

## D 4.4a - Policy synthesis and integrative report on Policy Transfer and Comparative Frameworks

**Maria Petmesidou, Maria C. González-Menéndez and Kari Hadjivassiliou**

**STYLE-WP4:  
Policy Transfer and Comparative Frameworks**

**Submission date - Planned: 31/08/2016      Actual: 04/08/2016**



**STYLE Working Papers** are peer-reviewed outputs from the [www.style-research.eu](http://www.style-research.eu) project. The series is edited by the project coordinator Professor Jacqueline O'Reilly. These working papers are intended to meet the European Commission's expected impact from the project:

- i) to 'advance the knowledge base that underpins the formulation and implementation of relevant policies in Europe with the aim of enhancing the employment of young people and their transition to economic and social independence', and
- ii) to engage with 'relevant communities, stakeholders and practitioners in the research with a view to supporting employment policies in Europe.' Contributions to a dialogue about these results can be made through the project website [www.style-research.eu](http://www.style-research.eu), or by following us on Twitter @STYLEEU.

To cite this report:

Petmesidou, M., González-Menéndez, M.C. and Hadjivassiliou, K. (2016). *Policy synthesis and integrative report on Policy Transfer and Comparative Frameworks*. STYLE Working Papers, WP4.4a. CROME, University of Brighton, Brighton. <http://www.styleresearch.eu/publications/working-papers>

© Copyright is held by the authors

## About the authors

- Maria Petmesidou** – <http://www.style-research.eu/team/maria-petmesidou/>
- María C. González-Menéndez** – <http://www.style-research.eu/team/m-c-gonzalez-menendez/>
- Kari Hadjivassiliou** – <http://www.style-research.eu/team/kari-p-hadjivassiliou/>

## Acknowledgements

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no. 613256.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Main findings by task .....	6
2.1 Barriers to and triggers of policy innovation and knowledge transfer .....	6
2.2 Policy learning and innovation processes drawing on EU and national policy frameworks on youth 8	
2.3 Vulnerable youth and gender in Europe .....	9
2.4 Database of effective youth employment measures in selected countries .....	10
3. Policy themes .....	14
3.1 Facilitators of learning and innovation .....	14
3.2 Foci of policy innovation .....	15
3.3 Policy pointers.....	17
4. Bibliography.....	18
5. Recent titles in this series .....	19
6. Research Partners.....	25
7. Advisory Groups .....	26

## Abbreviations

ALMPs	Active Labour Market Policies
EEPO	European Employment Policy Observatory
ESF	European Social Fund
ESL	Early School Leaving
IAG	Information, Advice and Guidance
ILO	International Labour Organization
MLP	Mutual Learning Programme
NEETs	Not in Education, Employment or Training
NGOs	Non-governmental organizations
PES	Public Employment Service
STW	School-To-Work Transition
VET	Vocational Education and Training

# 1. Introduction

This synthesis report consists of two parts. In part 2 we summarise the main objectives and findings of each of the (four) component tasks of WP4 on “Policy Transfer and Comparative Frameworks”. In part 3 we reflect upon the contribution of our findings to understanding the major barriers to and triggers of innovative policies for better youth labour market outcomes and come up with some policy considerations regarding policy learning.

The four tasks consisted of:

- **Task 4.1:** Barriers to and triggers of policy innovation and knowledge transfer
- **Task 4.2:** Policy learning and innovation processes drawing on EU and national policy frameworks on youth
- **Task 4.3:** Vulnerable youth and gender in Europe
- **Task 4.4:** Database of effective youth employment measures in selected member states

WP4 embraces nine countries (France, Belgium, the Netherlands, the UK, Denmark, Greece, Spain and Slovakia) that joined the European Union at different stages of enlargement, including Turkey as an accession country. These countries also represent different social protection patterns and STW transition regimes. The analysis under Tasks 1 & 2 draws upon information obtained through semi-structured, in-depth interviews (on the basis of a common format) carried out in each of the nine partner countries with key stakeholders involved in the design and implementation of youth related policies (high ranking officials in Ministries and relevant public services, in Trade Unions & Employers’ Associations, in vocational education and apprenticeship services, in Youth Organisations, firms, and other major relevant bodies), as well as with academics and researchers with a good grasp of policy issues and challenges regarding youth labour markets, policy learning and transfer within and across countries, policy negotiation, planning and implementation. For Task 1 the interviews were carried out in the period between December 2014 and April 2015, and for Task 2 between December 2015 and April 201.<sup>1</sup> The available literature on each country has also been scrutinized with the aim of unravelling the major planks of academic and public debate on facilitators or constraints of policy innovation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Detailed information on the interviews held in each country is provided in the country reports and the synthesis reports for each Task that are available electronically at <http://www.style-research.eu/publications/working-papers/>.

## 2. Main findings by task

### 2.1 Barriers to and triggers of policy innovation and knowledge transfer

The main objective of Task 4.1 was to critically assess the possibilities of, and barriers to, policy learning and transfer at various levels of interaction of major stakeholders (local/regional, national and supranational). Special emphasis was given to the inter-linkages between national institutional contexts and international actors.

The explanatory framework used for underscoring the way change is introduced, and what the major aims are, draws upon a combination of the typologies developed by Hall (1993), Streeck and Thelen (2005), and Dolowitz and Marsh (2000), this latter as to policy transfer. Regarding youth transitions, a combination of Walther and Pohl's (2005) scheme with Gangl's (2001) typology has been found useful for mapping similarities and differences among the countries studied.

Clustering of the national cases under scrutiny has been detected in terms of the severity of the 'youth problem' both as indicated by the youth total and long-term unemployment rates, the NEETs rate and the at-risk-of poverty and/or social exclusion rate. In addition, a cross cutting criterion is to what extent some countries can be considered as innovators, in the sense that policy-making machineries facilitate experimentation with innovative approaches. Denmark, the Netherlands, the UK and, to some extent, France stand out as rather 'proactive', though to varying extents and through different mechanisms, while Belgium, Greece, Spain, Slovakia and Turkey show a higher inclination to path dependency or inertia.

The above notwithstanding, in France and the UK, innovative policies do not seem to yield significant outcomes in dealing with the youth problem on account of the efficiency dimension (e.g. to drastically reduce youth unemployment in France), but most notably on account of the equity dimension, that is to significantly reduce the NEETs rate and the risk of poverty and social exclusion among the young, as well as gender disparities in this respect.

Drawing upon the classificatory approaches and concepts used for this comparative study, several conclusions have been reached as to the research questions posed, namely, (i) the role played by overall governance structures in the dynamics of policy change and innovation, and (ii) the major institutional aspects and interactions facilitating or hindering policy innovation.

Most of the countries studied exhibit a multi-level governance structure: regional/local administrations have competences over certain elements of policy relevant to youth transitions, while central government institutions play a significant role in strategic policy decisions and in the overall regulatory

framework. Differences in policy experimentation and innovation among the countries, be it among those countries found more prone to policy experimentation and innovation (Group A countries: Denmark, UK and the Netherlands) or among those where more intense path dependency or inertia can be detected (the rest, Group B countries) cannot be explained by the governance structures' degree of decentralisation to sub-national policy-makers.

Among the Group A countries, Denmark exemplifies systematic interaction and feedback among all levels of governance from the bottom upwards and the reverse, which is conducive to negotiated and evidence-informed innovation. In the Dutch case, multi-level plans to tackle youth unemployment and facilitate transitions are of significant importance to enhance innovation and learning. In the more centralised UK, market mechanisms, competition and choice are seen as key in driving policy innovation but, at the same time, the marketised logic of competition can act as an obstacle to the sharing of best practice among multiple public and private providers.

Among the Group B countries, piloting, programme evaluation and impact assessment is performed less systematically. It is also difficult to ascertain whether the acquired evidence feeds into policy design (e.g. Belgium). In France, state “dirigisme” with policy centralisation implies that most innovations focus on an extensive array of market and non-market youth contracts. In all these countries, barriers for policy-learning and innovation stem from fragmentation and overlapping of policy competences in the fields of education, training and employment for youth. Policy innovation and knowledge diffusion is limited due to highly centralized administration structures (Greece, Turkey) or excessive bureaucratization (Greece). Coerced transfer has been the case in Greece, while political interests overrule policy decisions to different extents in Turkey, Slovakia, Greece and Spain. Nonetheless, Slovakia and a number of regions in Spain stand out as examples of innovative initiatives. Further, in Spain, Greece and Slovakia, a path-shift is under way in VET structures with an attempt to strengthen the dual system.

As to inter-linkages between national institutional contexts and international actors, soft forms of learning across countries and through supranational channels of knowledge transfer/adaptation are of relevance in all national cases. Yet, the influence is more decisive in initiating policy change in the second group of countries, especially as to EU policy priorities and policy patterns of some North-west European countries (in some stances adopted by the EU as best practices).

Finally, a general trend at the macro-level is pointed out in most of the country reports. Namely, structural factors are tending to make STW transitions lengthier and more uncertain while, in parallel, the progressive polarisation of the labour market resulting in fewer intermediate jobs significantly diminishes opportunities for progression beyond entry level among young people.

## 2.2 Policy learning and innovation processes drawing on EU and national policy frameworks on youth

Under Task 2, in each country two innovative schemes were selected to be studied: a scheme consisting in a “holistic” intervention in reaching out to disadvantaged youth in order to improve qualifications and skills profile, provide integrated services and ease transition to the labour market; and an apprenticeship scheme with an innovative potential. In the partner countries, the cases selected are: (a) some policy strands of the Youth Guarantee (YG, or similar programme) or localised innovative practices for tackling youth unemployment in a specific region/locality; and (b) innovative apprenticeship initiatives along the lines of dual training and regarding the extent to which they lead towards a more central and active role of employers in the design and management of the apprenticeship system.

Innovative schemes are examined with regard to the extent to which they trigger significant changes in policy governance: whether a “bottom-up” push for cooperation triggers policy learning, transfer and experimentation, and how and to what extent does a more proactive role of employers in the apprenticeship system promote knowledge diffusion and peer-to-peer learning; what changes in the policy toolkit for reaching out to disadvantaged youth have been introduced; and what mechanisms of change underlie the innovative schemes studied (more or less intentional learning, the role of policy entrepreneurs, EU funding conditionality, etc.).

Significant differences are found among the nine countries as to the extent to which policies aimed at young people fulfil the youth guarantee. In countries where the active path of the YG is a novel overall policy (Greece, Slovakia, Spain) designing and delivering individually tailored services and coordinating the system at the national level pose a challenge. At the same time, in Spain local initiatives already in place and fitting the YG were formalised by it. In Slovakia the EU initiative for a Youth Guarantee triggered novel practices at the local level drawing upon policy learning and transfer from other EU countries and collaborative trust-based relationships locally. Key practitioners at the local level played a central role in this respect. Among the partner countries that have in place a youth guarantee, the Pact for a Youth Unemployment Free Zone, in the Mid-Brabant region (South Netherlands) is an example of a “good practice” from which policy practitioners can draw inspiration as to both governance and (potential) delivery of interventions for STW transitions.

In all the countries studied (with the exception of Turkey) we find the commitment to the youth guarantee linked to attempts at strengthening the dual vocational training system, particularly by mobilizing employers to play a more active role in it. The employers driven initiative to set a learning process on matching VET to the skill demands in Denmark, the coalition of stakeholders in the Amsterdam region for setting VET in the context of an integrated system of service provision and adapt it to the skill demands of the 21st century, as well as the Apprenticeship Trailblazers in the UK

are significant examples of a shift in both the governance and knowledge base of VET systems. A similar tendency is also present in France (e.g. the Second Opportunities Schools), in Greece, Slovakia and Spain. In the latter three countries, in particular, EU influence regarding the dual VET system created “windows of opportunity” for domestic policy entrepreneurs (or for negotiated agreements at the regional level in the case of Spain) to experiment with novel practices that promote work-based learning.

## 2.3 Vulnerable youth and gender in Europe

This Task focused on the gender differences in youth labour markets and school-to-work transitions. Its main objectives were: (a) to map vulnerability across several dimensions in terms of gender, ethnic and class differences, (b) to discuss policies for gender mainstreaming and policy learning, and (c) to provide a synthesis of the findings across the project on how vulnerable groups are affected by skill and mobility mismatch, opportunities for self-employment, family drivers and aspirations and the conditions of flexicurity.

Vulnerability is defined as “insecurity and exposure to the risk of future low incomes” rather than on current income inadequacy. The emphasis is on the probability that low incomes will have a long duration resulting in material deprivation (Göksen et al. 2016: 11). Therefore, the indicators used for measuring vulnerability should reflect, at a point of time, the risks of exposure to persistent disadvantages. For mapping vulnerabilities among young people, in respect to gender, ethnicity and socio-economic status, a quantitative comparison of a selection of European countries (including Turkey) has been carried out. Also evidence was collected from qualitative studies (through interviews with policy experts) undertaken in a sample of countries representing four types of STW transition regimes: universalistic (Denmark), liberal (the United Kingdom), employment-centred (France) and sub-protective regime (Spain & Greece). In addition, available data on Slovakia have been used as an example of a post-communist regime. The qualitative studies provided evidence for comparatively examining policy models and instruments for narrowing the gender gap in STW transitions, and for assessing the dynamics of cross fertilization of innovative practices on gender mainstreaming across various levels of governance.

A major conclusion drawn from the analysis is that gender differences linked to persistent risks of vulnerability among youth are underestimated. It is often assumed that gender gaps become noticeable and deepen around parenthood. But, the evidence presented in this comparative research strongly indicates that gender differences and ensuing vulnerabilities build up early in the life course and that the youth policies across European countries are often gender blind, with limited evidence of consistent gender mainstreaming.

On the basis of the EU-SILC data, the quantitative analysis demonstrated the existence of gender gaps among young people with regard to the educational, labour market and welfare dimensions that are used to assess vulnerable outcomes, namely school drop-outs and educational attainment, youth unemployment, joblessness and NEET status, material deprivation at the household level and occupational and wage outcomes. By integrating the gender and migrant status of young people, the analysis highlights the interaction of demographic characteristics with the above outcome measures and brings to the fore the issue of the intersectionality of vulnerabilities linked to youth, gender and ethnicity/migrant status. The extent of these vulnerabilities varies across different STW regimes; nevertheless there is evidence of their presence in all the countries studied.

The conclusions emphasize the following (see Göksen et al. 2016: 62-64): (1) Segmentation of the youth labour market has lifelong repercussions on the risks of vulnerability. Hence the need for a gender-sensitive approach to youth policies in order to clearly “understand the nuances and dynamics of emerging gender gaps” and their intersection with ethnicity and migrant status. (2) In the case of youth living in the parental home, research needs to develop tools with which to trace and assess vulnerabilities that are often disguised by the household level data. (3) Policy-wise, a more consistent gender mainstreaming approach with regard to education and youth employment policies needs to be adopted across EU countries in order to effectively tackle gender gaps at an early age, and particularly the intersection of disadvantage linked to youth, gender and migrant status.

## 2.4 Database of effective youth employment measures in selected countries

The focus of Task 4 was to compile a Database/inventory of effective youth employment measures in specific Member States (Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Netherlands, Slovakia, Spain, and UK). The database provides an overview of the main representative and/or most effective programmes which have been in operation in these Member States in the period 2008 (pre-crisis) to 2016. Specifically, for each youth-related programme the database summarises country-specific information in relation to:

- An overview of the programme, including its aims and objectives, target group(s) and main activities, i.e. what interventions it supports and how it is delivered on the ground
- The main body responsible for the programme and other key actors involved;
- Sources and level(s) of funding;
- Quantitative data about its take-up and progression outcomes, particularly employment outcomes; and

- Overall evaluation of the programme, including its effectiveness and the extent to which it facilitates young people's school-to-work transitions; its main strengths and weaknesses; any innovative elements; as well as key lessons learnt (i.e. what works and for whom, and what does not work and why) that can be used as policy pointers.

In order to add validity and enhance the thoroughness of the approach towards compiling the database the partners involved in Task 4 [CEPS (BE), CBS (DK), DUTH (EL), UNIOVI (ES), CCIG (FR), UVT (NL), SGI (SK) and IES (UK)] adopted a systematic approach both in how they identified and analysed key documents:

1. First, the *scope* of the country-level review was *focused* and provided an overview of the main representative programmes which have been in operation in a specific Member State in the period 2008 (pre-crisis) – 2016.
2. Second, the partners adopted *an inclusive approach* as to the type of documents reviewed. To this end, their data search focus on main types of content from:
  - Official national/regional data and policy documents, including the National Youth Guarantee Implementation Plans, National Youth Employment Plans, Programme Guidance and related documentation, including evaluation reports and related studies specific to the programme under review, etc.;
  - Data, including administrative data, available from national statistical sources and monitoring systems on the take-up and cost of the implemented programmes e.g. Public Employment Services (PES) for programmes which form part of ALMP, etc.; ESF-related data from ESF Managing Authorities, where applicable; relevant Ministries (e.g. Ministry of Employment/Labour, Ministry of Education, Ministry for Youth, etc.)
  - Relevant databases, e.g. European Commission's Database of Labour Market Practices and European Employment Policy Observatory (EEPO); Eurostat's Labour Market Policy Database (LMP); ILO's Youth Employment Inventory; etc.
  - The European Commission's Mutual Learning Programme (MLP), including a number of relevant Peer Reviews
  - Key published material (e.g. books; academic journals; research articles, independent research and evaluation studies and reports); and
  - Survey data, including employer and beneficiary surveys.
3. Third, in order to collect information in a consistent and comparable way the partners adopted a *quasi-systematic approach* to the country-level review by using a common data collection tool (in the form of an Excel proforma/template) which sought to elicit information in line with the key

focus of Task 4.4. Such a standardised pro-forma/template facilitated the collection of comparable data on youth-related programmes in each selected Member State and ensured consistency of information gathering across the partners.

4. Fourth, in order to fill in data gaps, especially in relation to quantitative and evaluation data, including data on the programme's funding/budget, participation/take-up and outcomes in terms of positive employment and other outcomes for young people, the partners conducted, where possible, interviews (face-to-face or via telephone/Skype) with the most relevant informants who could provide such information.
5. Fifth, given the fact that the database can be used as a useful repository/knowledge base in relation to youth-related programmes in the countries reviewed, it also includes key references and data sources used including, where available, the relevant online links and programme websites.

In total, the database includes **48 youth-related programmes** which cover a wide range of interventions, many of which have proved effective in facilitating school-to-work transitions, including those of youth at risk/NEETs. Using a classification developed by Eurofound (2012) in relation to young people's pathway to employment, these can be grouped in six broad categories (see Table below):

<b>Type/Category of Programme/Measure</b>	<b>Range of Programmes/Measures</b>
<b>Youth Guarantee</b>	Early intervention; integrated approach; personalised and intensive support; individualised action planning; quality options; monitoring
<b>Preventive measures for early school leaving (ESL)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diagnostic measures for early identification &amp; intervention</li> <li>• Alternative learning environments</li> <li>• Information, advice and guidance (IAG) &amp; support at key transition points, especially between lower and upper secondary education</li> </ul>
<b>Remedial measures for re-integrating early school leavers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tracking and/or outreach services</li> <li>• Second chance education programmes</li> <li>• Pre-vocational training, including basic and soft skills training</li> <li>• VET and work-related, practical training</li> <li>• Integrated and personalised approach for re-engaging ESL</li> </ul>

<b>Measures to enhance youth employability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apprenticeships and/or pre-apprenticeship (or pre-vocational) training</li> <li>• Structured traineeships which form part of a ‘train-first’ approach</li> <li>• Mentoring and support to young person throughout placement and beyond</li> <li>• Incentives and support to participating employers throughout placement</li> <li>• VET</li> </ul>
<b>Measures to facilitate school-to-work (STW) transitions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach and rehabilitation programmes</li> <li>• Intensive and personalised help and support, including individualised action planning through dedicated case workers and mentors</li> <li>• IAG and counselling, including individualised vocational &amp;/or socio-pedagogical guidance</li> <li>• Early activation, e.g. intensive and personalised job search assistance programmes combined with follow-up services</li> <li>• Special programmes addressing specific barriers faced by youth at risk, e.g. language courses, transport, living and/or childcare subsidies</li> </ul>
<b>Employment measures</b>	Subsidised employment programmes, e.g. well-targeted employer subsidies

## 3. Policy themes

### 3.1 Facilitators of learning and innovation

In most of the countries studied local/regional administrations and agencies are more prone to exchange knowledge on policy processes and tools among themselves and also get involved in EU-wide mutual policy learning. Moreover, the role of policy entrepreneurs in promoting policy transfer and learning -initially in the context of sectoral and/or local pilot initiatives, subsequently to be spread nationally- has been highlighted in a few countries (e.g. Slovakia, France and partly Greece and Spain). Over the last few years, EU level strategies, such as the Youth Guarantee and the European Alliance for Apprenticeships, opened up windows of opportunity for policy entrepreneurs. Equally important for policy innovation is local knowledge accumulated by key actors in policy design and delivery institutions that enables them to build trust and working relationships with major stakeholders.

Innovative practices at the local/regional level draw upon the added-value that is created, to existing policies, by local partnerships and networks among major actors (regional/municipal authorities, PES, employers, youth agencies, educational and training institutions, social enterprises and other relevant stakeholders). A comprehensive and integrated perspective for promoting youth employment is considered to be the added-value. This combines early intervention, personalised guidance and individualised action planning for young people in taking the initial step into employment (with a specific emphasis on subgroups of NEETs).

Our analysis highlighted a number of promising (but still at an initial stage) or already successful cases of innovative practices at the regional/local level involving policy learning and transfer. The Mid-Brabant Pact in South Netherlands, signed among major stakeholders in order to develop interventions that are expected to lead to a “Youth Unemployment Free Zone” within a three-year time (from 2015 to 2018) emulates successful network-based strategies for employment growth and youth labour market integration in another region of the country (the South-eastern Brainport region). The UK implementation of the Youth Contract in the region of Wales demonstrates ample scope for spreading innovation further. The Community Centres in Slovakia addressed to young Roma introduced significant innovation in assisting disadvantaged youth to develop soft skills for job searching. Epistemic communities and international NGOs transferred expertise for the establishment of these Centres. The “Local Missions” and the “Pôles emploi” in France, which function as main hubs of wider partnerships at the local level, promote innovation through coordination of measures addressed to the NEETs. Inter-regional spread of the JEEP (Jeunes, école, emploi) initiative, initially introduced by the Forest municipality of the Brussels region in order to inform advice and counsel young people about their future employment before they leave compulsory education, is another

example. Also in Spain, some local pilot projects involve cross-regional learning (e.g. Aragón imitated the employers' space of Lugones, and Gijón learnt from Cartagena the value of partnerships),

However, for the above initiatives to yield results with regard to sustained labour market integration of youth at the national level, a policy environment conducive to co-ordinated sharing and diffusion of knowledge between different levels of administration and joint stakeholders' bodies is required. In some countries (e.g. Denmark) corporatist governance highly supports systematic bottom-up and top-down learning and policy innovation, while in other countries fragmented governance hinders co-ordinated learning exchange. Major barriers refer to: fragmentation of competencies among different levels of administration, which leads to inconsistent cooperation across regions and across other actors, slowing innovation diffusion (e.g. in Belgium and Spain); over-centralised administrative structures, dominance of fragmented project-based solutions and inability to convert such projects into long-term sustainable policies (in Greece and Turkey); political culture and values (e.g. a strong liberal tradition in the UK) and party-political expediency (e.g. in Slovakia), which do not favour systematic and co-ordinated flow of information into high levels of (strategic) policy decision-making. Hence, the improvement of coordination capacities vertically and horizontally among key policy actors is crucial for facilitating the spread of good practices nationwide.

## 3.2 Foci of policy innovation

The main foci of innovation regarding effective STW transition strategies consist in: (a) a novel way of governance in policy design and delivery often referred to as a “triple” or “multiple” helix, which involves collaboration between the public administration, professional bodies and education/training providers, employers, youth associations and other stakeholders regarding employment growth and youth labour market integration; (b) a commitment to the youth guarantee through an integrated preventive and pro-active approach that combines services and provides comprehensive support tailored to individual needs; and (c) the strengthening of traineeships and apprenticeships (such as the dual VET) as a significant tool for enhancing youth employability in parallel with the mobilization of employers to play a more active role in this respect.

In the countries considered front-runners in active ALMPs with developed upper secondary vocational programmes comprising schooling and work-based training (e.g. Denmark, Netherlands), the main policy challenges are to improve the image of VET (set in the context of an integrated service provision to youth), to strengthen the commitment of employers to offer apprenticeship places, and to promote dissemination of knowledge about the matching of skills to the needs of industry. How to mobilize employers, in collaboration with professional bodies and training providers in order to reconsider the knowledge base, learning methodology and delivery of VET and develop new apprenticeship standards is a key policy challenge also in the UK and France. In other countries

(Greece, Spain and Slovakia) the expansion of dual learning models in VET needs to be supported, with the aim to improve the content and quality of dual VET, strengthen feedback mechanisms between VET and the labour market, and raise its public visibility and attractiveness for young people. In these latter countries, the reform of VET and apprenticeships is closely linked with another major policy challenge concerning the delivery of integrated individualized services under the youth guarantee. Improving the quality and capacity of PES operation is of paramount importance in this respect.

Finally, in all countries, a more consistent policy approach for tackling the intersection of disadvantage linked to youth, gender and migrant status needs to be developed from an early stage of the education path through to labour market entry.

### 3.3 Policy pointers

An analysis of the Database's programmes has highlighted a number of policy pointers that can serve as recommendations for successful policy learning and innovation in relation to effective school-to-work transitions in the EU. These are presented in the Box below.

1. **Prevention and early intervention at key transition stages** over the full cycle of school-to-work transition
2. **Policies designed with enough flexibility to cater for the different needs of specific sub-groups of NEETs**, or targeted at particular sub-groups
3. **Proactive outreach work**, including through active involvement of NGOs and/or youth organisations and e-outreach
4. **Systems for diagnosing** vulnerable young people's **specific needs**
5. **Early, integrated and person-centred interventions** to address complex needs
6. **Effective case management** combined with **individualised action planning** together with personalised mentoring, help and support as well as follow-up well after the end of the
7. **Sufficient PES capacity and resources** to properly service youth at risk who require much more intensive and personalised attention
8. Programmes **integrating and combining services to offer a comprehensive approach tailored to** young people's **individual needs** in relation to school-to-work transition
9. **Involvement of all relevant stakeholders**, including youth organisations and youth workers
10. **Partnership/multi-agency working** and co-ordination **for an integrated service** to youth at risk, especially at local level
11. **Individualisation of learning pathways** based on good understanding of how the young person actually learns, flexible/modularised curricula and alternative learning environments together with a focus on attitudes/self-esteem, 'soft' and basic skills
12. **Programmes combining work and study such as quality apprenticeships, traineeships and work experience placements together with, where required, pre-vocational/pre-apprenticeship training**
13. **Financial support acting as a safety net** for vulnerable NEETs taking part in an intervention

## 4. Bibliography

- Dolowitz, D. and Marsh, D. (2000). 'Learning from abroad: the role of policy transfer in contemporary policy making'. *Governance*, 13(1): 5-24.
- Eurofound, (2012). Effectiveness of Policy Measures to Increase the Employment Participation of Young People, December,  
[http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef\\_publication/field\\_ef\\_document/ef1260en.pdf](http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_publication/field_ef_document/ef1260en.pdf)
- Gangl, M. (2001). 'European patterns of labour market entry. A dichotomy of occupationalized systems vs. non-occupational systems?' *European Societies*, 3(4): 471-494.
- Gökşen, F., Iliztekin, A., Smith, M., Çelik, Ç., Öker, I. and Kuz, S. (2016). Vulnerable Youth and Gender in Europe. Report, STYLE-Project, electronically accessed at  
<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=7736>
- Hall, P. (1993). 'Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: the case of economic policymaking in Britain'. *Comparative Politics*, 25(3): 275-296.
- Streeck, W. and Thelen, K. (eds) (2005). *Beyond Continuity: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walther, A. and Pohl, A. (2005). Thematic Study of Policy Measures Concerning Disadvantaged Youth. Study Report. Tübingen: Institute for Regional Innovation and Social Research (IRIS).

## 5. Recent titles in this series

Available at: <http://www.style-research.eu/publications/working-papers>

### WP3 POLICY PERFORMANCE

#### **Key Indicators and Drivers of Youth Unemployment**

Hadjivassiliou, Kirchner Sala and Speckesser (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.1 Indicators and Drivers of Youth Unemployment](#)

#### **The Effectiveness of Policies to combat Youth Unemployment**

Gonzalez Carreras, Kirchner Sala and Speckesser (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.2 Policies to combat Youth Unemployment](#)

#### **Policy Performance and Evaluation: Qualitative Country Case Studies**

Eichhorst, Hadjivassiliou and Wozny (eds.)(2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.3 Policy Performance and Evaluation – Synthesis Report](#)

#### **Country Reports**

##### **Policy Performance and Evaluation: Germany**

Eichhorst, Wozny and Cox (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.3 Performance Germany](#)

##### **Policy Performance and Evaluation: Estonia**

Eamets and Humal (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.3 Performance Estonia](#)

##### **Policy Performance and Evaluation: Spain**

González-Menéndez, Mato, Gutiérrez, Guillén, Cueto and Tejero (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.3 Performance Spain](#)

##### **Policy Performance and Evaluation: Netherlands**

Bekker, van de Meer, Muffels and Wilthagen (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.3 Performance Netherlands](#)

##### **Policy Performance and Evaluation: Poland**

Ślęzak and Szopa (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.3 Performance Poland](#)

##### **Policy Performance and Evaluation: Sweden**

Wadensjö (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.3 Performance Sweden](#)

**Policy Performance and Evaluation: Turkey**

Gökşen, Yüksek, Kuz and Öker (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.3 Performance Turkey](#)

**Policy Performance and Evaluation: United Kingdom**

Hadjivassiliou, Tassinari, Speckesser, Swift and Bertram (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP3.3 Performance UK](#)

---

**WP4 POLICY TRANSFER****Barriers to and triggers of innovation and knowledge transfer**

Petmesidou and González-Menéndez (eds.)(2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP4.1 Barriers to and triggers of policy innovation and knowledge transfer](#)

**Country Reports****Barriers to and triggers for innovation and knowledge transfer in Belgium**

Martellucci and Marconi (2015)

[STYLE-D4.1 Country Report Belgium](#)

**Barriers to and triggers of policy innovation and knowledge transfer in Denmark**

Carstensen and Ibsen (2015)

[STYLE-D4.1 Country Report Denmark](#)

**Barriers to and triggers for innovation and knowledge transfer in Spain**

González-Menéndez, Guillén, Cueto, Gutiérrez, Mato and Tejero (2015)

[STYLE-D4.1 Country Report Spain](#)

**Barriers to and triggers for innovation and knowledge transfer in France**

Smith, Toraldo and Pasquier (2015)

[STYLE-D4.1 Country Report France](#)

**Barriers to and triggers for innovation and knowledge transfer in Greece**

Petmesidou and Polyzoidis (2015)

[STYLE-D4.1 Country Report Greece](#)

**Barriers to and triggers for innovation and knowledge transfer in the Netherlands**

Bekker, van der Meer and Muffels (2015)

[STYLE-D4.1 Country Report Netherlands](#)

**Barriers to and triggers of policy innovation and knowledge transfer in Slovakia**

Veselkova (2015)

[STYLE-D4.1 Country Report Slovakia](#)

**Barriers to and Triggers for Innovation and Knowledge Transfer in Turkey**

Gökşen, Yüksek, Kuz and Öker (2015)

[STYLE-D4.1 Country Report Turkey](#)

**Barriers to and Triggers for Innovation and Knowledge Transfer in the UK**

Hadjivassiliou, Tassinari and Swift (2015)

[STYLE-D4.1 Country Report UK](#)

**Policy learning and innovation processes**

Petmesidou and González-Menéndez (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP4.2 Policy learning and innovation processes drawing on EU and national policy frameworks on youth – Synthesis Report](#)

**Vulnerable Youth and Gender Mainstreaming**

Gökşen, Filiztekin, Smith, Çelik, Öker and Kuz (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP4.3 Vulnerable Youth & Gender in Europe](#)

---

**WP5 MISMATCH: SKILLS AND EDUCATION****A Comparative Time Series Analysis of Overeducation in Europe: Is there a common policy approach?**

McGuinness, Bergin and Whelan (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP5.1 Overeducation in Europe](#)

**Transitions and labour market flows – who moves and how?**

Flek et al. (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP5.2 Youth Transitions and Labour Market Flows](#)

**Are student workers crowding out low-skilled youth?**

Beblavý, Fabo, Mýtna Kureková, and Žilinčíková (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP5.3 Are student workers crowding out the low skilled youth](#)

**Recruitment Methods & Educational Provision effects on Graduate Over-Education and Over-Skilling**

McGuinness, Bergin and Whelan (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP 5.4 Report Recruitment Methods](#)

---

**WP6 MISMATCH: MIGRATION****Return Migration after the crisis Slovakia and Estonia**

Masso, Mýtna Kureková, Tverdostup and Žilinčíková (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP6.1 Return migration patterns of young return migrants after the crisis in the CEE countries: Estonia and Slovakia](#)

**Working Conditions and labour market intermediaries in Norway and Austria**

Hyggen, Ortlieb, Sandlie and Weiss (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP6.2 Working conditions and labour market intermediaries Norway and Austria](#)**Re-emerging migration patterns: structures and policy lessons.**

Akgüç and Beblavý (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP6.3 Re-emerging Migration Patterns: Structures and Policy Lessons](#)**Comparing Labour Market outcomes and integration of youth migrants**

Leschke et al. (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP6.4 Labour market outcomes and integration of recent youth migrants from Central-Eastern and Southern Europe in Germany, Norway and Great Britain](#)

---

**WP7 SELF-EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS START UPS****Business Start-Ups and Youth Self-Employment: A Policy Literature Overview**

Sheehan and McNamara (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP7.1 Business Start-Ups Youth Self-Employment Policy Literature Review](#)**Country Reports****Business Start-Ups and Youth Self-Employment in Germany**

Ortlieb and Weiss (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP7.1 Germany](#)**Business Start-Ups and Youth Self-Employment in Estonia**

Masso and Paes (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP7.1 Estonia](#)**Business Start-Ups and Youth Self-Employment in Spain**

González Menéndez and Cueto (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP7.1 Spain](#)**Business Start-Ups and Youth Self-Employment in Ireland**

Sheehan and Mc Namara (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP7.1 Ireland](#)**Business Start-Ups and Youth Self-Employment in Poland**

Pocztowski, Buchelt and Pauli (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP7.1 Poland](#)**Business Start-Ups and Youth Self-Employment in the UK**

Hinks, Fohrbeck and Meager (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP7.1 UK](#)

**Mapping patterns of self-employment**

Masso, Tverdostup, Sheehan, McNamara, Ortlieb, Weiss, Pochtowski, Buchelt, Pauli, González, Cueto, Hinks, Meager and Fohrbeck (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP7.2 Mapping Patterns for Self Employment](#)

---

**WP8 FAMILY DRIVERS****Work-poor and work-rich families: Influence on youth labour market outcomes**

Berloffa, Filandri, Matteazzi, Nazio, O'Reilly, Villa and Zuccotti (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP8.1 Work-poor and work-rich families](#)

**Family Strategies to cope with poor labour market outcomes**

Nazio et al. (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP8.2 Family strategies to cope with poor labour market outcomes](#)

**Leaving and returning to the parental home during the economic crisis**

Gökşen, Yüksek, Filiztekin, Öker, Kuz, Mazzotta and Parisi (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP8.3 Leaving and returning to the parental home during the economic crisis](#)

---

**WP9 ATTITUDES AND VALUES****Value system shared by young generations towards work and family**

Hajdu and Sik (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP9.1 Searching for gaps: are work values of the younger generations changing?](#)

**The impact of youth unemployment on social capital**

O'Higgins and Stimolo (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP9.2 Youth unemployment and social capital: An experimental approach](#)

**Aspirations of vulnerable young people in foster care**

Hart, Stubbs, Plexousakis, Georgiadi and Kourkoutas (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP9.3 Aspirations of vulnerable youth in foster care](#)

---

**WP 10 FLEXICURITY****Mapping Flexicurity Performance in the Face of the Crisis: Key Indicators and Drivers of Youth Unemployment**

Eamets, Beblavý, Bheemaiyah, Finn, Humal, Leschke, Maselli and Smith (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP10.1 Mapping flexibility and security performance in the face of the crisis](#)

**Tracing the interface between numerical flexibility and income security for European youth during the economic crisis**

Leschke and Finn (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP10.1a Tracing the interface between numerical flexibility and income security for European youth during the economic crisis](#)

**Youth School-To-Work Transitions: from Entry Jobs to Career Employment**

Berloffo, Matteazzi, Mazzolini, Sandor and Villa (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP10.2 Youth School-To-Work Transitions: from Entry Jobs to Career Employment](#)

**Balancing Flexibility and Security in Europe: the Impact on Young People's Insecurity and Subjective Well-being**

Russell, Leschke and Smith (2015)

[STYLE Working Paper WP10.3 Balancing Flexibility and Security in Europe: the Impact on Young People's Insecurity and Subjective Well-being](#)

**Flexicurity Policies to integrate youth before and after the crisis**

Smith and Villa (2016)

[STYLE Working Paper WP10.4 Flexicurity Policies to integrate youth before and after the crisis](#)

## 6. Research Partners

- |   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1. University of Brighton – BBS CROME     | – United Kingdom      |
| 2. Institute for Employment Studies       | – United Kingdom      |
| 3. Institute for the Study of Labor       | – Germany             |
| 4. Centre for European Policy Studies     | – Belgium             |
| 5. TARKI Social Research Institute        | – Hungary             |
| 6. University of Trento                   | – Italy               |
| 7. National University of Ireland Galway  | – Republic of Ireland |
| 8. Democritus University of Thrace        | – Greece              |
| 9. University of Oxford                   | – United Kingdom      |
| 10. Economic & Social Research Institute  | – Republic of Ireland |
| 11. University of Salerno                 | – Italy               |
| 12. University of Oviedo                  | – Spain               |
| 13. University of Tartu                   | – Estonia             |
| 14. Cracow University of Economics        | – Poland              |
| 15. Slovak Governance Institute           | – Slovakia            |
| 16. Metropolitan University Prague        | – Czech Republic      |
| 17. Grenoble School of Management         | – France              |
| 18. University of Tilburg                 | – Netherlands         |
| 19. University of Graz                    | – Austria             |
| 20. Copenhagen Business School            | – Denmark             |
| 21. Norwegian Social Research             | – Norway              |
| 22. Swedish Institute for Social Research | – Sweden              |
| 23. Koç University Social Policy Centre   | – Turkey              |
| 24. University of Turin                   | – Italy               |
| 25. EurActiv                              | – Belgium             |

<http://www.style-research.eu/research-organisations>

## 7. Advisory Groups

### **Consortium Advisory Network**

Business Europe

[www.buinesseurop.eu](http://www.buinesseurop.eu)

ETUI: European Trade Union Institute

[www.etui.org](http://www.etui.org)

European Youth Forum

[www.youthforum.org](http://www.youthforum.org)

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

[www.eurofound.europa.eu](http://www.eurofound.europa.eu)

ILO: International Labour Office

[www.ilo.org](http://www.ilo.org)

OECD: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

[www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org)

OSE: Observatoire Sociale Européen

[www.ose.be](http://www.ose.be)

SOLIDAR: European network of NGOs working to advance social justice in Europe

[www.solidar.org](http://www.solidar.org)

EurActiv

[www.euractiv.com](http://www.euractiv.com)

European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1036>

### **Local Advisory Boards**

including employers, unions, policy makers and non-government organisations

[www.style-research.eu/project-advisors/local-advisory-boards/](http://www.style-research.eu/project-advisors/local-advisory-boards/)