







Determinants of Youth Unemployment and NEET in Kyrgyzstan

Life in Kyrgyzstan Survey

International Conference 23rd - 24th of October 2019 Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

Eliza Mandieva & Sonja Scheuring, PhD Fellows Dep. of Sociology/ esp. Methods of Empirical Social Research University of Bamberg









Content

- 1. Aim of the study & research questions
- 2. Theoretical framework
- 3. Research methodology
- 4. Results
- 5. Conclusion & Limitations
- 6. Bibliography









1. Aim of the study & research questions

The aim of this research study is twofold:

- A) Define the determinants of youth unemployment & NEET in Kyrgyzstan using the LIK 2012 micro-data;
- B) Compare the effects of determinants on both genders.
- 1) What are the individual and family-level determinants of youth unemployment and NEET ?
- 2) Do determinants of unemployment/NEET have the same effect to both gender?









- Research design: this study frames school-to-work transition (STW) of youth within life course perspective, esp. adapted version of the model to muslim/traditional societies—> by differentiating between transitions into unemployment and NEET (inactivity) next to employment; transition from education to work (unemployment) and transition from education-to-home (Gebel & Heyne, 2014);
- For now these two models were applied to study women's transition from education to work/home. We apply the same models for both genders in order to see the differences in the effects of individual and family level determinants on the transitions of youth;

SECCOPA









2. Theoretical framework: Theory

- Within life-course course approach, transition to adulthood of youth is modelled based on series of transition events, including completion of initial schooling, leaving of education system, labour market entry, leaving the parental home, forming of family and entering the parenthood (Buchmann & Kriesi, 2011) -> we focus on the first events: leaving education and entering the labour market.
- However life-courses of individuals are not sequential (mostly parallel), especially in the context of Kyrgyzstan.









2. Theoretical framework: Theory



Source: Gebel & Heyne, 2014

eliza.mandieva@uni-bamberg.de









3. Research Methodology: Operationalisation

	Variable	Measurement	
Dependent variables	Unemployment	Being unemployed vs. employed	
	NEET	Not actively looking for a job vs. unemployed	
Independent variables	Education	Three categories (low, middle (voc.educ.) and high)	
	Social background	Highest educational degree of both parents	
	Childbirth	Ever gave birth to a child: yes vs. no	
	Marriage	Married at the moment vs. not married	
	Gender role attitudes	Summary index on typical gender roles	
Control variables	Rural	Rural vs. urban regions (place of living)	
	Age	In years (survey year - birth year)	
	Gender	Female vs. male	









- 3. Research Methodology: Data & method of analysis
- > Life in Kyrgyzstan in 2012
- > Binary logistic regression models (average marginal effects, AMEs to compare effect sizes)
- \succ Young individuals between 18 and 35, labor market entrants
- \succ No students or retirees
- > N = 20,191 (with information on employment status)









3. Research Methodology: Data & method of analysis

	freq.	pct	cumpct
employed	11623	57.57	57.57
unemployed	1186	5.87	63.44
inactive	7382	36.56	100.00
total	20191	100.00	

Frequencies of employment status of the Kyrgyzstani youth

Of 20,191 individuals between 18 and 35, 11,623 individuals are employed (i.e. 58 %), 1,186 (6 %) are unemployed but are actively looking for a job and 36.56 % (7,382 individuals) are inactive and thus unemployed but not actively looking for a job.



















H1: Individuals with lower education have higher incidence of being unemployed.

low educ. middle educ. higher educ.

-> Control V.: gender; rural/urban; age; social background:the highest educational degree of both parents.









15 percentage points higher 4. Results: H1 likelihood of being unemployed for individuals with low education Effect of education on unemployment, AMEs compared to high education. low education In line with H1 ✓ \rightarrow middle education 15 percentage points lower ~ likelihood of being rural unemployed for individuals with middle education age compared to high education. \rightarrow Not in line with H1 \times female middle background high background

.05 .1 .15 .2 .25 .3

-.4 -.35 -.3 -.25 -.2 -.15 -.1 -.05 0









H1A: Individuals with lower education have higher incidence of being NEET.

X1A: Education ------> NEET (Y)

low educ. middle educ. higher educ.

-> Control V.: gender; rural/urban; social background: the highest educational degree of both parents.









10 percentage points higher 4. Results: H1A likelihood in NEET for individuals with low Effect of education on NEET, AMEs education compared to high education. low education In line with H1A √ \rightarrow middle education 22 percentage points higher likelihood of being in NEET for individuals with middle age education compared to high education. female In line with H1A \checkmark \rightarrow middle background high background .15 .05 .25 .3

.2

eliza.mandieva@uni-bamberg.de

.1

-.05

-.1

0









H2: Social background of individuals matters: Higher is the parental education, the lower is the unemployment incidence by their offsprings.

X2: Parental education —————-> Unemployment (Y)

low educ. middle educ. Higher educ.

-> Control V.:rural/urban.









8 percentage points higher

4. Results: H2











H2A: Social background of individuals matters: Higher is the parental education, the lower is the NEET incidence by their offsprings.

X2A: Parental education ————————— NEET (Y)

low educ. middle educ. higher educ.

-> Control V.: gender.









4. Results: H2A











H3A: Effects of marriage on NEET: Marriage effects positively unemployment and NEET incidence by women.

X3: Marriage -----> NEET (Y)

Married/Not married

-> Control V.: rural/urban, education and age.









4. Results: H3A



On average, married women have a 34 percentage points higher likelihood to be in NEET than in unemployment compared to unmarried women. → In line with H3A ✓









H4A: Effect of childbirth on Women's inactivity: Childbirth effects positively NEET incidence by women.

X4: Childbirth ------ NEET (Y)

having own child/not having own child

-> Control V.: rural/urban, age.









4. Results: H4A



On average, women who gave birth to at least one child have a 44 percentage points higher likelihood of being in NEET rather than unemployed compared to women who never gave birth. → In line with H4A ✓









4. Results: H5A \rightarrow gender differences











4. Results: H5A



The more conservative women's gender role attitudes are, the more likely they are to be in NEET rather than unemployment. 1 unit increase in conservative values increases the likelihood of being in NEET by 0.1 percentage points.

eliza.mandieva@uni-bamberg.de









5. Conclusion & Limitations

- Preliminary conclusion: Individual's own education has a more prominent role compare to their social background in regard to unemployment and inactivity.
- \succ Gender indeed matters to understand the women's unemployment and inactivity.
- > In regard to gender attitudes: conservative gender attitudes has a positive effect on NEET.
- Limitations: many missing values on important variables (social background, marriage, childbirth, especially for men etc.) —> difficult to test interaction models.
- > Suggestion: pool of all waves (2010-2013) in order to test interaction models.









6. Bibliography

Buchmann MC, Kriesi I. 2011. Transition to adulthood in Europe. Annual Review of Sociology 37:481–503

Elder S, Barcucci V, Gurbuzer Y, Perardel Y, Principi M. 2015. *Labour market transitions of young women and men in Eastern Europe and Central Asia*. Geneva: ILO, Youth Employment Programme, Employment Policy Dept.

Gebel M, Heyne S. 2014. *Transitions to adulthood in the Middle East and North Africa. Young women's rising?* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Gebel M, Noelke C. 2011. The transition from school to work in Central and Eastern Europe: theory and methodology. In *Making the transition. Education and labor market entry in Central and Eastern Europe*, ed. I Kogan, C Noelke, M Gebel, pp. 29–57. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press

Heyne S. 2017. *Culture and female labor force participation in international comparison*. Mannheim: University of Mannheim









Thank you very much for your attention!!!

eliza.mandieva@uni-bamberg.de