	0.5	2.0	2.0	0.4	0.2	1.1	1.3	0.9	0.3	1.0	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.7
Marital status																
Single	35.5	35.9	32.4	32.4	38.8	38.5	38.2	38.1	41.1	39.3	38.7	38.7	44.0	42.7	41.5	41.5
Married	56.5	56.1	59.1	59.2	51.9	52.2	53.1	53.2	49.6	51.7	52.6	52.6	47.5	49.1	50.0	50.0
Other	8.0	8.0	8.4	8.4	9.3	9.4	8.7	8.7	9.3	9.0	8.8	8.8	8.5	8.2	8.5	8.5
Education																
Primary	9.5	13.3	12.1	12.1	10.1	14.7	13.2	13.2	6.8	9.2	8.6	8.6	9.0	10.1	9.6	9.6
Secondary	82.0	79.8	80.7	80.7	79.0	77.4	78.1	78.1	83.0	82.6	83.0	83.0	79.3	80.9	80.8	80.7
Tertiary	8.5	6.9	7.2	7.2	10.9	7.9	8.7	8.7	10.2	8.2	8.3	8.3	11.7	9.0	9.6	9.7

**Table 26.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Bulgaria, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13		_	20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	58.8	57.1	56.4	56.4	57.2	56.2	55.5	55.5	57.6	56.2	56.0	56.0	57.0	55.2	55.9	55.8
Female	41.2	42.9	43.6	43.6	42.8	43.8	44.5	44.5	42.4	43.8	44.0	44.0	43.0	44.8	44.1	44.2
Age																
15-24	17.0	17.1	17.2	17.2	14.9	15.9	16.4	16.4	12.5	14.1	13.7	13.7	13.1	13.5	14.9	14.9
25-34	26.5	25.1	24.7	24.6	27.2	26.4	25.8	25.8	25.7	26.4	25.7	25.6	24.8	23.9	24.1	24.1
35-44	22.4	21.3	21.9	21.9	22.2	21.5	20.9	20.9	23.4	21.6	20.9	20.9	23.5	22.7	21.0	21.0
45-54	20.2	20.9	20.9	20.9	19.0	19.8	19.0	19.0	20.0	20.0	20.1	20.0	21.2	21.2	21.3	21.3
55-64	13.6	15.2	15.0	14.9	16.2	15.9	17.1	17.1	17.7	17.4	18.4	18.6	16.7	17.6	17.5	17.5
65-74	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.6	1.2	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.2
Marital status																
Single	45.3	44.0	43.7	43.6	43.9	43.9	43.4	43.5	40.9	41.9	41.0	41.1	45.4	43.6	44.5	44.4
Married	46.7	47.3	47.6	47.7	46.5	47.1	47.3	47.2	50.0	49.6	49.7	49.6	45.1	47.2	46.4	46.3
Other	8.0	8.7	8.7	8.7	9.6	9.0	9.3	9.3	9.1	8.5	9.3	9.3	9.5	9.2	9.1	9.3
Education																
Primary	9.3	10.8	10.7	10.6	6.9	8.6	9.1	9.1	7.3	11.3	10.0	10.0	9.5	10.8	10.7	10.7
Secondary	79.5	79.7	79.4	79.4	79.6	80.1	79.0	79.0	79.0	77.2	77.3	77.3	77.5	78.6	78.5	78.5
Tertiary	11.2	9.5	10.0	9.9	13.5	11.3	11.9	11.9	13.8	11.5	12.7	12.7	13.1	10.6	10.9	10.8

**Table 27.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Denmark, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	010			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	49.0	47.6	44.6	43.9	58.2	57.7	50.8	48.7	59.2	57.5	51.4	49.1	53.4	51.6	48.3	47.3
Female	51.0	52.4	55.4	56.1	41.8	42.3	49.2	51.3	40.8	42.5	48.6	50.9	46.6	48.4	51.7	52.7
Age																
15-24	36.3	22.9	43.1	52.0	31.3	19.4	40.9	49.0	29.4	17.5	40.0	46.8	29.6	16.8	41.3	47.3
25-34	21.6	25.7	18.6	16.2	23.3	24.0	19.7	17.5	22.9	25.5	19.8	18.2	24.2	27.7	20.5	18.9
35-44	18.6	21.9	14.6	11.9	18.8	25.1	15.9	12.7	19.7	24.1	16.2	13.4	17.5	21.8	13.8	11.8
45-54	12.7	15.2	9.8	7.6	16.5	18.9	12.0	9.9	17.0	19.3	12.6	10.5	16.6	19.1	12.2	10.1
55-64	10.8	14.3	9.8	8.1	10.2	12.6	8.7	7.9	11.0	13.7	9.2	8.0	11.7	14.5	9.3	8.6
65-74	0.0	0.0	4.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	2.8	3.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	3.0	0.4	0.0	2.9	3.4
Marital status																
Single	60.4	52.9	64.4	70.3	60.5	52.8	64.6	69.4	59.2	50.7	63.8	68.3	59.9	50.9	65.5	69.3
Married	31.7	36.5	28.1	23.4	33.3	39.2	29.5	25.6	32.1	38.5	28.1	24.7	31.5	38.6	26.7	23.8
Other	7.9	10.6	7.5	6.3	6.2	8.0	5.9	5.0	8.7	10.8	8.1	7.0	8.6	10.5	7.9	6.9
Education																
Primary	3.1	1.0	5.6	5.5	2.9	1.2	4.2	4.6	1.9	0.5	4.0	4.1	2.4	1.5	3.9	3.7
Secondary	77.3	78.8	78.7	80.0	78.6	79.3	81.2	82.4	77.9	77.4	79.2	80.6	75.4	74.3	79.0	80.2
Tertiary	19.6	20.2	15.7	14.5	18.5	19.5	14.6	13.1	20.2	22.1	16.7	15.3	22.3	24.3	17.1	16.0

**Table 27.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Denmark, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13		_	20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	52.5	51.1	48.5	47.5	50.5	49.5	48.2	46.7	51.0	48.8	46.7	45.7	50.8	48.8	47.1	45.9
Female	47.5	48.9	51.5	52.5	49.5	50.5	51.8	53.3	49.0	51.2	53.3	54.3	49.2	51.2	52.9	54.1
Age																
15-24	28.9	16.4	40.9	47.3	28.2	16.8	41.5	48.3	29.3	17.5	42.5	48.3	27.1	15.8	41.3	47.6
25-34	24.3	27.3	20.0	18.4	23.3	27.1	20.4	18.9	24.1	27.5	20.8	19.2	24.3	27.2	21.2	19.7
35-44	18.8	23.2	15.1	12.7	18.8	22.0	14.2	11.8	17.8	21.5	13.7	11.8	17.7	21.8	14.2	11.8
45-54	16.5	19.5	12.3	10.3	18.3	20.6	13.1	10.9	17.3	20.5	12.6	10.7	19.3	21.8	12.8	10.8
55-64	11.5	13.6	8.8	7.8	11.4	13.6	8.4	7.3	11.5	13.0	8.2	7.3	11.0	12.9	8.4	7.4
65-74	0.0	0.0	2.8	3.5	0.0	0.0	2.4	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.8	0.6	0.5	2.1	2.7
Marital status																
Single	60.1	52.3	65.4	69.4	58.9	51.9	66.2	70.6	60.4	53.7	67.5	71.1	59.1	52.5	66.7	70.6
Married	31.2	37.3	27.0	23.8	30.7	35.5	24.9	21.9	29.7	34.8	24.7	22.0	31.5	37.0	25.9	23.1
Other	8.7	10.5	7.6	6.8	10.4	12.6	8.9	7.5	9.9	11.4	7.8	6.9	9.4	10.5	7.5	6.3
Education																
Primary	1.9	0.5	3.7	3.7	2.1	1.0	4.0	3.8	7.1	4.7	11.9	11.6	6.8	4.2	11.6	12.1
Secondary	76.7	75.9	79.9	80.8	75.4	75.0	78.4	79.5	68.5	68.8	69.7	70.8	65.3	66.7	67.1	67.8
Tertiary	21.4	23.6	16.5	15.5	22.5	24.0	17.6	16.7	24.5	26.6	18.4	17.5	27.8	29.2	21.3	20.1

**Table 28.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Finland, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	010			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	49.4	51.0	47.6	46.6	55.2	58.0	52.2	51.1	56.3	58.9	51.9	51.1	56.3	57.0	52.6	51.6
Female	50.6	49.0	52.4	53.4	44.8	42.0	47.8	48.9	43.8	41.1	48.1	48.9	43.8	43.0	47.4	48.4
Age*																
15-24	32.6	14.6	41.0	41.3	31.2	16.4	37.7	38.3	30.5	14.4	36.6	37.1	31.1	15.7	38.5	39.8
25-34	19.2	18.0	15.1	15.2	21.3	20.2	17.4	17.7	19.7	18.9	16.2	16.4	20.6	18.1	16.0	15.8
35-44	16.3	18.5	11.4	10.9	15.8	17.6	12.7	12.0	16.6	19.3	13.1	12.7	15.8	16.9	11.3	10.8
45-54	17.4	21.5	12.8	12.4	18.6	22.5	14.4	13.6	19.3	23.3	14.8	14.2	17.7	21.4	13.6	12.8
55-64	14.0	27.3	15.4	15.5	13.1	23.3	14.1	14.3	13.9	24.1	15.7	15.5	14.8	27.8	16.2	15.8
65-74	0.6	0.0	4.3	4.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	4.1	0.0	0.0	3.5	4.1	0.0	0.0	4.5	5.0
Marital status*																
Single	59.1	44.6	61.3	61.1	61.5	49.4	62.0	62.0	61.9	50.2	62.7	62.9	59.8	48.8	61.1	61.9
Married	29.2	37.3	26.8	27.2	25.8	34.1	26.6	27.0	26.0	33.5	25.9	26.1	28.2	35.5	26.9	26.8
Other	11.7	18.1	12.0	11.7	12.7	16.5	11.4	10.9	12.1	16.4	11.3	11.0	12.0	15.7	11.9	11.3
Education*																
Primary	9.8	11.8	13.1	12.7	5.9	10.3	10.1	9.8	5.4	7.0	9.6	9.8	7.2	8.9	9.6	9.5
Secondary	71.1	69.1	70.7	70.8	76.0	71.0	73.0	73.2	75.0	73.3	72.8	72.6	73.6	72.2	73.3	73.2
Tertiary	19.1	19.1	16.2	16.5	18.1	18.7	16.8	17	19.6	19.6	17.6	17.5	19.2	19.0	17.1	17.3

**Table 28.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Finland, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13			20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	55.6	58.6	52.3	51.0	55.7	57.8	52.3	51.6	55.6	56.2	52.9	51.9	54.4	54.7	51.8	51.2
Female	44.4	41.4	47.7	49.0	44.3	42.2	47.7	48.4	44.4	43.8	47.1	48.1	45.6	45.3	48.2	48.8
Age*																
15-24	30.3	15.6	37.1	38.1	30.1	15.2	37.8	38.5	29.4	16.9	34.5	35.1	28.9	17.3	33.7	34.2
25-34	20.7	19.6	16.2	16.1	20.5	18.4	15.5	15.1	21.2	19.4	16.8	16.5	21.3	20.3	16.6	16.8
35-44	14.9	16.0	10.7	10.1	16.0	17.7	11.4	10.9	16.0	16.6	11.8	11.3	15.8	17.0	12.2	11.8
45-54	18.3	22.0	13.2	12.5	17.8	21.6	13.1	12.5	18.2	19.1	13.0	12.4	18.2	20.3	13.4	13.1
55-64	15.4	26.8	16.2	15.9	15.1	27.0	16.2	15.9	15.2	28.0	17.4	17.3	15.0	25.2	16.1	15.7
65-74	0.5	0.0	6.5	7.3	0.5	0.0	6.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	6.6	7.4	0.8	0.0	8.0	8.5
Marital status*																
Single	61.2	49.6	61.0	61.2	63.0	50.9	62.1	61.8	60.0	50.3	59.9	59.5	59.8	50.9	58.7	58.8
Married	26.2	34.0	26.6	26.7	27.4	35.9	27.9	28.3	29.1	34.4	28.3	28.8	31.1	35.5	30.4	30.4
Other	12.6	16.4	12.4	12.1	9.6	13.2	10.1	9.9	10.9	15.3	11.8	11.7	9.2	13.6	11.0	10.8
Education*																
Primary	5.3	7.6	10.2	10.1	5.5	6.4	9.4	9.5	4.8	5.7	8.4	8.3	4.0	4.8	8.0	7.8
Secondary	74.4	70.9	71.9	71.8	74.4	73.4	72.6	72.4	71.9	70.8	70.7	70.7	67.6	68.3	68.5	68.3
Tertiary	20.3	21.5	17.9	18.1	20.1	20.2	17.9	18.1	23.4	23.5	21.0	21.0	28.5	26.9	23.5	24.0

**Table 29.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of France, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	010			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	47.9	46.5	44.2	42.9	51.1	49.8	46.5	45.2	51.4	50.1	47.6	46.1	50.1	48.8	46.1	44.8
Female	52.1	53.5	55.8	57.1	48.9	50.2	53.5	54.8	48.6	49.9	52.4	53.9	49.9	51.2	53.9	55.2
Age																
15-24	25.1	20.0	25.9	25.5	26.9	21.8	26.8	26.4	26.2	22.8	25.9	25.2	24.3	20.9	24.9	24.3
25-34	25.9	25.0	24.7	24.2	26.8	27.0	26.2	25.5	26.4	26.0	25.4	24.7	27.1	27.4	26.0	25.4
35-44	22.6	21.2	21.7	21.5	21.4	21.3	21.1	21.0	22.0	21.5	21.0	21.0	21.8	21.6	21.1	20.8
45-54	19.4	18.3	17.5	17.8	17.2	17.0	16.4	16.7	16.7	16.5	16.4	16.8	18.1	17.3	17.1	17.6
55-64	6.8	15.4	9.6	10.3	7.3	12.8	8.7	9.5	8.4	13.1	10.8	11.5	8.5	12.7	10.2	11.0
65-74	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.1	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.9
Marital status																
Single	59.8	53.6	56.2	55.2	60.5	55.6	58.2	57.1	61.7	57.7	58.5	57.1	61.7	58.4	59.4	58.0
Married	30.4	34.5	33.7	34.5	29.7	33.0	31.7	32.6	28.8	31.5	31.2	32.4	28.4	30.9	30.6	31.8
Other	9.9	11.9	10.2	10.3	9.8	11.3	10.2	10.3	9.6	10.7	10.3	10.5	9.9	10.7	10.0	10.2
Education																
Primary	10.3	13.6	10.8	11.2	10.3	12.0	10.4	10.7	9.8	11.0	10.2	10.5	9.4	11.0	9.5	9.8
Secondary	71.2	69.7	71.0	70.3	71.2	69.5	70.7	70.1	71.6	70.8	71.1	70.7	70.9	70.4	70.4	69.9
Tertiary	18.5	16.7	18.2	18.5	18.5	18.5	18.9	19.2	18.7	18.2	18.7	18.8	19.7	18.6	20.2	20.3

**Table 29.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of France, 2012-2015

		201	2		_	20	13			20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	50.5	50.2	47.0	45.8	52.8	50.5	48.7	47.5	53.1	51.3	48.9	47.8	54.1	51.9	50.1	49.0
Female	49.5	49.8	53.0	54.2	47.2	49.5	51.3	52.5	46.9	48.7	51.1	52.2	45.9	48.1	49.9	51.0
Age																
15-24	23.8	20.5	24.4	23.8	23.0	19.8	22.4	21.9	22.1	19.1	21.4	20.8	22.5	18.9	21.5	21.1
25-34	26.8	26.9	25.7	25.3	28.1	26.9	26.5	25.7	28.3	27.7	26.7	26.0	27.5	26.9	26.3	25.6
35-44	21.4	21.4	20.4	20.0	20.6	21.4	20.5	20.4	20.9	20.3	20.8	20.7	20.6	20.7	20.5	20.4
45-54	18.5	18.6	17.9	18.1	18.3	18.2	18.0	18.4	18.2	18.9	18.3	19.0	18.7	19.1	18.8	19.1
55-64	9.3	12.5	10.8	11.6	9.7	13.5	11.5	12.4	10.2	13.5	11.4	11.9	10.3	14.1	11.8	12.4
65-74	0.2	0.1	0.7	1.1	0.3	0.2	1.0	1.2	0.3	0.5	1.5	1.6	0.3	0.3	1.0	1.5
Marital status																
Single	61.5	58.6	59.5	58.4	62.6	59.4	59.6	58.4	63.8	60.8	60.9	59.8	63.0	60.0	60.1	58.9
Married	29.0	31.1	30.8	31.5	28.0	29.5	30.4	31.4	26.9	28.9	29.1	29.9	28.0	29.9	30.3	31.4
Other	9.5	10.3	9.8	10.0	9.4	11.0	10.0	10.2	9.3	10.3	10.0	10.2	9.0	10.1	9.5	9.8
Education																
Primary	9.3	10.6	9.7	10.2	8.1	9.4	9.2	9.6	7.9	9.3	9.2	9.5	8.5	10.6	9.6	10.0
Secondary	71.9	71.6	71.0	70.3	69.0	70.5	69.2	68.8	69.7	69.9	69.2	68.8	69.6	69.8	69.5	68.9
Tertiary	18.8	17.8	19.2	19.5	22.9	20.1	21.6	21.6	22.4	20.9	21.6	21.7	21.9	19.5	21.0	21.2

**Table 30.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Greece, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	010			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	39.2	41.0	37.2	36.8	42.5	44.5	40.0	39.9	45.9	46.7	43.6	43.5	48.9	49.5	46.5	46.5
Female	60.8	59.0	62.8	63.2	57.5	55.5	60.0	60.1	54.1	53.3	56.4	56.5	51.1	50.5	53.5	53.5
Age																
15-24	20.4	19.4	19.9	19.8	18.9	17.7	18.8	18.7	17.5	17.0	17.3	17.2	16.1	15.5	16.3	16.3
25-34	39.2	39.0	36.7	36.4	35.8	36.6	34.2	34.3	35.5	35.1	34.4	34.2	36.5	35.8	35.2	35.1
35-44	22.5	22.7	22.5	22.6	23.9	23.9	23.5	23.5	24.6	24.8	24.5	24.5	24.7	25.0	24.7	24.7
45-54	13.0	13.2	14.4	14.6	15.5	15.4	15.8	15.7	16.2	16.5	16.2	16.3	16.9	17.2	16.9	17.0
55-64	4.8	5.2	5.9	6.0	5.7	6.0	6.7	6.8	6.0	6.2	7.0	7.0	5.6	6.0	6.4	6.4
65-74	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.4	1.0	1.0	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.6
Marital status																
Single	55.7	55.0	50.1	49.9	51.6	51.6	46.8	46.9	50.7	50.0	47.0	47.0	52.2	50.9	49.1	48.9
Married	39.0	39.3	44.2	44.3	41.8	41.8	46.5	46.4	43.2	43.6	46.4	46.5	42.2	43.3	45.1	45.3
Other	5.3	5.7	5.7	5.8	6.6	6.6	6.8	6.7	6.0	6.4	6.6	6.5	5.6	5.8	5.8	5.7
Education																
Primary	15.9	17.3	17.8	18	17.0	17.1	18.9	19.0	16.9	17.5	18.8	19.0	16.4	17.3	17.8	17.9
Secondary	63.0	60.9	62.3	61.8	62.8	62.0	62.3	62.0	62.3	61.9	61.7	61.2	61.2	60.8	61.1	61.0
Tertiary	21.2	21.8	19.9	20.2	20.2	20.8	18.8	19.0	20.8	20.5	19.5	19.8	22.3	21.9	21.1	21.1

**Table 30.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Greece, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13			20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	50.6	50.6	48.3	48.2	50.3	50.6	47.9	47.8	49.8	50.2	47.4	47.4	48.4	48.9	46.0	45.9
Female	49.4	49.4	51.7	51.8	49.7	49.4	52.1	52.2	50.2	49.8	52.6	52.6	51.6	51.1	54.0	54.1
Age																
15-24	14.4	13.5	14.8	14.8	13.8	12.9	14.3	14.2	12.6	11.9	13.6	13.5	11.6	10.9	12.9	12.8
25-34	34.6	34.3	32.9	32.8	34.6	34.1	33.0	32.9	33.9	33.1	32.2	32.3	31.9	31.3	30.4	30.4
35-44	25.9	26.2	25.8	25.9	25.8	26.2	25.9	25.9	26.0	26.1	25.6	25.6	26.9	26.5	25.9	25.9
45-54	18.4	18.7	18.5	18.5	18.5	18.8	18.4	18.5	19.6	19.6	19.3	19.2	20.8	20.9	20.3	20.3
55-64	6.5	6.9	7.3	7.4	6.8	7.4	7.8	7.8	7.4	8.5	8.3	8.5	8.2	9.6	9.4	9.4
65-74	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.1
Marital status																
Single	50.4	49.1	48.0	47.7	50.6	49.3	48.5	48.3	50.3	48.7	48.3	48.3	48.4	47.2	46.9	46.8
Married	43.9	44.9	46.4	46.6	43.5	44.5	45.6	45.9	43.5	44.9	45.4	45.4	44.7	45.5	45.8	45.9
Other	5.7	6.0	5.6	5.7	5.9	6.3	5.9	5.9	6.2	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.9	7.3	7.3	7.3
Education																
Primary	16.2	16.7	16.7	16.8	15.0	15.6	15.3	15.4	14.2	15.0	14.6	14.7	13.5	14.2	13.8	13.8
Secondary	62.1	61.6	62.5	62.4	62.4	61.8	62.6	62.4	62.6	62.0	62.8	62.6	61.3	60.5	61.8	61.6
Tertiary	21.7	21.7	20.8	20.8	22.6	22.7	22.1	22.2	23.2	23.0	22.5	22.6	25.2	25.3	24.4	24.6

**Table 31.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Hungary, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	010			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	52.9	53.5	56.3	56.3	55.6	56.4	57.0	57.0	55.7	55.7	56.5	56.5	54.1	54.9	55.4	55.3
Female	47.1	46.5	43.7	43.7	44.4	43.6	43.0	43.0	44.3	44.3	43.5	43.5	45.9	45.1	44.6	44.7
Age																
15-24	18.5	17.0	14.2	14.1	18.9	17.7	14.6	14.6	16.7	15.4	14.1	14.1	16.5	15.8	14.8	14.8
25-34	30.1	29.3	26.8	26.8	30.1	28.3	26.9	26.8	30.2	28.4	25.7	25.6	26.7	25.6	23.6	23.5
35-44	23.4	24.1	23.5	23.4	23.6	24.1	23.9	23.9	24.5	24.3	24.8	24.8	25.9	24.7	24.8	24.7
45-54	21.6	22.8	24.1	24.2	20.8	21.8	22.8	22.7	20.5	21.7	22.5	22.5	20.9	22.2	22.2	22.2
55-64	6.4	6.8	10.1	10.2	6.7	8.1	10.8	10.9	8.2	10.2	11.8	11.8	10.0	11.8	13.4	13.5
65-74	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2
Marital status																
Single	46.5	45.2	38.7	38.7	47.6	46.6	39.9	39.8	47.8	46.0	41.1	41.0	48.7	47.2	42.0	42.0
Married	40.1	41.3	47.4	47.4	38.3	39.4	46.2	46.2	38.7	40.1	45.5	45.5	37.6	38.6	44.5	44.6
Other	13.4	13.5	13.9	13.9	14.0	14.0	13.9	14.0	13.5	13.9	13.4	13.5	13.7	14.2	13.5	13.5
Education																
Primary	2.7	4.4	2.7	2.7	1.7	3.4	2.3	2.3	2.1	3.1	2.3	2.3	2.1	3.5	2.5	2.5
Secondary	89.4	89.4	85.1	85.0	89.5	89.4	85.5	85.4	88.4	88.5	84.4	84.3	88.2	88.2	84.5	84.4
Tertiary	7.9	6.2	12.2	12.3	8.8	7.3	12.2	12.3	9.5	8.4	13.3	13.5	9.6	8.2	12.9	13.0

**Table 31.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Hungary, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13			20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	55.3	54.4	55.1	55.1	54.2	54.7	54.5	54.4	52.9	52.7	48.2	48.2	52.6	52.9	47.7	47.7
Female	44.7	45.6	44.9	44.9	45.8	45.3	45.5	45.6	47.1	47.3	51.8	51.8	47.4	47.1	52.3	52.3
Age																
15-24	17.9	16.8	15.4	15.4	19.0	18.8	16.9	16.9	19.7	17.9	21.1	21.1	19.2	16.9	20.6	20.5
25-34	28.6	26.5	24.7	24.7	24.9	23.0	21.3	21.2	24.9	22.3	21.4	21.2	24.4	22.6	21.2	21.1
35-44	24.4	24.1	23.6	23.6	25.6	24.9	24.3	24.3	25.5	24.3	22.4	22.3	24.4	23.4	21.7	21.6
45-54	19.8	21.1	21.0	21.0	19.7	21.0	20.8	20.8	18.0	19.9	18.4	18.3	19.5	19.5	18.6	18.5
55-64	9.1	11.6	13.9	13.9	10.6	12.3	15.1	15.1	11.6	14.9	15.3	15.5	12.3	16.3	16.2	16.4
65-74	0.2	0.0	1.4	1.5	0.2	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.3	0.7	1.5	1.6	0.3	1.3	1.8	1.9
Marital status																
Single	52.4	49.9	44.4	44.4	51.4	50.7	44.1	44.1	54.7	50.6	49.4	49.3	52.3	49.8	49.6	49.4
Married	34.3	35.8	41.9	41.9	33.3	34.2	40.0	40.0	30.5	33.0	34.0	34.1	31.2	32.8	33.5	33.7
Other	13.3	14.3	13.7	13.6	15.4	15.1	15.9	15.9	14.8	16.4	16.6	16.7	16.6	17.4	16.9	16.9
Education																
Primary	1.9	3.7	2.5	2.5	1.8	3.6	2.7	2.7	2.3	3.7	3.4	3.4	2.6	3.5	3.4	3.4
Secondary	88.0	87.8	83.9	83.7	88.7	88.5	83.3	83.2	87.5	87.7	86.9	86.8	88.3	88.5	87.4	87.3
Tertiary	10.1	8.5	13.6	13.7	9.5	7.9	14.0	14.1	10.2	8.7	9.7	9.8	9.1	8.0	9.2	9.3

**Table 32.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Ireland, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	010			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	67.5	73.5	66.5	64.0	70.0	73.4	67.9	66.2	68.5	72.6	66.3	64.5	67.2	71.4	65.8	64.1
Female	32.5	26.5	33.5	36.0	30.0	26.6	32.1	33.8	31.5	27.4	33.7	35.5	32.8	28.6	34.2	35.9
Age																
15-24	29.1	27.9	19.5	20.9	28.1	25.0	22.5	23.3	24.1	21.9	21.2	22.1	22.1	19.9	18.7	19.5
25-34	31.6	30.1	23.3	22.8	32.2	30.9	25.5	24.7	31.0	30.3	25.2	24.7	32.2	31.5	26.8	26.2
35-44	19.7	18.4	22.7	22.2	20.2	20.3	21.7	21.4	22.1	21.4	21.9	21.6	22.1	21.3	22.6	22.3
45-54	13.7	14.7	18.5	18.1	13.5	14.7	17.0	17.0	15.2	16.4	18.1	17.9	15.5	16.7	18.5	18.3
55-64	6.0	8.8	12.8	12.7	6.0	8.8	11.1	11.1	7.3	9.4	11.4	11.4	7.9	10.2	11.2	11.3
65-74	0.0	0.0	3.2	3.4	0.0	0.3	2.3	2.5	0.3	0.6	2.2	2.2	0.3	0.3	2.2	2.4
Marital status																
Single	63.8	64.0	46.7	47.2	60.8	60.0	50.8	50.9	57.4	57.3	49.8	50.0	58.4	57.3	49.7	49.8
Married	31.0	29.4	47.1	46.6	34.0	33.8	43.4	43.3	36.6	36.3	44.3	44.1	35.0	35.9	43.5	43.2
Other	5.2	6.6	6.2	6.3	5.2	6.3	5.8	5.9	5.9	6.4	5.9	5.9	6.6	6.8	6.9	7.0
Education																
Primary	14.3	19.8	16.1	16.0	10.1	14.7	12.9	12.7	9.2	13.3	11.6	11.5	9.8	14.2	11.6	11.5
Secondary	66.1	63.4	59.8	60.2	66.9	64.8	61.7	62.0	67.8	65.7	62.7	62.9	68.1	66.4	63.9	64.0
Tertiary	19.6	16.8	24.1	23.8	23.0	20.5	25.4	25.3	22.9	21.0	25.7	25.5	22.1	19.4	24.6	24.5

**Table 32.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Ireland, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13			20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	66.5	70.7	64.0	62.6	63.3	68.3	61.5	60.2	63.0	66.3	62.0	60.4	63.5	67.5	62.2	60.7
Female	33.5	29.3	36.0	37.4	36.7	31.7	38.5	39.8	37.0	33.7	38.0	39.6	36.5	32.5	37.8	39.3
Age																
15-24	21.5	18.5	18.3	18.7	20.2	16.9	17.5	18.1	19.3	16.2	17.1	17.6	19.3	16.3	17.6	18.4
25-34	29.7	28.8	24.6	24.2	28.7	27.9	22.7	22.4	28.3	27.9	22.7	22.4	27.2	26.1	21.8	21.4
35-44	23.1	22.8	23.2	22.9	23.0	23.0	22.8	22.7	23.0	21.7	22.7	22.5	22.8	22.4	22.2	21.9
45-54	16.8	17.9	19.3	19.2	17.4	18.4	20.1	19.9	18.4	19.7	20.2	20.2	19.3	20.4	20.8	20.6
55-64	8.5	11.4	12.2	12.3	10.3	12.9	13.6	13.7	10.7	13.8	14.0	13.9	10.9	13.5	13.7	13.6
65-74	0.3	0.5	2.4	2.6	0.4	0.9	3.2	3.2	0.4	0.7	3.3	3.4	0.5	1.2	3.9	4.1
Marital status																
Single	57.3	56.3	48.6	48.6	56.7	56.3	48.0	48.3	58.4	57.6	49.0	48.8	57.4	57.9	49.2	49.4
Married	36.1	36.4	44.3	44.3	36.2	36.3	45.0	44.8	34.6	34.5	43.9	44.0	34.8	33.6	43.3	43.2
Other	6.6	7.3	7.1	7.1	7.1	7.4	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.9	7.2	7.2	7.8	8.5	7.6	7.4
Education																
Primary	10.1	14.5	11.6	11.5	9.5	13.7	11.2	11.1	8.9	12.8	10.5	10.4	9.1	13.4	10.7	10.6
Secondary	67.9	65.6	62.6	62.9	66.1	64.4	61.5	61.6	66.2	65.2	63.0	63.2	64.6	64.0	61.7	61.8
Tertiary	22.1	19.8	25.7	25.6	24.5	21.9	27.3	27.3	24.9	22.0	26.4	26.4	26.3	22.6	27.6	27.6

**Table 33.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Italy, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	010			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	48.5	50.8	38.4	38.2	51.4	52.4	41.4	41.0	53.0	53.5	42.5	42.1	52.9	53.7	43.6	43.2
Female	51.5	49.2	61.6	61.8	48.6	47.6	58.6	59.0	47.0	46.5	57.5	57.9	47.1	46.3	56.4	56.8
Age																
15-24	23.6	22.3	26.9	26.6	23.1	22.0	25.4	25.2	22.8	21.7	24.1	23.8	22.9	21.5	23.8	23.5
25-34	32.3	31.0	26.9	26.7	32.1	31.1	27.8	27.6	32.3	30.2	27.9	27.7	30.7	29.1	26.9	26.8
35-44	25.1	25.0	23.1	23.1	25.0	24.6	23.7	23.8	24.3	24.6	23.9	24.0	24.6	24.4	24.0	24.0
45-54	14.1	15.1	14.8	15.0	14.9	15.8	15.6	15.7	15.5	16.6	16.5	16.6	16.3	17.3	17.2	17.3
55-64	4.7	6.3	8.1	8.2	4.7	6.2	7.3	7.4	4.8	6.7	7.4	7.6	5.4	7.5	7.9	8.1
65-74	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3
Marital status																
Single	54.8	53.4	49.2	48.9	55.4	53.9	49.7	49.4	55.8	53.7	49.4	48.9	55.4	53.8	49.7	49.4
Married	38.7	40.2	45.1	45.3	37.8	39.8	44.3	44.6	37.4	39.6	44.4	44.7	37.4	39.3	43.7	43.9
Other	6.6	6.4	5.6	5.8	6.7	6.3	6.0	6.1	6.8	6.6	6.2	6.4	7.2	6.9	6.6	6.7
Education																
Primary	8.9	11.4	11.3	11.3	7.9	10.3	10.5	10.5	7.6	10.0	9.9	10.0	7.5	9.7	9.8	9.8
Secondary	79.9	78.4	79.2	78.9	80.4	79.7	79.9	79.7	80.8	80.0	80.4	80.1	81.5	80.6	81.0	80.8
Tertiary	11.2	10.2	9.5	9.7	11.8	10.0	9.6	9.8	11.6	10.1	9.6	9.9	11.0	9.7	9.2	9.4

**Table 33.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Italy, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13			20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	53.5	53.6	43.4	43.0	54.6	54.3	45.1	44.7	53.8	54.2	45.4	44.9	55.0	54.2	45.6	45.2
Female	46.5	46.4	56.6	57.0	45.4	45.7	54.9	55.3	46.2	45.8	54.6	55.1	45.0	45.8	54.4	54.8
Age																
15-24	22.3	20.8	23.3	23.0	21.2	19.6	21.7	21.5	21.4	19.2	21.2	21.0	20.7	18.1	20.6	20.3
25-34	29.7	27.7	25.4	25.3	29.5	27.7	25.9	25.7	28.9	27.1	25.1	24.9	29.1	27.1	25.2	25.1
35-44	24.4	24.5	23.8	23.9	24.0	24.1	23.6	23.6	24.2	24.1	23.7	23.8	23.3	23.4	22.8	22.9
45-54	17.2	18.4	18.4	18.5	18.6	19.5	19.6	19.8	19.0	20.1	20.4	20.5	19.5	20.9	21.1	21.2
55-64	6.2	8.2	8.8	8.9	6.4	8.8	8.9	9.1	6.3	9.2	9.2	9.4	7.1	9.9	10.0	10.1
65-74	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.4
Marital status																
Single	55.0	52.7	49.0	48.6	54.9	52.8	49.4	49.0	55.2	52.8	49.5	49.1	55.5	52.6	49.8	49.3
Married	37.5	39.8	44.1	44.3	37.1	39.1	43.0	43.3	37.5	39.6	43.6	43.8	37.0	39.7	43.1	43.4
Other	7.5	7.6	6.9	7.1	8.0	8.1	7.6	7.7	7.2	7.5	6.9	7.0	7.5	7.7	7.2	7.3
Education																
Primary	7.3	9.2	9.2	9.2	7.2	8.6	8.7	8.7	6.4	7.8	8.0	8.0	6.1	7.6	7.6	7.5
Secondary	81.6	80.8	81.2	80.9	81.7	81.2	81.4	81.1	81.7	81.3	81.4	81.1	82.0	81.3	81.5	81.3
Tertiary	11.2	10.1	9.6	9.9	11.1	10.2	10.0	10.2	11.9	10.9	10.6	10.9	11.9	11.1	10.9	11.2

**Table 34.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Netherlands, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	010			2011		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	52.2	61.2	43.4	41.6	53.4	67.0	45.3	43.1	53.3	63.0	46.2	44.4	54.2	61.6	46.7	44.8
Female	47.8	38.8	56.6	58.4	46.6	33.0	54.7	56.9	46.7	37.0	53.8	55.6	45.8	38.4	53.3	55.2
Age																
15-24	31.7	17.1	35.9	42.9	33.0	19.3	37.4	44.1	31.0	16.0	38.1	44.0	27.3	11.6	37.1	43.6
25-34	15.3	21.2	11.1	9.6	18.0	21.8	12.7	10.9	19.5	23.4	13.7	11.9	17.8	22.2	13.1	11.4
35-44	16.8	19.9	14.3	13.0	19.2	22.3	14.8	12.9	17.7	22.3	14.1	12.5	19.3	22.5	14.9	12.8
45-54	18.7	20.5	15.0	13.4	17.4	20.8	14.5	12.9	19.2	22.3	14.8	13.2	20.1	23.9	15.2	13.5
55-64	14.6	21.2	15.6	14.3	11.2	15.7	13.5	12.9	12.1	16.0	13.6	13.1	13.7	19.7	13.4	12.7
65-74	3.0	0.0	8.1	6.8	1.2	0.0	7.1	6.3	0.5	0.0	5.7	5.3	1.8	0.0	6.2	5.9
Marital status																
Single	54.3	50.3	50.8	55.2	58.5	54.3	55.1	58.3	56.4	50.0	55.2	58.2	51.3	46.5	54.8	58.4
Married	31.8	30.6	36.4	34.5	29.4	30.5	33.2	31.9	32.6	36.7	34.6	33.4	36.6	38.7	34.9	33.1
Other	13.9	19.0	12.8	10.3	12.1	15.2	11.7	9.8	11.0	13.3	10.2	8.4	12.1	14.8	10.3	8.5
Education																
Primary	14.3	15.1	14.7	13.5	12.7	12.2	14.4	13.1	13.7	12.1	14.6	13.2	11.3	11.5	13.4	12.1
Secondary	65.8	65.1	68.1	70.4	67.8	65.3	68.6	71.3	66.9	64.2	68.2	70.5	66.9	64.0	68.0	70.2
Tertiary	19.9	19.9	17.2	16.1	19.5	22.4	17.0	15.7	19.4	23.8	17.1	16.3	21.8	24.5	18.6	17.6

**Table 34.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Netherlands, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13			20	)14			2015		
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	54.3	62.4	48.0	46.3	53.5	58.8	48.5	46.6	52.0	51.7	46.5	45.0	51.0	51.3	46.8	45.6
Female	45.7	37.6	52.0	53.7	46.5	41.2	51.5	53.4	48.0	48.3	53.5	55.0	49.0	48.7	53.2	54.4
Age																
15-24	28.6	14.2	36.3	42.5	28.7	16.8	34.1	39.5	26.5	15.2	34.3	39.7	25.8	14.8	33.2	39.2
25-34	19.0	22.8	13.9	12.0	19.3	22.0	14.6	12.9	18.8	23.9	15.2	13.6	16.6	21.3	13.9	12.6
35-44	18.6	22.8	14.6	12.6	17.9	20.1	14.2	12.7	17.1	19.5	13.1	11.6	16.8	20.3	13.8	12.2
45-54	18.6	20.8	15.1	13.6	18.8	22.8	15.8	14.4	19.7	24.1	15.8	14.4	19.9	23.3	16.1	14.6
55-64	13.2	19.4	13.3	12.6	14.2	18.3	14.3	13.6	16.2	16.5	14.7	13.7	19.1	19.6	15.8	14.5
65-74	1.9	0.0	6.9	6.7	1.1	0.0	7.1	6.8	1.7	0.8	6.9	7.0	1.8	0.9	7.1	6.9
Marital status																
Single	55.7	49.6	55.7	58.5	55.0	51.0	54.0	56.9	55.6	49.3	55.1	57.7	53.3	48.6	54.8	57.8
Married	34.1	37.9	34.0	32.7	34.0	35.9	35.0	33.8	33.0	37.4	34.1	32.7	35.0	38.5	33.7	32.4
Other	10.2	12.5	10.3	8.8	11.0	13.1	10.9	9.3	11.4	13.3	10.8	9.6	11.7	12.8	11.5	9.9
Education																
Primary	11.9	10.3	13.9	12.5	12.2	9.9	14.2	13.5	12.4	9.9	14.9	14.1	11.8	9.1	14.3	13.3
Secondary	68.5	64.7	67.2	70.1	68.1	66.8	67.3	68.8	68.7	65.9	66.9	68.3	68.0	65.7	66.3	68.0
Tertiary	19.7	25.0	18.8	17.4	19.7	23.3	18.5	17.7	19.0	24.2	18.2	17.6	20.2	25.2	19.3	18.7

**Table 35.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Poland, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	)10		2011			
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	49.5	47.7	42.9	42.9	52.0	51.6	43.9	43.8	53.4	53.7	45.7	45.6	51.6	52.1	45.0	44.9
Female	50.5	52.3	57.1	57.1	48.0	48.4	56.1	56.2	46.6	46.3	54.3	54.4	48.4	47.9	55.0	55.1
Age																
15-24	25.5	18.9	27.3	27.2	25.7	20.7	27.0	26.9	25.0	20.3	26.3	26.2	25.2	20.6	26.1	25.9
25-34	29.0	27.0	24.7	24.6	29.5	26.7	25.7	25.5	29.7	27.6	25.6	25.4	29.7	26.9	25.8	25.7
35-44	17.8	18.7	15.1	15.0	17.7	18.1	15.3	15.3	17.5	18.6	15.6	15.5	17.4	18.3	16.0	15.9
45-54	20.7	26.2	19.8	19.8	19.6	24.3	18.9	18.8	19.6	22.8	18.5	18.5	18.9	22.1	18.0	18.0
55-64	6.6	9.0	11.4	11.5	7.3	9.9	11.6	11.9	7.9	10.4	12.2	12.4	8.6	11.9	12.7	12.9
65-74	0.3	0.1	1.7	1.9	0.1	0.3	1.5	1.6	0.3	0.2	1.7	1.9	0.2	0.2	1.3	1.5
Marital status																
Single	45.6	38.4	40.9	40.8	45.8	40.8	41.3	41.1	46.5	42.3	41.9	41.8	47.4	42.7	42.4	42.2
Married	46.4	52.4	50.1	50.2	45.5	50.0	49.6	49.7	44.9	49.1	49.0	49.1	44.2	48.4	48.5	48.6
Other	8.0	9.2	9.0	9.1	8.7	9.2	9.2	9.2	8.5	8.7	9.0	9.1	8.4	8.9	9.1	9.2
Education																
Primary	1.2	1.5	2.1	2.1	1.3	1.4	2.1	2.1	1.5	1.6	2.0	2.0	1.3	1.5	1.8	1.8
Secondary	86.7	89.4	87.6	87.3	85.5	88.5	86.5	86.1	85.2	87.7	85.4	85.0	84.2	87.3	84.7	84.4
Tertiary	12.1	9.0	10.3	10.6	13.2	10.0	11.4	11.8	13.4	10.7	12.6	13.0	14.5	11.2	13.5	13.8

**Table 35.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Poland, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13			20	)14					
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	51.4	51.6	44.9	44.8	51.7	51.9	45.2	45.1	52.0	52.3	44.7	44.6	53.8	53.3	45.2	45.1
Female	48.6	48.4	55.1	55.2	48.3	48.1	54.8	54.9	48.0	47.7	55.3	55.4	46.2	46.7	54.8	54.9
Age																
15-24	23.7	19.8	24.4	24.3	22.7	19.1	23.1	23.0	22.2	18.6	22.8	22.7	21.9	17.8	22.1	22.0
25-34	30.0	27.4	26.3	26.2	29.9	26.9	25.9	25.7	29.9	26.0	25.7	25.6	29.5	26.0	25.5	25.4
35-44	18.7	19.0	16.7	16.7	19.9	19.8	17.7	17.5	20.0	19.7	18.4	18.3	20.4	19.5	19.4	19.4
45-54	17.9	20.7	17.3	17.3	16.9	19.7	17.0	16.9	16.9	19.4	16.5	16.4	17.2	19.1	16.2	16.2
55-64	9.5	12.9	13.6	13.7	10.3	14.2	14.6	14.7	10.8	15.9	14.7	14.9	10.7	17.2	14.9	15.0
65-74	0.2	0.3	1.6	1.8	0.3	0.3	1.8	2.1	0.3	0.4	1.9	2.1	0.3	0.5	1.8	2.0
Marital status																
Single	47.1	42.9	42.2	42.1	46.7	42.6	41.2	41.0	47.2	42.7	41.3	41.1	48.5	43.7	41.9	41.6
Married	44.4	48.3	48.6	48.7	44.0	47.9	49.2	49.3	44.0	48.1	49.2	49.3	42.6	47.2	48.7	48.9
Other	8.5	8.8	9.2	9.3	9.4	9.4	9.6	9.7	8.8	9.2	9.5	9.5	8.8	9.1	9.4	9.5
Education																
Primary	1.3	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.6
Secondary	83.1	85.9	83.5	83.2	82.3	85.3	83.2	83.0	82.6	85.8	83.2	82.9	82.0	85.8	82.7	82.5
Tertiary	15.6	12.5	14.8	15.1	16.2	13.0	15.0	15.2	16.1	12.7	15.2	15.4	16.8	12.8	15.7	16.0

**Table 36.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Portugal, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	)10		2011				
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2													
Gender																	
Male	45.4	44.1	42.9	41.6	49.4	48.6	47.7	46.8	47.7	47.0	45.8	45.1	51.8	50.7	47.6	47.0	
Female	54.6	55.9	57.1	58.4	50.6	51.4	52.3	53.2	52.3	53.0	54.2	54.9	48.2	49.3	52.4	53.0	
Age																	
15-24	19.5	15.8	19.4	18.6	17.6	15.0	17.4	17.0	15.8	13.7	16.0	15.6	19.0	14.7	21.0	20.0	
25-34	30.0	28.3	29.3	28.5	29.9	27.8	28.9	28.0	30.1	28.2	29.2	28.3	27.6	26.0	24.7	23.8	
35-44	22.3	21.7	22.1	21.6	23.1	23.2	22.9	22.6	23.8	24.2	23.7	23.1	22.8	23.2	21.2	20.5	
45-54	17.6	19.0	17.2	17.0	19.1	20.3	19.3	19.2	19.9	20.6	19.6	19.8	19.7	22.1	19.1	18.9	
55-64	10.6	14.6	11.3	12.0	10.0	13.2	10.7	11.2	10.1	12.8	10.9	11.3	10.6	13.7	12.1	13.2	
65-74	0.0	0.5	0.7	2.2	0.2	0.4	0.8	2.1	0.3	0.5	0.6	1.9	0.4	0.3	1.9	3.6	
Marital status																	
Single	40.0	34.7	38.7	36.9	36.1	32.2	35.1	34.4	34.3	31.1	33.8	32.9	46.0	41.5	45.1	43.5	
Married	53.9	58.2	54.9	56.4	56.5	59.7	57.2	57.8	57.9	60.7	58.1	58.6	43.5	47.4	44.1	45.4	
Other	6.1	7.1	6.4	6.7	7.4	8.1	7.6	7.8	7.8	8.2	8.1	8.4	10.5	11.1	10.8	11.1	
Education																	
Primary	45.6	51.3	47.0	48.7	47.1	51.6	48.2	49.3	44.4	49.8	45.6	46.9	37.3	44.7	40.2	42.2	
Secondary	40.9	37.6	40.5	38.9	42.5	39.8	41.7	40.7	44.9	41.2	43.9	42.7	49.7	44.6	48.0	46.0	
Tertiary	13.6	11.1	12.5	12.3	10.4	8.6	10.1	10.0	10.6	9.0	10.5	10.4	13.0	10.7	11.8	11.8	

**Table 36.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Portugal, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	)13			20	)14					
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	52.8	52.6	48.9	48.7	51.0	50.6	47.7	47.4	49.8	49.5	46.5	46.4	50.0	49.3	46.4	46.3
Female	47.2	47.4	51.1	51.3	49.0	49.4	52.3	52.6	50.2	50.5	53.5	53.6	50.0	50.7	53.6	53.7
Age																
15-24	18.7	14.5	20.6	20.0	17.3	13.7	21.1	20.5	18.0	13.7	22.5	21.7	18.2	13.7	22.2	21.4
25-34	27.8	26.1	24.5	23.9	25.9	23.7	21.8	21.4	24.0	22.3	20.1	19.8	21.9	20.0	18.5	18.1
35-44	23.0	23.7	20.9	20.5	24.4	24.9	21.4	20.8	23.4	23.6	19.9	19.4	22.7	22.8	19.6	19.3
45-54	19.5	21.5	18.9	18.7	20.5	22.3	19.3	19.1	20.2	22.5	19.3	19.1	21.3	23.5	20.1	19.9
55-64	10.3	13.8	12.9	13.5	11.6	15.1	14.1	14.6	13.8	17.2	15.5	16.1	14.8	19.0	16.3	16.7
65-74	0.6	0.3	2.2	3.5	0.4	0.3	2.4	3.6	0.6	0.8	2.8	3.9	0.9	1.0	3.3	4.5
Marital status																
Single	48.5	44.0	47.3	46.2	48.1	43.4	47.4	46.3	48.5	44.0	48.6	47.3	48.1	43.7	48.0	46.8
Married	41.3	45.3	42.6	43.5	41.4	45.5	42.0	42.9	41.5	45.1	41.3	42.4	40.6	44.8	41.1	42.2
Other	10.2	10.7	10.1	10.3	10.5	11.0	10.5	10.7	10.1	11.0	10.1	10.2	11.3	11.4	10.9	11.0
Education																
Primary	35.0	41.3	37.9	39.5	34.2	39.6	36.4	37.7	31.0	37.5	34.1	35.4	29.7	36.9	33.1	34.7
Secondary	50.2	46.3	48.8	47.4	49.8	47.1	49.5	48.0	52.6	48.7	51.5	50.2	52.5	48.2	51.1	49.8
Tertiary	14.8	12.4	13.3	13.1	16.0	13.3	14.1	14.3	16.4	13.8	14.4	14.4	17.8	14.9	15.7	15.5

**Table 37.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Romania, 2008-2011

		200	8			20	09			20	)10		2011				
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2													
Gender																	
Male	64.2	64.2	51.0	51.0	62.3	62.3	50.5	50.5	60.3	63.9	52.1	52.1	59.0	64.3	52.7	52.7	
Female	35.8	35.8	49.0	49.0	37.7	37.7	49.5	49.5	39.7	36.1	47.9	47.9	41.0	35.7	47.3	47.3	
Age																	
15-24	30.8	30.8	18.5	18.5	29.0	29.0	18.6	18.6	28.1	28.1	18.0	18.0	28.8	29.3	17.3	17.3	
25-34	26.8	26.8	20.8	20.8	27.1	27.1	21.0	21.0	28.8	28.5	22.1	22.1	28.5	27.7	21.8	21.8	
35-44	21.3	21.3	19.1	19.2	21.9	21.9	20.3	20.3	22.5	21.0	21.0	21.0	22.9	20.9	21.2	21.2	
45-54	16.6	16.6	16.1	16.1	17.4	17.4	16.8	16.8	15.6	16.3	16.0	16.0	14.2	15.4	15.9	15.9	
55-64	4.5	4.5	14.6	14.5	4.7	4.7	13.7	13.7	5.0	6.0	13.6	13.6	5.6	6.6	14.3	14.3	
65-74	0.0	0.0	10.9	10.9	0.0	0.0	9.6	9.6	0.0	0.1	9.3	9.2	0.0	0.1	9.6	9.6	
Marital status																	
Single	48.5	48.5	26.8	26.7	46.0	46.0	27.6	27.6	46.0	47.3	30.4	30.4	48.9	50.2	31.4	31.4	
Married	45.9	45.9	63.1	63.1	48.3	48.3	62.3	62.3	47.7	46.4	58.9	58.9	44.0	42.9	57.1	57.1	
Other	5.6	5.6	10.1	10.1	5.7	5.7	10.1	10.1	6.4	6.3	10.7	10.7	7.1	6.8	11.5	11.4	
Education																	
Primary	8.3	8.3	14.8	14.8	6.6	6.6	13.2	13.2	3.7	7.0	11.8	11.8	4.4	7.0	12.1	12.1	
Secondary	84.9	84.9	82.0	82.0	83.8	83.8	82.5	82.5	84.7	83.1	83.5	83.5	83.7	83.4	82.9	82.9	
Tertiary	6.8	6.8	3.2	3.2	9.5	9.5	4.4	4.4	11.6	9.9	4.7	4.7	11.9	9.6	5.0	5.0	

**Table 37.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Romania, 2012-2015

		201	2			20	13			20	)14					
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	59.8	65.6	53.6	53.6	61.3	67.3	56.0	56.0	61.0	67.2	56.2	56.2	63.3	69.8	57.6	57.5
Female	40.2	34.4	46.4	46.4	38.7	32.7	44.0	44.0	39.0	32.8	43.8	43.8	36.7	30.2	42.4	42.5
Age																
15-24	27.0	28.2	16.5	16.5	25.6	26.7	15.7	15.7	25.6	25.8	15.4	15.4	23.7	25.1	16.4	16.4
25-34	31.1	29.8	22.4	22.4	29.6	28.7	20.9	20.9	28.6	29.0	20.6	20.6	29.0	28.1	21.9	21.9
35-44	23.3	21.7	22.4	22.4	22.2	20.9	21.8	21.8	21.9	20.4	21.6	21.6	22.6	21.4	22.0	22.0
45-54	13.0	13.2	15.2	15.2	15.9	15.8	16.7	16.7	17.3	16.9	18.0	18.0	17.6	17.1	19.3	19.3
55-64	5.7	6.9	14.1	14.1	6.7	7.9	15.6	15.6	6.5	7.8	15.0	15.0	6.9	8.2	13.7	13.7
65-74	0.0	0.1	9.3	9.3	0.0	0.0	9.3	9.3	0.0	0.1	9.3	9.3	0.2	0.1	6.6	6.6
Marital status																
Single	51.1	53.1	32.8	32.8	49.6	51.7	32.6	32.7	51.9	53.5	33.6	33.6	50.6	52.8	35.0	35.0
Married	41.9	40.3	56.2	56.2	42.7	41.4	55.1	55.1	39.3	38.4	53.7	53.7	41.3	39.0	53.4	53.5
Other	7.0	6.6	11.0	11.0	7.7	6.9	12.3	12.2	8.8	8.1	12.8	12.8	8.2	8.2	11.6	11.6
Education																
Primary	4.3	6.8	11.0	11.0	4.0	6.3	9.7	9.7	5.1	8.0	9.9	9.9	5.8	7.5	9.2	9.2
Secondary	81.7	82.0	83.4	83.4	82.4	82.6	84.7	84.7	79.3	79.4	83.8	83.8	82.4	82.4	84.9	84.9
Tertiary	14.0	11.2	5.7	5.7	13.6	11.1	5.6	5.6	15.6	12.6	6.3	6.3	11.9	10.1	6.0	6.0
**Table 38.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Spain, 2008-2011

	2008				2009					20	)10					
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	50.6	49.8	46.7	46.1	55.2	55.1	49.9	49.2	54.6	54.8	49.4	48.9	53.8	53.1	49.9	49.4
Female	49.4	50.2	53.3	53.9	44.8	44.9	50.1	50.8	45.4	45.2	50.6	51.1	46.2	46.9	50.1	50.6
Age																
15-24	22.9	22.7	20.4	20.7	20.3	20.3	19.1	19.2	18.4	18.5	18.2	18.1	17.8	17.6	17.0	17.0
25-34	30.9	29.8	25.8	25.7	31.1	30.6	27.5	27.2	30.7	30.1	26.4	26.2	29.7	29.2	26.3	26.3
35-44	23.7	23.7	23.3	23.2	25.1	24.9	24.1	24.0	25.7	25.4	24.6	24.6	26.0	25.9	24.9	24.9
45-54	15.6	15.8	18.0	17.9	16.2	16.5	17.8	17.9	17.3	17.3	18.9	18.9	18.4	18.5	19.9	19.9
55-64	6.9	7.8	11.4	11.5	7.2	7.5	10.9	11.0	7.7	8.4	11.5	11.6	8.0	8.8	11.4	11.5
65-74	0.1	0.2	1.0	1.1	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.5
Marital status																
Single	50.0	48.8	43.7	43.7	48.0	47.3	44.0	44.0	47.6	47.5	43.8	43.8	47.5	47.1	44.0	43.9
Married	42.5	43.7	49.1	49.1	44.3	44.9	48.0	48.0	45.4	45.4	49.1	48.9	44.9	45.1	48.3	48.4
Other	7.5	7.4	7.2	7.2	7.7	7.9	7.9	8.0	7.0	7.1	7.2	7.3	7.6	7.8	7.7	7.8
Education																
Primary	22.8	22.9	23.6	23.4	22.2	22.4	22.9	22.8	21.8	21.9	22.4	22.4	19.0	19.5	19.8	19.7
Secondary	58.9	58.6	56.3	56.4	60.5	60.6	58.4	58.5	58.9	58.9	58.3	58.3	60.1	59.7	58.9	59.0
Tertiary	18.3	18.5	20.2	20.3	17.3	17.0	18.7	18.7	19.3	19.2	19.3	19.3	20.9	20.7	21.3	21.3

**Table 38.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Spain, 2012-2015

	2012				2013					20	)14					
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	53.7	53.6	49.9	49.5	53.0	52.8	49.1	48.7	52.0	51.8	49.3	48.8	50.6	50.3	48.7	48.1
Female	46.3	46.4	50.1	50.5	47.0	47.2	50.9	51.3	48.0	48.2	50.7	51.2	49.4	49.7	51.3	51.9
Age																
15-24	16.4	16.5	16.3	16.3	15.7	15.7	16.0	16.0	15.2	15.1	15.5	15.5	14.9	14.9	14.8	14.8
25-34	28.9	28.7	25.4	25.3	27.2	26.6	23.8	23.7	25.6	25.4	22.7	22.7	24.8	24.7	22.5	22.4
35-44	26.2	25.8	24.9	24.8	26.3	26.0	24.7	24.7	26.3	26.3	24.5	24.4	25.5	25.3	23.8	23.9
45-54	19.8	19.8	21.1	21.0	21.2	21.3	21.9	21.9	22.1	22.1	22.9	22.8	22.9	22.6	23.3	23.3
55-64	8.6	9.1	12.1	12.2	9.6	10.2	13.2	13.3	10.5	10.9	13.8	13.9	11.8	12.4	14.9	14.9
65-74	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.7
Marital status																
Single	48.0	47.9	44.3	44.3	47.6	47.2	44.8	44.7	48.9	48.9	46.0	46.0	47.3	47.3	45.2	45.1
Married	44.0	44.3	47.7	47.7	43.7	44.0	46.6	46.6	41.5	41.7	44.8	44.8	42.9	42.9	45.0	45.0
Other	8.0	7.8	8.0	8.0	8.8	8.8	8.6	8.7	9.6	9.5	9.2	9.2	9.7	9.8	9.8	9.9
Education																
Primary	18.0	18.2	18.5	18.3	16.6	16.9	17.3	17.3	13.8	14.0	14.3	14.2	13.6	14.2	13.4	13.2
Secondary	61.0	60.9	60.2	60.2	60.5	60.6	59.8	59.7	63.3	63.1	62.3	62.3	62.9	62.6	62.3	62.1
Tertiary	21.0	20.9	21.3	21.5	22.9	22.6	22.9	23.0	22.9	22.9	23.4	23.5	23.5	23.2	24.3	24.6

**Table 39.1** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Sweden, 2008-2011

	2008				2009					20	)10					
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	50.0	49.5	47.7	46.6	54.6	54.4	50.6	49.6	53.5	51.6	49.8	49.0	52.9	50.8	49.4	48.6
Female	50.0	50.5	52.3	53.4	45.4	45.6	49.4	50.4	46.5	48.4	50.2	51.0	47.1	49.2	50.6	51.4
Age																
15-24	42.3	30.3	47.8	48.3	38.3	29.5	46.6	46.8	37.1	30.4	45.1	45.3	38.4	31.5	45.3	45.4
25-34	18.7	21.8	15.6	15.7	20.2	22.1	16.6	16.4	19.4	21.3	16.8	16.6	19.3	21.7	16.7	16.6
35-44	14.8	17.7	11.1	10.4	15.6	18.1	12.1	11.7	16.4	18.4	12.5	11.9	15.5	17.5	12.0	11.3
45-54	12.8	15.6	10.1	9.5	13.7	16.2	10.8	10.3	14.3	15.7	11.0	10.4	14.0	15.9	10.8	10.1
55-64	10.8	13.9	10.4	10.1	11.5	13.5	10.2	10.1	12.1	13.5	10.6	10.6	12.0	12.7	10.6	10.6
65-74	0.7	0.7	5.0	5.9	0.7	0.7	3.6	4.7	0.7	0.7	4.0	5.2	0.8	0.8	4.6	6.0
Marital status																
Single	64.6	56.6	66.9	67.2	63.9	58.4	67.3	67.2	65.7	61.0	68.8	68.8	65.2	60.8	68.2	68.0
Married	25.6	31.2	23.3	23.2	25.6	29.5	23.1	23.3	26.8	30.4	24.1	24.2	27.1	30.4	24.7	24.9
Other	9.8	12.2	9.8	9.7	10.5	12.1	9.6	9.5	7.5	8.6	7.2	7.1	7.7	8.7	7.1	7.1
Education																
Primary	8.6	6.5	10.9	10.4	6.4	6.2	8.8	8.7	6.8	6.7	8.7	8.4	7.5	6.6	9.2	8.8
Secondary	74.2	74.3	72.9	72.4	76.4	75.8	75.3	74.4	75.3	74.6	74.6	73.9	74.6	73.9	74.1	73.5
Tertiary	17.2	19.2	16.1	17.2	17.2	17.9	15.9	16.9	17.9	18.7	16.8	17.7	18.0	19.4	16.6	17.7

**Table 39.2** The demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey of Sweden, 2012-2015

	2012					20	13			20	)14					
Variable	ILO	Per.	A1	A2												
Gender																
Male	54.2	53.3	50.5	49.5	53.4	52.1	49.7	49.1	54.1	52.6	50.1	49.3	53.4	52.9	50.3	49.1
Female	45.8	46.7	49.5	50.5	46.6	47.9	50.3	50.9	45.9	47.4	49.9	50.7	46.6	47.1	49.7	50.9
Age																
15-24	38.0	31.6	45.5	45.4	38.1	30.8	44.9	45.2	37.2	29.9	44.9	45.1	34.5	27.0	44.0	44.1
25-34	20.5	22.1	17.2	17.2	20.9	23.1	17.9	17.8	20.7	22.9	17.7	17.6	21.9	23.8	18.1	18.3
35-44	14.6	16.5	11.1	10.5	15.3	16.9	11.3	10.7	15.3	17.3	11.5	10.9	16.0	18.3	11.9	11.2
45-54	14.3	16.2	10.9	10.3	14.1	15.9	10.6	9.9	13.9	15.5	10.5	9.9	14.2	16.1	10.5	9.9
55-64	11.6	12.6	10.5	10.3	10.9	12.3	10.1	9.8	11.7	12.9	9.8	9.5	12.4	13.4	10.1	9.8
65-74	1.0	1.0	4.7	6.3	0.7	1.0	5.2	6.5	1.2	1.5	5.5	6.9	1.0	1.4	5.3	6.8
Marital status																
Single	65.5	61.7	68.6	68.3	65.2	61.3	68.1	68.3	64.1	60.1	67.8	67.9	61.9	57.7	67.2	67.2
Married	27.3	30.3	24.5	24.9	27.7	30.7	24.8	24.9	28.2	31.3	25.0	24.9	30.7	34.2	26.1	26.0
Other	7.2	8.0	6.9	6.8	7.1	8.0	7.1	6.9	7.8	8.5	7.2	7.2	7.5	8.2	6.7	6.8
Education																
Primary	7.4	6.7	9.5	9.0	7.8	6.7	10.1	9.5	9.0	7.5	10.7	10.1	10.3	9.0	11.6	10.8
Secondary	73.9	74.2	73.3	72.6	73.0	73.0	71.8	71.5	70.8	71.1	70.0	69.5	67.7	67.9	68.4	67.9
Tertiary	18.6	19.1	17.2	18.4	19.2	20.3	18.1	19.0	20.2	21.4	19.3	20.4	22.0	23.0	20.1	21.3

In the case of Belgium (Tables 25.1-25.2), the unemployed defined according to the ILO conventional definition are mainly men (51.1-57.5%), 25-34 years old (29.1-31.8%), single (52.0-57.7%) with secondary education (61.8-64.7%). In accordance with the self-perceived question, the unemployed are mainly women from 2008 to 2012 (50.6-54.3%) and mainly men from 2013-2015 (52.5-55.4%), 25-34 years old (23.4-26.1%), single (42.1-49.8%) except from 2008 where they were mainly married (42.0%), with secondary education (62.2-65.2%). According to the first alternative measurement, the unemployed are mainly men (53.4-55.7%), 25-34 years old (25.1-29.8%) and 35-44 years old (25.1%), mainly single (46.0-53.7%) and married in 2008 and 2009 (45.4%), with secondary education (58.3-61.8%). In accordance with the second alternative measurement, the unemployed are mainly men (54.1-55.8%), 25-34 years old (25.0-25.7%) and 35-44 years old in 2008 to 2010 (24.3-24.8%), single from 2011 to 2015 (45.8-51.0%) and married from 2008 to 2010 (44.5-45.6%), with secondary education (56.9-60.8%).

In the case of Bulgaria (Tables 26.1-26.2), the unemployed defined according to the ILO conventional definition are mainly men (52.0-58.8%), 25-34 years old from 2010 to 2015 (24.8-28.5%) 35-44 years old in 2009 (23.9%) and 45-54 years old in 2008(23.2%), mainly married (45.1-56.5%) and single in 2015 (45.4%) with secondary education (77.5-83.0%). In accordance with the self-perceived question, the unemployed are mainly men (52.0-57.1%) except in 2008 where they were mainly women (50.5%), 25-34 years old from 2010 to 2015 (23.8-26.4%), in 2008 they were 22.2% 35-44 years old and 22.2% 45-54 years old and in 2009 they were 35-44 years old (24.3%), married (47.1-56.1%) with secondary education (77.2-82.6%). According to the first and the second alternative definitions, the unemployed were mainly men (52.3-56.8%), 25-34 years old from 2010 to 2015 (23.6-25.8%) and in 2008 and 2009 they were mainly 35-44 years old (22.7-24.3%), mainly married for the first alternative definition (46.4-59.1%) and for the second alternative definition (46.3-59.2%) with secondary education for both definitions (77.3-83.0%).

In the case of Denmark (Tables 27.1-27.2), the unemployed are mainly men from 2009 to 2015 (50.5-59.2%) except from 2008 where they are female (51.0%), 15-24 years old (27.1-36.3%), single (58.9-60.5%), with secondary education (65.3-78.6%). According to the self-perceived question, the unemployed are mainly women in 2008, and from 2013 to 2015 (50.5-52.4%) and mainly men in 2009 and in 2012 (51.1-57.7%), 15-24 years old in 2008 (22.9%), 35-44 years old in 2009 (25.1%) and

25-34 years old from 2010 to 2015 (25.5-27.7%), singles (50.7-53.7%) with secondary education (66.7-79.3%). According to the first alternative definitions the unemployed are mainly women in 2008 and from 2011 to 2015 (51.5-55.4%) and mainly men in 2009 and in 2010 (50.8-51.4%), single (63.8-67.5%) with secondary education (67.1-81.2%) and according to the second alternative definition the unemployed are mainly female (50.9-56.1%), 15-24 years old (46.8-52.0%), single (68.3-71.1%) with secondary education (67.8-82.4%).

In the case of Finland (Tables 28.1-28.2), the unemployed defined according to the ILO conventional definition are mainly women in 2008 (50.6%) and mainly men in 2009 to 2015 (54.4-56.3%), 15-24 years old (28.9-32.6%), single (59.1-63.0%) with secondary education (67.6-76.0%). According to the self-perceived question the unemployed are mainly men (51.0-58.9%), 55-64 years old (23.3-28.0%), single (44.6-50.9%) with secondary education (68.3-73.4%). while using the first alternative definition the unemployed are mainly men from 2009 to 2015 (51.8-52.9%) and women in 2008 (52.4%), 15-24 years old (33.7-41.0%), single (58.7-62.7%) with secondary education (68.5-73.3%). According to the second alternative definition the unemployed are mainly men from 2009 to 2015 (51.0-51.9%) and women in 2008 (53.4%), 15-24 years old (34.2-41.3%), single (58.8-62.9%) with secondary education (68.3-73.2%).

In the case of France (Tables 29.1-29.2), the unemployed are mainly men from 2009 to 2015 (50.1-54.1%) and mainly women in 2008 (52.1%), 15-24 years old in 2009 (26.9%), 25-34 years old in 2008 and from 2010 to 2015 (25.9-28.3%), single (59.8-63.8%) with secondary education (69.0-71.9%). According to the self-perceived question the unemployed are men in 2010 and from 2012 to 2015 (50.1-51.9%) and women in 2008, 2009 and 2011 (50.2-53.5%), 25-34 years old (25.0-27.7%), single (53.6-60.8%) with secondary education (69.5-71.6%). While using the first alternative definition the unemployed are men in 2015 (50.1%) and women from 2008 to 2014 (51.1-55.8%), 15-24 years old from 2008 to 2010 (25.9-26.8%) and 25-34 years old from 2011 to 2015 (25.7-26.7%), single (56.2-60.9%) with secondary education (69.2-71.1%). According to the second alternative definition the unemployed are women (51.0-57.1%), 15-24 years old from 2008 to 2010 (25.2-26.4%) and 25-34 years old from 2011 to 2015 (25.4-26.0%), single (55.2-59.8%) with secondary education (68.8-70.7%).

In the case of Greece (Tables 30.1-30.2), according to the ILO conventional definition the unemployed are mainly women from 2008 to 2011 and in 2014 and 2015 (50.2-60.8%) and mainly men in 2012 and 2013 (50.3-50.6%), 25-34 years old (31.9-39.2%), single (48.4-55.7%) with secondary education (61.2-63.0%). According to the self-perceived question the unemployed are mainly women from 2008 to 2011 and in 2015 (50.5-59.0%) and men from 2012 to 2014 (50.2-50.6%), 25-34 years old (31.3-39.0%), single (47.2-55.0%) with secondary education (60.5-62.0%). According to the first alternative definition the unemployed are mainly women (51.7-62.8%), 25-34 years old (30.4-36.7%), single (46.8-50.1%) with secondary education (61.1-62.8%). According to the second alternative definition the unemployed are mainly women (51.8-63.2%), 25-34 years old (30.4-36.4%), single (46.8-49.9.1%) with secondary education (61.0-62.6%).

In the case of Hungary (Tables 31.1-31.2), the unemployed according to the ILO conventional definition are mainly men (52.6-55.7%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2012 (26.7-30.2%), 35-44 years old in 2013 and in 2014 (25.5-25.6%) and in 2015 are 24.4% for 25-34 years old and for 35-44 years old, single (46.5-54.7%) with secondary education (87.5-89.5%). According to the self-perceived question the unemployed are mainly men (52.7-56.4%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2012 (25.6-29.3%) and 34-44 years old from 2013 to 2015 (23.4-24.9%), single (45.2-50.7%), with secondary education (87.7-89.4%). While using the first alternative definition the unemployed are mainly men from 2008 to 2013 (54.5-57.0%) and mainly women in 2014 and in 2015 (51.8-52.3%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2010 and in 2012 (24.7-26.9%) and 35-44 years old in 2011 and from 2013 to 2015 (21.7-24.8%), single from 2012 to 2015 (44.1-49.6%) and married from 2008 to 2011 (44.5-47.4%) with secondary education (83.3-87.4%). According to the second alternative definition the unemployed are mainly me from 2008 to 2013 (54.4-57.0%) and women in 2014 and 2015 (51.8-52.3%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2010 and in 2012 (24.7-26.8%) and 35-44 years old in 2011 and from 2013 to 2015 (21.6-24.7%), single from 2012 to 2015 (44.1-49.4%) and married from 2008 to 2011 (44.6-47.4%), with secondary education (83.2-87.3%).

In the case of Ireland (Tables 32.1-32.2), according to the ILO conventional definition the unemployed are mainly men (63.0-70.0%), 25-34 years old (27.2-32.2%), single (56.7-63.8%) with secondary education (64.6-68.1%). According to the self-perceived question the unemployed are men (66.3-73.5%), 25-34 years old

(26.1-31.5%), single (56.3-64.0%) with secondary education (63.4-66.4%). While using the first alternative definition the unemployed are men (61.5-67.9%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2012 (23.3-26.8%), 35-44 years old in 2013 and in 2015 (22.2-22.8%) and in 2014 are 22.7% for 25-34 years old and for 35-44 years old, single from 2009 to 2015 (49.0-50.8%) and married in 2008 (47.1%) with secondary education (59.8-63.9%). While using the second alternative definition the unemployed are men (60.2-66.2%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2012 (22.8-24.2%) and 35-44 years old from 2013 to 2015 (21.9-22.7%), single (47.2-50.9%) with secondary education (60.2-64.0%).

In the case of Italy (Tables 33.1-33.2), the unemployed are according to the ILO conventional definition mainly men from 2009 to 2015 (51.4-55.0%) and women in 2008 (51.5%), 25-34 years old (28.9-32.3%), single (54.8-55.8%) with secondary education (79.9-82.0%). According to the self-perceived question the unemployed are mainly men (50.8-54.3%), 25-34 years old (27.1-31.1%), single (52.6-53.9%) with secondary education (78.4-81.1%). According to the first alternative definition the unemployed are women (54.4-61.1%), 25-34 years old from 2009 to 2015 (25.1-27.9%) and in 2008 the unemployed are 26.9% 15-24 years old and 25-34 years old, single (49.0-49.8%) with secondary education (79.2-81.5%). While using the second alternative definition the unemployed are women (54.8-61.8%), 25-34 years old (24.9-27.6%), single (48.6-49.4%) with secondary education (78.9-81.3%).

In the case of the Netherlands (Tables 34.1-34.2), the unemployed are men (51.0-54.3%), 15-24 years old (25.8-33.0%), single (51.3-58.5%) with secondary education (65.8-68.7%). According to the self-perceived question the unemployed are men (51.3-67.0%), 45-54 years old in 2011 and from 2013 to 2015 (22.8-24.1%), 35-44 years old in 2009 (22.3%), 25-34 years old in 2010 (23.4%), in 2008 the unemployed are 21.2% for 25-34 years old and for 55-64 years old, also in 2012 the unemployed are 22.8% for 25-34 years old and 35-44 years old, single (46.5-54.3%) with secondary education (64.0-66.8%). While using the first alternative definition the unemployed are mainly women (51.5-56.6%), 15-24 years old (33.2-38.1%), single (50.8-55.7%) with secondary education (66.3-68.6%). With the second alternative definition the unemployed are women (53.4-58.4%), 15-24 years old (39.2-44.1%), single (55.2-58.5%) with secondary education (68.0-71.3%).

In the case of Poland (Tables 35.1-35.2), according to the ILO definition are from 2009 to 2015 the unemployed are mainly men (51.4-53.8%) and in 2008 the

unemployed are mainly women (50.5%), 25-34 years old (29.0-30.0%), single from 2009 to 2015 (45.8-48.5%) and married in 2008 (46.4%) with secondary education (82.0-86.7%). According to the self-perceived question the unemployed are mainly men from 2009 to 2015 (51.6-53.7%) and women in 2008 (52.3%), 25-34 years old (26.0-27.6%), married (47.2-52.4%) with secondary education (85.3-89.4%). While using the first alternative definition the unemployed are mainly women (54.3-57.1%), 15-24 years old from 2008 to 2011 (26.1-27.3%) and 25-34 years old from 2012 to 2015 (25.5-26.3%), married (48.5-50.1%) with secondary education (82.7-87.6%). According to the second alternative definition the unemployed are mainly women (54.9-57.1%), 15-24 years old from 2008 to 2011 (25.9-27.2%) and 25-34 years old from 2012 to 2012 to 2015 (25.4-26.2%), married (48.6-50.2%) with secondary education (82.5-87.3%).

In the case of Portugal (Tables 36.1-36.2), the unemployed, according to the ILO conventional definition, are men from 2011 to 2013 (51.0-52.8%), women from 2008 to 2010 and in 2014 (50.2-54.6%) and 50.0% men and women in 2015, 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2014 (24.0-30.1%), 35-44 years old in 2015 (22.7%), married from 2008 to 2011 (43.5-57.9%) and single from 2012 to 2015 (48.1-48.5%), with primary education in 2008 and in 2009 (45.6-47.1%) and secondary education from 2010 to 2015 (44.9-52.6%). According to the self-perceived question the unemployed are men from 2011 to 2013 (50.6-52.6%) and women from 2008 to 2010 and in 2014 and in 2015 (50.5-55.9%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2012 (26.0-30.0%), 35-44 years old in 2013 and in 2014 (23.6-24.9%) and 45-54 years old in 2015 (23.5%), married (47.4-60.7%), with primary education from 2008 to 2011 (44.7-51.6%) and secondary education from 2012 to 2015 (46.3-48.7%). According to the first alternative definition the unemployed are mainly women (51.1-57.1%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2013 (21.8-29.3%) and 15-24 years old in 2014 and in 2015 (22.2-22.5%), married from 2008 to 2011 (44.1-58.1%) and single from 2012 to 2015 (47.3-48.0%) with primary education from 2008 to 2010 (45.6-48.2%) and with secondary education from 2011 to 2015 (48.0-51.5%). While using the second alternative definition the unemployed are mainly women (51.3-58.4%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2013 (21.4-28.5%) and 15-24 years old in 2014 and in 2015 (21.4-21.7%), married from 2008 to 2011 (45.4-58.6%) and single from 2012 to 2015 (46.2-47.3%), with primary education from 2008 to 2010 (46.9-49.3%) and with secondary education from 2011 to 2015 (46.0-50.2%).

In the case of Romania (Tables 37.1-37.2), according to the ILO conventional definition the unemployed are mainly men (59.8-64.2%), 15-24 years old in 2008, in 2009 and in 2011 (28.8-30.8%) and 25-34 years old in 2010 and from 2012 to 2015 (28.6-31.1%), single in 2008 and from 2011 to 2015 (48.5-51.9%) and married in 2009 and in 2010 (47.7-48.3%), with secondary education (79.3-84.9%). According to the self-perceived question the unemployed are men (62.3-69.8%), 15-24 years old in 2008, in 2009 and in 2011 (29.0-30.8%) and 25-34 years old in 2010 and from 2012 to 2015 (28.1-29.8%), single in 2008 and from 2010 to 2015 (47.3-53.5%) and married in 2009 (48.3%), with secondary education (79.4-84.9%). While using the first alternative definition the unemployed are men (50.5-57.6%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2011 (20.8-22.1%), 22.4% for 25-34 and to 35-44 years old in 2012 and 35-44 years old from 2013 to 2015 (21.6-22.0%), married (53.4-63.1%) with secondary education (82.0-84.9%). While using the second alternative definition the unemployed are mainly men (50.5-57.5%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2011 (20.8-22.1%), 22.4% for 25-34 and to 35-44 years old in 2012 and 35-44 years old from 2013 to 2015 (21.6-22.0%), married (53.5-63.1%) with secondary education (82.0-84.9%).

In the case of Spain (Tables 38.1-38.2), the unemployed according to the ILO conventional definition are mainly men (50.6-55.2%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2013 (27.2-31.1%) and 35-44 years old in 2014 and in 2015 (25.3-26.3%), single (47.3-50.0%) with secondary education (58.9-63.3%). The unemployed according to the self-perceived question are mainly men from 2009 to 2015 (50.3-55.1%) and women in 2008 (50.2%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2013 (26.6-30.6%) and 35-44 years old in 2014 and in 2015 (25.3-26.3%), single (47.1-48.9%) with secondary education (58.6-63.1%). According to the first alternative definition the unemployed are mainly women (50.1-53.3%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2012 (25.4-27.5%) and 35-44 years old from 2013 to 2015 (23.8-24.7%), single in 2008 and in 2014 and 2015 (43.7-46.0%) and married from 2009 to 2013 (46.6-49.1%), with secondary education (56.3-62.3%). While using the second alternative definition the unemployed are mainly women (50.5-53.9%), 25-34 years old from 2008 to 2012 (25.3-27.2%) and 35-44 years old from 2013 to 2015 (23.9-24.7%), single in 2008 and in 2014 and 2015 (43.7-46.0%) and married from 2009 to 2013 (46.6-48.9%) with secondary education (56.4-62.3%).

In the case of Sweden (Tables 39.1-39.2), according to the ILO conventional definition the unemployed are mainly men from 2009 to 2015 (52.9-54.6%) and in 2008 the unemployed are 50.0% men and women, 15-24 years old (34.5-42.3%), single (61.9-65.7%) with secondary education (67.7-76.4%). While using the self-perceived measurement the unemployed are mainly men from 2009 to 2015 (50.8-54.4%) and mainly women in 2008 (50.5%), 15-24 years old (27.0-31.6%), single (56.6-61.7%) with secondary education (67.9-75.8%). According to the first alternative definition the unemployed are mainly men in 2009, in 2012 and in 2014 and 2015 (50.1-50.6%) and mainly women in 2008, 2010, 2011 and in 2013 (50.2-52.3%), 15-24 years old (44.0-47.8%), single (66.9-68.8%) with secondary education (67.9-74.4%).

Investigation of the demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed according to the alternative definitions showed in all cases threatening unemployment rates for women and men also, the young (15-24 years old) in Austria, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Poland (until 2011) and Sweden, while at high risk is those aged 25-34 years in all other countries. Also, those that are single are in high risk except in the cases of Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, Portugal, Romania and Spain where the married are at more risk. Furthermore, those that completed secondary education are in high risk except in the case of Romania for 2008-2010 where those with primary education were more at risk.

Although, the social and demographic "profile" of the unemployed does change when using different measurements, it should be noted that, overtime and at the national level, the more changes were identified for the demographic variables gender and age than the social variables marital status and level of educational attainment.

## The impact of applying different definitions of unemployment to the measurement of the unemployment rate

In Figures 7 to 22, the unemployment rate measured according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived question and the two alternative definition is presented for Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece,

Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Sweden, respectively. The detailed results are presented in Table A8.



**Figure 7** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the selfperceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Austria, 2008-2015



**Figure 8** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the selfperceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Belgium, 2008-2015



**Figure 9** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the selfperceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Bulgaria, 2008-2015



**Figure 10** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Denmark, 2008-2015



**Figure 11** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Finland, 2008-2015



**Figure 12** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of France, 2008-2015



**Figure 13** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Greece, 2008-2015



**Figure 14** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Hungary, 2008-2015



**Figure 15** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Ireland, 2008-2015



**Figure 16** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Italy, 2008-2015



**Figure 17** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Netherlands, 2008-2015



**Figure 18** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Poland, 2008-2015



**Figure 19** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Portugal, 2008-2015



**Figure 20** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Romania, 2008-2015



**Figure 21** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Spain, 2008-2015



**Figure 22** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions: European Union Labour Force Survey of Sweden, 2008-2015

In the case of Austria, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 3.8% to 5.7%, 5.9% to 8.7%, 14.0% to 16.6% and 15.7% to 18.5%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 2.0-3.0%, 9.8-10.9% and 11.6-12.8%, respectively.

In the case Belgium, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 7.0% to 8.5%, 9.9% to 11.2%, 18.9% to 21.2% and 19.4% to 21.7%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 1.9-3.5%, 11.1-13.3% and 11.6-13.8%, respectively.

In the case of Bulgaria, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 5.6% to 13.0%, 11.6% to 18.6%, 13.6% to 20.9% and 13.6% to 21.0%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first and the second alternative definition ranges from 5.4-6.9% and 7.7-9.0%, respectively.

In the case of Denmark, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 3.4% to 7.6%, 3.9% to 8.4%, 9.5% to 15.5% and 12.8% to 19.0%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 0.5-1.4%, 6.1-8.3% and 9.4-12.0%, respectively.

In the case of Finland, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 6.4% to 9.4%, 8.1% to 13.0%, 12.3% to 17.9% and 13.6% to 20.7%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived

measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 1.8-3.8%, 6.0-8.6% and 7.2-10.1%, respectively.

In the case of France, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 7.6% to 10.4%, 9.0% to 13.8%, 11.6% to 15.5% and 12.3% to 16.3%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 1.4-3.4%, 4.1-5.1% and 4.7-5.9%, respectively.

In the case of Greece, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 7.7% to 27.5%, 8.6% to 29.6%, 9.8% to 30.3% and 10.0% to 30.7%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 0.9-2.5%, 2.1-2.9% and 2.3-3.2%, respectively.

In the case of Hungary, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, the first and second alternative definitions ranges from 7.8% to 11.2%, 11.2% to 15.4% and 13.5% to 25.2%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first and the second alternative definition ranges is from 3.1-4.6% and 6.6-14.3%, respectively.

In the case of Ireland, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 5.3% to 14.7%, 6.3% to 17.2%, 19.0% to 29.2% and 20.2% to 30.4%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 1.0-2.7%, 12.3-15.8% and 13.4-16.9%, respectively.

In the case of Italy, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 6.8% to 12.7%, 13.6% to 21.8%, 20.2% to 26.0% and 20.7% to 26.3%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived

measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 6.9-9.4%, 12.5-13.7% and 12.9-14.4%, respectively.

In the case of the Netherlands, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 3.0% to 7.4%, 2.0% to 9.4%, 11.7% to 18.2% and 16.5% to 22.9%, respectively. In this case, from 2008 to 2013, there is a decrease of 0.7-1.1% in the unemployment rate when using the self-perceived and only in 2014 and 2015 there is an increase in this measurement ranging from 1.8% to 1.9%. The increase of the ILO conventional definition while using the first and second alternative definitions ranges from 8.7-10.7% and 13.4-15.5%, respectively.

In the case of Poland, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 7.1% to 10.3%, 10.0% to 13.4%, 16.4% to 18.7% and 16.7% to 18.9%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 2.5-3.0%, 7.8-9.2% and 8.0-9.5%, respectively.

In the case of Portugal, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 7.7% to 16.4%, 10.8% to 22.9%, 9.8% to 24.5% and 10.5% to 25.7%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 3.1-6.56%, 2.1-8.2% and 2.7-9.3%, respectively.

In the case of Romania, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, the first and second alternative definitions ranges from 5.8% to 7.4%, 5.8% to 9.4% and 26.0% to 30.0%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first and the second alternative definition ranges from 0.0-2.6% and 16.8-22.6%, respectively.

In the case of Spain, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, the first and second alternative definitions ranges from 11.3% to 26.1%, 11.7% to 26.3%, 20.4% to 35.1% and 21.1% to 36.0%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as

measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 0.2-0.6%, 8.3-9.2% and 8.9-10.0%, respectively.

In the case of Sweden, the unemployment rate according to the ILO conventional definition, the self-perceived measurement, the first and second alternative definitions ranges from 6.2% to 8.6%, 6.5% to 9.3%, 11.7% to 14.4% and 13.3% to 16.3%, respectively. The increase in the unemployment rate as measured by the ILO conventional definition when using the self-perceived measurement, the first alternative definition and the second alternative definition ranges from 0.3-0.9%, 5.5-6.2% and 7.1-7.9%, respectively.

In all countries, the unemployment rate as defined by the ILO increases when the self-perceived measurement is applied except in the case of the Netherlands. The resulting increase is higher in the cases of Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Portugal.

The application of the two alternative definitions to the EU-LFS data resulted in an increase of the official unemployment rate in all countries. More remarked was the increase in the cases of Belgium, Hungary, Ireland, Italy and especially that of Romania.

## **Discussion and conclusions**

Stewart (1955, p.11) pointed out that "definition or concept is important because of the desirability of a measurement as suitable as possible for policy purposes and for an informed public opinion on current economic developments". In this respect, in order to demonstrate and assess the impact of definitions to the measurement of unemployment three different measures were used which were compared to the ILO conventional definitions. These measures were the self-perceived employment status and two alternative measures of the employment status defined in the context of the European Union Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) measurement of the unemployment as variations of the ILO conventional definitions.

The analysis was based on the 2008-2015 EU-LFS annual datasets for the following 16 European countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Sweden. These countries were selected from the 34 participating ones in the EU-LFS because the self-perceived measurement of the employment status was included in the datasets and also, in order to allow for possible cross-national comparisons between broader geographical regions.

This methodological study has both strengths and limitations. The demonstration of the complex sequence of decisions required for formulating the three different measures used in the analysis and ascertaining their cross-national and overtime comparability given the limitations of the EU-LFS questionnaire should be noted among the strengths of the study. The first such decision pertained to the underlying survey population. In this respect, in line with current literature (de la Fuente, 2011; Eurostat, 2016a), only respondents aged 15 to 74 years were considered in the analysis so as to allow for comparability with the ILO conventional definition of the unemployed. The decision to start the series in 2008 and not in 2006 when the self-perceived measurement of the employment status was first introduced in the EU-LFS questionnaire was based on the change of the reference period for this variable by Eurostat; a decision that complied with the strict methodological requirements for the cross-national and overtime comparability of measurements according to current theory and practice (Carey, 2000; Kish, 1994; Verma & Gabilondo, 1993). Certainly, the self-perceived measurement of the employment status included in the EU-LFS questionnaire and formulated as it is used in all large-scale sample surveys and the

census, i.e. as one of the occupational background variables, is not comparable to the EU-LFS measurement based on the ILO conventional definitions and their results will differ since a composite economic construct would normally deviate from people's perceptions. However, by obtaining a social "profile" of agreement and disagreement between Europeans' declared self-perceptions of their employment status and the ILO conventional definitions, we were able to investigate how conflicting and coinciding perceptions differed overtime within-nations and cross-nationally.

The resulting surprisingly high percentages of Europeans' overall perceptions of their employment status in agreement with the ILO conventional definitions indicate that this question should precede and not follow the questions on the labour status according to the ILO conventional definitions or the questions on the registration at the public employment office as is the Eurostat instruction to participating countries. Furthermore, the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000 (p. 20) stating that if the self-perceived measurement of the employment status were to precede the questions on the employment status measured according to the ILO conventional definitions "this would prejudice the response to the questions on the ILO labour status" is without methodological foundation. It is common practice in social sample survey research to place perception questions before concepts are made quite clear or as Oppenheim (1992, p. 112) pointed out: "We try, as much as possible, to avoid putting ideas into respondents' minds". Schwarz (1987) argued that cognitive issues raised from the questionnaire may have important implications on the questionnaire design and the survey operations. Bradburn, Sudman and Wansink (2004, p. 145) pointed out that:

"The potential biasing effect of the positioning of questions in a questionnaire has long been recognized as a problem in survey and market research [...] Although we still do not understand many of the processes involved in order effects, research on cognitive aspects of surveys have enabled us to better understand the effect of order and gives us guidance about where to expect such effects [...] Why should order matter? Stating explicit alternatives provides a context or framework within which the respondent answers questions. So, too, the order of questions provides a context within which questions are answered. Questions that are quite closely related tend to increase the saliency of particular aspects of the object".

In this context, "questions should be ordered so as to minimize the effect of respondents' answers on subsequent questions" (Bradburn, Sudman, & Wansink, 2004, p. 332), since "preceding questions can affect respondents' inferences about the

intended meaning of subsequent questions [...] Finally, preceding questions can influence which information respondents use in forming a mental representation of the attitude object and the standard against which the object is evaluated" (Schwarz, Knäuper, & Stich, 2008, p. 28; see also, Sudman, Bradburn, & Schwarz, 1996; Krosnick, & Presser, 2010).

In this sense, and based on our results we concur with Gauckler and Körner (2011) who proposed that the self-perceived employment status question should be asked first in their belief that this might provide radically different results. The fact that this perception question was placed first only the Irish questionnaire but the results showed in the same pattern as the other ten countries that followed the Eurostat instruction (Austria, France, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Spain and Sweden) does not change the methodological requirement for its placement in the EU-LFS questionnaire before any other relevant questions.

The questions on the labour status according to the ILO definition (employed, unemployed or inactive) are in general the first questions in the individual questionnaire, immediately following the questions on the demographic characteristics of the household members. In particular, they are not preceded by questions on the main or the usual activity (student, housekeeping, retired, etc.) or on the administrative status of a registration at the public employment office to claim unemployment benefits, where this would prejudice the response to the questions on the ILO labour status.

The detailed investigation of Europeans' perceptions of their employment status coinciding with the ILO conventional definitions of the employed, unemployed and inactive showed that more than 94.5% of all Europeans agreed with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as employed. Still, the pattern of Europeans' agreement in perceiving themselves as inactive differed from the almost complete agreement among all countries in perceiving themselves as employed since, although more than 90.0% of the Europeans from ten countries (Belgium, Bulgaria, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Romania, Spain) agreed in perceiving themselves as inactive, the percentages dropped to 77.9% for five countries (Austria, Denmark, Finland, Portugal, Sweden) and 65.5% for one country (Netherlands). The pattern of Europeans' agreement with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as unemployed deteriorated further as only in two countries coinciding perceptions exceeded 81.5% (Greece, Spain). More than 60.2%

of the Europeans from six countries (Denmark, France, Ireland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden) agreed with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as unemployed. Furthermore, more than 51.9% of the Europeans from six countries (Austria, Belgium, Finland, Hungary, Netherlands, Poland) agreed with the ILO conventional definition in perceiving themselves as unemployed. Italians (40.8-49.8%) ranked the lowest among Europeans in perceiving themselves as unemployed, followed by Bulgarians (42.2-62.3%). However, these finding did not result in any clear pattern of coinciding perceptions by geographical region or overtime.

The detailed investigation of the demographic and social characteristics of coinciding and conflicting perceptions showed that they did differ. The demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions for two Eastern European countries (Hungary, Poland) was quite similar: young (25+ years) married women with secondary education. In the cases of Bulgaria and Romania, it differed as it was young (25-34 years) married men and women with secondary education and young (15-24 years) married women with secondary education, respectively. The demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions for all four Northern European countries (Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Sweden) was uniform: young (15-24 years) single women with secondary education. The demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions for two Southern European countries (Greece, Spain) was much the same: young (25-34 years) married women with secondary education. In the cases of Italy and Portugal, it varied as it was young (25-34 years) single men and women with secondary education and older (55+ years) married women with primary education, respectively. The demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions for two Western European countries (France, Netherlands) was largely the same: young (15-24 years) single women with secondary education. In the cases of Austria and Belgium, it diverged as it was young (25-34 years) married women with secondary education and older (55-64 years) married women with secondary education, respectively. However, in all cases, the pattern of the demographic and social "profile" of conflicting perceptions within each country was in the main systematic overtime with only one exception: Portugal (age). These results suggest that there is some kind of "bias" introduced by the ILO conventional definitions of the employed, unemployed and inactive and further research is required as Gauckler and Körner (2011) carried out on the "main status effect".

In the literature, the need for using more than a single measure of unemployment especially in recessionary times is emphasized (see e.g., "Assessing labour market slack", 2017). In this respect, the application of the self-perceived measurement and the two alternative measures as compared to the ILO conventional measurement resulted in different distributions of the employment status for all countries under consideration. For three Eastern European countries (Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland), the difference between the percentages of the unemployed based on the first alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional measure exceeded 4.4% and in the case of Romania 11.1%. In three Northern European countries (Denmark, Finland and Sweden), the difference between the percentages of the unemployed based on the first alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional measure exceeded 4.4% and in the case of Ireland 9.8%. In two Southern European countries (Greece and Portugal), the difference between the percentages of the unemployed based on the first alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional measure was more than 1.4% and in the cases of Italy and Spain, more than 9.1% and 6.7%, respectively. In two Western European countries, the difference between the percentages of the unemployed based on the first alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional measure exceed 7.3% and in the cases of France and the Netherlands, more than 2.7% and 5.7%, respectively. The difference between the percentages of the unemployed based on the second alternative measurement as compared to the ILO conventional measure were more increased than those of the first alternative measurement except for Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania where there was no difference between these two alternative measurements. The differences between the percentages of the unemployed based on the first (and second) alternative measurement as compared to the self-perceived measurement were slightly less than those reported for the ILO conventional measure.

The investigation of the demographic and social "profile" of the unemployed according to the alternative measurements showed overtime threatening unemployment rates for women and men and the young (15-24 years old) in Austria, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Poland (until 2011) and Sweden, while at high risk were those aged 25-34 years in all other countries. Also, the single were at high risk except in the cases of Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, Portugal, Romania and Spain where the married were at more risk. Furthermore, those that had completed

secondary education were at high risk except in the case of Romania for 2008-2010 where those with primary education were more at risk.

Although, the social and demographic "profile" of the unemployed did change when using different measurements, it should be noted that, overtime and at the national level, the more changes were identified for the demographic variables gender and age than the social variables marital status and level of educational attainment.

In all countries, the unemployment rate as defined by the ILO increased when the self-perceived measurement was applied except in the case of the Netherlands. The resulting increase was higher in the cases of Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Portugal.

The application of the two alternative definitions to the EU-LFS data resulted in an increase of the official unemployment rate in all countries. More remarked was the increase in the cases of Belgium, Hungary, Ireland, Italy and especially that of Romania.

Despite its strengths, the following limitations should be considered in drawing conclusions from this study. First, although Eurostat provides harmonised variables for research, a close inspection of the countries' questionnaires revealed that they are not administering a common questionnaire as is the strict methodological requirement for ensuring the overtime and cross-national comparability of measurements (Carey, 2000; Kish, 1994). The fact that most of the variables are mainly factual in content does not alter this methodological requirement as the extensive studies on background variables have shown (Braun & Mohler, 2003; Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, 2008; Wolf & Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, 2003). Second, the limitations imposed by measurement, i.e. the EU-LFS questionnaire, did not allow for investigating the factors that had most impact in Europeans' conflicting perceptions of unemployment. In this respect, Gauckler and Körner (2011, p. 188) proposed a new approach that "tried to take into account everyday life's perception of the respondents and tailoring the questions to the situation of different groups of respondents, without giving up the objective of strictly applying the criteria laid down in the resolutions of the ILO as well as the relevant EU regulations". Third, although four countries were included in the analysis from each of the four broader European geographical regions, the results were not conclusive and the inclusion of all countries should be considered in future research. Fourth, a regional analysis of unemployment within each country is important especially for policy purposes. However, these analyses were not performed

because an inspection of the Nomenclature des Unités Territoriales Statistiques (NUTS) II three coding schemes implemented from the 2007 (NUTS 2006), 2012 (NUTS 2010) and 2015 (NUTS 2013) EU-LFS surveys showed that, although for most countries the regional codes used were the same overtime, it was not so for the datasets of Hungary and France (Eurostat, 2018).

In spite of these limitations, the findings exhibited the great divide between people's perceptions of their employment status and that resulting from applying the ILO conventional definitions — a result in line with Gauckler and Körner (2011) — and the two alternative measures. Therefore, the differences that ensued were the result of comparing differently defined measurements. This methodological study contributes to the growing research on the measurement of unemployment by demonstrating the importance of the measurements' definitions and the complexity of classifying key variables used in social research by discussing as Connelly (2016, p. 2) pointed out "a range of issues related to the inclusion of these measures in sociological analyses".

## References

- "Assessing labour market slack" (2017). *ECB Economic Bulletin*, Issue 3, Box 3, 31-35.
- Bartholomew, D.J., Moore, P., Smith, F., & Allin, P. (1995). The measurement of unemployment in UK. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series A (Statistics in Society), 158(3), 363-417.
- Bellhouse, D.R. (1988). A brief history of random sampling methods. In P.R.Krishnaiah & C.R. Rao (ed.), *Handbook of Statistics*, vol. 6 (pp. 1-14).Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers B.V.
- Bradburn, N.M., Sudman, S., & Wansink, B. (2004). Asking Questions: The Definitive Guide to Questionnaire Design—For Market Research, Political Polls, and Social and Health Questionnaires (revised edition). Jossey-Bass-A Wiley Imprint.
- Bradbury, K. (2006). Measurement of unemployment. *Public Policy Briefs*, no. 06-2 (1-10). Boston: Ferderal Reserve Bank of Boston.
- Brandolini, A., Cipollone, P., & Viviano, E. (2004). Does the ILO definition capture all unemployment? 1-30. Retrieved from http://www.aied.it/ROMA/Free contributions//Mobility/brandolini-cipollone-viviano.pdf.
- Braun, M., & Mohler, P.Ph. (2003). Background variables. In J.A. Harkness, F.J.R.
  Van De Vijver, & P.Ph. Mohler (Eds.), *Cross-cultural survey methods* (pp. 101-115). New York: Wiley.
- Bregger, J.E. (1984). The Current Population Survey: an historical perspective and BLS' role. *Monthly Labor Review*, *107*(6), 9-14.
- Bregger, J.E, & Haugen, S.E. (1995). BLS introduces new range of alternative unemployment measures. *Monthly Labor Review*, *118*(10), 19-26.
- Broersma, L., van Dijk, J., & van Wissen, L. (2004). Making the unused labour force work: assessing the facts for the Netherlands. *Discussion paper* 04008. Voorburg-Heerlen: Statistics Netherlands.
- Bureau of Labour Statistics (2003). *BLS Handbook of Methods*, Chapter 1. Retrieved from http://bls.gov/opub/hom/homch1\_c.htm.
- Card, D. (2011). Origins of the unemployment rate: the lasting legacy of measurement without theory. Paper prepared for *the 2011 meetings of the American Economic Association* (1-17). Retrieved from http://www.emlab.berkley.edu/

users/card/papers/origins-of-unemployment.pdf.

- Carey, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Measuring adult literacy: The international adult literacy survey (IALS)*. London: Office for National Statistics.
- Cohany, S.R., Polivka, A.E., & Rothgeb, J.M. (1994). Revisions in the Current Population Survey effective January 1994. *Employment and Earnings*, (February 1994), 13-37. Retrieved from http://fc43.com/cps/revision1994.pdf.
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000, Official Journal of the European Communities (L228), 43 (8 September 2000), 18-21.
- Connelly, R., Gayle, V., & Lambert, P.S. (2016). A Review of occupation-based social classifications for social survey research. *Methodological Innovations*, 9, 1-14.
- de la Fuente, A. (2011). New measures of labour market attachment: 3 new Eurostat indicators to supplement the unemployment rate (Statistics in Focus 57). Eurostat.
- Department of Economic and Social Affairs-International Labour Office (2009). *Handbook on measuring the economically active population and related characteristics in population censuses*. Studies in Methods, Series F, No. 102. New York: United Nations. Retrieved from http://unstats.un.org/unsd/ demographic/source/census/Entire Handbook.pdf.
- Devereaux, M.S. (1992). Alternative measures of unemployment. Perspectives on Labour and Income, 4 (4) Article No. 5. Retrieved from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/studies-etudes/75-001/archive/1992/5023057eng.pdf.
- Duncan, J.W., & Shelton, W.C. (1992). U.S. Government contributions to probability sampling and statistical analysis. *Statistical Science*, 7(3), 320-338.
- Ehling, M. (2003). Harmonising data in official statistics. In J.H.P. Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, & C. Wolf (Eds.), Advances in cross-national comparison: A European working book for demographic and socio-economic variables (pp. 17-31). New York: Kluger Academic-Plenum.
- Eurostat (2003). The European Union Labour Force Survey: methods and definitions
   2001. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Retrieved from http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY\_OFFPUB?KS-BF-03-002-EN.PDF.
- Eurostat (2006). Labour Force Survey explanatory notes from 2006 onwards. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/EU\_

labour\_force\_survey\_-\_methodology.

- Eurostat (2008). The concepts of employment and unemployment as set out by the 13<sup>th</sup> ICLS – Is there a need for revision? Some remarks from a European perspective. ILO: Invited paper for the Seminar on 'Employment and unemployment: Revisiting the relevance and conceptual basis of the statistics', Geneva, November 21 (1-3). Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/glodal/statisti cs-and-databases/meetings-and-events/WCMS\_100707/lang—en/index.htm.
- Eurostat (2008a). *Labour Force Survey revised explanatory notes (to be applied from 2008Q1 onwards)*. Luxembourg: European Commission.
- Eurostat (2009). *Task Force on the quality of the Labour Force Survey: Final report*. Luxembourg:European Commission.
- Eurostat (2013). Labour Force Survey revised explanatory notes (to be applied from 2014Q1 onwards). Luxembourg: European Commission.
- Eurostat (2016). *EU Labour Force Survey database user guide*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Eurostat (2016a). *Statistics explained: Underemployment and potential additional labour market force statistics*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ statistics-explained/
- Eurostat (2018). *Statistics explained: LFS coding lists and explanatory notes over time*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/
- Fleck, S., & Sorrentino, C. (1994). Employment and unemployment in Mexico's labour force. *Monthly Labour review*, 117(11), 3-31.
- Frankel, L.R., & Stock, J.S. (1942). On the sample survey of unemployment. *Journal* of the American Statistical Association, 37(217), 77-80.
- Gagliardi, F., Verma, V., & Ciampalini, G. (2009). Methodology of European labour force surveys: (2) sample design and implementation. *Working paper* no. 79. Retrieved from http://www.unisi.it/reicerca/dip/dmg/workingpaper/DMQ\_WP \_79.pdf.
- Garrido, L., & Toharia, L. (2004). What does it take to be (counted as) unemployed? The case of Spain. *Labour Economics*, 11, 507-523. doi: 10.1016/j.labeco. 2004.01.007
- Gauckler, B., & and Körner, T. (2011). Measuring the employment status in the Labour Force Survey and the German Census 2011: Insights from recent research at Destatis. *Methoden –Daten–Analysen*, 5(2), 181-205.

- Hansen, M.H. (1987). Some history and reminiscences on survey sampling. *Statistical Science*, *2*(2), 180-190.
- Hansen, M.H., & Hurwitz, W.N. (1943). On the theory of sampling from finite populations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, *17*, 333-362.
- Hansen, M.H., & Madow, M.G. (1976). Some important events in the historical development of sample surveys. In D.B. Owen (ed.), On the History of Statistics and Probability (pp. 75-100). New York: Marcell Dekker.
- Hansen, M.H., Dalenius, T., & Tepping, B.J. (1985). The development of sample surveys of finite populations. In A.C. Atkinson & S. E. Fienberg (eds), A *Celebration of Statistics: the ISI centenary volume* (pp. 327-354). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Hansen, M.H., Hurwitz, W.N., & Madow, W.G. (1953). Sample Survey Methods and theory. Vol. I Methods and Applications. New York: Wiley.
- Hansen, M.H., Hurwitz, W.N., Nisselson, H., & Steinberg, J. (1955). The redesign of the census Current Population Survey. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 50 (271), 701-719. doi: 10.1080/01621459.1955.10501962
- Haugen, S.E. (2009). Measures of labor underutilization from the Current population Survey. *BLS working papers*, working paper 424. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/ote/pdf/ec090020.pdf.
- Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, J.H.P. (2008). Harmonsation of demographic and socio-economic variables in cross-national survey research. *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 98(2), 5-24.
- Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, J.H.P., & Wolf, C. (Eds.). (2003). Advances in cross-national comparison: A European working book for demographic and socio-economic variables. New York: Kluwer Academic-Plenum.
- Hussmanns, R. (2007). Measurement of employment, unemployment and underemployment: current international standards and issues in their application. ILO. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-anddatabases/WCMS\_099394/lang-en/index.htm.
- Hussmanns, R., Mehran, F., & Verma, V. (1990). Surveys of economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment: An ILO manual on concepts and methods. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Jones, S.R.G., & Riddell, W.C. (1998). Unemployment and labour force attachment: a multistate analysis of nonemployment. In J. Haltiwanger, M.E. Manser & R.

Topel (ed.), *Labour statistics measurement issues* (123-155). National Bureau of Economic Research: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/chapters/ c8359.pdf.

- Jones, S.R.G., & Riddell, W.C. (1999). The measurement of unemployment: an empirical approach. *Econometrica*, 67(1), 147-161.
- Karanikoli, I. (2009). Comparability issues of sample surveys: the case of the Labour Force Survey (in Greek). M. Sc. Thesis, Department of Social Policy. Athens: Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences.

Kish, L. (1965). Survey sampling. New York: Wiley.

- Kish, L. (1994). Multi-population survey designs: Five types with seven shared aspects. *International Statistical Review*, 62(2), 167-186.
- Koopmans, T.C. (1947). Measurement without theory. *Cowles Foundation Paper* 25a, reprinted from The Review of Economic Statistics, 29(3), 161-172.
- Kostanich, D. (1996). Short history of the CPS. CPS Basic monthly survey history: a joint project between the Bureau of Labour Statistics and the Bureau of the Census, 1-11. Retrieved from http://www.bls.census.gov/cps/bhistory.htm.
- Krosnick, J.A., & Presser, S. (2010). Question and questionnaire design. In P. V.Marsen, & J.D. Wright (Eds), *Handbook of Survey Research* (second edition) (pp. 261-279). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Kruskal, W., & Mosteller, F. (1980). Representative sampling, IV: the history of the concept in Statistics, 1895-1939. *International Statistical Review*, 48, 169-195.
- Long, C.D. (1942). The concept of unemployment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 57(1), 1-30.
- Martin, G. (2000). Employment and unemployment in Mexico in the 1990s. *Monthly Labor Review*, *123*(11), 3-18.
- Michalopoulou, C.E. (2004). In the empire of indications: the history of sampling practice in Greece. In Greek. Athens: Papazisis.
- Michalopoulou, C.E. (2008). Comparability issues of the IPUMS-International microdata for Greece, 1971-2001. *IPUMS Workshop*: Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, Athens, March 18 and 20 (17-18). Retrieved from http://www.hist.umn.edu/~rmccaa/ipums-europe/.
- Murphy, K.M., & Topel, R. (1997). Unemployment and nonemployment. *The American Economic Review*, 87(2), Papers and Proceedings of the Hundred

and Fourth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (May, 1997), 295-300.

- National Statistical Service of Greece (2006). A guide to the Labour Force Survey questionnaire: first quarter 2006-fourth quarter 2006 (in Greek). Athens.
- Olkin, I. (1987). A conversation with Morris Hansen. *Statistical Science*, 2(2), 162-179.
- Oppenheim, A.N. (1992). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement* (new edition). London: Continuum.
- O' Muircheartaigh, C., & Wong, S.T. (1981). The impact of sampling theory on survey sampling practice: a review. *Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute*, 49(1), 465-493.
- Papell, D., Murray, C., & Ghiblawi H. (2000). The structure of unemployment. The Review of Economics and Statistics, 82(2), 309-315.
- Polivka, A.E., & Miller, S.M. (1998). The CPS after the redesign: refocusing the economic lens. In J. Haltiwanger, M.E. Manser & R. Topel (ed.), *Labour* statistics measurement issues (249-289). National Bureau of Economic Research: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/ chapters/c8362.pdf.
- Purcell, K. (1986). Work, employment and unemployment. In R.G. Burgess (ed.), *Key* variables in social investigation (153-177). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Raj, D. (1964). The use of systematic sampling with probability proportionate to size in a large scale survey. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 59, 251-255.
- Raj, D. (1968). The design of sample surveys. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Recktenwald, J. (2008). Harmonising the measurement of unemployment and employment in the European Labour Force Survey. Paper presented in the *International Conference on Survey Methods in Multinational, multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts (3MC)*, Berlin June 25-28, 1-8. Retrieved from http://www.csdiworkshop.org/pdf/3mc2008proceedings/session\_57/Recktenw ald\_sept08.pdf.
- Schwarz, N. (1987). Cognitive issues of Labour Force Surveys in a multinational context: Issues and findings, Paper prepared for the OECD Working Party on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Paris, 14-16 April, 14-16.
- Schweitzer, M. (2003). Ready, willing, and able? Measuring labour availability in the UK. *Working paper* 03-03, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.
- Schwarz, N. Knäuper, B., & Stich, C. (2008). The psychology of asking questions. In E.D. de Leeuw, J.J. Hox, & D.A. Dillman (Eds), International handbook of survey methodology (pp. 18-34). Routledge; Taylor and Francis.
- Shiskin, J. (1976). Employment and unemployment: the doughnut or the hole? Monthly Labor Review, 99(2), 3-10.
- Sorrentino, C. (1993). International comparisons of unemployment indicators. *Monthly Labour Review*, 116(3), 3-24.
- Sorrentino, C. (1995). International unemployment indicators, 1983-93. *Monthly Labour Review*, 118(8), 31-50.
- Sorrentino, C. (2000). International unemployment rates: how comparable are they? *Monthly Labour Review*, *123*(6), 3-20.
- Sorrentino, C. (2002). Providing comparable international labour statistics. *Monthly Labour Review*, 125(6), 3-14.
- Statistics Canada (2010). *Guide to the Labour Force Survey*. Catalogue no. 71-543-G. Retrieved from http://www.statcan.gc.ca.
- Stephan, F.F. (1948). History of the uses of modern sampling techniques. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 43, 12-39.
- Stephan, F.F., & McCarthy, P.J. (1958). Sampling opinions: An analysis of survey procedure. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Stewart, C.D. (1955). Unemployment statistics and economic policy uses. *The American Statistician*, 9(1), 10-14.
- Sudman, S., Bradburn, N. M., and Schwarz, N. (1996). Thinking about answers: The application of cognitive processes to survey methodology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- The 13<sup>th</sup> International Conference of Labour Statisticians (1982). *Resolution* concerning statistics of the economically active population, employment, unemployment and unederunemployment adopted by the Thirteenth International Conference of LabourStatisticians. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/download/res/ecacpop.pdf.
- The 14<sup>th</sup> International Conference of Labour Statisticians (1987). Guidelines on the implications of employment promotion schemes on the measurement of

employment and unemployment, endorsed by the Fourteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/ wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@integration/@stat/documents/normative instrument/wcms\_087602.pdf.

- The 16<sup>th</sup> International Conference of Labour Statisticians (1998). *Report of the Conference*. Geneva: International Labour Organization. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/meetings-and-events/inter national-conference-of-labour-statisticians/WCMS\_087599/lang—en.htm.
- United Nations Statistics Division (n.d.). *Methodology Standard country or area codes for statistical use (M49): Geographic regions*. Retrieved from https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/.
- Verma, V. (1995). Comparative surveys in Europe: problems and possibilities. Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute, 49(2), 527-528.
- Verma, V. (1999). Combining national surveys for the European Union. Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute, 52<sup>nd</sup> Session Proceedings, Tome LVIII, 1-2. Retrieved from http://www.stat.fi/isi99/proceedings.hmtl.
- Verma, V. (2002). Comparability in international survey statistics. International Conference on Improving Surveys, Copenhagen, 25-28 August 2002 (1-22). Retrieved from http://www.unisi.it/ricerca/dip/dmg/verma/manheim/2.1 Comparability(VermaKeynoteCopenhagen2002).pdf.
- Verma, V., & Gabilondo, L.G. (1993). Family budget surveys in the EC: Methodology and recommendations for harmonisation (Theme 3, Series E). Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Waksberg, J., & Goldfield, E.D. (1996). Morris Howard Hansen: December 15, 1910
   October 9, 1990. In *National Academy of Sciences: Biographical Memoirs*. National Academy Press, 70 (pp. 117-137). Retrieved from http://books.nap.edu/books/030955415/htm/117.html.
- Wolf, C., & Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, J.H.P. (2003). Measuring demographic and socioeconomic variables in cross-national research: An overview. In J.H.P. Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, & C. Wolf (Eds.), *Advances in cross-national comparison* (pp. 1-13). New York: Kluger Academic-Plenum.
- Yfanti, A. (2010). The definition of unemployment is a political decision and not a statistical choice (Masters' thesis; in Greek). Retrieved from Pandemos, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences.

- Yfanti, A., Michalopoulou, C. and Charalampi, A. (2017). The impact of applying alternative definitions to the European Union Labour Force Survey measurement of the unemployment rate for Southern Europe 2008-2014.
  Paper presented at the 13<sup>th</sup> Conference of the European Sociological Association (ESA), Athens, August-September, 29-1.
- Yfanti, A., Michalopoulou, C., Mimis, A. and Zachariou, S. (2017). Investigating Southern Europeans' perceptions of their employment status. Paper presented at the 17<sup>th</sup> Applied Stochastic Models and Data Analysis (ASMDA) International Conference, London, June, 6-9.
- Yfanti, A., Michalopoulou, C. and Zachariou, S. (2017). The decision of how to measure unemployment is a political and not a statistical question: Evidence from the European Labour Force Survey: 2008-2014. Manuscript in preparation.
- Yfanti, A., Michalopoulou, C. and Charalampi, A. (2018). Europeans' perceptions of their employment status and the ILO conventional definitions. Paper presented at the European Sociological Association (ESA) RN21 Midterm Conference "Potentials and Limits of Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences", Cracow, October, 3-6.
- Yfanti, A., Michalopoulou, C. and Zachariou, S. (2018). The impact of definitions in classifying the employed, unemployed and inactive when comparing measurements from different sources. Paper presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> Stochastic Modeling Techniques and Data Analysis (SMTDA) International Conference, Chania, Crete, June, 12-15.
- Yfanti, A., Michalopoulou, C., Mimis, A. and Zachariou, S. (2018). Investigating Southern Europeans' perceptions of their employment status. In C.H. Skiadas and C. Skiadas (Eds), *Demographic and Health Issues - Population Ageing, Mortality and Data Analysis* (pp. 251-263). Springer.
- Yamagami, T. (2002). Utilization of labour resources in Japan and the United States. *Monthly Labour Review*, *125*(4), 25-43.

Appendix

Table A1 The EU-LFS	S variables according to	o the Eurostat definitions
---------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------

YEARBIR			E.	un de e els c
11/14 Q		Year of birth	Eve	erybody
		Dissemination: usually as derived variable AGE, and A normally in 5-year age bands (0-4, 5-9 etc) AGE is aggregated in the anonymised microdata in these year age bands; see corresponding chapter	(GE 9 5-	
		Marital status	Eve	arybody
10 1	1	Single		siybody
	2	Married		
	3	Widowed Divorced or legally separated		
	blank	No answer		
	0	Dissemination usually as follows: Widowed, divorced or legally separated		
	1	Single		
	blank	No answer		
		MARSTAT is aggregated in the anonymised microdata in way; see corresponding chapter	this	
	I	1		
24 Q		Labour status during the reference week	Everybody years or n	y aged 15 nore
2	2	Did any work for pay or profit during the reference week hour or more (including family workers but exc conscripts on compulsory military or community service) Was not working but had a job or business from which h was absent during the reference week (including workers but excluding conscripts on compulsory milit community service)	luding luding ) ne/she family ary or	
3	3	Was not working because on lay-off Was a conscript on compulsory military or community se	arvice	
5	5	Other (15 years or more) who neither worked nor had a	job or	
		business during the reference week		
	,	Dissemination: usually as derived variable ILOSTAT		
		HOURS WORKED		
HWUSUAL				
61/62 Q		Number of hours per week usually worked in the main job	WSTATO	0R=1,2
	00 01-98 99	Usual hours cannot be given because hours worked vary considerably from week to week or from month to month Number of hours usually worked in the main job Not applicable (WSTATOR=3-5,9)		
	DIATIK	HWUSUAL hours greater 80 are aggregated in a single category in the anonymised microdata; see corresponding chapter		

# Table A1 (continued)

	1		I	
63/64 Q		Number of hours actually worked during the reference week in the main job	WSTATOR=1,2	
	00	Person having a job or business and not having worked at all in the main activity during the reference week		
	01-98	Number of hours actually worked in the main job during the reference week		
	99 blank	Not applicable (WSTATOR=3-5,9) No answer		
		HWACTUAL hours greater 80 are aggregated in a single category in the anonymised microdata; see corresponding chapter		
SEEKWORK				
99 Q		Seeking employment during previous four weeks	(WSTATOR=3-5 SIGNISAL=3) ar Age<75	or nd
	1	Person has already found a job which will start within a period of at most 3 months		
	2	Person has already found a job which will start in more than 3 months		
	3	Person is not seeking employment and has not found any job to start later		
	4 9	Person is seeking employment Not applicable ((WSTATOR=1,2 or 9 and SIGNISAL $\neq$ 3) or age equal or greater than 75)		
		METHODS USED DURING PREVIOUS FOUR WEEKS TO FIND WORK		
METHODA 103 Q		Contacted public employment office to find work	SEEKWORK=4	or
	0	No Yes		
METHODB	9			
104 Q		Contacted private employment agency to find work	SEEKWORK=4 LOOKOJ=1	or
	0 1 9	No Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
METHODC				
105 Q	0	Applied to employers directly No	LOOKOJ=1	or
	1 9	Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
METHODD			SEEKWORK-4	or
100 Q		Asked mends, relatives, trade unions, etc.	LOOKOJ=1	01
	0 1	No Yes		
METHODE	9	Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
107 Q		Inserted or answered advertisements in newspapers or journals	SEEKWORK=4 LOOKOJ=1	or
	0 1 9	No Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
	I.	1	I	

# Table A1 (continued)

METHODF		Studied advertisements in newspapers or journals	SEEKWORK=4	or
	0	No	LOOKOJ=1	-
	1 9	Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
METHODG 109 Q	0	Took a test, interview or examination	SEEKWORK=4 LOOKOJ=1	or
	1 9	Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
METHODH 110 Q		Looked for land, premises or equipment	SEEKWORK=4	or
	0 1 9	No Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)	LOOKOJ=1	
METHODI 111 Q		Looked for permits, licences, financial resources	SEEKWORK=4 LOOKOJ=1	or
	0 1 9	No Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
METHODJ 112 Q		Awaiting the results of an application for a job	SEEKWORK=4	or
	0 1 9	No Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
METHODK 113 Q		Waiting for a call from a public employment office	SEEKWORK=4 LOOKOJ=1	or
	0 1 9	No Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
METHODL 114 Q		Awaiting the results of a competition for recruitment to the public sector	SEEKWORK=4 LOOKOJ=1	or
	0 1 9	No Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
METHODM 115 Q		Other method used	SEEKWORK=4	or
	0 1 9	No Yes Not applicable (SEEKWORK≠4 and LOOKOJ≠1)		
		Willingness to work for person not seeking employment	SEEKWORK=3	
	1 2 9 blank	Person is not seeking employment: - but would nevertheless like to have work - and does not want to have work Not applicable (SEEKWORK ≠ 3) No answer	CLEANORA-S	

AVAILBLE 117 Q	1 2 9 blank	Availability to start working within two weeks If work were found now: Person could start to work immediately (within 2 weeks) Person could not start to work immediately (within 2 weeks) Not applicable (SEEKWORK ≠ 1,4 and WANTWORK ≠ 1, blank and WISHMORE ≠ 1) No answer	SEEKWORK=1,4 or WANTWORK=1, blank or WISHMORE=1
MAINSTAT 122 Y	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 blank	MAIN LABOUR STATUS Main status (since 1998 only, optional: not available for certain countries) Carries out a job or profession, including unpaid work for a family business or holding, including an apprenticeship or paid traineeship, etc, Unemployed Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience In retirement or early retirement or has given up business Permanently disabled In compulsory military service Fulfilling domestic tasks Other inactive person Not applicable (child less than 15 years) No answer	Everybody aged 15 years or more
HATLEVEL 197/199 Q	00 10 (2) 11 22 31 32 30 33 (2) 34 (2) 35 (2) 36 (1) 41 42 43 51 52 60 99 Blank	EDUCATION AND TRAINING – highest attainment level Highest educational attainment level Codes from 1998 to 2013 (ISCED 97) No formal education or below ISCED 1 ISCED 0-1 ISCED 1 ISCED 2 ISCED 3c (shorter than 2 years) ISCED 3c (2 years and more) ISCED 3 (2 years and more) ISCED 3 (2 years or longer) or ISCED 4c ISCED 3 (years or longer) or ISCED 4c ISCED 3 or ISCED 4b ISCED 3 or ISCED 4a ISCED 3 or 4 (without distinction a, b or c possible) ISCED 4a,b ISCED 4c ISCED 5b ISCED 5a ISCED 6 Not applicable (child less than 15 years) No answer	Everybody aged 15 years or more

	<ol> <li>According to 2001/2002 codification this code contains only ISCED 3 levels without distinction a, b or c possible but of various lengths.</li> <li>Codes valid for the years 1998-2000 only</li> </ol>
000 100 200 302	Codes from 2014 onwards (ISCED 11) No formal education or below ISCED 1 ISCED 1 ISCED 2 (incl. ISCED 3 programmes of duration of less than 2 years) ISCED 3 programme of duration of 2 years and more, sequential (i.e. access to part ISCED 3 programme only)
303 304	ISCED 3 programme of duration of 2 years and more, terminal or giving access to ISCED 4 only ISCED 3 with access to ISCED 5.6 or 7
300 400	ISCED 3 programme of duration of 2 years and more, without possible distinction of access to other ISCED levels ISCED 4
500 600 700 800 999 Blank	ISCED 5 ISCED 6 ISCED 7 ISCED 8 Not applicable (child less than 15 years) No answer
	Dissemination: complete variable as HAT97LEV (until 2013) and HAT11LEV (from 2014) respectively. Highest educational attainment level usually as derived variable HATLEV1D aggregated to 3 levels (also for data before 1998)

Reproduced from *EU Labour Force Survey database user guide*, by Eurostat, 2016, Luxembourg: Office for official publications of the European Communities, pp. 11-13, 17-18, 23-27, 30-31.

 Table A2 SPSS syntax for the computation of the employment status based on alternative definition 1: European Union Labour Force Survey

WEIGHT BY COEFF. USE ALL. COMPUTE filter\_ $=(AGE \ge 17 \& AGE \le 72)$ . VARIABLE LABELS filter \$ 'AGE >= 17 & AGE <= 72 (FILTER)'. VALUE LABELS filter \$0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'. FORMATS filter \$ (f1.0). FILTER BY filter \$. EXECUTE. \*COMPUTE EMPLOYED AS employed1 DO IF (ILOSTAT=4). COMPUTE military new = 1. ELSE. COMPUTE military new = 0. END IF. EXECUTE. DO IF (reage GE 1) & (WSTATOR =  $1 \mid WSTATOR = 2$ ). COMPUTE employed 1 = 1. ELSE. COMPUTE employed 1 = 0. END IF. EXECUTE. DO IF (employed1= 1) & (HWUSUAL LE 4). COMPUTE employed\_new = 0. ELSE. COMPUTE employed\_new= employed1. END IF. EXECUTE. \*COMPUTE UNEMPLOYED DO IF (reage LE 2) & (SEEKWORK = 1). COMPUTE unemployed 1 = 1. ELSE IF (reage LE 2) & (SEEKWORK = 4) & (METHODA = 1 | METHODB = 1 | METHODC = 1 | METHODD = 1 | METHODE = 1 | METHODF = 1 | METHODG = 1 |METHODH = 1 | METHODI = 1 | METHODM = 1). COMPUTE unemployed 1 = 1. ELSE IF (WANTWORK= 1). COMPUTE unemployed 1 = 1. ELSE. COMPUTE unemployed 1 = 0. END IF. EXECUTE. DO IF unemployed 1 = 0 & (employed 1 = 1 & HWUSUAL LE 4). COMPUTE unemployed new = 1. ELSE. COMPUTE unemployed new= unemployed1. END IF. EXECUTE.

Table A2 (continued)

**\*COMPUTE INACTIVE** DO IF (reage GE 1) & (employed\_new= 0) & (unemployed\_new= 0). COMPUTE inactive\_new = 1. ELSE. COMPUTE inactive new = 0. END IF. EXECUTE. \*COMPUTE ALTERNATIVE1 AS ILOSTAT\_NEW DO IF (employed\_new = 1). COMPUTE ILOSTAT\_new = 1. ELSE IF (unemployed\_new =1). COMPUTE ILOSTAT\_new = 2. ELSE IF (inactive new = 1). COMPUTE ILOSTAT\_new = 3. ELSE IF (military\_new =1). COMPUTE ILOSTAT\_new =4. END IF. EXECUTE.

**Table A3** SPSS syntax for the computation of the employment status based on alternative definition 2: European Union Labour Force Survey

WEIGHT BY COEFF. USE ALL. COMPUTE filter\_ $=(AGE \ge 17 \& AGE \le 72)$ . VARIABLE LABELS filter \$ 'AGE >= 17 & AGE <= 72 (FILTER)'. VALUE LABELS filter \$0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'. FORMATS filter \$ (f1.0). FILTER BY filter \$. EXECUTE. \*COMPUTE EMPLOYED AS employed1 DO IF (ILOSTAT=4). COMPUTE military new = 1. ELSE. COMPUTE military new = 0. END IF. EXECUTE. DO IF (reage GE 1) & (WSTATOR =  $1 \mid WSTATOR = 2$ ). COMPUTE employed 1 = 1. ELSE. COMPUTE employed 1 = 0. END IF. EXECUTE. DO IF (employed1= 1) & (HWUSUAL LE 8). COMPUTE employed new = 0. ELSE. COMPUTE employed\_new= employed1. END IF. EXECUTE. \*COMPUTE UNEMPLOYED DO IF (reage LE 2) & (SEEKWORK = 1). COMPUTE unemployed 1 = 1. ELSE IF (reage LE 2) & (SEEKWORK = 4) & (METHODA = 1 | METHODB = 1 | METHODC = 1 | METHODD = 1 | METHODE = 1 | METHODF = 1 | METHODG = 1 | METHODH = 1 | METHODI = 1 | METHODM = 1). COMPUTE unemployed 1 = 1. ELSE IF (WANTWORK= 1). COMPUTE unemployed 1 = 1. ELSE. COMPUTE unemployed 1 = 0. END IF. EXECUTE. DO IF unemployed 1 = 0 & (employed 1 = 1 & HWUSUAL LE 8). COMPUTE unemployed new = 1. ELSE. COMPUTE unemployed new= unemployed1. END IF. EXECUTE.

Table A3 (continued)

**\*COMPUTE INACTIVE** DO IF (reage GE 1) & (employed\_new= 0) & (unemployed\_new= 0). COMPUTE inactive\_new = 1. ELSE. COMPUTE inactive new = 0. END IF. EXECUTE. \*COMPUTE ALTERNATIVE2 AS ILOSTAT\_NEW DO IF (employed\_new = 1). COMPUTE ILOSTAT\_new = 1. ELSE IF (unemployed\_new =1). COMPUTE ILOSTAT\_new = 2. ELSE IF (inactive new = 1). COMPUTE ILOSTAT\_new = 3. ELSE IF (military\_new =1). COMPUTE ILOSTAT\_new =4. END IF. EXECUTE.

Country	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Austria								
%	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
N	22,000	23,000	24,000	25,000	22,000	20,000	20,000	21,000
Denmark								
%	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
N	3,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,000	2,000
Finland								
%	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5
N	23,000	20,000	16,000	22,000	18,000	20,000	17,000	22,000
Sweden								
%	0.1	0.1	0.1					
N	6,000	5,000	4,000					

**Table A4** Individuals in compulsory military service: European Union Labour Force Survey

**Table A5** SPSS syntax for creating an overtime comparable measurement of the highest level of educational attainment: European Union Labour Force Survey

### 2008-2012

RECODE HATLEVEL (SYSMIS=SYSMIS) (0 thru 11=1) (21 thru 43=2) (51 thru 60=3) INTO newhatlevel. EXECUTE. VALUE LABELS newhatlevel 1 'Primary' 2 'Secondary' 3 'Tertiary'.

#### 2013

RECODE HAT97LEV (SYSMIS=SYSMIS) (0 thru 11=1) (21 thru 43=2) (51 thru 60=3) INTO newhatlevel. EXECUTE. VALUE LABELS newhatlevel 1 'Primary' 2 'Secondary' 3 'Tertiary'.

### 2014-2015

RECODE HAT11LEV (SYSMIS=SYSMIS) (0 thru 100=1) (200 thru 400=2) (500 thru 800=3) INTO newhatlevel. EXECUTE. VALUE LABELS newhatlevel 1 'Primary' 2 'Secondary' 3 'Tertiary'.

· · · · ·								
Country	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Belgium								
%	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
N	16,000	14,000	19,000	19,000	17,000	13,000	18,000	18,000
Bulgaria								
%	0.0	0.0						
N	2,000	1,000						
Denmark								
%	0.0	0.0	0.0					
N	1,000	1,000	2,000					
Finland								
%	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
N	1,000	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
France								
%	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
N	693,000	14,000	12,000	11,000	12,000			
Ireland								
%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
N	1,000	1,000	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	2,000
Netherlar	nds							
%	0.1	0.1	2.4	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
N	10,000	10,000	296,000	14,000	26,000	14,000	20,000	30,000
Romania								
%	7.1	7.3	2.0					
N	1,219,00	1,238,000	336,000					
Spain								
<b>^</b>	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3
N	456,000	437,000	422,000	423,000	427,000	417,000	417,000	466,000
Sweden	-	-						
%	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	1.1	0.3
N	22,000	10,000	12,000	12,000	15,000	19,000	81,000	20,000

**Table A6** Missing values of the self-perceived measurement of the employment status:European Union Labour Force Survey

1			5					
Country	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Belgium								
%	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.3
N	76,000	82,000	64,000	75,000	56,000	31,000	25,000	25,000
Bulgaria								
%	3.1	3.7	3.1	2.5	2.7	2.7	3.1	3.2
N	187,000	219,000	178,000	144,000	153,000	153,000	175,000	179,000
Finland								
%	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2
N	6,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	8,000	9,000	6,000	10,000
France								
%	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.4	1.4	1.5
N	314,000	367,000	343,000	346,000	347,000	621,000	637,000	687,000
Hungary								
%							3.2	3.1
N							245,00	235,000
Ireland								
%	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2
N	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	8,000	9,000	7,000	6,000
Italy								
%	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2
N	218,000	178,000	39,000	34,000	31,000	54,000	51,000	61,000
Portugal								
%	1.1	1.6	1.6	2.0	2.8	3.3	3.2	3.2
N	92,000	127,000	133,000	162,000	228,000	264,000	253,000	251,000
Sweden								
%	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
N	7,000	9,000	11,000	9,000	11,000	12,000	14,000	15,000

**Table A7** Missing values of both alternative measurements of the employment status:European Union Labour Force Survey

Country	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Austria								
ILO	3.8	4.8	4.4	4.2	4.3	5.4	5.6	5.7
Perception	5.9	6.8	6.8	6.3	6.3	7.6	8.4	8.7
Alternative 1	14.0	14.7	14.8	14.0	14.6	15.8	16.4	16.6
Alternative 2	15.7	16.4	16.6	15.8	16.4	17.6	18.3	18.5
Belgium								
ILO	7.0	7.9	8.3	7.2	8.1	8.4	8.5	8.5
Perception	9.9	11.1	11.2	10.6	10.6	10.9	10.7	10.4
Alternative 1	18.9	21.2	20.2	19.2	19.2	19.5	19.7	19.6
Alternative 2	19.4	21.7	20.6	19.8	19.7	20.0	20.3	20.2
Bulgaria								
ILO	5.6	6.8	10.3	11.3	12.3	13.0	11.4	9.2
Perception	11.6	13.0	17.1	17.7	18.6	18.4	17.5	14.5
Alternative 1	13.6	15.1	19.2	20.2	20.7	20.9	19.6	16.8
Alternative 2	13.6	15.1	19.3	20.2	20.7	21.0	19.6	16.8
Denmark								
ILO	3.4	6.0	7.5	7.6	7.5	7.0	6.6	6.2
Perception	3.9	6.6	8.0	8.4	8.4	8.1	7.7	7.6
Alternative 1	9.5	12.6	14.4	15.5	15.0	14.6	14.9	13.8
Alternative 2	12.8	16.0	18.1	19.0	18.6	18.2	18.6	17.8
Finland								
ILO	6.4	8.2	8.4	7.8	7.7	8.2	8.7	9.4
Perception	8.1	10.5	10.8	9.9	11.1	11.1	12.4	13.0
Alternative 1	12.3	14.3	15.0	14.9	14.9	15.9	17.2	17.9
Alternative 2	13.6	15.6	16.1	16.1	16.1	17.2	18.5	19.5
France								
ILO	7.6	9.5	9.3	9.4	10.0	9,9	10.3	10.4
Perception	9.0	11.6	11.4	11.6	12.1	12.5	13.4	13.8
Alternative 1	11.6	13.8	13.4	13.7	14.2	14.3	15.3	15.5
Alternative 2	12.3	14.6	14.2	14.5	15.0	15.2	16.1	16.3
Greece	1210	1.110		1	1010	1012	1011	1010
ILO	7.7	9.5	12.6	17.7	24.3	27.5	26.5	24.9
Perception	86	10.5	13.8	19.4	26.1	29.6	28.9	27.4
Alternative 1	9.8	11.9	14.8	20.1	27.0	30.3	29.4	27.9
Alternative 2	10.0	12.1	15.0	20.3	27.3	30.7	29.7	28.2
Hungary	10.0	12.1	10.0	20.0	27.5	50.7	_>.,	20.2
ILO	78	10.0	11.2	10.9	10.9	10.2	77	68
Perception	11.2	13.7	15.4	15.2	15.4	14.8	11.8	9.9
Alternative 1	21.2	23.2	24.7	25.2	24.1	22.9	15.0	13.5
Alternative 2	21.2	23.2	24.7	25.2	24.1 24.2	22.9	15.0	13.5
Ireland	21.2	25.5	24.0	25.5	27.2	25.0	15.1	15.5
	53	12.0	13.9	147	147	13.1	113	Q /
Percention	63	14.5	16.6	17.7	17.7	15.1	13.6	11 5
$\Delta$ Iternative 1	10.0	26.0	28.1	17.2 27.5	20.2	19.2 28 Q	25.3	21.7
$\Delta$ lternative 7	20.2	20.0 27 1	20.1 20.1	27.5	29.2	20.9	25.5 26 A	21.7
Alternative 2	20.2	27.1	29.4	28.9	30.4	30.0	20.4	22.9

**Table A8** The unemployment rate (%) according to the ILO conventional definitions, the self-perceived question and two alternative to the ILO definitions (A1 and A2): European Union Labour Force Survey, 2008-2015

Table A8	<b>B</b> (continued)
----------	----------------------

Country	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Italy								
ILO	6.8	7.8	8.4	8.4	10.7	12.2	12.7	11.9
Perception	13.6	15.3	16.4	16.9	18.8	21.1	21.8	21.3
Alternative 1	20.2	20.3	21.0	21.0	23.3	24.8	26.0	25.7
Alternative 2	20.7	20.7	21.5	21.5	23.8	25.4	26.6	26.3
Netherlands								
ILO	3.0	3.8	4.5	4.4	5.3	7.3	7.4	6.9
Perception	2.0	2.7	3.7	3.8	4.6	6.3	9.4	8.7
Alternative 1	11.7	12.5	13.5	13.1	14.5	17.9	18.2	17.6
Alternative 2	16.5	17.4	18.1	17.8	19.2	22.5	22.9	22.3
Poland								
ILO	7.1	8.2	9.7	9.7	10.1	10.3	9.0	7.5
Perception	10.0	10.9	12.2	12.3	12.9	13.4	12.0	10.5
Alternative 1	16.4	16.9	18.2	17.8	18.2	18.7	17.3	15.3
Alternative 2	16.7	17.2	18.5	18.0	18.5	18.9	17.5	15.5
Portugal								
ILÕ	7.7	9.6	11.0	12.9	15.9	16.4	14.1	12.6
Perception	10.8	13.1	14.3	18.0	21.7	22.9	20.3	18.7
Alternative 1	9.8	11.8	13.1	18.5	22.8	24.5	22.3	20.4
Alternative 2	10.5	12.4	13.7	19.7	24.0	25.7	23.4	21.5
Romania								
ILO	5.8	6.9	7.3	7.4	7.0	7.1	6.8	6.8
Perception	5.8	6.9	8.9	9.2	9.0	9.0	8.9	9.4
Alternative 1	26.0	27.8	29.2	30.0	28.1	27.1	25.7	23.6
Alternative 2	26.0	27.8	29.2	30.0	28.1	27.1	25.7	23.6
Spain								
ÎLO	11.3	18.0	20.1	21.7	25.0	26.1	24.5	22.1
Perception	11.7	18.6	20.5	22.2	25.3	26.3	24.7	22.5
Alternative 1	20.4	26.6	28.4	29.9	34.2	35.1	33.7	31.2
Alternative 2	21.1	27.3	29.0	30.6	34.9	36.0	34.4	32.0
Sweden								
ILO	6.2	8.4	8.6	7.8	8.0	8.1	8.0	7.4
Perception	6.5	9.3	9.0	8.2	8.4	8.4	8.3	7.8
Alternative 1	11.7	14.4	14.7	13.7	13.9	14.3	14.0	13.2
Alternative 2	13.3	15.9	16.3	15.2	15.5	15.9	15.6	14.8