

THE EFFECTS OF ACTIVE LABOUR
MARKET PROGRAMMES
ON EMPLOYMENT IN IRELAND

Philip J. O'Connell

February 1996

Working Paper No. 72

Working Papers are not for publication
and should not be quoted without prior
permission from the author(s).

The Effects of Active Labour Market Programmes on Employment in Ireland

Abstract

Ireland ranks as one of the leading countries in the share of GNP devoted to active labour market programmes for the unemployed. Research into the effectiveness of such programmes has been limited. This paper is based on a follow-up survey of individuals who completed or dropped out of a range of active labour market policies in 1992. The paper differentiates between different types of training and employment programmes, and controlling for the effects of individual characteristics, estimates the effects of participation in different programme types on four post-programme outcomes - short and long-term employment probabilities, proportion of post-programme time spent in employment, and income from employment. The analysis shows that two types of programme - training in marketable skills and subsidies to employment in the open labour market - conferred long-term benefits on participants, compared both with participants in other types of programmes and with a control group of non-participants.

The Effects of Active Labour Market Programmes on Employment in Ireland¹

Introduction

The main response of the Irish state to the emergence of mass unemployment since the early 1980's has been the expansion of active labour market programmes for the unemployed. Research into the effectiveness of such programmes has been limited. Where performance indicators are available, they typically consist of placement rates - the percentage of participants in a programme which obtains employment on completion of the programme. The available evidence suggests, however, that the outcomes of such programmes are related to participants' background characteristics - including their sex, age, and educational qualifications - with the result that placement rates that take no account of such factors do not measure effectiveness adequately. This paper differentiates between training programmes by level of training provided and between employment programmes in terms of their market orientation, and estimates the effects of programme type on the employment chances and income from employment of a sample of individuals who exited from active labour market programmes in the middle of 1992, controlling for individual characteristics.

Labour Market Developments

Ireland suffered from acute and persistent labour market problems throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s. Table 1 shows the main trends in employment and unemployment for selected years between 1980 and 1995. The period from 1980 to 1987 was one of severe recession coupled with economic restructuring which resulted in a rapid deterioration in the labour market. Total employment fell by 75,000 - due mainly to decreases in employment in manufacturing and construction and the continued decline in agricultural employment. Over the same period the population of working age continued to increase, and the level of unemployment escalated from 91,000 in 1980 to 226,000 in 1987, or from 7% to over 17% of the labour force. Annual net emigration, merely a trickle in the early 1980s, increased rapidly to 23,000 in 1987.

Table 1

Labour Market Trends, Selected Years 1980-1995

	1980	1987	1990	1993	1995
	<i>Thousands</i>				
At Work	1,156	1,090	1,134	1,146	1,231
Unemployed	91	233	176	230	192
Labour Force	1,247	1,323	1,310	1,376	1,423
Net Migration	-8	-23	-23	-6	-6
Unemployment Rate	7.3%	17.6%	13.4%	16.7%	13.5%

The period 1987 to 1990 was one of positive economic performance with strong economic growth, low inflation, wage moderation, and curtailment of public sector borrowing. The numbers at work increased by 45,000 from 1,081,000 in 1987 to 1,126,000 in 1990 - employment in services continued to increase and the decline in industrial employment was reversed. Unemployment fell by over 50,000. However, emigration continued at its high level; the net outflow peaked at 46,000 in 1988-89, - representing a loss of almost 3.5% of the labour force in that year, but it declined during the 1990s in the face of adverse international labour market conditions.

The 1990s have seen fluctuating trends in both economic performance and labour market conditions. Real GNP growth fell from 7% in 1990 to just over 2% averaged over the years 1991-1993 and the number at work increased by about 12,000 between 1990 and 1993. During the same period the labour force grew by 66,000, with the result that unemployment increased by 54,000 to almost 17% in 1993. Aggregate performance improved markedly in 1994 and 1995, resulting in about 7% per annum growth in GNP. Under these favourable conditions the number at work increased by 85,000 between 1993 and 1995 (over 7%), substantially greater than the growth in the labour force, with the result that unemployment fell to 13.5% in 1995.

Two features of Irish unemployment are of particular concern. First, the labour market for young people was particularly unfavourable over the past decade, and the unemployment rate for those aged 15-24 years increased from 15% in 1981 to 24% in 1991 and 27.5% in 1993 - almost double that for those aged 25 years and over in 1993. This surge in youth unemployment occurred despite a decline in the numbers aged 15-24 in the labour force, due both to substantial increase in their educational participation and increased emigration (O'Connell and Sexton, 1994).

The relationship between labour market success and educational qualifications is particularly strong among young people. About 20% of young people leave school with inadequate qualifications and face particularly high risks of unemployment - almost half of labour force participants aged 15-24 who had no qualifications whatsoever were unemployed in 1990.

Second, as unemployment soared over the course of the 1980s, so also did long-term unemployment. Analysis of Live Register data published bi-annually by the Central Statistics Office shows that in 1980 just under 35% of the registered unemployed had been out of work for at least one year. By 1987, when unemployment had increased to almost 17% of the labour force, the proportion unemployed for more than 12 months had increased to almost 45%. The long-term unemployed have not benefited as much as other labour force participants from the recent improvements in labour market conditions, with the result that in April 1995 the proportion of long-term unemployed in total unemployment was almost 50%. In April 1995, 34% of the unemployed had been out of work for more than two years, and almost 25% for three years or more. The registered long-term unemployed are predominantly male - males account for over 70% of total long-term unemployment, and the incidence of long-term unemployment is greater among males (53%) than females (39%).

Long-term unemployment is strongly associated with age. In April 1995, while the share of long-term unemployment in total unemployment was 37% among those aged under 25 years, it increased with age, and the ratio for persons aged 45-54 was 67%. About 80% of the long-

term unemployed are aged over 25 years, and over half are aged over 35 years. Thus, the Irish long-term unemployment problem involves a significant majority of males and its age composition is weighted heavily toward the older age groups. The long-term unemployed also tend to have a particularly poor educational profile. While only about 22% of those at work lack formal educational qualifications, and over half have completed secondary education, almost half of the long-term unemployed have no qualifications whatsoever and only 20% have completed second level education. These impediments to effective labour market participation mean that the long-term unemployed are less likely than others to benefit from improvements in labour market conditions.

Active Labour Market Policies

Labour market policies in Ireland during the 1960s and early 1970s were largely confined to training the labour force by supporting apprenticeships and enterprise related training, and in facilitating the supply and demand for labour. With the growth of unemployment in the 1970s, labour market policies were expanded in scope with the introduction of a range of measures to subsidize employment or create temporary jobs directly. The focus on temporary employment schemes was due to the perception of the unemployment crisis as a temporary phenomenon. By the early 1980s the invalidity of this view was apparent and there was a shift to training of the unemployed (Breen, 1991). The numbers receiving adult non-apprenticeship training implemented by AnCo - then the national training authority - increased from 10,500 in 1980 to 36,800 in 1984. FAS, which succeeded AnCo as the principal national training authority in 1987, continued this level of training activity, and trained 37,000 in 1990 (FAS, 1990). While training of the unemployed expanded during the 1980s, unemployment continued to increase, leading to a renewed growth of temporary employment schemes. In 1990, almost 20,000 people participated in employment subsidy schemes or in the Social Employment Scheme which provided part-time temporary employment for the long-term unemployed (FAS, 1990). In addition to these training schemes, about 2,000 individuals participate annually in the Vocational Training Opportunities Scheme which is a continuing education measure run by the Department of Education directed principally at long-term unemployed adults and combines formal education with vocational training.

More recently, the numbers participating in active labour market policies have increased, and the balance of active labour market programmes has shifted in favour of temporary employment programmes, with about 40,000 individuals participating in the Community Employment programme, which provides half-time temporary work for the long-term unemployed, and, we estimate, about 25,000 participating in various training programmes.

The Present Study

Little empirical work has been conducted, to date, to measure the effectiveness of the range of active labour market programmes in Ireland. Breen (1991) analyzed the effectiveness of training and employment schemes among a cohort of young labour market participants during the mid-1980s. Breen's data, drawn from a five-year follow-up survey of a cohort of 1981-82 school leavers, allowed him to compare post-programme employment of training and employment participants with a comparison group of individuals who did not participate in such programmes. The data set did not, however, allow him to analyze the effects of

programmes among adult labour market participants, and the size of his sample did not permit him to distinguish between types of training and employment programmes. Breen showed that the effectiveness of training and employment programmes for this group was heavily influenced by sex, education and prior labour market experience. He found that both training and employment programmes conferred a positive short-term benefit in improving the participants' chances of getting a job, and that while this effect endured over a longer term (12 months) among participants in employment programmes, it disappeared among participants in training programmes.

A wide ranging review of 51 studies of the effectiveness of active labour market programmes in various countries conducted by the OECD (1993) suggests that their effectiveness in improving employment chances is limited. With regard to broadly targeted training programmes for unemployed adults - the most common category of active labour market programme - the review found "remarkably meagre support for a hypothesis that such programmes are effective." (p. 58). The review did, however, suggest that training targeted specifically at disadvantaged did yield more positive results. With regard to public subsidies to employment or self-employment in the private sector, the review suggested high levels of deadweight (where the outcome would have been obtained in the absence of the subsidy), substitution (where programme participants substituted for non-participants in recruitment or business start up), and displacement (where employed workers are displaced from their jobs by "in-coming" programme participants). The OECD concluded that there was little to justify broad targeting of such subsidies, although specific targeting could be justified if the policy objective is to redistribute employment opportunities. Finally, the review suggested that direct job creation schemes were less likely to suffer from high deadweight than employment subsidies - since most participants would have few alternative employment opportunities - and that programmes can be designed to minimise substitution and displacement. Nevertheless, the evidence is inconclusive regarding the impact of broadly targeted public works, although as in the case of training, positive employment effects have been found for specialised schemes designed for particular groups.

The OECD review highlights the importance of differentiating between different types of training and employment schemes - not all active labour market programmes are of equal value to their participants. However, most previous research has not taken account of qualitative differences between active labour market programmes. Research in Ireland has been unable to differentiate between different types of training or employment schemes (Breen, 1991). Other researchers have focused exclusively on a single scheme - e.g. the Youth Training Scheme in Britain (Dolton, Makepiece and Treble, 1994; Main and Shelly, 1994) or on the duration of training (Torp, 1994).

The present paper attempts to remedy the gaps in our knowledge of the effectiveness of labour market programmes in Ireland. The analysis is based on a follow-up survey of participants in all the major training and employment schemes in operation in 1992. The paper distinguishes between qualitatively different training and employment programmes and seeks to analyse their relative effectiveness. Programme effectiveness is measured in terms of participants' probability of employment both immediately and 18 months after leaving a programme, the proportion of post-programme time spent in employment, and income from employment after leaving a programme.

The Data

The survey of post-programme-participants was commissioned by the Department of Enterprise and Employment and the Commission of the European Union with the objective of assessing the impact of active labour market programmes on their participants. The European Commission is the source of a very significant share of funding for most training and employment schemes in Ireland. The population for the survey was defined as all those leaving training and employment programmes in the period from April 1 to July 31, 1992. This ensured that all respondents had left their programmes at about the same point in time, and therefore experienced similar labour market conditions.

The sample of 4,654 programme participants was drawn from administrative records of the population of almost 20,000 individuals who left programmes during the target period in 1992. The sample was stratified by programme and target group to allow comparison between 17 different programmes and it included both those who completed programmes and drop-outs who left programmes prior to their scheduled completion date. Fieldwork was conducted between April and September 1994 by face-to-face interview. A total of 3,267 interviews were completed, representing a response rate of about 70%.²

To assess the net effectiveness of programmes, we need more than just the placement rates of participants - we also need to estimate the extent to which, if any, participation in a programme improves participants' post-programme labour market outcomes - e.g. probabilities of getting jobs - above what they would have been if the participants had not participated. For younger participants, we were able to compare post-programme outcomes with a comparison group of unemployed young people who had not participated in a training or employment programme. Our sample of nonparticipants was drawn from two-cohorts of school leavers who left school in the academic years 1990-91 and 1991-92. The original source of the sample was the Annual School Leavers Surveys conducted in spring 1992 and spring 1993, respectively, of those who had left second-level education in the previous academic years. From the two School leavers Survey samples were selected those who had not, by the time of the surveys, participated in any state-run training or employment schemes. This generated a sample of 600 school leavers, and of these, 485 were re-interviewed in Summer 1994 to collect a record of labour market and training experiences over the entire period since they left school. From this sample were selected the 246 individuals who were unemployed in July 1992, one month after the last of them would have left school. This constitutes the "risk set" among the comparison group, comparable with programme participants, all of whom were at risk of unemployment immediately after leaving their programmes. Virtually all of the school leavers sample were aged under 23 years, so the comparison of labour market experiences of participants with non-participants is confined to those aged under 23.

To facilitate the analysis individual programmes were reclassified into four programme types - two types of training programme and two employment schemes. We can make a broad distinction between training programmes in terms of the level of training offered:

[1.] *Foundation Level Training:* This category includes a range of measures to provide basic or foundation level training in general skills. Most of the programmes were designed for those with poor educational qualifications experiencing difficulties in the labour market. Included in this group also are programmes designed for women

seeking to return to the labour market after a prolonged absence (usually in home duties) and older long-term unemployed males; the Vocational Training and Opportunity Scheme, to provide second-chance education to long-term unemployed adults; and community training programmes, oriented toward the development of community resources and responses to unemployment. Participants in Foundation level training programmes accounted for 30% of programme leavers during the target period in 1992.

[2.] *Specific Skills Training*: This is in fact a single programme, the largest single FAS training course, which provided training in specific employable skills, generally at a more advanced level than foundation training, and in skill areas linked to local labour market needs. A total of 5,100 trainees exited from Specific Skills Training courses between April-July 1992, 27% of the population of programme leavers.

Employment programmes share a reliance on public subsidies to income but they can be distinguished in terms of their relation to the open labour market:

[3.] *Employment/Enterprise Subsidies*. These provided subsidies to the recruitment or self-employment of unemployed workers in the private sector. The schemes were of one-year duration. About two-thirds of participants - those in the Employment Incentive Scheme and the Employment Subsidy Scheme participated as employees, and a further one-third receive support under the Enterprise programme during their first year of self employment in their own businesses. A significant proportion of participants in the Employment Incentive and Subsidy Schemes are believed to have been retained in the job after the period of wage subsidization ended. Employment Subsidy schemes accounted for about 11% of programme leavers during the target period.

[4.] *Direct Employment Schemes*. These programmes consisted of subsidised temporary part-time employment in community based work. They included the Social Employment Scheme, targeted at long-term unemployed adults, and Teamwork, targeted at unemployed young people. The Social Employment was replaced by Community Employment in 1994. Direct employment schemes represented the largest category of programme types in 1992, accounting for over 6,000 (or 32%) of all programme leavers in 1992. Since 1994, the new Community Employment programme has provided places for about 40,000 participants per year, with the result that Direct Employment schemes have come to dominate active labour market policy in Ireland.

The Effects of Programme Participation

The Probability of Employment

The survey recorded employment status for each month intervening between the time the participant left the programme and the time of the interview. We can regard the proportion at work within 2 months of leaving a programme as the short-term employment effect, and the proportion at work after 18 months as the long-term effect. Table 2 shows the distribution

of both short and long-term employment probabilities by programme. The table shows substantial variation by programme type: about 57% of participants in both Skills Training and Employment/Enterprise Subsidies measures were at work within 2 months of leaving the programme, but only 30% of participants in Foundation Training and 22% of participants in Direct Employment Schemes were at work at this stage. The long term effects of programme participation were very similar, with the proportion at work from each programme type increasing somewhat, with the exception of Direct Employment Schemes, and the relative performance ranking of programmes persisting over time.

Table 2

Proportion at Work within 2 months and 18 months after leaving a Programme

	Foundation Training	Specific Skills Training	Employment/Enterprise Subsidy	Direct Employment Schemes	All Programmes
<i>Short-term effect:</i>					
At Work within 2 months	.31	.57	.56	.25	.40
<i>Long-term effect:</i>					
At Work after 18 Months	.34	.60	.61	.28	.43

These differences in outcome by programme type raise the question of the extent to which differentials in outcome relate to the effectiveness of programmes *per se* versus the effects the characteristics of individuals participating in the programmes. To estimate the net effects of programme participation and individual characteristics, we use a logistic regression analysis of the log odds-ratio of being in employment at time *t* as a function of a set of variables as follows:

$$\ln (E/(1-E))_{it} = a + b_1 * P_i + b_2 * I_i + b_3 * X_i + u_i$$

where $\ln (E/(1-E))_{it}$ is the natural logarithm of the predicted value of the odds ratio (E/1-E) at time *t* (*t*=1 or *t*=18 months) for the *i*th individual, and where "E" is the probability of having a score of 1 - i.e., at work.

"P" denotes a vector of dummy variables indicating participation in *Specific Skills Training*, *Employment/Enterprise Subsidies*, and *Direct Employment Schemes*, (with *Foundation Level Training* as the reference category).

"I" denotes a vector of individual characteristics as follows:

Sex: A dummy variable, coded 1 for Female, 0 for Male.

Age group: 4 dummy variables for age, coded 1 respectively for *Age 20-25*, *Age 25-35*, *Age 35-45* and *Age 45+*. The reference category is aged less than 20.

Education: Two dummy variables: *Junior Cert*, coded 1 for those who had taken Junior Certificate level exams, and *Leaving Cert*, coded 1 for those who took Leaving Certificate exams (including, therefore, those who attended third level). The reference category is those with no qualifications.

"X" denotes a vector of additional variables measuring pre- and post-programme experiences of individuals:

[1] *Never worked:* A dummy variable coded 1 if the respondent never worked before participating in the programme.

[2] *Not in Labour Force* immediately prior to programme participation.

[3] *Pre-programme Long-term Unemployed:* A dummy variable coded 1 if the respondent had been unemployed for one year or more immediately prior to programme participation. Those who had not previously been in the labour force (new entrants) or women returning to the labour force after a prolonged absence were coded as 0 unless they specified the number of months unemployed and looking for work.

[4] *Dropouts:* We asked respondents whether they had completed the training or employment scheme of interest prior to completion, and we asked those who had dropped out why they had done so. We created two dummy variables for drop-outs: *Dropout to job* was coded 1 for those who had dropped out of a programme to take up a job; *Dropout-other* was coded 1 for those who had dropped out for any other reason.

Table 3 compares the results of logistic regression equations specifying, first, only Programme variables, and then adding variables measuring individual characteristics, on the chances of being in employment in the either of the two months immediately after leaving a programme.

Equation (1) simply shows the effects of programme participation. The constant shows the effect of participating in Foundation level training, the reference category, to be .30 - i.e. 30% of participants found work immediately after leaving the programme.³ The effect of Skills Training was positive and significant, and increased the probability of immediate employment to .57. The effect of participating in an Employment Subsidy scheme had almost as great an effect. Participating in a Direct Employment Scheme substantially reduced the probability of finding a job, compared with participation in Foundation Training. These results, then, effectively provide the same information as the "raw" placement data in Table 2, albeit in a less intuitively appealing manner.

Table 3

Log-Odds of Being At Work within 2 Months after Leaving a Programme

Equation:	(1)		(2)	
	Coefficient	Standard Error [t-ratio]	Coefficient	Standard Error [t-ratio]
Constant	-.789	.070 [-11.25]	-.649	.150 [-4.33]
Specific Skills	1.078	.098 [10.96]	.894	.112 [7.95]
Employment Subsidies	1.063	.130 [8.17]	1.180	.145 [8.10]
Direct Employment	-.490	.104 [-4.73]	-.158	.122 [-1.29]
% Female			-.192	.091 [-2.10]
Age 20-25			.336	.127 [2.65]
Age 25-35			-.385	.138 [-2.79]
Age 35-45			-.551	.150 [-3.66]
Age 45+			-.689	.173 [-3.97]
Junior Cert.			.399	.120 [3.32]
Leaving Cert			.601	.122 [4.93]
Never Worked			-.396	.105 [-3.76]
Not in Labour Force			-.275	.113 [-2.44]
Long-term Unemployed			-.761	.110 [-6.89]
Dropout to job			2.975	.268 [11.11]
Dropout - other			-1.021	.181 [-5.64]
-2 Log-Likelihood	3865.142		3365.309	
Chi squared	318.847		802.645	
N of Cases	3113		3099	

Equation (2) adds individual characteristics and other variables expected to effect employment chances. Controlling for these additional variables, the effect of participation in Skills Training remains positive and significant, although the effect is somewhat attenuated - suggesting that a part of the comparatively favourable performance of Skills Training is due to compositional differences between programmes. The effect of Employment/Enterprise Subsidy schemes is increased somewhat, again suggesting compositional effects, while the effect of participation in a Direct Employment Scheme is not significantly different from participation in Foundation Training.

Table 4

Log-Odds of Being At Work 18 Months After Leaving a Programme

Equation:	(3)		(4)	
	Coefficient	Standard Error [t-ratio]	Coefficient	Standard Error [t-ratio]
Constant	-.668	.069 [-9.66]	-.786	.146 [-5.39]
Specific Skills	1.08	.098 [11.04]	.721	.109 [6.64]
Employment Subsidies	1.143	.132 [8.69]	1.113	.144 [7.76]
Direct Employment	-.581	.103 [-5.67]	-.381	.118 [-3.25]
% Female			-.098	.090 [-1.10]
Age 20-25			.388	.125 [3.10]
Age 25-35			-.165	.134 [-1.23]
Age 35-45			-.458	.146 [-3.13]
Age 45+			-.622	.170 [-3.67]
Junior Cert.			.490	.117 [4.17]
Leaving Cert			1.065	.118 [9.02]
Never Worked			-.291	.102 [-2.84]
Not in Labour Force			-.130	.109 [-1.19]
Long-term Unemployed			-.657	.107 [-6.15]
Dropout to job			1.088	.181 [6.02]
Dropout - other			-.792	.169 [-4.70]
-2 Log-Likelihood	3858.141		3491.803	
Chi squared	363.658		714.849	
N of Cases	3079		3066	

The effect of being female is negative and significant (at $P < .05$) suggesting that, controlling for other relevant factors, women experienced a lower rate of employment than men immediately post programme. Those in each of the age groups over 25 years were less likely to find work than those aged less than 20, and the negative effect of age increased with age group, but those aged 20-25 were more likely to find work than those aged less than 20. Education had a positive and significant effect on employment: those who had taken Junior and Leaving Certificate exams were more likely to find work than those with no qualifications. Those who had not been in the labour force immediately prior to participation were less likely than those who had to find employment immediately after the programme. Not having worked prior to the programme of interest had a negative effect on post-

programme employment. As expected, pre-programme long-term unemployment had a negative effect on post programme employment. Also as expected, dropping out of a programme to take a job had a strong positive effect on immediate post-programme employment chances, while dropping out for other reasons had a negative, effect.

Table 4 shows the equations estimating the odds of being in employment 18 months after leaving a programme. Again, equation 3 simply models the effects of programmes, irrespective of other variables, and provides the same information as in Table 2 - the long-term effect of participation in Direct Employment Schemes in placing participants in jobs is lower than that of Foundation Training, while Skills Training and Employment/Enterprise Subsidies both significantly increase the long-term probability of employment, compared to Foundation Training.

Controlling for the effects of other variables - in Equation (4) - this pattern of effects are maintained - Skills Training and Employment/Enterprise Subsidies both perform significantly better than Foundation Training, and Direct Employment Schemes perform significantly worse. The effect of gender is eliminated over the longer term. Those aged over 35 continue to face lower probabilities of employment than those aged under 20, the effect of being aged 25-35 is not significantly different from that of being aged under 20. Those aged 20-25 had a higher long-term probability of finding work.

The positive effect of education is maintained over the longer term, as, perhaps surprisingly, is that of dropping out of a programme to take a job. The effects of being long-term unemployed prior to programme participation, and of dropping out for reasons other than to take a job remain negative.

The models for employment probabilities show that controlling for individual characteristics of participants, Skills Training and Employment/Enterprise Subsidies increased the probability of employment, compared to Foundation Level Training, while Direct Employment schemes reduced that probability. The models also show that when individual characteristics are controlled for, the differential effects of programme participation are attenuated, particularly over the longer term, where the effects of more enduring characteristics of individuals, such as educational attainment assert their importance.

The classification of programmes into programme types was driven by qualitative distinctions between levels of training and the market orientation of employment programmes, and there is some heterogeneity within programme types in post-programme performance indicators. Appendix Table 1 shows performance indicators by detailed programme. Among the eleven Foundation level training programmes, two stand out with particularly poor placement rates: Travelling Persons Workshops, targeted specifically at members of the highly disadvantaged Travelling community) and VTOS (the Vocational Training Opportunities Scheme, a second-chance education programme targeted at long-term unemployed adults). For example, eighteen months after leaving their programmes, only 9% of participants in Travelling Persons Workshops and 17% of those in VTOS were at work, compared with a mean of 33% of all Foundation level training participants. There were also substantial differences between the two Direct Employment schemes: after 18 months 18% of participants in the Social Employment Scheme (targeted at long-term unemployed adults) were at work, compared to

44% of participants in Teamwork (a direct employment scheme targeted on young unemployed people).

In order to ensure that the relatively unfavourable performance of Foundation level training was not simply an artifact of the inclusion of the two "outlying" programmes, participants in Travelling Persons Workshops and VTOS were dropped from the sample and Equations (2) and (4) re-estimated. The resulting programme coefficients were somewhat lower than reported for the full sample in Table 3 and 4, but the pattern of effects, including the clear superiority of Skills Training and Employment Subsidies remained. In order to assess the sensitivity of the estimates of the effects of Direct Employment Schemes, the effects of Social Employment Scheme and Teamwork were estimated separately. In the short term, the effects of each were non-significant, as reported in Table 3, Equation (2). Over the longer term, the effect of the Social Employment Scheme was negative, significant, and of somewhat greater magnitude than reported for all Direct Employment Schemes, while the effect of Teamwork was not significantly different from Foundation Training. This suggests that the poor performance of Direct employment Schemes is mainly attributable to the Social Employment Scheme for long-term unemployed adults, although outcomes for participants in Teamwork, equivalent to Foundation Training, fall below those for participants in Skills Training and Employment Subsidies.

Assessing Net Effectiveness

So far we have considered the differential effects of participation in different types of programme on subsequent employment probabilities, controlling for individual characteristics. This does not, however, address the question of the net effects of training and employment schemes - i.e. how much do programmes increase participants' probabilities of getting jobs above what they would have been if the participants had not participated? To assess the net effectiveness of programmes, we need more than just the placement rates of participants - we also need to estimate what would have occurred under the counterfactual assumption. In this section we estimate the net effects of programmes by comparing the outcomes for a subset of our sample of participants with a comparison group of individuals who did not participate in any training or employment schemes but who were participating in the labour market at around the same time as our participants.

Virtually all of the comparison group were aged under 23 years, so the comparison of participants and non-participants was confined to those aged 22 or less. For the participant group, labour market experiences were timed from the month they left their programme. Defining a starting point for the non-participants is more problematic, but for this analysis, their labour market experiences were timed from July 1992 - the middle of the exit period for the participant sample, and one month after the last of the 1992 school leavers left school. Thus, for participants short term employment was defined as employment in either of the two months following a programme as in Table 1, and in the case of non-participants, as employment in August or September 1992. Long-term employment effects were defined as the probability of employment 18 months post programme for participants, and January 1994 for non-participants.

Table 5 compares short and long-term employment rates for non-participants, and for participants by programme. The short-term measure suggests that non-participants (17%

employed in August-September 1992) fared substantially worse than participants in any programme (average 44% employed within 2 months of leaving a programme). The very low short-term employment probabilities among the comparison group partly reflects a "natural" short-term absorption rate of unemployed young people into employment in the absence of training or employment interventions.⁴ That this is the case is suggested by the long-term employment probabilities: after 18 months the placement rate of the comparison group was equal to the mean for all programme participants (49%), although it was well behind the employment probabilities for participants in Skills Training and Employment/Enterprise Subsidies, both of which had long-term employment probabilities in excess of 60%. Comparing the outcomes for the entire sample (in Table 2) with those for young participants (in Table 5), it should be noted that young participants generally fared better than their older counterparts: 40% of all participants were at work in the short term, compared with 47% of young participants, and this differential was also maintained over the long term. This is, of course, consistent with the negative effects of age found in the models of employment probability in equations (2) and (4) above. The difference between the young and entire sample was particularly marked in respect of Direct Employment Schemes, partly because the sample of young participants in this category included only Teamwork participants - most Social Employment Scheme participants are older than 23.

Table 5

Proportion at Work within 2 months and after 18 months,
Comparing Programme Participants and Non-Participants

	Foundation Training	Specific Skills Training	Employment/ Enterprise Subsidies	Direct Employment Schemes	All Programme Participants	Non- Participants
At Work within 3 months	.37	.59	.65	.37	.47	.17
At Work after 18 Months	.36	.63	.61	.46	.49	.49

How much of the differences in outcome between participants and non-participants are due to personal characteristics? To answer this, simple logistic models of the probability of long and short-term employment were estimated, specifying the following variables:

Programme Three dummy variables, coded 1, respectively for participation in *Foundation Training*, *Specific Skills Training*, *Employment/Enterprise Subsidies* and *Direct Employment Schemes*.⁵ The reference category is non-participation.

Age A continuous variable measured when the participant left the programme or at July 1992 in the case of non-participants.

Unemployment *Pre-unemployment* - the number of months continuously unemployed prior to programme participation, or prior to July 1992 in the case of non-participants.

Education, Female, and Dropouts were defined as in the previous analysis (Tables 2-4). The mean values of the independent variables used in the analysis are presented in Table 6.

Table 6 presents the results of the logistic models of short-term (Equation (5)) and long-term (Equation (6)) employment effects.

Table 6
Log-Odds of Obtaining a Job:
Comparing Programme Participants with Non-Participants

Equation:	(5)		(6)	
	Short Term		Long Term	
	Coefficient	Standard Error [t-ratio]	Coefficient	Standard Error [t-ratio]
Constant	-2.765	.776 [-3.56]	-2.642	.751 [-3.51]
Foundation	1.211	.212 [5.73]	-.129	.180 [-.72]
Specific Skills	1.948	.204 [9.56]	.634	.175 [3.63]
Employment Subsidies	2.379	.286 [8.31]	.851	.260 [3.28]
Direct Employment	1.215	.256 [4.74]	-.072	.231 [-.31]
Female	-.289	.123 [-2.35]	-.040	.118 [-.34]
Age	.038	.044 [0.87]	.097	.043 [2.24]
Junior Cert.	.573	.187 [3.07]	.570	.181 [3.15]
Leaving Cert	.867	.208 [4.17]	1.225	.199 [6.14]
Unemployment Duration	-.041	.011 [-3.78]	-.049	.011 [-4.58]
Dropout to job	2.470	.348 [7.09]	1.011	.250 [4.04]
Dropout - other	-1.046	.242 [-4.32]	-.816	.236 [-3.46]
-2 Log-Likelihood	1697.356		1807.262	
Chi squared	331.347		244.433	
N of Cases	1712		1701	

Equation (5) suggests that participation in any programme had a positive and significant effect on the probability of finding a job in the short term. The effects of the other variables are in line with our expectations. The effect of being female was negative, but not significant. Age had no significant effect on this group. Duration of unemployment before a programme (or prior to July 1992 in the case of non-participants) had a negative and significant effect. Both of the education measures had positive and significant effects, as did the effect of dropping out of a programme to take a job.

Equation (6) models long-term employment effects. Over the longer term the situation changes: the effects of Foundation Training and Direct Employment Schemes are reduced to non-significance, and the effects of Skills Training and Employment/Enterprise Subsidies are both substantially attenuated, although compared with non-participants, the long-term effects of both Skills Training and Enterprise Subsidies remain positive and significant.⁶

The long-term effect of gender is not significant among this group, but age has a positive long-term effect. Duration of previous unemployment also has a negative effect on post-programme employment probabilities. Education (both at Junior and Leaving Certificate levels) continues to exert a strong and positive influence on long-term employment prospects.

An enduring issue with comparisons of this type is the problem of selection bias (Heckman and Robb, 1986). In the present analysis the issue concerns the possibility that we may not have measured all of the relevant characteristics, and that unmeasured variables may be related both to the outcome and to participation. For example, "better motivated" individuals may be more likely to participate in training or employment schemes, and such motivation may also be of help in finding a job.

In this analysis a simple strategy was adopted to address the issue of potential selection bias. We estimated two equations, [1] a participation equation for the probability of programme participation; and [2] an employment equation. The correlations between the residuals were then examined. If a variable exists which does influence both participation and employment probabilities, then the residuals from the two equations should be correlated, resulting in biased coefficients in the employment equations. In fact none of the residuals were correlated at anything greater than .02, suggesting that we can conclude for the present that the programme coefficients are unbiased estimates of the effects of participation.

Table 7 compares observed placement rates in employment from the four programme types with the predicted probabilities of employment derived from the multi-variate logistic regression models reported in Table 7, which control for individual characteristics. With regard to the short term effects of programmes, the comparison shows that "raw" placement rates for each programme overstate the differences between programme participants and the comparison group. For example, the short-term placement rate for Specific Skills Training is 42 percentage points higher than that for the non-participant comparison group, but if we control for individual characteristics, the differential is reduced to 22 percentage points. The comparison of long-term effects is somewhat more complex. First, while comparison of placement rates suggested that Foundation Training had a substantial, and Direct Employment Schemes a modest, negative long-term impact, when we control for individual characteristics, we find no significant difference in outcomes between these programmes and the comparison group. Thus the "raw" placement rates underestimate the long-term impact of these

programmes. This was also the case with Employment/Enterprise Subsidies - controlling for individual characteristics resulted in a substantial increase in the measured effectiveness of the programme. Placement rates and model predictions of the percentage point difference between Specific Skills Training and the comparison group were equal, although expressed as a percentage of the success rate of the comparison group, the model predictions are substantially higher.⁷

Table 7
Measures of Programme Effectiveness
Observed and Predicted Probability of Employment

	Short-term Effects		Long-term Effects	
	Placement Rate	Model ¹ Predictions [Equation 5]	Placement Rate	Model ¹ Predictions [Equation 6]
Comparison Group	.17	.05	.49	.26
Differences from Comparison Group:				
Foundation Training	+.20	+.10	-.13	.00
Specific Skills	+.42	+.22	+.14	+.14
Employment Subsidies	+.48	+.32	+.12	+.19
Direct Employment	+.20	+.10	-.03	.00
Leaving Cert.	--	+.06	--	+.28
Unemployed (18 Months)	--	-.02	--	-.11

¹ Model predictions are based on a male, at the mean age of 18.7 years, with no qualifications, who had been unemployed for 4 months.

Table 7 also includes the effects of two individual characteristics: education and duration of unemployment. Compared to those with no qualifications, possession of a Leaving Certificate increased the probability of employment by 6 percentage points in the short term and by 28 percentage points over the long-term. Duration of unemployment also had a significant impact on employment probabilities: having been unemployed for 18 months depressed an individual's short-term chances of finding a job by 2 percentage points, and this was reduced to 11 percentage points over the long term.

Employment Duration and Income

Up to this point we have focused on the chances of being at work at two points in time. Dolton, Makepiece and Treble (1994) argue that modelling the probability of employment at a single point in time does not preclude the possibility of differing effects at other post-programme durations, and that even analysis of observations at multiple durations, as in Card and Sullivan (1988) and the present study, does not address the question of how one interpolates the remaining distribution of outcomes. We now consider two variables which capture aspects of the entire period after participants left their training or employment programme. Proportion of time at work is the number of months spent in employment in each of up to three post-programme jobs during the period elapsed between leaving a programme and the survey interview, expressed as a proportion of that post programme period. In the case of non-participants, the post programme period equals the period from July 1992 to the time of the interview, and employment is measured as the total duration of jobs held during that period. Income from employment is measured as total income from each job (i.e. monthly income multiplied by job duration), standardised by proportion of post programme time at work, as defined above.

Table 8 shows the proportion of participants who held at least one job after leaving a programme, the mean proportion of time at work post-programme and mean income from employment by programme type. These measures of post-programme labour market outcomes preserve the relative performance ranking of Skills Training and Employment/Enterprise support measures compared with Foundation level training or Direct Employment schemes. Participants in the former two programmes are more likely to have worked at some point after leaving a programme, they spend a substantially greater proportion of time since leaving the programme in employment, and, partly because of this, their income from employment was higher.

Table 8

Post-Programme Labour Market Outcomes - All Programme Participants

	Foundation Training	Specific Skills Training	Employment/ Enterprise Subsidies	Direct Employment Schemes	All Programmes
Proportion with at least one job	.50	.80	.78	.37	.58
Proportion of time in employment	.30	.53	.56	.20	.36
Income from employment	£123.47	£271.30	£288.19	£88.40	£166.64

About 42% of programme participants held no job after leaving their programmes with the result that both proportion of time employed and income from employment are left censored - with zero values for those who held no job but variation in the remaining cases. A Tobit estimation model is therefore used to generate consistent estimates of the parameters of the models of both proportion of post-programme time employed and income from employment. The independent variables are the same as those used in the analysis of employment probabilities above.

Table 9

**Tobit Estimations of Proportion of Time Employed Post-Programme
and Income From Employment - All Programme Participants**

Equation:	(7)		(8)	
	Prop. of Time Employed		Income from Employment	
	Coefficient	Standard Error [t-ratio]	Coefficient	Standard Error [t-ratio]
Constant	.102	.036 [2.82]	1.264	.292 [4.33]
Specific Skills	.223	.027 [8.17]	1.575	.223 [7.06]
Employment Subsidies	.357	.035 [10.14]	2.291	.293 [7.83]
Direct Employment	-.111	.029 [-3.81]	-1.020	.237 [-4.31]
Female	-.034	.022 [-1.55]	-.281	.180 [-1.56]
Age 20-25	.081	.031 [2.66]	.145	.253 [.57]
Age 25-35	-.099	.033 [-3.01]	-1.340	.273 [-4.92]
Age 35-45	-.173	.036 [-4.81]	-1.646	.293 [-5.62]
Age 45+	-.273	.042 [-6.51]	-2.714	.342 [-7.93]
Junior Cert.	.197	.029 [6.87]	1.728	.229 [7.56]
Leaving Cert	.323	.029 [10.97]	2.594	.238 [10.89]
Never Worked	-.094	.025 [-3.71]	-.907	.207 [-4.39]
Not in Labour Force	-.061	.027 [-2.23]	-.780	.223 [-3.50]
Long-term Unemployed	-.189	.026 [-7.27]	-1.222	.213 [-5.75]
Dropout to job	.425	.040 [10.53]	-2.053	.314 [-6.54]
Dropout - other	-.288	.040 [-7.24]	3.433	.341 [10.08]
<i>Sigma</i>	.509	.009 [54.57]	3.888	.082 [47.49]
N	3090		2762	
Log likelihood	-2177.8		-4868.9	

Table 9 shows the results of the Tobit analysis for all programme participants. Equation (7) estimates proportion of post-programme time employed and equation 10 is a model of income from employment. The pattern of results is very similar to the analysis of employment probabilities among the full sample of programme participants, and confirm the relative superiority of both Skills Training and Employment/Enterprise Subsidies: compared with Foundation level training, participants in Skills Training or Employment/Enterprise Subsidies spent a greater proportion of post-programme time in employment, and their income from employment was significantly higher. Participants in Direct Employment Schemes, however, spent a significantly lower proportion of post-programme time in employment, and their income from employment was lower than participants in Foundation level training programmes.⁸

While there was no significant difference between men and women in the proportion of time employed, women received significantly lower income from employment. The effects of the other independent variables in the models are consistent with effects found for employment probabilities. Older participants spent less time in employment and had lower incomes from employment, as did those who had been long-term unemployed or not in the labour force immediately before participating in the programme. Education had a positive effect on both proportion of time at work and income from employment.

Table 10
Post-Programme Labour Market Performance -
Comparing Programme Participants and Non-Participants

	Foundation Training	Specific Skills Training	Employment/ Enterprise Subsidies	Direct Employment Schemes	All Programme Participants	Non- Participants
Proportion with at least one job	.60	.85	.84	.67	.72	.73
Proportion of time in employment	.33	.55	.59	.40	.44	.35
Income from employment	£134.08	£261.02	£242.97	£179.97	£192.80	£145.32

When we compare young participants (aged less than 22) with the comparison group of non-participants (in Table 10), we find that while a similar proportion of non-participants (.73) held at least one job as did participants, non-participants were employed for a smaller proportion of the time intervening between summer 1992 and the date of their interview than the equivalent measure for programme participants. This is mainly due to a slower take up of employment among non-participants, for example, after 6 months 47% of young participants were at work, compared to 31% of non-participants. This is also reflected in

income from employment - mean income for non-participants was about 25% lower than the mean for participants. Participants in Foundation level training, however, scored substantially below the averages both for all participants and for non-participants in terms of both proportion of time at work and income from employment, while outcomes for participants in Direct Employment Scheme fell between the averages for participants and non-participants.

Table 11

**Tobit Estimations of Proportion of Time Employed Post-Programme
and Income From Employment
Comparing Programme Participants with Non-Participants**

Equation:	(9)		(10)	
	Prop. of Time Employed		Income from Employment	
	Coefficient	Standard Error [t-ratio]	Coefficient	Standard Error [t-ratio]
Constant	-.256	.147 [-1.74]	.048	1.11 [.04]
Foundation	.064	.037 [1.71]	.259	.281 [.92]
Specific Skills	.255	.036 [7.10]	1.572	.273 [5.75]
Employment Subsidies	.369	.052 [7.10]	2.137	.397 [5.38]
Direct Employment	.116	.047 [2.46]	.462	.360 [1.28]
Female	-.050	.024 [-2.09]	-.469	.180 [-2.60]
Age	.016	.008 [1.94]	.055	.064 [.86]
Junior Cert.	.182	.036 [5.08]	1.435	.265 [5.42]
Leaving Cert	.336	.040 [8.47]	2.514	.297 [8.48]
Unemployment Duration	-.011	.002 [-5.92]	-.072	.014 [-4.99]
Dropout to job	.298	.046 [6.52]	2.112	.357 [5.92]
Dropout - other	-.275	.044 [-6.18]	-2.011	.327 [-6.16]
<i>Sigma</i>	.446	.010 [46.12]	3.241	.078 [41.65]
N	1713		1558	
Log likelihood	-1165.1		-3192.2	

Table 11 shows the results of the Tobit analysis comparing participants with non-participants. Compared with non-participants, participation in any programme had a positive effect on proportion of post-programme time employed, although the effect of Foundation training was of marginal significance. In the analysis of income from employment (Equation (8)), Skills training and Employment subsidies have positive and significant effects, with no evidence of any effect of either Foundation training. Gender had negative and significant effects on both

time employed and income. Age was positively related to both, but the effect was insignificant in respect of income, of marginal significance in respect of time employed. Both education variables had strong positive effects on both dependent variables, as did dropping out of a programme to take a job. Duration of prior unemployment, and dropping out of a programme for reasons other than to take a job both had negative effects on both proportion of time employed and income from employment⁹.

Conclusions

This paper distinguished between types of training programme on the basis of the level of training offered, and types of employment programme in terms of their orientation to the open labour market. Four measures of programme effectiveness were analyzed: probability of employment within 2 months and 18 months after leaving a programme, the proportion of the total post-programme period spent in employment, and income from post-programme employment.

Table 12
Summary of Effects of Participation in Programmes
Controlling for Individual Characteristics

<i>Dependent Variable</i>	Proportion At Work Short term	Proportion At Work Long Term	Proportion of post-programme time employed	Income from Employment (£)
Panel A.				
<i>Full sample of programme participants</i>				
<i>Reference category: Foundation Training</i>				
<i>Equation no.:</i>	(2)	(4)	(7)	(8)
Specific Skills Training	+	+	+	+
Employment/Enterprise Subsidies	+	+	+	+
Direct Employment Schemes	n.s.	-	-	-
Panel B.				
<i>Participants and Non-participants, aged under 23</i>				
<i>Reference category: Non-participants</i>				
<i>Equation no.:</i>	(5)	(6)	(9)	(10)
Foundation training	+	n.s.	+	n.s.
Specific Skills Training	+	+	+	+
Employment/Enterprise Subsidies	+	+	+	+
Direct Employment Schemes	+	n.s.	+	n.s.

Table 12 provides a summary of the results of the analyses of each of the measures of programme effectiveness, controlling for individual characteristics and experiences in the labour market. Panel A shows the results for the entire sample of programme participants, excluding non-participants and with Foundation Training as the reference category. Compared to Foundation level training, participation in Specific Skills Training and Employment Subsidies has positive and significant effects on each of the measures of programme effectiveness. However, the effect of participation in Direct Employment Schemes on short-term employment probability is not significantly different from Foundation level training, but participants in such schemes had a significantly lower probability of being employed in the long term, were employed for a lower proportion of the post-programme period, and their income from employment was lower than that of participants in Foundation level training.

Panel B summarises the results of the analyses comparing young programme participants with the comparison group of young non-participants, all of whom were aged less than 23 years. In this analysis of the net effects of programme participation, the superiority of Specific Skills Training and Employment/Enterprise Subsidies is maintained across all four measures of programme effectiveness. The impact of Foundation Training and Direct Employment Schemes is more equivocal: participation in either type of programme increased the probability of employment in the short term, but not in the long term. While participants in any programme were more spent a greater proportion of post programme time in employment than did non participants, the income from employment of participants in Foundation Training or Direct Employment Schemes was not significantly different from that of non-participants.

The analyses presented in this paper confirm the general conclusions of the international literature on the effectiveness of active labour market programmes: some programmes are more effective than others in conferring benefits on their participants. Previous research on active labour market programmes in Ireland has been confined to gross comparison between training and employment schemes. This limitation was mainly due to data constraints, but such comparisons fail to take account of qualitative differences between programmes, and are thus unable to assess differential effectiveness by programme type. The analysis presented here identifies two types of programmes which are most likely to enhance their participants' labour market capacities. What the two successful programmes appear to share is a common orientation to meeting needs identified in the market place - in the form of training in specific marketable skills or subsidies to employment in the open labour market. The analysis also identifies those types of programmes which are less successful in enhancing the employment prospects of their participants. This is not to argue that such programmes should necessarily be terminated, but it would suggest that Foundation level training programmes and direct employment subsidies are more likely to enhance their participants prospects if they are integrated in a "reintegration package" which includes progression from foundation level training or work experience programmes to a more market-oriented and programme. Nevertheless, these findings would suggest that there is cause for concern over recent policy developments in Ireland, in which the Community Employment programme - a Direct Employment Scheme with a minimal basic level training component - has come to dominate active labour market programme provision in Ireland, and has taken centre stage in the campaign against unemployment.

Endnotes

1. The survey upon which the analysis is based was funded by the Irish Department of Enterprise and Employment and the Commission of the European Communities, DG V. I wish to thank Brendan Whelan for his advice on sampling and data collection, Maureen Lyons, for her assistance with questionnaire design, data collection and processing, Fran McGinnity, who assisted in the production of this paper, and Denis Conniffe, Brian Nolan, Chris Whelan and Jerry Sexton for comments on an earlier version of the paper.
2. Of the 3,267 completed interviews, we discarded 25 either because the respondents could not recall having participated in any programme or because the quality of the information was too poor to justify coding. A further 56 respondents who had participated in Specific Skills Training had done so with sponsorship from their employers and were therefore not comparable with the rest of the sample, all of whom had been either unemployed or not participating in the labour force immediately prior to programme participation. This left us with a total of 3,168 cases for analysis.
3. $E/(1-E) = e^{-.789} = .4493, \Rightarrow E = .4493/1.4493 = .31$
4. The slow entry to employment does not appear to reflect a job-search interval experienced by those who had just left school, since new labour market entrants only represented about one-third of the comparison group, the remainder consisting of those who had been unemployed for some period prior to July 1992.
5. In the comparison of participants with non-participants, Direct Employment Schemes include only Teamwork participants, since the Social Employment Scheme is targeted at long-term unemployed adults aged over 21.
6. To ensure that the nonsignificant effects of Foundation Training were not due to the inclusion of the poor performers, participants in Travelling Peoples' Workshops and VTOS were dropped and Equations (5) and (6) were re-estimated. The non-significant effect of Foundation level training remained. In this analysis Direct Employment Schemes included only Teamwork participants, since the SES was targeted on long-term unemployed adults, who were excluded from this analysis because of their age.
7. We were not in a position to estimate displacement effects, whereby programme participants took jobs which would otherwise have been taken by other (non-participant) recruits, although it should be recognised that displacement effects from active labour market policies are believed to be high.
8. Equations (7) and (8) were replicated, dropping participants in the poor performers, Travelling Peoples' Workshops and VTOS from the analysis: the relative superiority of Skills Training and employment Subsidies persisted, although the coefficients were somewhat lower. Specifying separate dummy variables for the Social Employment Scheme and Teamwork, we found that the former had strong negative effects on both proportion of time employed and income from employment, while Teamwork had no significant effects - a repeat of the pattern found in the analysis of employment probabilities above. These results confirm that outcomes from Teamwork programme are similar to those from Foundation Training, while the negative

effects of Direct Employment Schemes are entirely attributable to the Social Employment Scheme.

9. Equations (9), and (10), were replicated, dropping Travelling Peoples' Workshops and VTOS participants from the sample to test the parameters for sensitivity to the inclusion of these poor performing programme in Foundation level training and found that the relative superiority of Skills Training and Employment Subsidies were maintained. In this analysis Direct Employment Schemes included only Teamwork participants.

References

- Breen, R., 1991
Education, Employment and Training in the Youth Labour Market
ESRI General Research Series No. 152. Dublin: ESRI
- Card, D., and D. Sullivan, 1988
"Measuring the Effect of Subsidized Training Programmes on Movements in and out of Employment", *Econometrica*, Vol 56, Pp. 497-530.
- Dolton, P., G. Makepiece, and J. Treble, 1994
"The Youth Training Scheme and the School-to-Work Transition", *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol. 46, Pp. 629-657
- Heckman J., and R. Robb, 1986
"Alternative Identifying Assumptions in Econometric Models of Selection Bias."
Advances in Econometrics, vol. 5. Pages 243-287.
- Main, B., and M. Shelley, 1990
"The effectiveness of the Youth Training Scheme as a Manpower Policy", *Economica*, Vol. 57, Pp. 495-514
- OECD, 1993
"Active Labour Market Policies: Assessing Macroeconomic and Microeconomic Effects", *Employment Outlook*, July
- OECD, 1991
Evaluating Labour Market and Social Programmes: The State of a Complex Art. Paris: OECD
- O'Connell, P. and J. Sexton, 1993
"Evaluation of the Operational Programme for the Occupational Integration of Young People in Ireland: Objective 4 of the Community Support Framework. Dublin: ESRI.
- O'Connell and Sexton, 1994
"Labour Market Developments in Ireland, 1971-1993" in S. Cantillon, J. Curtis and J. Fits Gerald (eds.), *Economic Perspectives for the Medium Term*. Dublin: ESRI
- Torp, H., 1994
"The Impact of Training on Employment: Assessing a Norwegian Labour Market Programme", *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, Vol 96, No. 4, Pp. 531-550.

APPENDIX

Performance Indicators by Detailed Programme

	Proportion At Work Short term	Proportion At Work Long Term	Proportion of post-programme time employed	Income from Employment (£)	N of Cases
Foundation Training	.31	.33	.30	123.47	947 ¹
Alternance	.26	.37	.30	104.77	230
Community Enterprise	.29	.27	.25	118.28	84
Community Training	.37	.27	.27	104.83	171
Community Youth Training	.35	.41	.37	187.97	200
Enterprise Training	.36	.54	.43	236.53	151
Local Training Initiative	.35	.41	.33	136.19	193
Linked Work Experience	.53	.47	.46	164.07	72
Skills Foundation	.41	.45	.39	161.75	194
Traveling Persons	.07	.09	.08	25.25	77
Youthreach Education	.29	.30	.28	89.63	159
VTOS	.15	.17	.15	59.01	198
Specific Skills Training	.57	.60	.53	271.30	856
Employment/Enterprise Subsidies	.57	.61	.56	288.19	340
Employment Incentive Sch	.65	.58	.58	268.21	181
Employment Subsidy Sch	.47	.56	.50	242.44	98
Enterprise Programme	.69	.75	.70	407.46	137
Direct Employment	.22	.22	.20	88.40	1007
Social Employment Scheme	.19	.18	.16	73.03	268
Teamwork	.36	.44	.39	166.01	158
Total	.38	.40	.36	166.64	3150

¹ Totals reported for programme types are weighted to be representative of the population of participants in 1992.