Analysis chart for measures in the transitional insertion domain

The transitional domain is defined as the **system comprising all the strategies and measures deliberately set up to encourage the insertion (of young people) into the job market**.

This area is made up of specific measures and how these measures are arranged needs to be taken into account, in addition to the effects of each particular measure These specific measures will be assessed in line with their intervention logic, in other words, the nature of their *modus operandi* in relation to the young people they target.

The table below helps compare the measures presented in workshops. It uses practical questions to set out the main the principal descriptions and assessments of the insertion measures.

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="7">WHAT FOR?
- Which algorithm underlies the measure? (Causal hypothesis or intervention hypothesis)</td>
<td>WHO FOR?
– Which young people are covered by the measure?
– Which young people are excluded or drop out?
– Which young people are not covered?
=> degree of specialisation of target group/impact of selection process</td>
<td rowspan="7">AND SO WHAT?
What are the effects (change of behaviour, representations and situation of the various stakeholders) and what about the outcomes (desired/undesired; beneficial/damaging; quantitative/qualitative; objective/subjective)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON WHAT?
- On which dimensions of the young person’s experience is the measure active? Training/information/Self-confidence/Socialisation/Behaviour and strategies/Resources
- On which of the other stakeholders’ dimensions is the measure active? Employer’s information/representation/Introducing the young person to a company, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHY?
This is the key question. Here we characterise and describe in detail the modus operandi: procedures and processes; tangible instruments and practices (relationships, facilitation, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO BY?
- Who are the participants? (Profile, training, skills, team, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEN?
- At what point in the young person’s transition? How often? How long for? Sequences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE?
- Where action is located: Intra muros/ extra muros/ Home environment / Corporate environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO WITH?
- Partnerships, mode of exchange between stakeholders, structuring of networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">PERTINENT INSTITUTIONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">LEARNING OUTCOMES (interesting practices) (tools, practices, strategies to be disseminated)</td>
</tr>
</table>

WHO FOR?

Who is the measure aimed at *in reality*?

- An unconditionally "open to all" measure or specifically targetted at one or more "target groups"?
- In the second case, how are the different target groups defined? To what extent are they specifically targetted?
    - Administrative categories and unemployment types?
    - Age or sex?
    - Subjectively (level of motivation, for example)?
    - Reserved for "young people" (and how is this loose category defined?) "Under-qualified" young people (and what counts as "under-qualified?")?

We will pay attention to formal and institutional categories and also to categorisations used by professionals in practice (employability, for example, or profile assessments).

ON WHAT?

Specifying and differentiating between the various measures by examining the dimensions (or factors) they focus upon.

- Do they aim to intervene in the 'big picture' or on specific aspects (like job-seeking strategy or skill levels in a specific technical domain)?
- Or do they focus on the personal dimension (self-confidence, reactions, etc.), the social dimension (adhering to behaviour standards) or the professional dimension?
- Do they attempt to change behaviour or cognition and representations?
- In what areas is the measure active for other stakeholders? Employer information or awareness raising, support for recruitment and introducing young people to the company? etc.

HOW?

This is the key question: characterising and describing the measure's *modus operandi*.

- What are the procedures and processes?
- What are the tangible instruments and practices (relationships, facilitation, etc.)?
    - This is not a question of abstract discussions *about* practices ("We help people look for work", "We are a company that trains people through work", etc) that do not actually specify whether or not these practices lead to tangible outcomes.
    - How does the action work exactly? How do the participants manage concrete situations, like aggression or lack of motivation in the young people in question?

WHO BY?

Here it is a matter of identifying, for the various measures being assessed, who the participants are and how they organise their role and their work.

The domain of insertion has encouraged the emergence of new areas of professional affirmation which reflect in the definition of new professional identities or even new professions (no longer called 'social worker' but rather 'job coach', 'insertion advisor', 'project guide', 'facilitator' and the like). The content of these new jobs is fluid and varies widely, and we therefore need to find out more about them and better recognise them. It is now crucial to consider in detail the profile and recruitment of professional agents in that they can favour a particular type of approach.

WHEN?

Examination of when and how frequently the intervention and guidance activities would take place for the target public.

- At what points in the young people's trajectory would the measures intervene?
- How frequently?
- Would it be a one-off measure or would it have a longer duration?

In general, we see a shift from a model with a *static timeline* (covering at the same time states and official status, secondary treatment of stocks in an administrative, sectorial logic of rights applying to different categories of social benefit claimants) to a *dynamic timeline* that is proactive, focussed on the practical project, individualised guidance, flow management, networking and the transversality and continuity of guidance.

WHERE?

The question of location should make it possible to differentiate between measures that take place in a specific area, whether in various living environments (local communities or companies) or according to how they involve various spaces-times.

Location also covers the geographical locality to which the measure refers (at the local level, the administrative area or 'commune' or the sub-region).

WHO BY?

Working in a network, in 'synergy' and in 'partnership', is a categorical imperative for modern public action, particularly in the transitional domain of professional training and socio-professional insertion.

The aim is to examine the experiences of partnerships and modes of exchange among stakeholders.

WHY?

In order to solve collective problems (in this case, the underemployment of poorly qualified young people), any public policy will be based on a theory of action.

Here we leave the terrain of describing the practices and *modus operandi* of a measure, to consider the underlying logic and reasoning. In fact, any measure is implicitly or explicitly based on one or more *causal hypotheses and intervention hypotheses*[1].

- **Causal hypotheses** reflect assumptions about the chain of cause and effect characterising the social problem to be resolved.
  - E*xamples of causal hypotheses: Attributing young people's under-employment to their lack of skills and erroneous job-seeking strategies, or attributing under–employment to discriminatory practices among employers against certain stigmatised groups.*
- **Intervention hypotheses** set out how the collective problem to be resolved can be reduced or even solved by the measure being implemented. They define strategies to be implemented and instruments to be applied to influence the decisions and activity of the designated target groups in order to get the latter to be compatible with the objectives being sought. Making explicit these starting hypotheses that underlie public action is important in order to be able to assess their pertinence based on the results observed during the assessment in the field.
  - *Example of an intervention hypothesis underlying a measure like the 'Convention Premier Emploi' (first job agreement or CPE, formerly 'Rosetta' jobs, for which the employer benefits from a reduction in charges for employing a poorly qualified young person): by providing poorly qualified young people with the possibility of rapidly holding down their first job, they become more employable and are more likely to become a part of the ordinary job market.*

---

1 Here we use definitions suggested by Knoepfel P., Larrue C., Varone F., *Analyse et pilotage des politiques publiques*, Verlag Rüegger, Zürich, 2006, p. 144.

AND SO WHAT?

Here we measure the impacts of the measure in question. It is important to distinguish between **outcomes and outputs. effets (outcomes) des produits (outputs).** Outcomes are the desired or undesired impacts on the nature of the social problem to be solved, in other words **r es effets induits, ou outcomes**, for CPEs, for example, on the problems some young people face in accessing employment/GETTING A JOB.

As Muriel Dejemeppe and Bruno Van der Linden point out about the Convention Premier Emploi mechanism: "*Knowing that 85,923 young people benefitted from CPEs unfortunately tells us nothing about the impact of the Rosetta Plan, in terms of measuring the 'effects,' either in terms of the young people who benefitted from it or in terms of the non-beneficiaries. It tells us nothing about the number of young people who found a job because of the CPE, or about new jobs that the policy enabled to be created*."[2]

STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES (interesting practices) (tools, practices, strategies to be disseminated)

Each case study ends with a summary of its strengths and weaknesses.

Translator's note:
I put stakeholders, but actors or players could also be used. It is a matter of personal preference.

[2] Dejemeppe M., Van der Linden B., (2006), Cherche bonne évaluation, *La Libre Entreprise*, 3 June 2006, p. 6.