Katalin Tardos

Multiple Discrimination and the Quality of Jobs across Europe[1]

Abstract

The paper investigates the phenomenon of multiple discrimination and the quality of jobs available on the labour market in the European Union. Numerous studies have demonstrated the negative impact of discrimination on employment prospects, however only very few have investigated how discrimination relates to overall job quality. The paper analyses the significance of discrimination on multiple grounds; the grounds of discrimination that are most likely to be combined, and finally, whether there is a significant difference in job quality among victims of single or multiple grounds discrimination. The research tested the hypothesis that victims of multiple discrimination have both a lower employment rate and, when employed, a lower overall job quality compared to those affected by no or single ground discrimination at the same educational level. To measure overall job quality of respondents, a complex index has been designed. The research evaluates data from the fifth round of the European Social Survey (ESS) conducted in 2010. Findings reinforced that victims of multiple discrimination had a lower job quality level compared to those not discriminated or discriminated on a single ground , especially at the lower and higher end of the educational continuum. Furthermore, the research revealed important methodological implications concerning the measurement of discrimination.

Key words: Multiple discrimination, job quality, social exclusion

Discrimination in employment or in access to services such as education, health care, social protection, or other is a wide-spread phenomenon in most countries despite the presence of laws on the prohibition of discrimination and the legal requirement of equal treatment. Discrimination and exclusion are self-sustaining social mechanisms that in the longer run become a dimension of the social structure. The unequal treatment linked to both structural/institutional and personal/cognitive factors result in tensions and conflicts among the majority and minority and form a major source of social disintegration. The majority of studies linked to the topic of discrimination focus on the so-called single ground discrimination, namely considering the grounds and cases of discrimination separately and independently from each other. However, in the last few years there has been a growing

[1] The author is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Sociology, Centre for Social Sciences, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and Programme Director at International Business School Budapest. The research was supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA K 101468: Multiple Discrimination: Personal and Institutional Perceptions, Impacts, and Actions).

awareness of the importance of tackling the issue of multiple discrimination both in the European Union and elsewhere (European Agency for Fundamental Rights 2011; Ontario Human Rights Commission 2001).

This paper examines the phenomenon of multiple discrimination in relation to the quality of jobs available on the labour market across Europe. For this purpose, data arising from the fifth round of the European Social Survey has been used, representing the state of affairs in 2010. The research aims to identify the scope of multiple discrimination and the occurrences of various grounds of discrimination leading to multiple discrimination across European countries. Using additional data, methodological issues will also be raised about the difficulties of measuring multiple discrimination. Numerous studies have demonstrated the negative impact of discrimination on employment prospects (Helps –Skitmore 1975, Conway – Roberts 1994, Ravaud–Madiot– Ville 1992), however only very few have investigated how discrimination affects overall job quality. This paper aims to identify whether there is a significant difference in terms of job quality among those who have not been subject to any form of discrimination, those who have been discriminated on a single ground, and those who were subject to discrimination on multiple grounds. The study also aims to analyse which elements of job quality are most likely to be at a lower level in case of previous experience with multiple discrimination. For this purpose 8 dimensions of job quality have been identified: compensation, working hours, opportunities for participation, self-actualisation, satisfaction of social and self-esteem needs, work-life balance, and issues of workload.

The research aims to test the following hypotheses:

- Multiple discrimination is an important aspect of discriminatory processes across Europe.
- Discrimination on multiple grounds has an aggravated impact on employment prospects compared to discrimination on a single ground or no discrimination.
- When employed, victims of multiple discrimination have a lower overall job quality compared to those previously affected by no discrimination or by discrimination on a single ground among people of equal qualification.

Literature Review

A study published by the European Commission in 2007 entitled Tackling Multiple Discrimination summarises the problem as follows:

> „Multiple Discrimination happens in all spheres of social life. The labour market, however, appears to be the sector where Multiple Discrimination occurs most often. In many Member States, the scope of anti-discrimination legislation outside employment and occupation is limited to only gender and race/ethnic origin. This could be the reason for the lack of visibility of Multiple Discrimination in sectors such as education, access to goods and services, social protection, etc. Lack of data again adds to an incomplete picture of which intersectional groups are vulnerable and in which sectors Multiple Discrimination occurs. Lack of data also means insufficient knowledge about the extent of Multiple Discrimination." (European Commission, 2007, p. 5.)

Historically, the term "multiple discrimination" appeared in the United States in the late 1980s to describe the specific situation when a person belonged to more than one disadvantaged group and thus experienced forms of discrimination of a more complex and severe nature than those subject to discrimination on a single-ground. (ENAR, 2007) People affected by discrimination on the basis of multiple grounds can be subject to three distinct types of discrimination: *multiple discrimination* (two or more grounds operating separately); *compound* or *additive discrimination* (a person discriminated on the basis of two or more grounds at the same time; and finally, *intersectional discrimination* (in this case several grounds of discrimination operate simultaneously and interact in a indivisible way) (Danish Institute for Human Rights, 2007)

According to the above mentioned study of the European Commission (2007), most National Equality Bodies and organisations concerned with anti-discrimination *legislation* and policy are still focused on the single-ground approach to discrimination, thus the concept and the reality of multiple discrimination remains unclear. A recent research carried out by the European Agency for Fundamental Rights (2011) published comparative European findings on the extent of multiple discrimination in European countries. In the fifth European Union Minorities and Discrimination (EU-MIDIS) survey carried out in 2008, 23,500 immigrant and ethnic minority people were surveyed from 27 EU countries. The survey revealed that every fourth (23 percent) ethnic minority or immigrant respondent interviewed in EU-MIDIS indicated they had felt discriminated against on at least one ground, and every seventh respondent (14 percent) on two or more grounds in the last 12 months. Interestingly, comparing EU-MIDIS and Special Eurobarometer 296 on Discrimination in the European Union, the results of the EU_MIDIS survey showed that the majority population in EU

Member States felt discriminated against less often across a range of grounds than ethnic minority and immigrant persons surveyed in EU-MIDIS. According to the Eurobarometer 296, the occurrence of discrimination on a single ground affected 12 percent of the European population in 2008, whereas the incidence of multiple discrimination was not higher than 3 percent. (European Agency for Fundamental Rights 2011; European Commission 2009).Therefore, the authors of the report concluded that ethnicity or immigrant origin consistently emerged as the most significant ground for experiencing discrimination on more than one ground. The EU-MIDIS survey (2011) also proved that 'visible' minorities –those who generally look different to the majority population – felt discriminated against more often and across a wider range of grounds than other minorities.

Concerning the link between discrimination and job quality most of the literature deals with the impact of gender and race on wage differentials. (Bodvarsson– Sessions 2011, Carnoy 2010, Petersen –Togstad 2006, Eckstein –Wolpin 1999).Pinkston (2003), for instance, assumes that observable wage differences among men and women are tied to weaker performance signals of women during the selection process. Research more specifically on the impact of discrimination, especially that of multiple discrimination, on overall job quality could not be found. Research was more developed on the issue of how experience with discrimination influences job satisfaction, and furthermore the subjective perception of job quality. Goldsmith *et al.* (2004) revealed that jobseekers who had been previously victims of discrimination either tended to target lower level jobs; or on the contrary, would be motivated to develop their competencies and level of qualifications, which was apparent in their CVs. Poggi (2010) claimed, based on research evidence, that job satisfaction was not an objective indicator of working conditions, as previously experienced good or bad instances of working conditions influenced the level of personal aspirations for job quality. Using the data of the 1997 *International Social Survey Program*, Llorente & Macias (2005) investigated whether job satisfaction was a fair indicator for job quality, and concluded that in most cases it was not. The above research results reinforce the methodological consideration that job quality needs to be studied through objective figures and not indirectly by using the indicator of job satisfaction. Moreover, one also needs to give due consideration to the statement that perception of job quality is influenced by subjective personal aspirations, as well as previous experience with discrimination.

Multiple Discrimination across Europe

It is important to note that the European Social Survey (ESS) database does not make it possible to differentiate among the different types of multiple discrimination (*multiple discrimination* (two or more grounds operating separately); *compound* or *additive discrimination* (a person discriminated on the basis of two or more grounds at the same time; and finally, *intersectional discrimination* (several grounds of discrimination operate simultaneously and interact in a indivisible way*)* discussed in the literature review. Therefore, we used the broadest term of *multiple discrimination*, keeping in mind that the ESS data might include all three types of multiple discrimination. The core ESS questionnaire included a question on whether the respondent would describe her/himself as a member of a group that was discriminated against. In the case of a positive response, respondents were given nine grounds of discrimination to choose from: colour or race, nationality, religion, language, ethnic group, age gender, sexuality, and disability.[2] Please note that the survey method assesses the respondents' personal, subjective perception of discrimination..

According to the ESS 2010 data of 17 European Union countries, on average, 94.9% of the respondents were not subject to discrimination, 4.0% experienced discrimination on a single ground basis, whereas 1.1% of the population were hit by discrimination on multiple grounds. Overall, the level of discrimination on multiple grounds varies across European countries. Hungary and Estonia represent the higher end of the scale with a 2.6% ratio of multiple discrimination in absolute terms, while respondents of Poland, Portugal and Slovenia have reported the lowest ratio of discrimination on multiple grounds (0.1 and 0.2 percent). The data shows a relatively high variance by countries in respect to what share of the victims of discrimination were due to a disadvantage on a single or on multiple grounds. According to the ESS 2010 data of 17 European Union countries, on average, approximately one-quarter (22 percent) of the victims of discrimination are subject to discrimination on multiple grounds. In this respect, too, Hungary and Estonia have the largest proportion of people hit by multiple discrimination among those discriminated (52 and 49 percent), whereas in Poland, Portugal and Slovenia multiple discrimination is the least probable amongst victims of discrimination. (Table 1)

[2]ESS round 5 core questionnaire, questions C24 and C25.

To gain a better understanding of the nature of discrimination on multiple grounds, we investigated the occurrence of the different grounds of discrimination amongst those affected by multiple discrimination. The frequency of the various grounds of discrimination varies to a great extent among the European countries. One could say that each country has its own pattern for multiple discrimination. In Belgium, the most frequent grounds of multiple discrimination were related to colour and religion. In the Czech Republic, age and gender were the basis for typical combination of discrimination grounds. In Hungary, ethnic origin and colour were the most frequent reasons for multiple discrimination, while in Estonia nationality and language turned out most frequently to be the grounds of multiple discrimination. (Table 2.)

To sum up the European trends of multiple discrimination, we can conclude that colour and race, nationality, ethnic origin, religion and language constitute the most frequent grounds of discrimination amongst those discriminated on multiple grounds, which grounds are clearly closely linked to ethnicity. In this respect, the results of the ESS and those of EU_MIDIS (European Union Agency For Fundamental Rights, 2011) strongly converge. Conducting the principal component analysis for the entire sample of 17 EU countries led to 2 principal factors of discrimination: that of *Ethnicity*-related and *Non-ethnicity-related factors*. This result underlines the major role ethnicity plays in multiple discrimination. (Table 3) To further study the linkages amongst grounds of discrimination, we conducted a principal component analysis among the victims of multiple discrimination and found three factors explaining 55% of the variance. The first factor was labelled "*Demographic factor*", integrating grounds of discrimination based on age and gender. The second factor was entitled *Ethnicity factor*, as it comprised grounds of discrimination such as colour or race, nationality, language and ethnic group, and finally the third factor was labelled *Physical and spiritual difference factor*, as it integrated mostly sexuality, disability and religion as grounds of discrimination. (Table 4)

A few methodological notes need to be made at this point. First of all, being discriminated is a sensitive data. The extent to which respondents will reveal previous incidents of discrimination strongly depends on the phrasing of the question, the context in which the question is embedded, and how the questionnaire is administered. Comparing the incidence of discrimination on both single and multiple grounds of the European Social Survey (ESS 2010), the Special Eurobarometer on Discrimination in Europe (European Commission, 2009) and the EU-MIDIS (European Union Agency For Fundamental Rights, 2011), one can detect

that the ESS had the lowest rate of discrimination reported by respondents. This is surely due to the fact that the question on discrimination was integrated into a set of questions that included a wide range of different topics compared to the focused nature of both the Eurobarometer and the EU-MIDIS surveys. Another important aspect of the extent to which people reveal previous discrimination incidents is related to whether the questionnaire is a face to face interview or a self-completed one. In Hungary, the ESS 2010 survey had a supplement on discrimination administered in a self-completed manner (asking about 19 grounds of discrimination included in the Hungarian law on Equal Treatment) in addition to the core face to face questionnaire. While the occurrence of discrimination was 5 percent, based on the nine grounds of discrimination in the core ESS questionnaire, 47 percent of exactly the same sample reported incidences of discrimination in the self-completed questionnaire. Similarly, the ratio of reported multiple discrimination was higher both in absolute and relative terms in the self-completed ESS questionnaire. [3] The huge difference in reported discrimination rates among the same population can be the result of a combination of factors: the wording of the question, the context in which the question on discrimination is embedded in, the overall focus of the questionnaire, the method of administering the questionnaire itself (face to face or self-completed). Also, one has to keep in mind, that we are measuring the respondents' subjective perception of their previous discrimination experience. Some respondents might not be aware of the exact meaning of discrimination, or did not recognise a disadvantageous incident as discrimination, or simply are not able to recall the experience on the spot. On the other hand, others might not want to admit belonging to a group of discriminated people or having been discriminated against, and there might also be cases in which respondents classify their negative experiences as discrimination while legally they would not be qualified as such. Levels of awareness and respondent strategies to hide or uncover discriminatory experiences might differ significantly from one country to the other, and different social groups within countries. In this special case of the ESS 2010 Hungary the huge differences based on the core and the supplementary questionnaire in terms of discrimination rates (5 versus 47 percent), were most probably also due to a combination of

[3] The wording of the question in the core and the self-completed supplementary ESS questionnaire was somewhat different. In the ESS core questionnaire it was first asked: "Would you describe yourself as being a member of a group that is discriminated against in this country?" and then if the response was positive a second question was raised: "On what grounds is your group discriminated against?" In the Hungarian self-completed questionnaire the grounds of discrimination were asked separately, one after the other: "Have you ever been discriminated on the ground of … ." Obviously, in the core questionnaire there was much less time for the respondent to reflect on previous experience linked to discrimination, furthermore if the first response was negative, no further questions followed.

the above mentioned factors accentuated by the fact that the questions on discrimination in the supplementary questionnaire appeared for the second time, and as respondents had no time constraints during the self-completion of the questionnaire could recall more experiences in the less stressful circumstances, as well as might have decided to change strategy from hiding to reporting personal discrimination incidents due to the non-verbal nature of the communication. Previous research conducted on discrimination (Tardos, 2005) revealed similar discrepancy of reported discrimination rates among the same population when in the first phase respondents answered a non-discrimination focused questionnaire, then in the second phase a smaller subsample participated in a discrimination focused face-to face deep interview. Reported discrimination rates increased from 17 percent in the first phase to 80 percent in the second phase. Furthermore, only half of those who reported an incident in the interview actually reported discrimination previously in the questionnaire. In this particular research, the face to face deep interview was a more effective method to reveal exposure to discrimination than the non-focused questionnaire. Related to the sensitive and hidden nature of discrimination data, researchers have to be very careful in designing the methodology for discrimination related data collection circumstances and methodology as reported discrimination will particularly be influenced by these factors.

Discrimination and Labour Market Status

In 11 of the 17 European Union countries, the ratio of those in paid employment, but previously discriminated[4] was lower than of those not discriminated. Within the group of those subject to discrimination, the lowest employments rates were reported from Bulgaria (22%), Hungary (35%), the Czech Republic (40%) and Portugal (40%). To investigate the relative chances of finding employment, we compared employment rates of those discriminated to those not discriminated, and to the general employment rates in the countries respectively. The ratios of the employment rate of the discriminated and non-discriminated were also the lowest in Bulgaria (0.53), Hungary (0.71) and the Czech Republic (0.72). Similarly, the ratio of country-level employment rates of the discriminated and that of the

[4]People having paid work in the last 7 days prior to the completion of the questionnaire were considered „employed" in our analysis.

whole population put Bulgaria (0,55), Hungary (0,71) and the Czech Republic (0,74) to the lower end of the scale.(Table 5) Hence, according to the results, we can state that people discriminated in Eastern-Central Europe are more likely to be in a disadvantageous position for finding employment than in other parts of Europe. The statement is especially true for discriminated people with secondary or higher education, as employment opportunities for people with primary education are limited for both the discriminated and the non-discriminated in these countries.

It is also important to find out whether discrimination on multiple grounds has an aggravated impact on employment prospects compared to single ground discrimination. However, because of the low case numbers for multiple discrimination, we eliminated the country level analysis. Taking a glance at the average employment rate in Europe of those non-discriminated (51,7%), those who were discriminated on a single ground (50,6%), and those discriminated on multiple grounds (50,0%), we could not identify, as assumed, a significant reverse linear relationship between the number of grounds of discrimination and the employment rate. In fact, there seems to be a more important demarcation line in terms of employment rate among those not discriminated at all, and those discriminated on single grounds. One might assume that, regarding employers' hiring decisions the dominant factor considered is whether the jobseeker has any characteristics considered to be risky for the employer or not, while the number of risky characteristics might be of secondary importance. Nevertheless, this issue needs further investigation with larger sample size.

Job Quality and Multiple Discrimination

In the framework of the research, a Job Quality Index has been created composed of 23 variables. Eight dimensions of job quality have been identified: compensation, working hours, opportunities for participation, self-actualisation, satisfaction of social and self-esteem needs, work-life balance, and issues of workload. The eight dimensions have been weighted with a point value of 10 or 15. Higher weighting has been assigned to factors of job security, workload, social and self-esteem needs, and compensation based on expert decision. Correspondingly, variables have been weighted, too. As a result, the point values of the Job Quality Index can range from 0 to 100 points.

The Job Quality Index has been calculated for all 17 European Union countries, restricting the sample to those who were employed, i.e. had a paid job in the last seven days. The average score of the Job Quality Index across Europe was 59.18 out of 100 points. The highest levels of job quality were measured in Norway, Sweden, and France (64.2; 63.6; 62.3). While mostly East and South European countries scored the lowest on job quality (Hungary: 57.5; Czech Republic: 55.6; Poland: 55.4; Spain: 56.6; Portugal: 55.5). (Table 6)

According to the ESS 2010 data, on an aggregated level, there was a significant reverse relationship between the number of grounds of discrimination and the average score of the job quality index. The score of the Job Quality Index amongst those who were not victims of discrimination was the highest (59.30), among people discriminated on a single ground the job quality index score was somewhat lower (57.31), while the score for job quality was the lowest amongst those hit by discrimination on multiple grounds (55.32). The two variables are therefore inversely proportional. Overall, the relationship was rather weak between the number of grounds of discrimination and the average score of the index. Moreover, not all dimensions of the job quality index have a significant relationship with the fact of discrimination, especially discrimination on multiple grounds. There was no significant correlation between the fact of being a victim of discrimination and the quality of working hours, the extent of workload, or the opportunities for self-actualisation. On the contrary, multiple discrimination had a significant correlation with the level of wages and job security. (Table 7)

To look at the influence of education levels, we differentiated among people with primary, secondary and higher level education. The aim was to examine whether multiple discrimination could be associated with lower levels of job quality than single ground or no discrimination at all educational levels or not. To measure the level of education, the years spent in full-time education were used. [5] According to our findings, at all educational levels multiple discrimination could be linked with lower job quality, but to different degrees. The largest differences of job quality could be observed among people with primary education (maximum 8 years of full-time education). In their case, employed people who had previously experienced multiple discrimination had a job quality index of approximately 10 points lower compared to those people with primary education who had never been subject to

[5] We coded 0-8 years of full-time education as "primary education", 9-14 years full-time education as "secondary education" level, finally 15 years or more of full time education as "higher education" level.

discrimination (54.5 and 45.08 points). Interestingly, the relationship of multiple discrimination and job quality was the weakest in the case of people with a secondary level education. In this category of people, the job quality index of those with discrimination experience based on multiple grounds was only 3 points lower than those without any experience of discrimination. (58.33 and 55.65 points). Employees with higher education (at least 15 years full-time education) have a medium position in this respect: the gap between the non-discriminated and those discriminated on multiple grounds was half as large as in the case of people with primary education (61.31 and 56.78 points). (Table 8) Additionally, the relationship between job quality and discrimination has been controlled for gender, age, and ethnic minority membership. Gender does not influence job quality levels, whereas age does. In general, younger and older age groups have lower level of job quality in average. However, in all age groups the number of discrimination grounds shows an inversely proportional relationship to job quality levels. Similarly, job quality levels vary according to the presence or absence of ethnic minority membership, but in both groups average level of job quality shows an inversely proportional trend related to the number of discrimination grounds.

As stated above, multiple discrimination and lower level job quality will be associated most probably in case of jobs at the lower and higher ends of the job market. One could rephrase the relationship between labour market competition and discrimination as "those who are at the bottom of the hierarchy and subject to discrimination will more probably get the worst jobs among the bad ones, while those who do not have to fear discrimination will get the best jobs among the better ones". However, multiple discrimination does not equally affect all components of job quality at each educational level. In the case of people with primary/lower level education, being subject to multiple discrimination most probably will be connected to lower levels of participation opportunities (2.51 vs. 4.84 points), work-life balance (4.19 vs. 6.03 points) and job security (7.55 vs. 10.13 points) compared to others with the same level of education. For people with secondary education, multiple discrimination might be linked to lower levels of compensation (7.27 vs. 8.93 points) and job security (9.68 vs. 10.67 points) in their job compared to others with similar qualifications. Whereas, for people with a higher education diploma, discrimination on multiple grounds will most typically be associated with lower levels of job security (9.38 vs. 10.97 points) and work-life balance (5.50 vs. 6.09 points). (Table 9) To sum up, the number of discrimination grounds and various components of the job quality indicator are in most cases inversely proportionate at different educational

levels, nevertheless, one dimension of job quality, namely, job security level is the most likely to be endangered in the case of multiple discrimination no matter what the level of education is.

Conclusions

In the first section of this paper, we have elaborated on the significance of discrimination on multiple grounds across Europe and revealed that only 1.1 percent of the population actually reported previous experience of multiple discrimination. It has also been stated that the level of multiple discrimination varies across European countries, based on the ESS 2010 data. In relative terms, approximately one quarter (22 percent) of the victims of discrimination were subject to discrimination on multiple grounds, which ratio could be considered important, but in absolute terms, the observed occurrence of 1.1 percent of the population certainly cannot be evaluated as a significant level postulated in the first hypothesis. Hence, the first hypothesis was only partially true, considering ESS data only. However, comparing the results of the ESS 2010 survey data with other European surveys (Special Eurobarometer 296, EU-MIDIS), which were more focused on the topic of discrimination, revealed that the methodology used was probably responsible for a high latency rate in surfacing incidents of discrimination by the European Social Survey core questionnaire.

Concerning the European trends of multiple discrimination, we concluded that colour and race, nationality, ethnic origin, religion and language constituted the most frequent grounds of discrimination amongst those discriminated on multiple grounds, which grounds were clearly all closely linked to *ethnicity*. The principal component analysis carried out for the entire European population of 17 countries also identified two major factors among the grounds of discrimination: that linked to *ethnicity* and a second one integrating all other *non-ethnicity* factors such as gender, age, sexuality and disability. The primordial role of ethnicity in multiple discrimination was identified by the EU-MIDIS (2011) survey as well. At this point, related to the results of the factor analysis, we might actually raise the question to what extent are we measuring cases of genuine multiple discrimination. We have to acknowledge that separate grounds of discrimination might overlap in certain cases. A person living elsewhere than the country-of-origin, might be recorded as being discriminated on multiple grounds,

linked to nationality, language, and colour, though the major reason for unequal treatment has the same root cause: being born in another country. This differs from the classical case of multiple discrimination when colour and gender, or age and gender are associated in an inseparable way and called intersectionality. Nevertheless, seemingly overlapping grounds of discrimination can also come into action separately, thus aggravating the outcomes for the victim of unequal treatment. In most large scale surveys, as in the ESS, the method of data collection does not make it possible to clearly identify the exact type of multiple discrimination, but using the legally defined grounds of discrimination is yet the best way forward.

The second hypothesis of the paper assumed that discrimination on multiple grounds had an aggravated impact on employment prospects compared to discrimination on a single ground. Based on the ESS 2010 data, we had to reject this hypothesis as we could not identify a significant reverse linear relationship between the number of grounds of discrimination and the employment rate on the European level. As a matter of fact, there seems to be a more important demarcation line in terms of employment rate among those not discriminated at all, and those discriminated on single grounds in a higher number of European countries. An explanation offered for this trend was that employers' hiring decisions were influenced by whether the jobseeker had any characteristics considered to be risky by the employer or not, while the number of risky characteristics could be of secondary importance for hiring decisions.

In the literature review section, it was shown that the quality of jobs could not be assessed indirectly through the indicator of job satisfaction (Poggi 2010, Llorente–Macias 2005). These research results reinforced our adopted methodological approach to measure job quality by a complex indicator composed of 23 variables. Our third hypothesis stated that victims of multiple discrimination, when employed, have a lower overall job quality compared to those previously affected by no discrimination or by discrimination on a single ground among people of equal qualification. The hypothetical relationship between multiple discrimination and lower level job quality among people with equal educational levels was accepted. Statistical data of ESS 2010 reinforced the assumption that experiences of multiple discrimination could more likely be associated with lower level job quality, be it at the primary, secondary or higher education level. These research results were in line with the findings of Goldsmith et al. (2004) who identified accepting lower quality jobs as one of the

possible jobseeker strategies in view of employers' discriminatory practices. The analysis of the ESS 2010 data also revealed that at each educational level, different dimensions of job quality were at stake in the case of multiple discrimination. The most "sensitive" dimensions of job quality to multiple discrimination were participation opportunities, work-life balance, job security, and lower levels of compensation. However, there was one single job quality dimension that was significantly lower for all levels of education: job security.

Finally, it is crucial to insist on the necessity to further investigate the multiple discrimination phenomenon. It would be of utmost importance to develop research into the more specific types of multiple discrimination, namely, compound and intersectional discrimination, in order to be able to better understand the forms of discrimination of a more complex and severe nature, and the combination of various grounds of discrimination inseparable from each other. Also, the research has important policy implications in respect to raising awareness on the more complex nature of discrimination, especially multiple ground discrimination, and how it is connected to job quality dimensions and social wellbeing in general.

References

Bodvarsson Ö. B. –Sessions J. G. (2011). The measurement of pay discrimination between job assignments. *Labour Economics*, Volume 18, Issue 3, pp. 297-309.

Carnoy M. (2010). Race Earnings Differentials. *International Encyclopaedia of Education* (Third Edition), pp. 288-297.

Conway, Delores A., Roberts, Harry V. (1994). Analysis of employment discrimination through homogeneous job groups. *Journal of Econometrics*, Volume 61, Issue 1,March, pp. 103-131.

Danish Institute for Human Rights (2007). Literature Review on multiple discrimination. http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/pdf/fs33_multiplediscrimination_july2007_en.pdf. Accessed: November 15, 2011.

Egyenlő Bánásmód Hatóság (2011). Az egyenlő bánásmóddal kapcsolatos jogtudatosság növekedésének mértéke – fókuszban a nők, a romák, a fogyatékos és az LMBT emberek**.** http://www.egyenlobanasmod.hu/tamop/data/MTA_1hullam.pdf. Accessed: November 15, 2011.

European Commission (2009) Special EuroBarometer 296. Discrimination in the European Union: Perceptions, Experiences and Attitudes.

European Communities (2007).Tackling Multiple Discrimination Practices, policies and laws. http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=51&type=2&furtherPubs=no. Accessed: November 15, 2011.

European Network Against Racism (ENAR) (2007). FactSheet 33. Multiple Discrimination. http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/pdf/fs33_multiplediscrimination_july2007_en.pdf. Accessed: November 15, 2011.

European Network Against Racism (ENAR) (2011). FactSheet 44. The Legal Implication of Multiple Discrimination. http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/pdf/fs33_multiplediscrimination_july2007_en.pdf. Accessed: November 15, 2012.

European Union Agency For Fundamental Rights (FRA) (2011). European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey. Data in Focus Report. Multiple Discrimination. www.fra.europa.eu/eu-midis. Accessed: November 15, 2012.

Fredman, S. and Szyszak, E. (1993). "The Intersection of Race and Gender" in: Hepple and Szyzak (eds) Discrimination: The Limits of the Law, London: Mansell.

Goldsmith, A., Sedo S. Darity Jr. W. and Hamilton D. (2004). The labor supply consequences of perceptions of employer discrimination during search and on-the-job: Integrating neoclassical theory and cognitive dissonance. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Volume 25, Issue 1, pp. 15-39.

Hannett, S. (2003). "Equality at the Intersections: The Legislative and Judicial Failure to Tackle Multiple Discrimination" *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies.* Volume 23, No. 1, pp. 65–86.

Helps, I.G. –Skitmore P. M. (1975). Discrimination against women in employment *Long Range Planning*, Volume 8, Issue 1, February 1975, pp. 2-13.

Llorente, R. M. –Macías E. F. (2005). Job satisfaction as an indicator of the quality of work. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, Volume 34, Issue 5, October 2005, pp 656-673.

Makkonen, Timo (2002). "Multiple, compound and intersectional discrimination: Bringing the experiences of the most marginalized to the fore" Institute For Human Rights, ÅboAkademi University. p.67.

Mannila, S. –Messing, V. –Broek, H. and Vidra, Zs. (2010). Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities. European Tensions, Country Cases and Debates. Helsinki: National Institute for Health and Welfare.

McDonald, Steve (2011). What's in the "old boys" network? Accessing social capital in gendered and racialized networks. *Social Networks*, Volume 33, Issue 4, October 2011, pp. 317-330.

MiekeVerloo (2006). Multiple Inequalities, Intersectionality and the European Union *European Journal of Women's Studies.* August 2006, Volume. 13. No. 3, pp. 211-228.

Moon, Gay (é. n.). "Multiple discrimination – problems compounded or solutions found?" http://www.justice.org.uk/images/pdfs/multiplediscrimination.pdf. Accessed: November 15, 2011.

Ontario Human Rights Commission (2001). An intersectional approach to discrimination: Addressing multiple grounds in human rights claims. http://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/resources/discussion_consultation/DissIntersectionalityFtnts/pdf. Accessed: November 15, 2011.

Pagan Ricardo (2011). Ageing and disability: Job satisfaction differentials across Europe. *Social Science &Medicine*, Volume 72, Issue 2, January 2011, pp. 206-215.

Petersen, Trond –Togstad Thea (2006).Getting the offer: Sex discrimination in hiring. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, Volume 24, Issue 3, 3rd Quarter 2006, pp. 239-257.

Pinkston Joshua C. (2003). Screening discrimination and the determinants of wages. *Labour Economics*, Volume 10, Issue 6, pp 643-658.

Poggi Ambra (2010). Job satisfaction, working conditions and aspirations. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Volume 31, Issue 6, December 2010, pp. 936-949.

Ravaud, Jean-François–Madiot, Béatrice and Ville, Isabelle (1992). Discrimination towards disabled people seeking employment. *Social Science &Medicine*, Volume 35, Issue 8, October 1992, pp. 951-958.

Shoben, E. W. (1980). Compound Discrimination: The Interaction of Race and Sex in Employment Discrimination.*NYU Law Review.* 55, pp. 793-835.

Tardos, K. (2005) Employment Discrimination in a Small Region of Hungary (Foglalkozási diszkrimináció egy magyarországi kistérségben) In: Landau Edit – Vince Péter (ed.), Munkanélküliség, inaktivitás, munkahelyteremtés, foglalkoztatáspolitika. (Tanulmányok és körkérdés). KOPINT-DATORG Konjunktúra Kutatási Alapítvány, Külgazdaság Szerkesztősége, 2005 May.

Appendixes

Table 1: Distribution of the population by the number of grounds of discrimination and the rate of multiple discrimination among the discriminated in the European Union in 2010 (%)

	No discrimination	**Discrimination on one ground**	**Discrimination on two or more grounds**	**Total**	**Rate of multiple discrimination among the discriminated**
Hungary	95.0	2.4	2.6	100.0	52
Estonia	94.7	2.7	2.6	100.0	49
Bulgaria	91.1	6.9	2.0	100.0	31
United Kingdom	90.1	8.3	1.6	100.0	29
Netherlands	93.4	5.0	1.5	100.0	24
France	94.1	4.5	1.4	100.0	24
Sweden	94.7	4.1	1.3	100.0	24
Czech Republic	94.6	4.1	1.3	100.0	24
Germany	96.8	2.2	1.1	100.0	22
Denmark	96.5	2.5	1.0	100.0	20
Belgium	96.5	2.8	.8	100.0	16
Spain	96.3	3.1	.6	100.0	16
Finland	95.2	4.2	.6	100.0	14
Norway	96.5	3.0	.5	100.0	12
Slovenia	97.9	1.9	.2	100.0	10
Portugal	97.6	2.2	.2	100.0	8
Poland	97.4	2.5	.1	100.0	4
EU average (17 countries)	94.9	4.0	1.1	100.0	22

Source: ESS 2010

Table 2: Frequency of different grounds of discrimination among those hit by multiple discrimination (two or more grounds) in the European Union countries, in 2010 (%)

	Colour or race	Nationality	Religion	Language	Ethnic group	Age	Gender	Sexuality	Disability	Total
Belgium	84.6	38.5	61.5	15.4	15.4	15.4	7.7	0.0	7.7	100.0 N=13
Bulgaria	56.0	8.0	34.0	26.0	76.0	20.0	8.0	0.0	6.0	100.0 N=50
Czech Republic	42.4	21.2	15.2	9.1	36.4	63.6	45.5	12.1	27.3	100.0 N=33
Denmark	50.0	50.0	43.8	37.5	43.8	12.5	12.5	0.0	12.5	100.0 N=16
United Kingdom	59.0	31.6	34.2	10.5	18.4	36.8	31.6	5.1	10.3	100.0 N=38
Estonia	0.0	82.6	2.2	91.3	19.6	15.2	10.9	2.2	10.9	100.0 N=46
Finland	27.3	27.3	18.2	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	18.2	9.1	100.0 N=11
France	73.9	56.5	34.8	21.7	39.1	17.4	30.4	26.1	21.7	100.0 N=23
Netherlands	48.1	55.6	48.1	11.1	48.1	18.5	18.5	7.4	3.7	100.0 N=27
Poland	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0 N=2
Hungary	75.0	47.2	8.1	5.6	66.7	13.9	8.3	0.0	8.1	100.0 N=36
Germany	25.6	74.4	35.9	51.3	25.6	5.3	7.7	10.3	10.3	100.0 N=39
Norway	42.9	28.6	42.9	14.3	28.6	14.3	28.6	14.3	0.0	100.0 N=7
Portugal	100.0	75.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0 N=4
Spain	46.2	38.5	23.1	30.8	15.4	25.0	33.3	25.0	0.0	100.0 N=13
Sweden	10.5	26.3	15.8	26.3	42.1	36.8	57.9	5.3	31.6	100.0 N=19
Slovenia	33.3	100.0	100.0	33.3	33.3	66.7	33.1	33.3	33.3	100.0 N=3
EU average (17 countries)	50.3	48.9	32.9	25.6	32.7	21.1	23.2	11.6	12.1	100.0 N=380

Table 3: Principal components of grounds of discrimination across Europe (17 countries)

	Component	
	1 Ethnicity related factor	**2 Non-ethnicity related factor**
Discrimination of respondent's group: colour or race	.613	-4.174E-02
Discrimination of respondent's group: nationality	.726	-.135
Discrimination of respondent's group: religion	.654	-.137
Discrimination of respondent's group: language	.748	-.137
Discrimination of respondent's group: ethnic group	.666	-7.522E-02
Discrimination of respondent's group: age	.152	.628
Discrimination of respondent's group: gender	.178	.626
Discrimination of respondent's group: sexuality	.175	.461
Discrimination of respondent's group: disability	.167	.469

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. . KMO=0.770, BartlettSig=0.00
a 2 components extracted.

Table 4: Principal components of grounds of discrimination among those discriminated on multiple grounds in Europe (17 countries)

	Component		
	1 Demographic factor (age & gender)	**2 Ethnicity factor**	**3 Physical and spiritual difference factor (Disablity, sexuality, and religion)**
Discrimination of respondent's group: colour or race	-.370	-.662	.100
Discrimination of respondent's group: nationality	-.426	.636	.152
Discrimination of respondent's group: religion	-.274	-6.088E-02	.425
Discrimination of respondent's group: language	-.309	.711	8.062E-02
Discrimination of respondent's group: ethnic group	-.333	-.499	.250
Discrimination of respondent's group: age	.809	-4.887E-03	-.147
Discrimination of respondent's group: gender	.768	2.145E-02	-9.920E-02
Discrimination of respondent's group: sexuality	.374	-1.778E-02	.730
Discrimination of respondent's group: disability	.430	.133	.578

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. KMO=0.613, BartlettSig=0.00
a 3 components extracted.

Table 5: The ratio of those in paid work among those hit by discrimination and those not hit by discrimination. (%)

	Rate of those in paid work in the total population	Rate of those in paid work among persons not hit by discrimination (%)	Rate of those in paid work among persons hit by discrimination (%)	Ratio of the employment rate of the discriminated and non-discriminated	Ratio of the employment rate of those discriminated and the total population
Bulgaria	40	42	22	0.53	0.55
Hungary	49	49	35	0.71	0.71
Czech Republic	54	55	40	0.72	0.74
Portugal	40	40	40	0.101	1.00
Poland	50	51	41	0.81	0.82
Denmark	56	56	42	0.75	0.75
Netherlands	59	60	44	0.73	0.75
Belgium	51	51	45	0.88	0.88
Sweden	57	58	46	0.81	0.81
Estonia	49	49	46	0.94	0.94
Finland	48	49	48	0.99	1.00
Slovenia	47	47	48	0.103	1.02
Germany	53	53	50	0.93	0.94
United Kingdom	53	52	54	0.104	1.02
France	52	52	55	0.106	1.06
Spain	49	49	61	0.126	1.24
Norway	62	62	66	0.106	1.06
EU average (17 countries	**52**	**52**	**50**	**0.96**	**0,96**

Source: ESS 2010

Table 6: Average value of the Job Quality Index among the employed population by job quality dimensions and countries of the European Union

	Compensation (15 points)	Working hours (10 points)	Participation (10 points)	Social and self-esteem needs (15 points)	Job security (15 points)	Work-Life Balance (10 points)	Workload (15 points)	Self-actualisation (10 points)	Job Quality Index (100 points)
Norway	9.9	5.5	7.2	10.3	11.6	6.2	6.5	7.0	64.2
Sweden	9.6	5.7	7.0	10.0	11.7	6.2	6.6	6.7	63.6
France	9.4	5.8	6.2	9.4	11.5	6.3	6.8	6.9	62.3
Denmark	9.4	5.8	6.8	10.0	11.1	6.8	5.9	6.4	62.2
Belgium	10.2	5.5	6.0	10.1	11.3	6.4	6.3	6.4	62.2
Finland	8.7	5.8	6.8	9.9	11.4	6.7	6.3	6.4	61.9
United Kingdom	9.4	5.3	6.1	9.9	10.1	6.2	6.9	6.5	60.4
Slovenia	8.7	5.5	5.4	9.4	11.4	6.1	6.7	6.9	60.2
Estonia	7.8	5.8	5.7	10.4	10.3	6.0	6.8	6.8	59.5
Germany	8.9	5.3	5.6	9.5	11.0	5.8	6.3	6.3	58.7
Bulgaria	8.8	5.8	4.8	9.3	10.7	6.2	7.0	5.7	58.1
Netherlands	9.1	5.3	6.1	9.4	10.0	6.2	5.9	6.0	58.0
Hungary	8.5	5.7	4.9	9.3	10.5	5.9	6.7	6.0	57.5
Spain	8.1	5.2	5.8	9.2	10.2	6.2	6.4	5.5	56.6
Czech Republic	8.6	5.4	4.5	8.5	10.0	5.5	6.8	6.0	55.6
Portugal	9.0	5.4	4.8	8.3	10.3	5.9	6.7	5.1	55.5
Poland	8.1	5.2	5.0	8.8	10.1	5.7	6.4	6.1	55.4
European Union average (17 countries)	**8.9**	**5.4**	**5.8**	**9.4**	**10.7**	**6.0**	**6.5**	**6.3**	**59.18**

Source: ESS 2010

Table 7: Average value of the Job Quality Index dimensions among the employed population by number of discrimination grounds across 17 Europe Union countries

	Non-discriminated	Discriminated on a single ground	Discriminated on multiple grounds	Total
Compensation (15 points)	8.98	8.42	7.81	8.94
Working hours (10 points)	5.42	5.24	5.46	5.41
Participation (10 points)	5.81	5.61	5.43	5.80
Social and self-esteem needs (15 points)	9.43	9.36	8.90	9.43
Job security (15 points)	10.76	9.65	9.41	10.70
Work-Life Balance (10 points)	6.08	5.83	5.47	6.07
Workload (15 points)	6.51	6.90	6.73	6.53
Self-actualisation (10 points)	6.30	6.29	6.11	6.30
Average Job Quality Index (EU 17) (max. 100 points)	**59.30 N=15960**	**57.31 N=670**	**55.32 N=184**	**59.18 N=16814**

Source: ESS 2010

Table 8.Average Job Quality Index value by the number of discrimination grounds and level of education among the employed of the 17 European Union countries.

Years of full-time education completed	Number of grounds of discrimination	Job Quality Index average value	N	Std. Deviation
Primary/Lower level education (0-8 years)	0	54.50	898	19.036
	1	55.38	34	15.622
	2	45.08	13	16.811
	Subtotal	54.40	946	18.914
Secondary/Vocational education/ (9-14 years)	0	58.33	8717	18.284
	1	55.31	284	16.657
	2	55.65	101	14.790
	Subtotal	58.33	8717	18.284
Higher education (at least 15 years full-time)	0	61.31	6345	18.046
	1	59.11	352	18.652
	2	56.78	70	15.879
	Subtotal	61.15	6767	18.067
Total	0	59.30	15960	18.326
	1	57.31	670	17.763
	2	55.32	184	15.546
	Total	59.18	16814	18.283

Source: ESS 2010, International