

Situation and consequences of long-term unemployment in Croatia and measures for its decrease

Abstract

The text is dedicated to the situation and consequences of long-term unemployment in Croatia and measures for its decrease. After Introductory notes, Section 2 provides analysis of the causes for the long term unemployment. Government's measures for the decrease of the long term unemployment are explained in Section 3, while the text finishes with future perspectives and recommendation for improvement.

Key words: long-term unemployment, Croatia, active labour market policy

1 Introduction

Employment has a fundamental role in every society. People are frequently defined (and define themselves) by what they do for a living. Sociological and economic studies stress that employment is not only the most important determinant of the status of people in any country, but it is also essential for creating sense, income, social stability, quality of life, and ensuring participation in society (Jahoda, 1982). Employment is called "the glue that holds our society together" (Smith, 1987). Market incentives for increasing investments in education and professional development may have a specific role in alleviating the increasingly bigger inequality of employability and salaries, and the related potential poverty. If people are employed, it is less likely that they will be poor. Nevertheless, some of those who work are also poor due to a low income and large personal and family expenses. Therefore, efforts are made for people to work and to earn a salary, and thus be in a better position than those who receive assistance and benefits in the system of unemployment and social welfare.

Unfortunately, in Croatia, as in many transition countries, many people are unemployed and/or have low employability and therefore are exposed to economic poverty and social exclusion. Although, unemployment is a problem *per se*, particular problem is long-term unemployment (when somebody is waiting for a job longer than 1 year) because it leads to poverty and social exclusion, persons forget their knowledge and skills or they become obsolete, they lose self-esteem and a sense of self-reliance and so on. Furthermore, employers are also suspicious on long-term unemployed person, believing that his or her situation is his or her own failure or inactivity. The text is dedicated to the situation and consequences of long-term unemployment in Croatia and measures for its decrease. After Introductory notes, Section 2 provides analysis of the causes for the long term unemployment. Government's measures for the decrease of the long term unemployment are explained in Section 3, while the text finishes with future perspectives and recommendation for improvement.

2 Causes for the long term unemployment

2.1 Theoretical framework

Long-term unemployment (LTU), defined as those unemployed for at least a year, is a serious problem in Western Europe and in Central Europe. For example, Nickell (2006) reviews short-term and long-term unemployment rates in Western Europe. He finds that with the exceptions of the four largest countries, France, Germany, Italy and Spain, most of the remaining countries have relatively low short-term unemployment rates. However, even when short-term rates are not particularly high, LTU rates still tend to be much larger than in other countries.

Many factors of supply on the labour market limit the possibilities for the employment of long-term unemployed persons, of whom many are social welfare beneficiaries - particularly those who are very difficult to employ. Activities related to the reform of the labour market and the social welfare system should be supplemented by measures to reduce employment barriers, particularly for difficult-to-employ and poorly paid workers. According to different international experiences (Holcomb and Martinson, 2002), there continue to be LTU individuals who are difficult to employ, even after participation in activation programmes which contain the element of compulsion, such as *workfare*.

No doubt, LTU individuals and social welfare beneficiaries face numerous, complex obstacles in the search for a job. Usually, they combat a number of different and complex obstacles to employment, including physical disability / incapacitation, psychological problems, domestic violence, learning difficulties, alcoholism or drug addiction, and they mostly have a low educational background, they live in areas with poor traffic connections, are of poor health and/or have difficulties with socialisation, etc. The Acheson Report (1998) mentions that the unemployed, especially if they are social welfare beneficiaries, have a considerably lower level of psychological stability and are frequently susceptible to depression and dissatisfaction, even to the extent of inflicting self-injury and committing suicide.

Gallie et al (1994:255) found that persons whose social network consists of similar unemployed people *have greater vulnerability problems when exposed to psychological and financial difficulties which, in turn, make it more difficult for them to escape poverty*. Long-term unemployment is particularly harmful for health. It destroys personal opportunities and capacities, not only material, but also social and mental ones. Also, the effects of unemployment on health accumulate over time.

A review of long-term unemployment and poverty should include research of some of the characteristics affecting the individual and society as a whole. Sen (1997) states that the list of characteristics mentioned should include, for the community, the loss of the generated *output* and the fiscal burden, and for the individual the loss of freedom to make decisions (which means much more than a reduction in income), the loss of knowledge and expertise, and the consequent long-term damage (just as one learns through *work*, so one also *forgets through lack of activity* – because the person is outside the world of work and practice), psychological harm, health problems, damage to the morale, a loss of motivation for future work, a loss of relationships and family life (unemployment and poverty may be very detrimental for social relations, and they can

also impair the harmony and unity of the family and also jeopardise relations with friends and relatives); finally, the loss of social values and responsibilities (the long-term unemployed and poor people may become cynical about the fairness of social relations, and unemployment and poverty can also create a feeling of dependence on others – such impacts are not conducive to the development of responsibility and self-reliance).

There are several possible explanations for why long-term unemployment may persist even in the presence of economic growth. In Western Europe (and elsewhere), these include the impact of technological change, international trade, obsolescence of skills, regional immobility, and government policies such as non-employment benefits, taxes and regulations. In Central Europe, the situation is even more complex because labour markets face the additional challenges of disruptions caused by the economic transition from communism to capitalism and the transition into the European Union. These additional long-term factors suggest that the severity and pattern of transition to modern economy. Most of mentioned is also applicable for Croatia, but there are also some national specificities.

2.2. Croatia and long-term unemployment

The relatively high level of long-term unemployment in Croatia is the consequence of more limited labour flows, or a lower number of newly employed together with a slight reduction in the number of those quitting their jobs. Long-term unemployment particularly affects women; almost a half of them had been unemployed for over 2 years. Although there is no qualitative research to call on for the particular Croatian circumstances, international experience, Croatian Employment Service data, Šućur (2001), World Bank and UNDP Croatia (2010) report point towards the following four main causes of long term joblessness for most people:

- Low levels of employability brought about by poor education and work experience; this results in such people being uncompetitive in the labour market because of very poor educational standards – many of them failing to complete even elementary school and over a half without any form of secondary education. Over two thirds of long term unemployed persons have no qualification or have only elementary school education. Thus, it would be reasonable to assume that many do not have basic skills of literacy and numeracy; some have had no formal education whatsoever.
- Employer recruitment practices that tend to discriminate against long term unemployed people; long unemployment is often used by employers as an indicator of lack of motivation and other undesirable personal traits;
- Passivity in seeking work and reluctance to accept those jobs (mostly low paid) that do become available; the long term unemployed frequently blame others for their predicament and absolve themselves of any responsibility to find work. They see no worthwhile financial benefit in accepting low paid work sometimes with good reason but sometimes incorrectly.
- Unwillingness to risk disturbing their current 'life style arrangements' because they fear change and ending up in a worse position. They may be unemployed and poor but their circumstances are predictable and

manageable. In some cases they have supplementary forms of undeclared income (grey economy and subsistence farming).

The education level significantly affects the duration of unemployment (the period of waiting for a job significantly declines with the higher level of educational qualifications). Whereas the share of long-term unemployed (for more than one year) in the total number of unemployed with no schooling and primary school leavers for example at the end of 2007 before economic crisis was 76.4%, in the total number of the unemployed with the completed primary school it was 66.3%. The share of long-term unemployed was even lower with people with secondary three-year or four-year education (57.4% and 51.3%, respectively), and with college and higher educational qualifications (48.3% and 44.3%, respectively). Whereas 42.6% of the unemployed with faculty or academy qualifications found a job after waiting for up to 6 months, with people without school qualifications and with uncompleted primary school the mentioned share was only 15.7%. On the other hand, more than one-half (more precisely, 56.1%) of the latter educational category of people were unemployed for longer than 3 years, whereas the said share with persons with completed tertiary education accounted for 22.1%.

These are difficult issues to address and present a considerable challenge to policy makers everywhere. They are long standing and concern both deficiencies of education and skill and behavioural and attitudinal barriers to getting and keeping jobs. The range of policies for mitigating unemployment is discussed in the following text from which it is clear that the existing range of policies in Croatia needs adjusting to focus more intensively on the addressing long term unemployment.

Missing from the above list of causes is the 'aggregate deficiency of jobs' on the demand side of the labour market. It would of course be helpful to all unemployed people if there were more jobs. However, there is clear international evidence and examples in Croatia, that labour supply shortages can exist alongside high levels of long term unemployment. Further, each business cycle and particularly current economic crisis creates additional long term unemployment that is not extinguished by the following business cycle. As a result long term unemployment is ratcheted upwards and more and more unemployed people drop out of the effective labour supply. This will affect the efficiency of the labour market, the well being of those affected and increase welfare costs.

Besides, the issue of most concern is why some groups suffer disproportionately long periods of unemployment in comparison with others. It is an entirely appropriate and valuable labour market and social policy objective to reduce the concentration of long term unemployment at the expense a slight increase in the average duration of unemployment for everyone that joins the unemployed register.

3 Government's measures for the decrease of the long term unemployment

3.1. General framework for Government's measures

It is hardly necessary to remind that the labour market is, most often, not perfect, so that at the same time there is both unemployment and a high demand for workers. This means that, particularly in countries with high unemployment like Croatia, there is room to improve the activities of the labour market by approximating unemployment to the minimum labour supply and demand, thus diminishing evident unemployment and the number of vacancies. An active labour market policy (ALMP) may help in alleviating (reducing) the structural (frictional) disharmony between supply and demand, primarily by reducing the professional and spatial disharmony between supply and demand, and increasing the transparency of the labour market. The most important instruments of ALMP to improve harmony are training and professional development, informing and counselling with regard to labour demand, selection during recruitment, and mediation.

ALMP may redistribute the opportunities for employment, so that fewer people remain long-term unemployed and/or become beneficiaries, i.e. recipients of a form of social welfare in the social welfare system. When total employment and total labour supply are determined, this would mean the *distribution* of the burden of unemployment to more people (presuming that the result of the ALMP measures means that unemployment does not affect the same people in different periods of time). Naturally, an increase in overall employment would signify a more favourable impact of ALMP than the redistribution of unemployment to a larger number of people. Economic theory holds that ALMP has almost no immediate effect on overall employment (de Koning and Mosley, 2001), but that the efficiency of the labour supply would increase if those long-term unemployed or beneficiaries/recipients of assistance in the social welfare system could become employed. Therefore, the inclusion of the long-term unemployed or the prevention of long-term unemployment is surely worth considering. Although the introduction of such measures may increase the likelihood of negative impacts, the risk is acceptable if the overall impact is a reduction in the average duration of unemployment. Perhaps the greatest significance of ALMP is that the mentioned effects of dismissal and replacement become more acceptable if employment opportunities for the long-term unemployed and social welfare system beneficiaries are increased (in Croatia the most important form is *support allowance*), whereby social exclusion is decreased.

According to Schmid, Speckesser and Hilbert (2001), training and education are considered to be most effective for *short-term* unemployed people (those waiting for a job for up to two years), whereas salary subsidies appear to be more efficient for persons who have been waiting for a job for more than two years. If the economy is on an upward trend, it seems to be particularly efficient in preventing "structuralisation" (among the unemployed, the *strongest* will be selected for employment, whereas the *weakest* will remain unemployed), as well as in the accelerated reduction of long-term unemployment. Training and education will be more efficient if implemented over a shorter period of time as well, whereas temporary employment in the public sector and salary subsidies will have greater effect in the long term and in carefully selected cases. In general, employment and training programmes have the strongest impact and the

highest social return for those with the least previous experience in the labour market and for those that are the most vulnerable (Björklund et al, 1991).

With regard to the wider term *social exclusion*, it is generally believed that employment and education policies should provide a way out of the problems associated with long-term unemployment, such as poverty and dependency on social welfare. Many unemployment problems may be alleviated by an active labour market policy. Of course, the eternal question remains whether this is really a success, or just a way of concealing the problems related to employment. In order to avoid disappointing results, an active labour market policy should adjust to the changed economic conditions, and focus on long-term supply, improving factors such as the activity rate of the labour force, the level of education, and flexibility and adaptability of the employed and those who wish to become employed. When it comes to consistency, the coordination of labour market and social welfare policies is particularly important, so that they could reinforce one another. The policy of preserving income and benefits during unemployment, and the legal protection of employment should create incentives for the integration and efficiency of the labour market. Of course, coordination is desirable, but difficult to achieve.

3.2 The policy framework in Croatia for the decrease of the long term unemployment

Croatia has the normal range of passive measures. Unemployment benefit is insurance based. For unemployed people in need welfare payments are also available. These are not time limited like unemployment benefit. In December 2010 out of the total number of the registered unemployed around 83.000 or 26.0% claimed the unemployment benefit. Around 50,000 (20%) receive welfare payments. A comparatively small number (around 2000) receive both. The administration of unemployment benefit is done by the Croatian Employment Service. The administration of welfare payments is carried out by the Centres of Social Work.

Many 'non claimant' groups register as unemployed with the employment service. In fact the unemployment register has a majority of people who claim neither unemployment benefit nor welfare. However groups of working age people *claiming welfare* for reasons of disability, single parenthood, etc. are not required or actively encouraged/supported to find work. The wider concept of 'welfare to work' cannot therefore be said to be developed in Croatia.

There has been a range of active labour market measures. They were and still are comparatively small scale and suffer from a funding mechanism that treats them as a residual once the costs of passive measures are met. This has the perverse effect of diminishing funding for ALMPs as unemployment rises. Active labour market measures in Croatia have been monitored but they have not systematically evaluated for net effect (what would have happened to the individuals had they not gone on an active measures like training). Only for the public works programme has there been this kind of evaluation; it showed the public works projects examined had almost no effect in improving the success of participants subsequently getting jobs in the open labour market.

Having in mind existing problems the Government of the Republic of Croatia in various strategic documents tried to improve targeting of ALMPs to long term unemployed persons and those with lowest employability. Thus, in *Joint Memorandum on Social Inclusion of the Republic of Croatia (JIM)* prepared by the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MHSW, 2007) among other 4.1.1.2. *Priorities and measures* was underlined the need

to focus ALMP measures on the long-term unemployed or groups at risk of long-term unemployment, instead of targeting almost all unemployed persons. In other words, the aim is to decrease both the inflow into long-term unemployment and the numbers of those who are already long-term unemployed.

Furthermore, in a part 4.1.2, *Promoting the integration of, and fighting discrimination against, persons in an unfavourable labour market position* was stipulated the obligation to decrease the inflow into long-term unemployment and to reduce the number of those who are already long-term unemployed, particularly by helping the latter find work. The problems encountered by many long-term unemployed are generally multidimensional, often involving a low level of both education and motivation.

In the *Implementation Report on the Jim Follow-Up Process on Social Inclusion of the Republic of Croatia, Between the Government of Croatia and the European Commission for the Period March 2007 - June 2008* (MHSW, 2008) were explained realised activities. In a part 3.1.1, *Raise employability of the groups most affected by long-term unemployment or discrimination* was mentioned that

The Government of RC adopted the Annual Employment Promotion Plan for 2007, which includes various measures for promoting entrepreneurship, development of cooperatives, co-financing employment, education and self-employment. Measures focus on employment, education and training of long-term unemployed persons, young people without previous working experience, persons of older working age, and persons with lower education level, as well as persons who left school (drop-outs). Further, a part of operational measures was related to promoting integration and fight against discrimination of persons in unfavourable position on the labour market (e.g. persons with disabilities, persons who have lower employability prospects, unemployed single parents of children under age etc.), and to measures of co-financing employment and inclusion into programmes of public works implemented by local self-government units.

On the basis of the measures - co-financing of employment of long-term unemployed persons - in 2007, it was planned to cover 1,690 persons, whereas the implementation results by the end of 2007 indicate that 1,693 persons were employed, of whom 1,083 women (or 64%). The share of the employed on the basis of this measure in total employment on the basis of support for employment was 40.2%. The implementation results were as expected because this is a measure with the biggest coverage towards the targeted group of the unemployed, because there are no age limitations, the

required educational qualifications and previous working experience, but the only requirement is the duration of being on unemployment records. For 2007 HRK 33.3 million was planned for the implementation of this measure, whilst HRK 41 million was paid, predominantly to small- and medium-size employers.

In May 2008 Croatia and the European Commission signed *Joint Assessment of the Employment Policy Priorities of the Republic of Croatia* (MELE, 2008). In mentioned document is also expressed the importance of enhancing the access to the labour market of vulnerable groups and addressing the long-term unemployment problem. Mentioned problem in Croatia goes beyond the objective of increasing the employment rate and has social implications. The long-term unemployed are highly vulnerable to the depreciation of human capital, social marginalisation and ultimate exclusion from the labour market. As *Priorities* are defined two tasks:

- Review and evaluate the existing programmes for the long-term unemployed and people at risk of becoming long-term unemployed and, based on the results of the evaluation, develop an effective policy strategy in this area.
- Provide adequate training for the unemployed and others at risk of becoming unemployed.

Economic crisis, negative GDP growth and increased number of unemployed in the circumstances of limited financial resources for ALMPs forced Croatia in 2009 to perform further improvements in its labour market policy. Thus, in *Report on the Implementation of the Joint Inclusion Memorandum of the Republic of Croatia for the Period from January 2008 to March 2009* was explained that

in the period from January 1 – March 31, 2009 the following outcomes were achieved: - co-financed the employment of unemployed persons: 1,003 young persons (whereof 460 women) without working experience; 1,290 long-term unemployed persons (807 women) without working experience; 706 older persons (432 women) and 351 persons from special groups (70 women); - co-financed training of 1,105 persons (426 women) for known employer and financed training of 2,361 persons (1,259 women) for unknown employer; - involvement in public works of the overall number of 715 persons (187 women) from special groups. The overall number of comprised persons is by 11.3% lower if compared with the previous year.

According to the first available results (available in *the Monthly Statistical Bulletin, year 23, 12* by Croatian Employment Service,) in 2010 there were around 2500 people included in Measure 1 - Employment co-financing of young persons without working experience Measure 2 - Employment co-financing of the long-term unemployed Measure 3 - Employment co-financing of persons above the age of 50 Measure 4 - Employment co-financing of special groups of the unemployed. The number of participants increased but it is still very low. Thanks to various strategic documents and EU accession process measures are better targeted towards those with lowest

employability and long-term unemployed persons, but there is still a space for improvement.

What can be concluded about the policy framework in Croatia as regards its effect on welfare recipients? The following are the most striking points:

- There is nothing exceptional about the passive measures – unemployment compensation. This does not mean that they are without criticism but that *in themselves* they should not lead to worsening the flow of unemployed people into long term unemployment;
- Active labour market measures are diverse and recognised as a useful instrument of labour market policy. They have not been sufficiently targeted to where most international evidence indicates they are effective i.e. disadvantaged people at risk of, or in, long term unemployment. Their scale is small and their availability is made particularly uncertain by the funding arrangements. They are not yet integrated as closely as possible with benefit (administration of unemployment compensation) and placement work;
- Activation is developing well and the CES is creating the institutional capacity for it to become a central feature of the administration of unemployment compensation. It needs to be configured and reinforced so that it is present in all aspects of the administration of unemployment compensation and directed to lessening the flow of people into long term unemployment; ‘activation’ works best through the accumulation of small effects at each stage of administration;
- There is no focus in the range of policies measures on long term unemployed people: activation does not intensify with the duration of unemployment, active labour market measures are not directed towards those at a disadvantage in the labour market nor used in support of activation, and job broking/mediation is understandably biased towards finding the best people to keep employers satisfied;
- For long term welfare claimants the involvement of two distinct and separate organisations makes more difficult the integration of activities to support and encourage active job search within the administration of their payments system.
- The CES faces the dilemma of keeping employers happy and getting people of low employability and motivation into employment. This challenge is faced by all public employment services. In Croatia a strategy for doing so has yet to evolve. New measures need to be developed that specifically address the problems faced by long term unemployment.
- Active labour market policy measures in Croatia have not been sufficiently adjusted to the crisis conditions and their impact on unemployment has been lower than needed. As already mentioned, the measures are implemented on a small scale: the number of participants is low in relation to the number of unemployed. Second, the expansion of the education, training and skilling programmes in response to the crisis probably will not

significantly improve the current employment prospects of the unemployed, although it may improve their future chances.

The range of policies for mitigating unemployment is discussed in the final section (Conclusion, future perspective and recommendation) from which it is clear that the existing range of policies in Croatia needs further adjusting to focus more intensively on the addressing long term unemployment.

4. Conclusion, future perspectives and recommendation

Unemployment in Republic of Croatia – in particular long-term unemployment (people who wait for employment for more than 12 months) – is quite a sure determinant or “entrance ticket” to difficulties related to poverty and social exclusion. People in unemployment records may be categorised according to the length of their unemployment. According to the CES data around 50% of registered waited for a job for more than a year. (The recent decrease of share of long-term unemployment in 2009 and 2010 to 45.2% and 46.9% is caused by the increase in total unemployment.) More than one-third of unemployed people were waiting for a job for more than three years. Long-term unemployment obviously affects women more than men and the share of people unemployed for longer than a year in the total number of unemployed men. The education level significantly affects the duration of unemployment (the period of waiting for a job significantly declines with the higher level of educational qualifications). It seems that the skills of many long-term unemployed persons are obsolete and unsuited to new labour market demands. Additionally, the human capital of people who become long-term unemployed is liable to depreciate if it is not kept up to date during the unemployment spell.

Thus, for the majority of the long-term unemployed, it is very difficult to emerge from poverty and related social exclusion, so they are forced to stay permanently in the social welfare system. The threat of growing long-term unemployment and poverty among social assistance recipients at the time of economic recovery and growth has a strong impact on social exclusion and the disruption of social cohesion and solidarity. ALMP is considered (and not only in transition countries) as a universal tool for higher employment and, consequently, for lower unemployment. It is sometimes claimed that unemployment could be resolved immediately if only there were sufficient available funds for the implementation of measures. For transition countries like Croatia, it seems much more useful to invest in the "quality" of ALMP than in its quantity. Quality here means a coherent framework of measures with clearly determined components which mutually reinforce each other in alleviating long-term unemployment and assisting the persons who suffer from it. Such a framework implies directing additional measures towards the long-term unemployed or those in greatest danger of sinking into long-term unemployment, as well as assistance through personal counselling in the selection of what is most in line with their needs. This also includes the choice of different possibilities and support for persons with various personal conditions, as well as cooperation and partnership with other services and non-governmental non-profit organisations (NGOs).

Currently, one of the most important priorities of Croatia's economic policy is to deal with the low employment rates or, in other words, to increase employment. There is obviously a strong inter-relation among poverty, education, employability and long-term unemployment. The problems that many of the long-term unemployed have are mostly multidimensional, and frequently include a low level of education and motivation. Croatia already has active and passive measures of assistance to the unemployed. Employment of the long-term unemployed should be encouraged, and through appropriate working activities the social inclusion of those persons may be improved as well. At the same time, time evaluations of the real efficiency of individual measures do not exist. This can be tackled by introducing new techniques (*tracking studies*) to collect data about the achieved effects. Further, job creation through diverse programmes enables the fight to begin against long-term unemployment. It is well known that for unemployed persons it is most important not to lose working experience (i.e. acquired knowledge and skills) and ties with the labour market. The supply of jobs and employment within various programmes, such as public works, may have greater benefits than programmes of in-service training, pre-service training and professional improvement.

ALMP programmes carried out in the wrong way may waste resources, may be inefficient and counterproductive, and may cause the currently employed to be pushed out. In contrast, carefully implemented programmes seem to increase employment, have an insignificant influence on the pushing out of the employed, enable the creation of *real value-added*, and may effectively increase the earnings of workers with lower educational qualifications. There are some golden rules and a critical relation in every programme: jobs that will more probably increase future earnings are generally more expensive and harder to implement, while jobs that are closer to *real* jobs and which are apparently more useful for the community also have a greater tendency towards the replacement of workers in the public sector. Less extensive employment programmes should be planned and conducted, from which the lessons learned may help in the better application of larger programmes in the future. Furthermore, extensive additional training and education programmes, directed towards large groups of the unemployed, have rarely proven to be good investments, either for the community or for the programme participants. On the other hand, the thorough and precise targeting of programmes certainly pays off.

Bibliography

Acheson, D. (1998.) *Independent Inquiry into Inequalities in Health Report*. London: HMSO and The Stationery Office. <http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/doh/ih/part2c.htm>

Atkinson, A. B. (1989.) How Should We Measure Poverty? Some Conceptual Issues in Atkinson, A. B. *Poverty and Social Security*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Björklund, A., Haveman, R., Hollister, R., Holmlund, B. (1991.) *Labour Market Policy and Unemployment Insurance*, FIEF, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Boeri, T., Burda, M. (1996.) Active Labour Market Policies, Job Matching and the Czech Miracle. *European Economic Review* 40: 805-817.

Davies, S., Hallet, M., (2001.) Policy responses to regional unemployment: Lessons from Germany, Spain and Italy. *Economic Papers: No. 161*. European Commission Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs. http://europa.eu.int/comm/economy_finance.

Franz, W. (1995.) Central and East European Labour Markets in Transition: Developments, Causes, and Cures. *Discussion Paper No. 1132*. London: Centre for Economic Policy Research.

Gallie, D., Gershuny, J., Vogler, C. (1994.) Unemployment, the household, and social networks. In Gallie D, Marsh, C., Vogler, C. (ed.) *Social change and the experience of unemployment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gallie, D., Paugam, S. (eds) (2000.) *Welfare Regimes and the Experience of Unemployment in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jahoda, M. (1982.) *Employment and unemployment – A social-psychological analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koning de, J., Mosley, H. (ed.) (2001.) *Labour Market Policy and Unemployment: Impact and Process Evaluations in Selected European Countries*. Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Machin, S., and Manning, A., (1998.) The Causes and Consequences of Long-Term Unemployment in Europe, *LSE Working Paper Series number 400*, London: London Schools of Economics, on line available on http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/20255/1/The_Causes_and_Consequences_of_Long-Term_Unemployment_in_Europe.pdf

Matković, T., (2010.) *Utjecaj ekonomske krize na tržište rada* [The Impact of Economic Crisis on the Labour Market], Zagreb: UNDP (available on http://www.undp.hr/upload/file/234/117299/FILENAME/Trzisterada_HR_fin.pdf).

Ministry of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship Ministry of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship, (2008.) *The Joint Assessment of the Employment Policy Priorities of the Republic of Croatia*. Zagreb: Ministry of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship. Ministry of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship

Ministry of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship, (2010.) *Report on the Implementation of the Joint Assessment of the Employment Policy Priorities of the Republic of Croatia for 2009*. Zagreb: Ministry of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship.

Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, (2008.) *Report on the Implementation of the Joint Inclusion Memorandum of the Republic of Croatia for the Period from March 2007 to June 2008*, Zagreb: Ministry of Health and Social Welfare.

Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, 2009. *Report on the Implementation of the Joint Inclusion Memorandum of the Republic of Croatia for the Period from January 2008 to March 2009*, Zagreb: Ministry of Health and Social Welfare.

Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, 2010. *Report on the Implementation of the Joint Inclusion Memorandum of the Republic of Croatia in 2009*, Zagreb: Ministry of Health and Social Welfare.

Mondschein, T. S., Oppenheimer, M., (2007.) Long-term unemployment in Central Europe: how bad is it?, *International Journal of Business Research*. March, on line available on <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-178900197.html>

Nickell, S. (2006). A Picture of European Unemployment: Success and Failures, in Werding, M., (2006) pp. 9-52.

Schmid, G., Speckesser, S., Hilbert, C. (2001.) Does active labour market policy matter? An aggregate impact analysis for Germany in Koning de, J.; Mosley, H. (ed.) (2001.)

Sen A., (1997.) Inequality, unemployment and contemporary Europe. *International Labour Review* 136 (2):155-171. <http://www.ilo.org>.

Smith, R. (1987.) *Unemployment and health: a disaster and a challenge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Šućur, Z., (2001.) *Siromaštvo: Teorije, koncepti i pokazatelji*, Zagreb: Pravni fakultet.

Werding M. (2006.) *Structural unemployment in Western Europe: reasons and remedies*, London: MIT Press.

World Bank and UNDP Croatia, (2010.) *Social Impact of the Crisis and Building Resilience*, Zagreb: World Bank and UNDP Croatia (available on www.worldbank.hr).

Annex

Harmonised unemployment rate at last quarter 2010

Unemployment rate	Total	Males	Females	Long-term unemployment
Euro area (17 countries)	10.2	10.0	10.3	3.8
Euro area (16 countries)	10.1	10.0	10.3	3.8
EU 27	9.7	9.8	9.6	3.9
EU 15	9.6	9.7	9.5	3.8
Belgium	8.5	8.2	8.7	4.1
Bulgaria	10.0	10.6	9.3	4.8
Czech Republic	7.4	6.5	8.6	3.0
Denmark	7.5	9.0	5.8	1.4
Germany	7.3	7.8	6.8	3.2
Estonia	17.9	21.1	14.9	7.7
Ireland	13.3	16.4	9.3	6.7
Greece	12.2	9.7	15.6	5.7
Spain	19.8	19.5	20.1	7.3
France	9.8	9.5	10.1	3.9
Italy	8.6	7.8	9.7	4.1
Cyprus	6.5	6.5	6.4	1.3
Latvia	19.3	22.5	16.0	8.4
Lithuania	18.3	22.2	14.4	7.4
Luxembourg	4.5	3.9	5.2	1.3
Hungary	11.3	11.9	10.7	5.5
Malta	7.2	6.8	8.0	3.1
Netherlands	4.5	4.5	4.5	1.2
Austria	4.6	4.8	4.4	1.1
Poland	9.6	9.3	10.0	3.0
Portugal	10.9	10.0	11.9	5.7
Romania	7.1	7.6	6.5	2.5
Slovenia	7.2	7.5	6.8	3.2
Slovakia	14.5	14.2	14.9	9.2
Finland	8.6	9.3	7.7	2.0
Sweden	9.0	8.8	9.3	1.5
United Kingdom	7.8	8.7	6.6	2.5
Norway	3.7	4.3	3.0	0.7
Croatia	11.4	10.7	12.3	5.2
Turkey	10.8	10.5	11.3	2.8

Source: Eurostat