

National report
Poland

Work Package 3

Slawomir Nowotny

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Social background	5
3. Relation to work and unemployment	7
4. Social exclusion	11
5. Political exclusion	17
6. Well-being	23
7. Summary and conclusion	26

1. Introduction

Kielce is a city situated in the middle of Poland between the capital city of Warsaw and other big cities like Cracow, Katowice, Lodz. Being the capital of the Swietokrzyskie Province (voivodship) it is an economic, administrative, educational and cultural centre. Once an important centre of limestone mining, one of the oldest industrial zones in Poland, Kielce is now the second Polish trade fairs market, a centre of construction industry and building materials production. Roman Catholic Diocese of Kielce is a part of the Archdiocese of Cracow, one of the most important in Polish Church (late Pope John Paul II was Archbishop of Cracow). In 1816 the first Polish technical university was founded in Kielce (then moved to Warsaw became the Warsaw University of Technology). Today Kielce hosts more than ten academic schools and several high schools. Kielce is the 16th biggest Polish city with a population of 205.902 (2007, a year before the YOUNEX project started). The city is an administrative unit in terms of labour market policy (carried locally by the City Labour Office). In 2007 the unemployment rate in Kielce amounted at 9,8%, below the whole country's rate of 11,1%. During the time of the research it still remains significantly below the country level as show the following data for December 2010:

	Unemployed in 000	Unemployment rate in %
POLAND	1 954,7	12,3
Province (Voivorship)	82,1	14,7
City of Kielce	11,4	10,6

In January 2011 the unemployment register of the City Labour Office accounted:

- 12 118 unemployed persons, of what 5 821 were women (48,0%)
- 1 891 unemployed persons aged up to 25 years, of what 929 were women (49,1%)
- 6 079 long-term unemployed persons, of what 3 069 were women (50,4%)

The data analysed in this report were collected within the survey conducted between 30 January and 17 May 2010 by professional interviewers of the Center for Scientific Research, the research unit of PTS. The sampling frame was derived from the official census of the City of Kielce and contained all its residents born between 31 December 1974 and 1 January 1991. The data file contained 50.665 records including for each person: ID number (*PESEL*), surname and family name, date and place of birth and gender. From this frame the first tranche of the sample contained 4.725 persons was drawn applying random numbers. The objective was to complete 400 valid interviews in each of three target groups: long-term unemployed, precarious and regularly employed people. Net size of these groups obtainable from the first tranche were insufficient (293 unemployed, 389 precarious and 402 regularly employed before check) thus the second tranche of 2.300 persons was drawn. It was exploited until required numbers of interviews in two first groups were achieved; 1.628 addresses from

this tranche were contacted. After a careful control and check procedure some of interviews were rejected and finally the net sample of three groups contained:

- ⇒ 396 unemployed
- ⇒ 399 precarious
- ⇒ 400 regularly employed.

All interviews were conducted personally by interviewers using printed questionnaires.

2. Social background

Table 1: Socio-demographic composition of the sample divided into the three studied groups

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
<i>Gender</i>			
Men	47,2	48,9	42,8
Women	52,8	51,1	57,3
(Cramer's $V = ,052$) ¹	(n=396)	(n=399)	(n=400)
<i>Age</i>			
18-24	31,8	22,6	4,3
25-34	68,2	77,4	95,7
(Cramer's $V = ,289$ ***)	(n=396)	(n=399)	(n=400)
<i>Education</i>			
Not completed primary school	0,3	0	0
Completed primary school	3,5	1,8	0,3
Lower level secondary or second stage of basic education	18,7	11,1	4,8
Upper secondary school	32,4	25,2	12,9
Post secondary school	8,6	5,8	3,8
First stage of tertiary education	13,4	13,4	10,6
Second stage of tertiary	23	42,8	67,6
(Cramer's $V = ,273$ ***)	(n=395)	(n=397)	(n=395)
<i>Native or immigrant</i>			
Native	99	99,7	99
Immigrant	1	0,3	1
(Cramer's $V = ,041$)	(n=394)	(n=397)	(n=396)
<i>Marital status</i>			
Single	49,7	41,6	18,8
In partnership	50,3	58,4	81,2
(Cramer's $V = ,273$ ***)	(n=327)	(n=392)	(n=399)
<i>Living conditions</i>			
Living alone	2,4	2,8	4,1
Living together with someone	97,6	97,2	95,9
(Cramer's $V = ,042$)	(n=380)	(n=386)	(n=391)
<i>Parenthood</i>			
Living with children	35,4	33,8	58,3
Living without children	62,4	63,4	37,8
(Cramer's $V = ,169$ ***)	(n=396)	(n=399)	(n=400)
<i>Finances</i>			
Salary	9,2	97,7	98,7
Unemployment benefits	1,1	0	0
Social aid	7,5	1	0
Family member	64,2	0,8	0,5
Other	18,1	0,5	0,8
(Cramer's $V = ,640$ ***)	(n=371)	(n=394)	(n=397)
<i>Personal income</i>			
Mean (PLN)	773,18	1645,04	1929,39
Median (PLN)	675	1400	1700
(Eta ² = ,089***)	(n=56)	(n=244)	(n=231)
<i>If unemployed</i>			
Benefiting from an active measure/employment measure	9,3 (n=396)		
Have never had a paid job	27,5 (n=396)		

¹ Significance levels: no star: the relationship is not significant, *=significant on the 0,05 level, **=significant on the 0,01 level, ***=significant on the 0,001 level.

Gender: There is no significant statistical dependence between gender and employment status. Slight overrepresentation of women in the control group (regularly employed) doesn't make the dependency between gender and employment status significant.

Age: There is a significant statistical dependence between age and employment status: among long-term unemployed the younger group (18-24 years) is highly overrepresented (almost 32%) while almost all (>95%) regularly employed belong to the older cohort. It shows that unemployment is a problem affecting mostly younger people.

Education: Also statistical dependence between education and employment status is expectedly significant: those of regular employment are higher educated than long-term unemployed. Among the first group only 5% haven't secondary education and more than $\frac{3}{4}$ have first or second stage of tertiary education while among the long-term unemployed as much as 22,5% have no more than lower level secondary or second stage of basic education and only 36,4% is educated on tertiary level.

Migration: Immigrants are very small group in Poland, and in the City of Kielce this group is so narrow that any kind of statistical dependence between this status and unemployment is immeasurable.

Marital status: There is a very significant statistical dependence between employment status and living with a partner or being single. In the group of regularly employed more than 4 in each 5 persons live with a partner, while only half of the unemployed are in this situation.

Living conditions: Almost all interviewees live with someone else, and this feature does not differ between groups of employment status. Combining this result with marital status it's easy to conclude that ca. 46% of long-term unemployed live with their parents or other members of family, being still singles.

Children: Living in a household with children is much more frequent (significant dependence) among regularly employed (more than 58%), less – in the group of unemployed (only 35%) and even less frequent in precarious group. A considerable part of long term unemployed live as singles with their parents, and in their not too big apartments there is no place for other nuclear families – let say of siblings – with children.

Finances: The strong significant dependence between employment status and financial situation is highly expectable: while almost all regularly employed and even those of precarious status cover their living expenses from more or less regular salaries, nearly $\frac{2}{3}$ of unemployed live on their family expense. On the other hand 9% of them claim to get salary which is at odds with their status. What is also noticeable is that even less of long term unemployed live on unemployment benefits or social aid.

Personal income: The most distinctive result is that only 56 out of 396 of all unemployed (14%) indicate any personal income. And these seldom declared incomes are much less than of two other groups – an average income of an unemployed equals 47% of an average in precarious group and only 40% of those having job. Pretty bad financial situation of long term unemployed in Kielce is deepened by fact that only less than 10% of them benefit from any kind of active or employment measures, and as much as 28% have never had a paid job.

3. Relation to work and unemployment

The general satisfaction with work during the last 12 months – between those who have had any work then – is moderately well: on the 11-point scale (0 – 10) it's average is over 7, with a slightly higher level in the group of regularly employed, however this relationship is statistically insignificant.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Work satisfaction in generally during the last 12 months <i>Eta</i> ² = NS		7,03 (n=398)	7,24 (n=398)

In some correspondence to the above results are numbers of those among the both groups who have low hopes for of finding a better job (precarious are slightly more pessimistic) and – on the other hand – high fear of losing the current job (here the fear is slightly stronger among the regularly employed). Long-term unemployed could have only hope to get any job, but for almost half of them this hope is quite low.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Low hopes of getting a job	44,8 (n=386)		
Low hopes of getting a better job <i>Cramer's V</i> = -,167***		11,7 (n=385)	8,3 (n=387)
High fears of losing the job <i>Cramer's V</i> = ,117**		76,9 (n=376)	85,6 (n=384)

As it can be seen in the next table, the most important aspect of life for interviewees is family, no matter the employment status. This is quite expectable in Polish society, where family is unconquerable value. Quite similar situation is in attitudes of young people to friends. What is less expectable, is lack of significant statistical dependence between the three groups in their valuation of work, which is second most important aspect of life.

On the other side of the importance scale there are two aspects: voluntary organizations and politics, which is particularly low important for young interviewees. And despite of statistical significance of differences between the three groups in terms of their appraisal for “politics”, “voluntary organization” and “leisure time” (relatively less important for unemployed people who have it enough), all these statistical relationships are very weak.

The similar situation we can find in differentiation of attitudes toward work (see Table 5 below). The relatively strongest (and significant) is dependence between employment status and opinion that *unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person*: among three of four regularly employed accept this statement, while among unemployed do this less than 60%. The question remains open if (or how much) it is a psychological defence mechanism making unemployed people more reluctant to think about their own situation as something “worst that can happen to a person”, or – on the other hand – if (or how much)

such more carefree attitude of some people makes their motivations to get and keep a job weaker?

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family	$Eta^2 = ,005^*$	9,56 (n=395)	9,61 (n=398)	9,75 (n=400)
Friends	$Eta^2 = NS$	8,25 (n=395)	8,42 (n=398)	8,31 (n=398)
Leisure time	$Eta^2 = ,014^{***}$	7,42 (n=395)	7,99 (n=397)	7,76 (n=400)
Politics	$Eta^2 = ,014^{***}$	2,79 (n=391)	3,44 (n=395)	3,40 (n=399)
Work	$Eta^2 = NS$	8,45 (n=395)	8,41 (n=399)	8,32 (n=400)
Religion	$Eta^2 = NS$	6,08 (n=386)	6,25 (n=394)	6,43 (n=397)
Voluntary organizations	$Eta^2 = ,012^{**}$	4,94 (n=387)	5,61 (n=392)	5,15 (n=396)

More than 80% in each group refuse the idea to resign of work just because of the very high unemployment benefit or winning a large sum of money. On the other hand – for 76% of unemployed and 86% of those having regular job *having a paid job to go to is very important*. These results are quite coherent with those in Table 4 above.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Having a paid job to go to is very important	$Cramer's V = ,093^{**}$	75,9 n=395	81,5 n=399	85,5 n=400
If I won a large sum of money I would immediately stop working	$Cramer's V = ,093^{**}$	19,6 n=388	18,3 n=393	13,4 n=395
Unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a person	$Cramer's V = ,105^{***}$	58,6 n=394	66,9 n=399	72,8 n=400
I get bored quickly when I have no work to do	$Cramer's V = ,079^*$	57,7 n=395	59,8 n=398	67,3 n=397
The most important things that happen in life do not involve work	$Cramer's V = ,067$	49,6 n=389	50,6 n=395	48,7 n=394
Being without a job gives time to spend on other important things	$Cramer's V = ,093^{**}$	58,1 n=396	57,5 n=398	46,9 n=399
If the unemployment benefit was very high I would not want a paid job to go to	$Cramer's V = ,093^{**}$	16,2 n=395	12,9 n=395	8,9 n=394

Work is an important value for surveyed young people, but what is particularly important in it? It looks (see Table 6) that almost everything: the salary, being regularly active, having social contacts, identity and status or opportunity for personal development. All of them are quite or very important for overwhelming majority of 90% up to almost 100% of

interviewees. And as above – differentiation between groups in assessing importance of these functions of work is quite weak.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The salary	<i>Cramer's V = ,057</i>	98,2 (n=394)	99,7 (n=396)	99,5 (n=399)
Regular activities	<i>Cramer's V = ,089***</i>	94,7 (n=394)	98,7 (n=397)	97,0 (n=399)
Social contacts	<i>Cramer's V = ,050</i>	97,5 (n=394)	98,5 (n=397)	99,7 (n=399)
Gives an identity and status	<i>Cramer's V = ,048</i>	89,4 (n=388)	91,3 (n=393)	89,4 (n=396)
Personal development	<i>Cramer's V = ,107***</i>	95,4 (n=394)	98,2 (n=397)	97,2 (n=399)

The results presented in the Table 7 show that opinions on the importance for men and women of having a fulltime job to be considered adults are almost evenly distributed in all three groups. And in general the average level of acceptance of this idea is not very high: for women the “average importance” is ca. 5,5 points on the 11-point scale from 0 to 10, and for men is higher by ca. 1,5 point. One can say that a man without a fulltime job is a bit “less adult” than a woman in the same situation. But sociological interpretation of these results should take into account that the very idea to define adulthood by having a paid job is rather strange and far from intuitiveness. Common sense is rather reverse: if you are adult you can/should have a job, and not – if you have a job you are adult.

Much more differentiated is acceptance for both sexes to have a full time job while having a children younger than 3 years: the average level of approval for working fathers is by half higher than for a working mother. That is coherent with pretty typical traditional Polish hierarchy of values in which maternity vocation – taking care of children, bringing them up – is higher than having a paid work.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The importance a full time job to be considered an adult for a woman	<i>Eta² = ,002</i>	5,39 (n=355)	5,64 (n=332)	5,36 (n=330)
The importance a full time job to be considered an adult for a man	<i>Eta² = ,000</i>	6,89 (n=339)	6,90 (n=337)	6,99 (n=334)
Approval of a woman with children younger than 3 having a full time job	<i>Eta² = ,006</i>	5,06 (n=391)	5,68 (n=393)	5,50 (n=397)
Approval of a man with children younger than 3 having a full time job	<i>Eta² = ,000</i>	8,72 (n=396)	8,80 (n=394)	8,80 (n=399)

The mentioned Polish hierarchy of values seems to affect also the subsequent opinions (Table 8) on rights and duties of men and women toward work and family. The impact is, however, not overwhelming: majority of 60-66% thinks that *a woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family*, but hardly all agree with this opinion. On the other hand almost all interviewees agree that *a man should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children*, and only minor part of each group support priority for men in access to jobs if there is insufficient work places. This opinion, however, differentiate significantly (even if not very strongly) the three groups. The most generous for men are long-term unemployed: more than 1/3 of them give men a priority, while among regularly employed less that 20% do the same. Of course much more stronger is differentiation in this opinion between sexes: Cramer's V amounts here at ,323 at the significance level 000.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family <i>Cramer's V = ,083**</i>	66,0 (n=382)	64,1 (n=393)	59,2 (n=387)
A man should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children <i>Cramer's V = ,084*</i>	96,2 (n=394)	98,0 (n=398)	96,0 (n=398)
When jobs are scarce, men should have jobs in the first place <i>Cramer's V = ,115***</i>	34,2 (n=374)	27,3 (n=384)	19,6 (n=387)

The above results of the survey don't give a basis to claim that the three interviewed groups: long-term unemployed, precarious and regularly employed differ significantly in their attitudes to work and roles of men and women on labour market.

4. Social exclusion

The present section summarises and discusses information collected from the interviewees on various elements and factors of their social capital. The first element is number of friends declared by them. As can be seen in Table 9 distributions of number of friends are quite similar in all three groups: most of them have from 3 to 7 friends, slightly less – only 1 to 2 people with whom they feel friendship. The total differentiation is statistically not significant, some differences are, however, apparent: the relatively biggest number of having no friends at all is among long-term unemployed people, while precarious most frequently declare to have more than 7 friends.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
None	5,3	2,8	3,5
1-2 people	40,7	37,7	40,6
3-7 people	42,7	43,2	45,1
More than 7 people	11,4	16,3	10,8
	<i>Cramer's V=,065</i> (n=396)	(n=398)	(n=399)

When behaviours are considered the picture seems consistent: precarious are the group in which there is the less people who during the last month have not meet any family members, friends nor acquaintances. In two other groups, however, numbers of those who have meet nobody last month don't exceed 8 percent points, except for regularly employed, 13% of whom have no gatherings with acquaintances during this time.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Family members not living in the household <i>Cramer's V = ,054</i>	7,8 (n=395)	6,3 (n=397)	5,5 (n=397)
Friends not living in the household <i>Cramer's V = ,115***</i>	6,3 (n=394)	5,5 (n=398)	7,8 (n=397)
Acquaintances not living in the household <i>Cramer's V = ,184***</i>	6,1 (n=393)	4,8 (n=399)	13,1 (n=396)

Much more important component of social capital than declared number of friends and frequency of meeting with them and other close people is support – actual and possible – which one can get from other people. In the survey people were been asked about receiving such help as *getting a lift with someone, help in looking after children, having shopping done, having something repaired at your house*. Table 11 presents some data on negative side of this issue: 40% of employed and 32% of unemployed did not get such help from anybody during the last 12 months. If such help is received, however, the least common is getting it from neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances) and present or former workmates. The last is particularly uncommon among long-term unemployed – statistical dependence is

significant and pretty strong. And even stronger is differentiation if we consider a help from a partner: among unemployed there is twice as much of those who didn't get it than among regularly employed.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one	<i>Cramer's V = ,072**</i>	40,8 (n=392)	34,4 (n=395)	31,6 (n=399)
Partner	<i>Cramer's V = ,155***</i>	30,2 (n=222)	20,3 (n=246)	15,0 (n=267)
Family members (not in the same household)	<i>Cramer's V = ,075</i>	13,8 (n=232)	11,1 (n=252)	10,5 (n=266)
Friends	<i>Cramer's V = ,082</i>	16,9 (n=231)	14,2 (n=254)	17,5 (n=268)
Acquaintances	<i>Cramer's V = ,092*</i>	30,7 (n=231)	25,6 (n=254)	28,9 (n=266)
Colleagues/former colleagues	<i>Cramer's V = ,121***</i>	61,7 (n=230)	43,1 (n=253)	48,7 (n=265)
Neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances)	<i>Cramer's V = ,094*</i>	74,8 (n=230)	74,5 (n=255)	73,6 (n=265)

On the other hand reciprocity in offering help to others may be important source of social capital. When the same kind of help but given by interviewees to other people is considered the most apparent is the generally high level of reciprocity – most of figures in Table 12 are higher than in Table 11. It looks that young people feel obliged to help others and – if we take declarations as the reliable source of information about facts – do this. What is interesting when we compare both tables that is the relatively highest level of mutuality among unemployed: there is less of them who never offer a help to given category of others than those who never get it from the same category.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No one	<i>Cramer's V = ,078**</i>	38,4 (n=393)	29,8 (n=393)	28,4 (n=391)
Partner	<i>Cramer's V = ,155***</i>	27,1 (n=229)	22,6 (n=261)	16,3 (n=276)
Family members (not in the same household)	<i>Cramer's V = ,075</i>	6,2 (n=242)	6,3 (n=270)	6,8 (n=278)
Friends	<i>Cramer's V = ,082</i>	11,2 (n=241)	7,0 (n=270)	11,9 (n=277)
Acquaintances	<i>Cramer's V = ,092*</i>	18,8 (n=240)	18,5 (n=271)	21,9 (n=278)
Colleagues/former colleagues	<i>Cramer's V = ,121***</i>	50,6 (n=239)	34,9 (n=269)	38,6 (n=277)
Neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances)	<i>Cramer's V = ,094*</i>	65,4 (n=240)	61,7 (n=269)	67,6 (n=275)

One of the most practical problems of unemployed and precarious people is shortage in financial resources. Borrowing some money can help them when the situation gets tough and easiness of receiving this kind of help is a good indicator of social capital. Table 13 shows that differentiation of the three investigated groups from this point of view is of moderate strength and statistically significant: borrowing money is most difficult for unemployed and easiest for regularly employed. Of course the crucial factor in this is assessment of solvency of potential receiver of a loan by creditor – unemployed people give the lowest chance to repay.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Very difficult	18,1	8,5	7,7
Quite difficult	45,3	39,4	35,9
Quite easy	30,2	43,3	46,3
Very easy	6,5	8,8	10,1
<i>Cramer's V = ,138***</i>	(n=371)	(n=363)	(n=365)

The next table gives more insight into practice of borrowing money among interviewees in the three investigated groups. The biggest demand for this kind of support have naturally unemployed people, the lowest – those of regular employment (the dependence is statistically significant and relatively strong). Similar differentiation – although not so strong and significant – can be observed in reference to borrowing money from friends, acquaintances and neighbours. In terms of frequency of borrowing from various categories of people in general, the main source is family – ¾ or more in each group during the past 12 months have borrowed money from their family members not living in the same household. The second common source are friends (more than half of unemployed have availed of their loans) and third is interviewee's partner.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Have borrowed money during the past 12 months <i>Cramer's V = ,265***</i>	38,2 (n=390)	19,6 (n=398)	11,5 (n=399)
From their partner <i>Cramer's V = ,127</i>	22,0 (n=141)	16,4 (n=73)	25,0 (n=44)
From family members not living in the same household <i>Cramer's V = ,149*</i>	80,4 (n=148)	74,4 (n=78)	84,8 (n=46)
From their friends <i>Cramer's V = ,192***</i>	53,4 (n=148)	31,2 (n=77)	28,3 (n=46)
From acquaintances <i>Cramer's V = ,170*</i>	26,35 (n=147)	17,9 (n=78)	10,9 (n=46)
From their colleagues or former colleagues <i>Cramer's V = ,084</i>	10,2 (n=147)	9,0 (n=78)	10,9 (n=46)
From their neighbours (not being friends or acquaintances) <i>Cramer's V = ,108</i>	6,1 (n=147)	2,6 (n=78)	0,0 (n=46)

An attempt to grasp a kind of “projective” view of the interviewees on their social involvement in terms of taking part in social activities provided results shown in the Table 15. It looks that the three groups don’t differ significantly in this aspect: most of them feel “average” – their habits are *about the same compared to other people of the same age*. On the other hand, however, much more in each group feel that in this aspect they are below the “average” (combined responses “much more seldom” and “more seldom”) of majority then below (“more often” and “much more often”).

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Much more seldom than most people in their age	17,9	15,4	17,3
More seldom than most	27,2	31,6	33,1
About the same	45,6	41,3	43,0
More often than most	6,4	9,6	4,6
Much more often than most	2,6	2,0	1,8
<i>Cramer’s V=,075</i>	(n=390)	(n=395)	(n=393)

Perhaps a bit unexpected is the finding (presented in Table 16) that there is no significant differences between the three groups in being active in any ‘spare time’ activities such as hobbies or sports. Around one fourth of each group declare to be “not active” in this field. When we want to explain the reasons of lack of spare time activities, we find however quite differentiated picture. While the majority of unemployed just have no hobby/sport, precarious and regularly employed more frequently claim that they cannot afford their hobby/sport activities anymore or suggest another reason for being inactive in spare time. The question rises if the status of unemployed affects negatively having hobbies or – rather – people of no special interest in active way of spending time are also more passive in seeking for a job. The survey results don’t allow to answer this question.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not active	25,6	25,3	23,0
<i>Cramer’s V =NS</i>	(n=395)	(n=399)	(n=400)
have no hobby/sport	52,0	29,3	38,5
not interested in their hobbies/sports anymore	6,0	11,1	6,6
cannot afford it anymore	27,0	31,3	34,1
another reason	15,0	27,3	19,8
<i>Cramer’s V=,155*</i>	(n=100)	(n=99)	(n=91)

On the other side of the range of social integration/exclusion is an issue of experiencing various kind of discrimination. In Poland it is not very common that people feel *being a member of a group that is discriminated against*. There is no here any strong ethnic, national or religious conflicts, especially with division into the dominating majority and suppressed minority. As it is shown in Table 17 as much as 89% of unemployed and 98% of regularly

employed don't count themselves to any of discriminated groups. The only significant exception is feeling of 8% of long-term unemployed belonging to the group discriminated on the ground of ... employment status which seems quite obvious in their situation.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
No	<i>Cramer's V = ,117***</i>	88,8	93,4	98,3
Colour or race	<i>Cramer's V = ,157***</i>	0,0	0,0	0,0
Nationality	<i>Cramer's V = ,111***</i>	0,5	0,3	0,0
Religion	<i>Cramer's V = ,111***</i>	0,3	0,3	0,0
Language	<i>Cramer's V = ,157***</i>	0,0	0,0	0,0
Ethnic group	<i>Cramer's V = ,111***</i>	0,3	0,3	0,0
Age	<i>Cramer's V = ,111***</i>	1,3	0,8	0,3
Gender	<i>Cramer's V = ,131***</i>	0,5	1,0	1,3
Sexuality	<i>Cramer's V = ,157***</i>	0,0	0,0	0,0
Disability	<i>Cramer's V = ,112***</i>	0,8	0,3	0,0
Employment status	<i>Cramer's V = ,142***</i>	7,8	2,0	0,3
Other	<i>Cramer's V = ,123***</i>	1,0	2,0	0,0
		(n=396)	(n=399)	(n=400)

The next table presents distribution of answers for projective question what people think about unemployed. Generally, as in other issues, this question doesn't differentiate the three investigated groups as well. The biggest difference is in case of the opinion that "unemployed people are lazy" – among regularly employed there is 11 percent points more those who think that this opinion is prevalent "in our society" than among unemployed. Part of this difference may be ascribed to the very opinion of the interviewees themselves (on the basis of psychological mechanism of projection), but the survey results don't provide ground to verify this hypothesis or to measure the scope of this phenomenon.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
They are lazy	<i>Cramer's V = ,078*</i>	49,9 (n=391)	54,9 (n=397)	61,1 (n=396)
They have intended to take advantage of the system	<i>Cramer's V = ,033</i>	44,9 (n=390)	50,1 (n=393)	52,5 (n=396)
They are passive/without initiative	<i>Cramer's V = ,085**</i>	48,7 (n=388)	51,8 (n=394)	60,0 (n=395)
They have had bad luck	<i>Cramer's V = ,046</i>	40,0 (n=390)	36,6 (n=396)	39,8 (n=392)
They have themselves to blame	<i>Cramer's V = ,047</i>	39,6 (n=389)	40,5 (n=390)	44,3 (n=393)
They have no job because of alcohol or drug problems	<i>Cramer's V = ,080*</i>	45,2 (n=385)	45,5 (n=393)	49,4 (n=391)
They are people who have become victims of the socio-economic development	<i>Cramer's V = ,058</i>	51,3 (n=382)	53,4 (n=384)	52,8 (n=386)

What seems more evident is a kind of ranking of alleged popularity of opinions about unemployed people in the Polish society. While “laziness” is on top of this list, the next are opinions that unemployed people are passive and without initiative or just victims of the socio-economic development of the country. The fourth in a ranking is opinion going further in ascribing responsibility to unemployed people themselves, and even more – blaming them for bad intentions, namely opinion that unemployed intend to take advantage of the system. The least popular in the Polish society would be, according to our interviewees, opinion that lack of job is a result of “bad luck”.

5. Political exclusion

Poles are far from being heavily interested in politics. Relatively low actual participation in elections has an equivalent in answers for the survey question. As it shown in Table 19 as much as 30% of regularly employed up to 46% of unemployed is not interested in politics at all. With next 34 – 40% of “not very interested” we have the majority of 70 – 80% of young people who doesn’t care about politics. This attitude, however, differentiate significantly the three investigated groups: the less interested in politics are long-term unemployed while relatively most interested are those of regular employment status.

Table 19: *Political interest (percentage).*

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Not interested at all	45,8	36,7	30,3
Not very interested	34,0	39,9	40,2
Fairly interested	15,7	21,9	27,3
Very interested	1,8	1,5	2,3
<i>Cramer's V=,117***</i>	(n=394)	(n=398)	(n=396)

Interest in politics is far from being an obligatory element of the profile of “a good citizen”. Results presented in Table 20 are evident: “being active in politics” is important to be a good citizen for less than 20% of interviewees in each group (differentiation insignificant). For the vast majority “a good citizen” obeys laws and regulations, supports people who are worse off than him/herself and forms his/her own opinion independently of others. In other words citizenship consists in legality, charity and independent thinking. Much less important is not only being active in politics but also voting in elections and being active in voluntary organisations. And only the latter differentiates significantly the three groups, being most important for regularly employed and least for long-term unemployed.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Supporting people who are worse off than themselves <i>Cramer's V=,032</i>	82,6 (n=390)	82,0 (n=395)	83,1 (n=396)
Voting in elections <i>Cramer's V=,068</i>	54,8 (n=389)	62,4 (n=394)	65,8 (n=389)
Obeying laws and regulations <i>Cramer's V=,077</i>	84,2 (n=392)	86,1 (n=396)	89,2 (n=399)
Forming your own opinion independently of others <i>Cramer's V=,062</i>	75,9 (n=390)	79,2 (n=395)	81,8 (n=396)
Being active in voluntary organisations <i>Cramer's V=,100**</i>	50,0 (n=388)	55,6 (n=390)	58,7 (n=395)
Being active in politics <i>Cramer's V=,045</i>	17,3 (n=387)	19,6 (n=392)	19,6 (n=393)

Some explanation of lack of esteem for politics one can find in opinions on relationships between “we” (meaning “people like me”) and political sphere, presented in Table 21. For the overwhelming majority of all three groups parties need only votes of people, and are not are

interested in their opinion. Thus it's hard for a man in the street to feel that he/she has an influence on governmental politics. The more so because politics for majority of investigated young people *is so complicated* that people like them *do not understand anymore what is going on*. This opinion, however, differentiates the three groups significantly and pretty strongly: it is shared by 73% of unemployed and precarious, but only by less than 60% of those with regular job.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Parties are only interested in our votes, not in our opinion <i>Cramer's V=,043</i>	93,3 (n=375)	92,5 (n=388)	91,0 (n=388)
People like me definitely have an influence on governmental politics <i>Cramer's V=,064</i>	14,0 (n=379)	16,8 (n=386)	19,3 (n=389)
Sometimes politics is so complicated that people like me do not understand anymore what is going on <i>Cramer's V=,123***</i>	73,0 (n=378)	72,9 (n=391)	59,2 (n=390)

Trust – or rather lack of it – in political institutions is presented in Table 22.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Civil servants and employees in civil service <i>Eta²= ,015***</i>	5,08 (n=381)	5,17 (n=372)	5,67 (n=385)
The government of Kielce <i>Eta²= ,101**</i>	5,05 (n=337)	5,11 (n=353)	5,54 (n=356)
The Kielce city council <i>Eta²= ,010**</i>	4,93 (n=328)	4,91 (n=340)	5,38 (n=345)
The police <i>Eta²= ,028***</i>	5,16 (n=384)	5,39 (n=389)	6,06 (n=392)
The regional parliament <i>Eta²= ,019***</i>	5,00 (n=251)	4,97 (n=266)	5,60 (n=291)
The regional government <i>Eta²= ,022***</i>	5,06 (n=252)	5,10 (n=277)	5,75 (n=291)
The Church <i>Eta²= ,008**</i>	5,14 (n=381)	5,44 (n=383)	5,73 (n=385)
The national government <i>Eta²= ,018***</i>	3,58 (n=372)	3,98 (n=377)	4,27 (n=380)
The courts <i>Eta²= ,021***</i>	4,81 (n=367)	5,09 (n=373)	5,62 (n=379)
The national parliament <i>Eta²= ,007**</i>	3,48 (n=357)	3,65 (n=367)	3,90 (n=363)
The institutions of the European Union <i>Eta²= ,006*</i>	5,77 (n=357)	5,81 (n=360)	6,11 (n=358)
Employers and enterprises <i>Eta²= ,025***</i>	4,91 (n=370)	5,42 (n=380)	5,60 (n=386)
The media <i>Eta²= ,000</i>	5,21 (n=384)	5,25 (n=390)	5,22 (n=388)
Trade unions <i>Eta²= ,004</i>	5,07 (n=255)	4,84 (n=289)	5,23 (n=291)

In general the most trusted is European Union, the least – Polish parliament (Sejm), and the difference is substantial: average of 5,90 compared to 3,68 on the 11-point scale 0-10, and doesn't depend on belonging to one of the investigated groups. Similarly there is no considerable differences between the groups in their trust to other institutions except for the government of Kielce which is the least trusted by unemployed and the most by regularly employed. What is worth to mention is that the national institutions are less trusted than their equivalents on the regional or local level, e.g.: city government of Kielce has average 5,24 and national government 3,95; city council 5,08 and national parliament 3,68. The second and third most trusted by all interviewees are police (5,54) and the Church (5,44) while the second and third least trusted are national government (3,95) and trade unions (however trust for them is not so low: in average 5,04).

Even lower than trust to political institutions is satisfaction with democracy and with government management of different issues. The way democracy works in Poland is most satisfying for regularly employed people (an average of 5,70 on the 11-point scale 0-10), less for precarious (5,72) and the least for long-term unemployed (4,80). It looks that the sense of deprivation of need for job is generalised into the frustration with the whole democratic system.

As in the case of other questions in this survey no item differentiates apparently the three investigated groups even if dependence is statistically significant – the Eta^2 coefficients don't exceed 0,04 which means that differences between groups explain no more than 4% of variance of satisfaction. In other words it might suggest that satisfaction of the investigated youth people hardly depend on their employment status, and is influenced by other factors.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The way democracy works	$Eta^2 = ,030^{***}$	4,80 (n=388)	5,27 (n=391)	5,70 (n=386)
Economy	$Eta^2 = ,023^{***}$	4,37 (n=379)	4,79 (n=386)	5,14 (n=389)
Poverty	$Eta^2 = ,015^{***}$	2,74 (n=389)	3,11 (n=389)	3,25 (n=392)
Education	$Eta^2 = ,011^{***}$	4,51 (n=388)	4,83 (n=391)	5,02 (n=392)
Unemployment	$Eta^2 = ,015^{***}$	2,56 (n=391)	2,91 (n=392)	3,09 (n=394)
Health care	$Eta^2 = ,003$	3,19 (n=391)	3,11 (n=390)	3,36 (n=395)
Precarious employment	$Eta^2 = ,034^{***}$	2,74 (n=379)	3,19 (n=380)	3,58 (n=390)
Environment/sustainable development	$Eta^2 = ,011^{**}$	4,59 (n=373)	4,69 (n=373)	5,05 (n=337)
Youth	$Eta^2 = ,017^{***}$	3,68 (n=383)	3,83 (n=383)	4,36 (n=388)

Thus only differences between items are worth of consideration. For all interviewees the most satisfying is government management in education (4,79) and very close are average scores for environment and economy. The least satisfying are government dealing with: unemployment (2,85), poverty (3,03) and precarious employment (3,17).

Low level of trust in political institutions and even lower satisfaction of government's performance are – most likely – among main factors of small interest in politics (Table 19 above) and its behavioural representation: participation in election. According to the pattern very common in democracies, post-electoral declarations of participation over-estimate actual attendance. In 2007 national parliamentary elections in Poland the attendance in Kielce was 47,45% (of all eligible, not only people aged 18-34) while in the survey as much as 63,4% of respondents claim their participation in this election. In 2006 local election in Kielce attendance count 40,21% while survey declarations are at the level of 52,0%. If we assume that the mechanism that "memory" of voting rises with time works similarly in all groups than significant and moderately strong differentiation in levels of declared participation in elections we can take as evidence of actual differentiation (although at lower level). In the group of unemployed there is significantly less actual voters than in the group of precarious and regularly employed.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
The last national election	<i>Cramer's V=,190***</i>	52,4 (n=332)	69,1 (n=362)	77,3 (n=375)
The last local election	<i>Cramer's V=,195***</i>	42,2 (n=294)	59,9 (n=314)	67,9 (n=346)

The mentioned phenomenon of post-electoral memory of supposed voting is usually explained by sociologists with reference to the moral qualification of voting as a "citizen obligation". That is why some respondents try to avoid disapproval for their actual electoral absence. This is not the case of other political behaviours which were subject of following questions on "different ways of trying to improve things in society or to help prevent things from going wrong". And without the moral sanction behind these kinds of political activities the level of declared adherence to them within the past 12 months is much lower. The most "popular" are: contacting a national or local government official (8% of employed and 6% of precarious do this) and signing a petition, declared by 6% of precarious, 5% of employed and only 2% of unemployed. The former activity is also the only which differentiate groups significantly and relatively strongest. One of possible factors of this is the fact, that the term "contacting official" beyond of strictly political activity covers also several formal situation when a citizen is obliged to follow some procedures or tries to set his/her matters in administrative sphere.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Contacted a politician	<i>Cramer's V=NS</i>	1,0 (n=396)	3,3 (n=398)	3,3 (n=400)
Contacted a national or local government official	<i>Cramer's V=,105***</i>	2,3 (n=396)	6,0 (n=398)	8,0 (n=399)
Worked for a political party	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,8 (n=396)	1,5 (n=397)	0,8 (n=400)
Worked in a political action group	<i>Cramer's V=NS</i>	0,8 (n=396)	1,8 (n=397)	0,8 (n=400)
Worn or displayed a badge, sticker or poster	<i>Cramer's V=NS</i>	0,5 (n=396)	1,8 (n=398)	2,3 (n=399)
Signed a petition	<i>Cramer's V=,069*</i>	2,3 (n=396)	5,5 (n=398)	4,8 (n=400)
Taken part in a public demonstration	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,3 (n=396)	0,5 (n=398)	0,8 (n=400)
Boycotted certain products	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,3 (n=396)	1,8 (n=398)	1,8 (n=400)
Deliberately bought certain products for political reasons	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,5 (n=396)	1,3 (n=398)	10,6 (n=400)
Donated money to a political organisation or group	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,8 (n=393)	1,5 (n=398)	2,3 (n=400)
Taken part in a strike	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,0 (n=396)	0,8 (n=398)	1,0 (n=399)
Contacted the media	<i>Cramer's V=,061*</i>	1,3 (n=396)	4,3 (n=398)	2,5 (n=399)
Contacted a solicitor or a judicial body for non-personal reasons	<i>Cramer's V=NS</i>	0,5 (n=396)	2,5 (n=397)	2,3 (n=399)
Participated in an illegal action	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,0 (n=396)	0,5 (n=397)	0,0 (n=400)
Participated in a violent action	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,0 (n=399)	0,3 (n=397)	0,0 (n=400)

Next step on the scale of citizen participation is membership of various organizations.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Political party	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	1,0 (n=396)	1,5 (n=398)	2,0 (n=399)
Trade union	<i>Cramer's V=,150***</i>	0,0 (n=396)	0,8 (n=398)	0,8 (n=399)
Religious organisation	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,5 (n=396)	1,0 (n=398)	0,8 (n=399)
Cooperative	<i>Cramer's V= ,120***</i>	2,8 (n=396)	6,0 (n=398)	13,0 (n=399)
Social movement organisation	<i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	0,0 (n=396)	0,0 (n=398)	0,5 (n=400)
Other civil society organisation	<i>Cramer's V= ,083***</i>	1,0 (n=396)	4,3 (n=398)	1,3 (n=400)

In Poland – after decades of full control of the state over any kind of civic self-organization – the inclination to participate actively in civil society institutions remains still on the low level. For all but one kinds of organisations mentioned in the questionnaire no one has membership exceeding 2%. The only exception is membership in a cooperative which in Poland means mainly a housing cooperative, being in communism the easiest (and sometimes the only) way to get a flat, called “inhabitable local”. The form of cooperative enabled communist state to preclude ownership of apartments. This explains to some extent pretty strong, significant differences between the groups: the better employment status the more affordable an apartment, in some cases – within a housing cooperative.

6. Well-being

All above discussed problems: unemployment, financial shortages, distrust in politics and low satisfaction of government seem to have rather limited impact on feeling happy, optimistic and healthy (see Table 27). The average score on the 11-point (0-10) scale of feeling happy varies from 7,3 for unemployed to 7,96 for employed, and differences between the groups are considerably strong and statistically significant. Slightly weaker is the dependence between employment status and optimism, however the general level of optimism is also high. Almost all interviewees feel of good or very good health, no difference for employment status.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
Happiness	<i>Eta</i> ² = ,024***	7,30 (n=395)	7,68 (n=399)	7,96 (n=398)
Optimistic about the future	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,104***	86,1 (n=389)	90,8 (n=393)	95,5 (n=396)
Experience a good health in general	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,074*	95,4 (n=393)	98,5 (n=397)	98,2 (n=399)

Almost all items of the General Health Questionnaire used in the survey differentiate the three groups significantly, however not very strongly.

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

		Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
I have lost much sleep over worry	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,126***	16,6 (n=391)	10,1 (n=396)	6,3 (n=396)
I feel that I am playing a useful part in things	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,113***	96,4 (n=392)	97,5 (n=395)	99,0 (n=394)
I feel capable of making decisions about things	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,074*	94,1 (n=390)	99,5 (n=396)	98,7 (n=398)
I feel constantly under strain	<i>Cramer's V</i> = NS	26,9 (n=390)	23,2 (n=393)	20,9 (n=392)
I feel that I cannot overcome my difficulties	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,173***	14,6 (n=390)	7,6 (n=396)	8,3 (n=396)
I am able to concentrate on whatever I do	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,143***	97,6 (n=392)	98,5 (n=396)	98,0 (n=398)
I am able to face up to my problems	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,143***	95,2 (n=373)	98,7 (n=386)	99,0 (n=387)
I feel unhappy and distressed	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,140***	7,7 (n=388)	3,0 (n=395)	1,8 (n=398)
I have lost confidence in myself	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,176***	8,2 (n=391)	1,3 (n=397)	1,5 (n=398)
I think of myself as a worthless person	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,159***	2,3 (n=394)	0,8 (n=396)	0,0 (n=397)
I feel reasonably happy, all things considered	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,166***	93,5 (n=386)	98,5 (n=393)	99,0 (n=397)
I am able to enjoy my normal day-to-day activities	<i>Cramer's V</i> = ,140***	95,5 (n=377)	98,7 (n=393)	97,2 (n=396)

On the other hand overall picture seems quite positive. Unemployed more than three times often than regularly employed to have lost much sleep over worry, but the numbers are not very big: 16,6% compared to 6,3%. Overwhelming majority in each group *feels that is playing a useful part in things, is able to enjoy normal day-to-day activities* and generally *feels reasonably happy, all things considered*. And again – slightly less frequent are these feelings among unemployed than precarious and employed, but in any case a difference doesn't exceed 6 percent points.

On the other hand, however, 21 - 27% in particular groups *feel constantly under strain*, 15% of unemployed feel that they *cannot overcome difficulties*. Since some of these statement seem to be contradictory or at least not convergent, and respective percentages for them sum up to more than 100%, it looks that the GHQ has limited validity in reference to some interviewees who are ready to accept at once two statements: “I feel capable of making decisions about things” and “I feel that I cannot overcome my difficulties”; in the Polish sample there were 107 such persons in total.

One of important dimensions of well-being being subject of this survey is experiencing any form of institutional discrimination. That's why we asked people if it happen that at some public institutions they did not get a service they feel you were entitled to? Table 30 presents percentages of answers only for those of interviewees who in the precedent question declare that they visited mentioned institutions during the past 12 months and these numbers are presented in Table 29. The most frequent in each group is visiting a doctor or hospital, with slight differences between groups: only 63% of unemployed did this in past 12 months, while employed in 74%.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital <i>Cramer's V= ,095*</i>	63,1 (n=396)	69,7 (n=399)	73,9 (n=398)
At the social service office, by social worker <i>Cramer's V= ,122***</i>	14,6 (n=396)	6,0 (n=399)	3,8 (n=399)
At their child's school, training agency <i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	20,7 (n=396)	23,6 (n=399)	25,1 (n=399)
At the employment agency, job centre <i>Cramer's V= ,421***</i>	63,4 (n=396)	16,0 (n=399)	2,0 (n=399)
At the housing agency, by their landlord <i>Cramer's V= ,151***</i>	15,2 (n=396)	20,8 (n=399)	36,1 (n=399)
At any other community office <i>Cramer's V= ,125***</i>	15,7 (n=396)	28,6 (n=398)	33,6 (n=399)

That doesn't mean that the unemployed are more healthy (from Table 27 we know that slightly less of them *experience a good health in general*) but rather they hardly can afford healthcare services which – even if officially free of charge – require some costs. And part of them have no social and healthcare security. Quite obvious, however, is the strong significant differentiation in numbers of those visiting an employment agency or job centre: almost 2/3 of unemployed and nearly nobody of employed did it during past 12 months. Slightly less strong

but still significant is dependence between employment status and visits at one's housing agency or landlord, however this relationship is reverse: the long-term unemployed much more often live in their families' (mainly parents') apartments and they are not in a position to fix any formalities concerning housing matters. Similar reason may explain slight differences between the three groups in visiting one's child's school (which seems, however, not enough to explain less contacts with a training agency by unemployed).

The level of suffering from institutional discrimination is generally similar for the groups and for types of institutions – it varies between 20 and 35% with the few exceptions. The most discriminating seem to be housing agencies and landlords – up to 43% of precarious experienced that they did not get there a service they feel you were entitled to. The unemployed, on the other hand, feel discriminated most frequently at the social service office or by social worker (but the differences are not significant) while employment agencies or job centres are on the last but one place in this ranking of institutions indicated as practically discriminating. What is interesting that is an almost even percentage of discriminated by healthcare system institutions in each group: ca. 30% of young People in Kielce, no matter their employment status, have felt in the past 12 months that their client rights has been disregarded.

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

	Long-term unemployed	Precarious	Regularly employed
At the doctor's, hospital <i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	30,4 (n=250)	30,7 (n=277)	30,6 (n=291)
At the social service office, by social worker <i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	37,9 (n=58)	29,2 (n=24)	26,7 (n=15)
At their child's school, training agency <i>Cramer's V= ,129*</i>	22,0 (n=82)	11,7 (n=94)	27,0 (n=100)
At the employment agency, job centre <i>Cramer's V=NS</i>	28,5 (n=249)	21,9 (n=64)	25,0 (n=8)
At the housing agency, by their landlord <i>Cramer's V= , NS</i>	35,0 (n=60)	43,4 (n=83)	36,4 (n=143)
At any other community office <i>Cramer's V= NS</i>	30,6 (n=62)	29,5 (n=112)	34,6 (n=133)

7. Summary and conclusion

The main hypothesis of this study – that the long-term unemployment reduces social capital of the unemployed individual – gets only limited evidence in the results of the survey in Poland. First of all rather small number of issues differentiate significantly the three investigated groups: long-term unemployed, precarious and regularly employed.

Long-term unemployed is negatively correlated with age – the younger group the more long-term unemployed persons; unemployment affects mostly younger people. There is also significant dependence between employment status and living with a partner or single. Vast majority of regularly employed live with a partner, while only half of the unemployed are in this situation. Almost half of long-term unemployed live with their parents or other members of family, being still singles. Very few unemployed indicate any personal income, and their incomes are much less than of two other groups. Pretty bad financial situation of long term unemployed in Kielce is deepened by fact that very few of them benefit from any kind of active or employment measures, and most have never had a paid job. The situation of long-term unemployed is objectively much worse than of those who have job at least on precarious basis. This worse situation is reflected also in some subjective aspects. For almost half of long-term unemployed their hope to get any job within one year is quite low, which is parallel to the high fear of losing the current job among the precarious and regularly employed. The latter are also quite satisfied with their work during the last 12 months.

On the other hand there are similarities between people of different employment status. They have similar number of friends, similarly assess their participation in social activities (most of them feel “average” when compared to other people of the same age, however, much more in each group feel that in this aspect they are below the “average”).

Discrimination is not a heavy problem in Poland and it is not very common that people feel being a member of a group that is discriminated against. There is no here any strong ethnic, national or religious conflicts, especially with division into the dominating majority and suppressed minority. As the survey results show the vast majority in each group don't count themselves to any of discriminated groups (except for a minor part of the long-term unemployed self-identifying as discriminated on the ground of employment status, of course). Institutional discriminating – as something directly and practically experienced by people – is bigger problem, however. Its level is generally similar for the groups and for types of institutions and varies between 20 and 35% with the few exceptions. The unemployed feel discriminated slightly more frequently at the social service office or by social worker, but not at employment agencies or job centres.

Poles are far from being heavily interested in politics. For the vast majority of surveyed young people “a good citizen” should obey laws and regulations, support people who are worse off than him/herself and form his/her own opinion independently of others. In other words citizenship consists in legality, charity and independent thinking. Much less important is not only being active in politics but also voting in elections and being active in voluntary organisations. The trust in politics and politicians is generally pretty low, with relatively the biggest to the European Union, police and the Church. On the bottom are national parliament and government. Even lower than trust in political institutions is satisfaction with democracy

and with government management of different issues. But here we have a significant differentiation between the employment statuses – the least satisfied being LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED. It looks that the sense of deprivation of need for job is generalised into the frustration with the whole democratic system. Low trust and satisfaction result in very low political participation and membership in civil society organisations. It is evidently a part of heritage of communism – after decades of full control of the state over any kind of civic self-organization, the inclination to participate actively in civil society institutions remains still on the low level.

All these problems: unemployment, financial shortages, distrust in politics and low satisfaction of government seem to have rather limited impact on feeling happy, optimistic and healthy, and it is almost independent from the employment status. Overwhelming majority in each group feels that they are playing a useful part in things, are able to enjoy normal day-to-day activities and generally feel reasonably happy, all things considered.