

# NEGOTIATE

Overcoming early job-insecurity in Europe

Strategies to improve labour market  
integration of young people:  
Analysing linkages between  
horizontal and vertical  
policy coordination

Irene Dingeldey  
Lisa Steinberg  
University of Bremen,  
Germany

NEGOTIATE working paper no. 8.1

This project has received funding from the European  
Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation  
programme under grant agreement No 649395



NEGOTIATE – Negotiating early job-insecurity and labour market exclusion in Europe

Horizon 2020, Societal Challenge 6, H2020-YOUNG-SOCIETY-2014, YOUNG-1-2014, Research and Innovation Action (RIA)

Duration: 15, 30 May 2018

[www.negotiate-research.eu](http://www.negotiate-research.eu)

twitter: @NEGOTIATE\_EU

Facebook: negotiateEU

### Associated Work Package (WP)

WP8 – Strategies to improve labour integration of young people: Analysing linkages between horizontal and vertical policy coordination

### Lead beneficiary for D8.1

University of Bremen, Germany

### WP Leader

University of Bremen, Germany

## Deliverable 8.1 (D8.1)

**Strategies to improve labour market integration of young people: Analysing linkages between horizontal and vertical policy coordination**

Deliverable type: Report  
Dissemination level: Public  
Month and date of Delivery: Month 16, July 2016

### Authors

Irene Dingeldey, University of Bremen, Germany  
Lisa Steinberg, University of Bremen, Germany

© 2016 – NEGOTIATE. All rights reserved  
Published by NEGOTIATE HiOA in July 2016



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 649395.

This publication reflects the views only of the author(s), and *the Research Executive Agency (REA)* cannot be held responsible for any use of the information contained therein

WP8 deals with the co-ordination of policy measures and strategies to strengthen young people's negotiating positions in the transition to the labour market. The focus is on the development and coordination of policy efforts within a system of multi-level governance. The template aims to address three issues by analysing the following questions:

**1. Vertical and horizontal coordination of European policies to improve labour market integration of young people**

- Does coordination take place through 'hard' or 'soft' measures?
- Which actors are involved in decision-making?
- When does multi-level policy coordination to help labour market integration of young people work best?  
'Under what conditions are the development and coordination of such policies across multiple levels of governance likely to succeed?'

**2. Impact of European initiatives, support and mutual learning on national and subnational policies/strategies**

- What impact did European programs like "Youth Guarantee" and Youth initiative and "Youth on the move" have at national and sub-national level?

**3. Re-integration of national experiences in the European policy agenda**

- Which approaches, experiences and achievements of European countries have influenced European level initiatives?

The template aims to provide a basis for country chapters on the implementation of European initiatives, a comparative report on strengths and weaknesses of policy coordination and policy outcomes in a MLG system as well as policy recommendations on how actors might improve coordination across governance levels.

Empirical information of this working paper will be based on secondary country-based literature, official documents, existing national policy/program evaluations, and expert interviews with 4–5 key officials from agencies involved in the implementation of these programs in each country.

## Contents

1 The European Youth Guarantee in Context	4
2. Theoretical background	6
3. Subject of empirical analysis, methods and data	9
3.1 First step: Mirror the Discourse and political process	10
3.2 Second step: Assess the Implementation of the Youth Guarantee, the Youth Employment Initiative	10
3.3 Third step: Analyse the Implementation of two/three particular measures introduced/financed with explicit notion to the Youth Guarantee	13
3.4 Fourth step: Typologise national approach and explain change	14
3.5 Fifth step: Policy Recommendations	15
4 Annex	19
4.1 Guidelines for analysis of policy documents	19
4.2 Guidelines for analysis of interviews with national key experts	19
References	23

## 1 The European Youth Guarantee in Context

The *Youth Guarantee* is a new approach for tackling youth unemployment which ensures that all young people under 25 – whether registered with employment services or not – receive a good-quality, concrete offer within 4 months of leaving formal education or becoming unemployed (EU Commission 2015). Good-quality offers, according to the European Commission, should add value and improve a young person's prospects in the education and labour markets, i.e. a job, apprenticeship, traineeship, or continued education. It should help to integrate young people into the labour market to ensure that they do not fall back into unemployment or inactivity. From the perspective of an outcome-based approach, good quality means that the person does not return to inactivity or unemployment afterwards (EC 2015: 5). The offer should thus be made in the form of a package comprising advice and an action plan tailored to the young person's specific needs (BMAS 2014). The Youth Guarantee requires a balance of short-term measures combined with longer-term structural reforms to bring about a systematic improvement in the school-to-work transition and for combatting segmentation (European Commission 2015; see also Bussi/Geyer 2013; Escudero/Lopez Mourelo 2015).

In its Communication on the 'Youth on the Move' program (2010), the EC already encouraged member states to introduce Youth Guarantee schemes. The implementation, however, was limited and in 2013 the EU initiated the 'Youth Guarantee'. It is linked to the 'Europe 2020' Strategy by contributing to the objectives that 75 per cent of people aged 20-64 years should be in work, that early school dropout rates should be under ten percent and that at least twenty million people should be lifted out of poverty and social exclusion (Council 2013). Thereby, the Youth Guarantee is accompanied by additional EU-initiatives: the *European Alliance for Apprenticeships* (since 2013 ) and the *Quality Framework for Traineeships* (since 2014) are supposed to be carried out in close partnership with social partners and the relevant stakeholders (European Commission 2015). To improve the school-to-work transitions, for example joint-up initiatives or partnership approaches amongst education and employment authorities are required (European Commission 2015). Furthermore, the financing of the Youth Guarantee suggests the combination of national and European funds, such as the *European Social Fund* or the *Youth Employment Initiative (YEI)*<sup>1</sup> (European Commission 2015).

---

<sup>1</sup> The purpose of the YEI is to provide extra financial support for the implementation of measures supporting youth employment, notably the Youth Guarantee, in those regions that are most affected by youth unemployment (NUTS 2 level, youth unemployment rate above 25 % in 2012). Out of the 28 EU Member States, 20 Member States have regions that are eligible for YEI support. YEI funding consists of a budget of 3.2 billion, which requires no co-financing at national level. An additional 3.2 billion will originate from the ESF allocations to the Member States for the 2014-2020 programming period for 2014 and 2015. All other member countries

In contrast to the Youth Guarantee, YEI is under the investment priority to be directed towards NEETs (Not in Education, Employment or Training). Moreover, it directly supports individuals and does not aim at reforming structures in the countries.

The guiding ideas of the *European Employment Strategy*, the OECD's *Jobs Strategy* (Casey 2004) as well as the Youth Guarantee can be seen to be rooted in the normative paradigms of an activating labour market policy (Gilbert/Van Voorhis 2001; Oecd 1990) and a social investment welfare state (Giddens 1998; Morel et al. 2012). Here, the activation and labour market integration of all people capable to work and the focus on human capital formation with a particular emphasis on children and youth is highlighted (Jenson 2010). Critics have indicated that enabling policies are closely linked with enforcement (Dingeldey 2007; Torfing 1999). Furthermore, an understanding of social policy to produce an 'added value' could also be meant 'only' to avoid transfer payments for long term unemployed (Nolan 2013). Compared to former welfare policies that followed a Keynesian welfare state paradigm, however, the new ideas also include the need for structural reforms concerning the governance of social policy intervention and its administration.

Also Employment policies of member states have been transformed in line with the activating and social investment welfare state paradigm for nearly twenty years. As a result, however, we see different reform trajectories and paths of transformation that often relate to different welfare state types (Bonoli 2010; Clasen/Clegg 2011; Dingeldey 2007, 2011; Hemerijck 2013; Berkel van et al. 2011). Furthermore, we must consider that there exists a great variety of different educational and vocational training systems as well as of youth policy (EC et al. 1995; Powell/Solga 2008; Wallace/Bendit 2009). Even labour market responses to the financial crisis have been shown to be diverse (Greve 2012). We may therefore expect that the implementation of the Youth Guarantee in the member states will influence changes in national policy regimes, depending, however, on the type of youth employment and educational policy already established in the respective country.

Additionally, the outcome-oriented approach of the Youth Guarantee allows that member states can implement programs according to national and local circumstances. As in federal states educational policies are often subject to regional competence and social services are provided by local authorities, we may assume that not only policy arenas on the European and national level but also on the regional and local level are important (Heidenreich/Rice 2016). Moreover, we have several relevant policy fields like education, vocational training and youth (employment) that are influenced coined by a variety of stakeholders such as public actors,

---

must rely exclusively on national funds and general funding by the European Social Fund to implement the Youth Guarantee.

employers, social partners and third sector organisations. Vertical and horizontal coordination therefore seems to be relevant with respect to successful implementation.

These considerations substantiate the above mentioned research questions. In order to answer these questions, in the following section we will outline the theoretical background that guides our research.

## 2. Theoretical background

### *Multi-level Governance approach and vertical coordination*

About twenty years ago, Marks and Hooghe (2004) developed the concept of MLG to understand the entanglement between the domestic and international levels of authority, particularly applied to (certain) areas of European policy making (Stephenson 2013). Historically, the emergence of the concept coincided with the increasing importance of regions due to the reform of EU structural funds in 1988 that required the administration of funding by supranational, national and subnational (regional/local) actors. In subsequent years the Commission pushed also for agreement with non-state actors (trade unions, environmental organisations and voluntary and community groups) (Bache 2012: 629). In this context, the concept of MLG was meant to analyse a *“system of continuous negotiation among nested governments at several territorial tiers – supranational, national, regional and local - as the result of a broad process of institutional creation and decisional reallocation that has pulled some previously centralised functions of the state up to the supranational level and some down to the local/regional level”* (Marks 1993:392).

Since 2001, the introduction of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) as a ‘soft’ policy instrument encouraged co-ordination, benchmarking and best practice without threats of sanctions. The OMC is the dominant form of governance for European social and labour market policies in sensitive areas where member states have not been willing to grant the EU political powers. However, the recently introduced procedures according to the European Semester have a more binding character in some policy areas (Costamagna 2013). Further instruments of vertical coordination are related to the funding procedures of the European Social Fund or particular programs like the *Youth Employment Initiative*.

In an analytical framework therefore, different institutional settings between the member states as well as the division of competences and procedural regulations of decision making between national, regional and local governments and actors have to be considered (see for example Catalano/Graciano 2016). Furthermore, it should be reflected that the so called ‘programme countries’, such as for example Greece, are subject to ‘hard’ requirements according to compromises for budget consolidation that may also influence employment policies.

### *Horizontal coordination*

In social policy systems in which non-employment is treated in a passive manner, fragmentation of policy fields and administrations is hardly recognised as a problem. As the Youth Guarantee is strongly related to an activating or a social investment approach, it requires coordination between different services and administrative organisations (Champion/Bonoli 2012; Heiderneich/Aurich-Beerheide 2014). Within the governance literature this was named a ‚joint-up approach‘ or ‚holistic governance‘ (6 2004; 6 et al. 2002): the importance of social services and their tailoring to individual needs implies that various policy measures regulated in different policy fields and governed by different administrations have to be coordinated. This step may include the adjustment of legal rules or inter-agency collaboration between different policy fields as for example labour market and educational measures with youth welfare services or/and family policy. The coordination challenges could imply mergers of different administrations in order to create a ‚one-stop-institution‘ which provides a single gateway (Minas 2014). Also the cooperation of different public and private actors - such as social partners, crafts and public authorities - in form of ‚pacts‘ or agreements could help to implement the Youth Guarantee. These forms of cooperation could create rules for governing vocational training and/or (additional) supply of apprenticeships. Furthermore, partnership approaches between different administrative systems can help to facilitate for example school to work transitions (Berkel van et al. 2011; Graaf/Sirovátka 2012).

### *Combining MLG with new institutionalism*

Among others, Schmitter/Kim (2005) and Bache (2012) criticised the MLG approach due to its lack of explanatory power and insight. As a response, a combination of a multi-level governance approach with other, e.g. neo-institutionalist theories, is suggested to provide a deeper understanding of the evolvment and dynamics of policy processes within the EU (George 2004: 117-118). The respective approaches underline that the relevance of MLG seems to develop fully only when the entire process of policy-making is mirrored. This includes compliance (Falkner et al. 2005) and implementation of different policy measures, respectively.

To investigate the influence of the EU on national policies and its outcomes it seems appropriate to combine MLG with an actor-centred approach (Bonoli, Giuliano 2001; Bonoli, Giuliano 2010; Scharpf 2000), historical institutionalism (Pierson 2000; Thelen 1999) and/or discursive institutionalism (Schmidt/Radaelli 2006; Schmidt 2010). The combination allows for addressing the variety of institutional settings as well as discourses that may influence the strategies of both collective and individual actors with respect to the development of youth employment and educational policies. Furthermore, different economic situations that go

along with the financial crisis as well as different reform trajectories according to the activation paradigm can be integrated. Examples would not only be mergers of benefit agencies and employment services (Bredgaard/Larsen 2005; Finn et al. 2005) but also established activation rules and programs for the young unemployed. Reflecting on the emerging differences of vertical and horizontal coordination it can be explored what works best to successfully integrate different groups of young people into the labour market.

#### *Drawing on existing typologies in order to assess change*

Assessing 'change' requires the definition of a starting-point. Moreover, 'closeness' or 'distance' of national policies and institutional settings to the new European policy approach should be analysed in detail. It is important to acknowledge the differences of educational systems, vocational training and different types of activating labour market reforms in the 1990s, respectively after the financial crisis in 2008 as the 'starting point' in order to assess most recent changes that may be due to the implementation of the Youth Guarantee. In order to do this systematically, we use different typologies of active labour market policy. Bonoli identifies two contrasting types:

1. a mixture of '*upskilling*' and '*employment assistance*' to emphasise training, placement services, counselling and job subsidies
2. '*occupation*', a type that uses job creation schemes overall in the public sector or incentive reinforcement such as tax credits, in work benefits and benefit conditionality) (Bonoli 2010).

Within another typology, additionally, different types of governance are highlighted: These types of governance concern the division of responsibilities regarding decision making, financing and service provision at the national, subnational and local level in different policy fields and between different actors (public, private/market oriented and third-sector organisations). Furthermore, the forms of coordination between these actors are differentiated as hierarchy/regulation, markets/financial incentives, and negotiation/networks (Dingeldey 2011). Most important for enduring success of activating policy, however, seems cross-policy field coordination to create a holistic approach to individual enablement. Hence, policies that combine the support for individual labour market participation and increase human capital formation through an holistic approach are typologised as '*encompassing social enablement*'. It is set against '*making work pay*' which prioritises labour market integration and focuses on the coordination of financial incentives to work. A third type is characterised to promote '*flexibilisation and institutional dualisation*', which goes along with labour market segmentation (Dingeldey 2011).

Drawing on these distinctions we can classify national policies as well as changes due to reforms. Although we try to answer the outlined questions concerning the influence of the

European integration on national policy making, the research focus always has to be open to the fact that the European employment policy, respectively the Youth Guarantee, may have no or little impact on the development of labour market policies on national and subnational level. Hence, the impact of European policies should always be mirrored in line with other influential explanations for change or continuity of national/subnational policies.

3. Subject of empirical analysis, methods and data

We will use a case-study approach to analyse how European strategies to combat youth unemployment and early job insecurity are implemented in nine European countries (BG, CZ, DE, EL, ES, PL, UK as EU member states plus CH and NO as non-members)<sup>2</sup>. A major aim is to identify patterns of vertical and horizontal coordination that work best with respect to the integration of different groups of young people into the labour market. Empirical results are drawn from official documents, existing national policy/program evaluations, secondary country-based literature, and expert interviews with 4–5 key officials from agencies involved in the implementation of these programs.

In order to answer the above mentioned research questions we would like to proceed in five steps:

<b>1</b>	<b>Mirror the discourse on the Youth Guarantee in the countries</b>	about 4 pages
<b>2</b>	<b>Assess the implementation of the Youth Guarantee</b>	about 10 pages
<b>3</b>	<b>Analysis of the implementation of two/three particular measures</b>	up to 12 pages
<b>4</b>	<b>Typologise national approach and explain change (assess influence of EU-policy)</b>	about 6 pages
<b>5</b>	<b>Suggestions for policy improvements</b>	about 1 page

---

<sup>2</sup> As Norway and Switzerland are non-EU members we can not analyse how they implement the European YG. As Norway has a national Youth Guarantee we are interested in how this is discussed and implemented. Furthermore, commonalities and differences between the European and the Norwegian YG or mutual references could be highlighted. With respect to Switzerland, we would like to know if there was or is a national discourse reflecting the introduction of a youth guarantee similar to the European one. Also countries where the youth guarantee has not been implemented yet should mirror the respective discourse and indicate reasons for the delay of introduction.

### **3.1 First step: mirror the discourse and political process**

Here, the national policy discourse on the implementation of the Youth Guarantee and YEI (if applicable) should be mirrored within policy documents, policy statements of different collective actors (ministries, social partners, etc.) and/or secondary studies as well as newspaper articles. In accordance with the MLG approach also differences within corporate actors (social partners, specific institutions) according to different regions/governance levels should be lined out, if relevant.

Acceptance and discourse of EU policy measures in the country and by specific actors:

- a. Are the goals, regulations and opportunities formulated and provided by the EU accepted in the country and by specific actors (e.g. use of funds etc.)?
- b. What are the most urgent reforms discussed in order to combat youth unemployment, respectively to implement the Youth Guarantee and YEI (if applicable)?
- c. How is the involvement of different stakeholders discussed in the national context? Do different actors promote different goals to implement the YG or YEI?
- d. Which goals / strategies have successfully pushed through? Has the Youth Guarantee produced some added value with respect to the coordination of different measures?

Please indicate if the discourse gives priority to structural reforms, as for example to create one step-administration, or to the expansion of educational measures and/or vocational training or others. If EU-policies are not relevant to the discourse or the implemented reforms, indicate what were the dominant subjects and goals in the discourse, respectively the 'drivers' for reform.

### **3.2 Second step: assess the implementation of the Youth Guarantee, the Youth Employment Initiative and Youth on the Move**

The information given should go beyond the national implementation plan of the Youth Guarantee and draw information from further national policy documents and statistics as well as from secondary studies<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, we suppose that on an enlarged empirical basis some assessments concerning the relevance of focal points of policies and/or governance instruments could be given. We would like you to seek information on how the 'good quality offer' of the youth guarantee is defined in national context. We expect further information on how national, local and possibly federal state governments are involved in implementing the Youth Guarantee and whether vertical coordination works well or if problems occur.

---

<sup>3</sup> As Youth on the Move is a rather particular program, we expect only a brief comment on its implementation.

Additionally, we would like to know if implementation reflects that different policy fields (education, labour market, family, and youth policy) have to be coordinated in order to enable smooth transitions from school to work or if different administrations are coordinated in order to support young people at risk, e.g. employment offices and youth assistance.

It should be documented if and to what extent funding offered by the European Social Fund, the Youth Employment Initiative, special credit programs of the European Investment Bank as well as reclassified structural fund resources have been used. Further information with respect to the application for EU-Funding from 'user-side' could be gained on the basis of interviews.

Please make sure that you give us information on the points below.

**a) Target groups**

- Is a particular age group approached? Who are the target groups, i.e. NEETs, migrants, people with low educational background, young men and women with children, ethnic groups and/or people in disadvantaged urban districts?
- How are non-registered unemployed people reached by measures of the YG/unemployment policy measures in general?

**b) Focal points of measures and structural measures/instruments of YG/YEI**

- *'Job first' measures*
  - Employer based, i.e. employment subsidies (to create additional employment), flexible forms of employment, particular low wage rates?
  - Individual based, i.e. wage subsidies/guarantees, in-work or in-training benefits, else?
  - How important is registration in order to receive funding/participate in measures?
- *'Enabling' measures, predominantly related to education and training*
  - General education, supply vocational training, counselling and advice (long term/short term measures)
  - provide pathways to (re-)enter education and training, particular with respect to drop-outs (leading to a recognised vocational / educational qualification)?
  - Do sanctions and enforcement play a role? How far is 'choice' guaranteed?
- *Structural reforms*
  - To create one-stop-agencies;
  - Reform / regulate VET and apprenticeships systems, etc.
  - Building up partnership-based approaches
  - Other
- *Promotion of labour mobility*
  - Promotion of labour mobility within the country
  - Services and schemes that encourage young people to move and work within the EU
- *Other Instruments*
  - Are individual action plans used? If IAPs are used please specify on the procedure.

**c) Quality, Innovations and Evaluation**

- Is the YG- qualitative offer of employment or education (planned to be) implemented in form of a binding guarantee (young people have the right to such promotion)? How is the good-quality, concrete offer defined within national policy? Do young people receive the offer that is promised? Is there an agency to control the respective rights and quality?
- Are gender relevant issues reflected, i.e. different training patterns for 'female' professions, reconciliation of work and family?
- To what extent do these offers include importance of freedom and choice in leading the life that young people value?
- Was something substantially 'new' introduced within the portfolio of labour market policy due to the implementation of the Youth Guarantee?
- How is the success of the respective measures mirrored? Are evaluation results already available and what do they prove?

**d) Actors and coordination**

- Which actors are involved in the implementation (also non-state actors)? Are social partners and/or other non-state actors involved in decision making concerning the programs and/or their implementation? At what level? Is their participation legally guaranteed or subject of voluntarism?
- Mode of governance: Do 'hard' or 'soft' forms of governance dominate? Is the Youth Guarantee really implemented as a social right (legally binding)?
- How are European programs coordinated vertically (involvement/ share of responsibilities concerning regulation, implementation, financing between EU/national/regional/local level)?  
How are the European programs coordinated horizontally (across different policy fields, involving non-state actors)? Are multiple forms of exclusion prevented by particular forms of horizontal coordination, holistic governance?
- Which forms of coordination are used, i.e. creation of networks or pacts (name participants), financial incentives (tax deductions) to firms/individuals or subsidies to firms, legal regulation?
- Please try to assess the governance type of structural reform: privatisation, decentralisation, coordination (networks with social partners, joint-administration, etc.).
- In how far does the situation of enduring economic crisis play a role in the process?

### e) Finance and budget

- Has EU-Funding for youth policies increased in the respective country with the Youth Guarantee? What is the relation between EU funding and national funding?
- How much money does the respective country get from different EU financial sources? How is this money distributed to regional/local entities? Are problems named for application/co-financing by particular regions/small communities?
- In case the country receives EU funds from YEI, how is it programmed?
  - as a dedicated operational program (consistent exclusively of dedicated YEI priority axes, with the exception of a possible technical assistance priority axis)
  - as a dedicated priority axis (composed only of the specific allocation for the YEI and the ESF corresponding support)
  - as a part of one or more priority axes

### ***3.3 Third step: analyse the implementation of two/three particular measures introduced/financed with explicit notion to the Youth Guarantee***

In order to get a well-founded impression on horizontal and vertical coordination, we suggest an in depth analysis of the implementation of two/three particular measures across the different governance levels, including the experience of local actors. It is therefore important to choose two/three different measures that are typical or most significant for your country to implement the Youth Guarantee. One of these measures, however, should explicitly target the group of NEETs. Please make sure these measures receive co-financing by ESF or YEI funds.

4

Please try to select different types of measures, namely a structural measure and/or a program to support education and/or labour market integration and/or advice to ease transitions from school to work. Give some reasoning for your selection and indicate the quantitative relevance of it (how many participants are included in the program and as share of all participants in active measures) and assess its success with respect to labour market integration (if countable) of young unemployed on an annual basis. By structural measure we refer to governance reforms such as the establishing of 'common focal points' to ensure coordination between organisations concerned or 'one-stop-agencies'. The establishment of

---

<sup>4</sup> As not being EU members Norway and Switzerland should assess 2-3 relevant national measures in the field of youth unemployment (most similar to those suggested to be analysed with respect to the Youth Guarantee in the EU countries) and their horizontal and vertical coordination on different government levels. For Switzerland we would suggest to indicate the coordination between the national level and the Canton (if there is none, this is also a result) and the local level. You could select a Canton that may give the opportunity to have measures similar to those in the YG to make sure that there is a comparison possible. If, like in Greece, YG-measures have not been implemented yet, we suggest similar proceedings concerning the selection of relevant other European or national measures and their implementation.

Additionally, in all countries the influence of other European recommendations concerning policy reforms should be analysed if they have a clear impact on labour market policy, respectively the employment/unemployment situation of young people.

a registration system for unemployed young people would also be considered as a structural measure.

The analysis should be directed to answer the following questions on the basis of policy documents, secondary analysis and the planned expert interviews.

- a. Which institutions/actors are governing the program/structural reform (responsibility, coordination, implementation);
- b. If and how does the structure of financing influence the implementation process?
- c. Do the public actors on local level, i.e. the public employment service, have the ability to implement the program on their own or do they need to cooperate with other actors (employers, social partners, service provider), possibly in other policy fields (for example programs of youth assistance, particular regulations for transfers)?
- d. How is this cooperation organised and does it work?
- e. Do problems occur with respect to horizontal or vertical coordination or is success related to particular forms of coordination, i.e. involvement of social partners, etc.? If there are differences between the respective programs/targets– what works best within the country?
- f. What are the outcomes of the programs, i.e. how are the NEETs addressed and reached, can improvements be noticed with respect to other target groups, indicators?

### ***3.4 Fourth step: typologise national approach and explain change (assess influence of EU-policy and others)***

Adopting the above mentioned typologies to the subject of youth policies, educational and vocational training systems we may characterise each country. This will enable us to assess if the implementation of the Youth Guarantee has induced changes to national policies. Drawing on results from WP 3, D 3.4 and on the second and third step analysis in this paper, we can easily develop a country's policy profile before the implementation of the Youth Guarantee in 2013 and at present along the following criteria (see table 1 below). This step is meant as a heuristic instrument to summarise our results and conclude towards a focal point. As we suppose that national policy profiles often include different elements, we might interpret each criterion on a continuum between weak, medium and strong commitment/follow up.

Please write a short paragraph to each item so that we are able to follow your assessment. If classification is not possible, write a brief note. You may point out differences between policy discourse and implementation. For example, in Germany improving 'education and training' is a major goal but neither spending nor participants in certain measures increase. Furthermore, you may outline if named changes in programs or governance are related to the introduction of the Youth Guarantee or due to other influences, such as problem pressure, new (party composition of changing) governments etc.. Of course you may also mention other

EU policies such as financial restrictions through crisis policy. If there are hardly any changes, please try to explain this fact as well.

Finally, the analysis should be used to answer the following questions:

- a. How would you characterise the youth policy in your country before and after 2013 when using the above mentioned policy types?
- b. Have substantial changes of national policies been implemented since 2013? Can they be qualified as path breaking changes? Do they create new institutional structures like “youth training agency” or change of norms, beliefs, social fabric of ideas that guide policy content?
- c. Can these changes be connected to the introduction of the European Youth Guarantee, respectively processes of mutual learning within the EU and/or were policies related to EU crisis management most important? What influence did the economic situation and crisis management in general have, on the development of youth employment policies? What other influences were dominant, possibly national politics?
- d. Did the closeness/divergence of established national youth policies create advantages for the implementation of the Youth Guarantee (getting access to EU-funds)? Does closeness/divergence go along with huge commitment to fully implement EU policies or create resistance to (further) progress?

### ***3.5 Fifth step: policy recommendations***

What policy/governance improvements would you or respectively interview partners suggest both on national and on EU level?

### ***Further proceedings***

All this will enable us to answer comparative questions such as:

- How do implementation processes and structures differ within EU member states and their regions regarding youth employment policy?
  - actors (national, regional, local; public and/or private actors)
  - centralised or decentralised implementation
  - other policy fields involved (education, family...)
- Under what conditions does multi-level coordination work best/are EU policies likely to succeed

**Table 1: Typologising Youth (employment) policies<sup>5</sup>**

(broadly based on Bonoli 2010; Dingeldey 2011 and Graaf/Sirovátka 2012)

POLICY OBJECTIVES	before 2013			2016			Change influenced by		Comment
	strong	medium	weak	Strong	medium	weak	YG	other	
<p><b>Work first approach</b> Flexible forms of employment as 'bridge' Pricing young workers into jobs: age-related (minimum) wages</p> <p><b>Occupation</b> job subsidies public employment Other</p>									
<p><b>social security/financial incentives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- familialised support (parents plus/without child allowances etc.)</li> <li>- individual social transfers</li> <li>- transfers during educational attainment</li> <li>- in-work or /in-education-benefits</li> <li>- sanctions for non-compliance</li> <li>- other</li> </ul>									
<p><b>employment assistance</b> short term measures such as: placement services, counselling</p>									
<p><b>Upskilling/enabling</b> Encouraging training/ formation of human capital as long term measure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- within general school-system</li> <li>- within vocational training system</li> <li>- as further training</li> </ul> <p>in general and/ or as particular part of employment policy pathways back to education Other</p>									
<p><b>Target groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- according to educational level</li> <li>- NEETs</li> <li>- People with migration background</li> <li>- young parents</li> <li>- women</li> <li>- other</li> </ul>									

<sup>5</sup> Please note that you answered many aspects of this table in the already completed steps 1-4. Please feel free to write and give comments inside the table.

<b>GOVERNANCE and vertical coordination</b>									
<b>Centralisation of/most relevant level of regulatory competences</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General education</li> <li>- Vocational training</li> <li>- Youth employment policy</li> </ul> <b>Centralisation of funding/most relevant level of funding for</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General education</li> <li>- Vocational training</li> <li>- Youth employment policy</li> </ul>									
<b>Forms of cooperation between actors on vertical axes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- hierarchy</li> <li>- negotiation, network</li> <li>- other</li> </ul> Relevance of non-state actors <sup>a</sup>									
<b>GOVERNANCE and horizontal coordination</b>									
vocational training system as intermediary institution between school and work									
<b>...between different policy fields</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- organised/institutionalised school-to-work transitions</li> <li>- employment policy and youth welfare policy</li> <li>- employment policy and family policy</li> <li>- alternative paths from work back to education</li> <li>- other</li> </ul> <b>...within administration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- fragmented access to different services/transfers</li> <li>- creation of one-stop institution/single gateway</li> <li>- other</li> </ul>									
<b>Forms of cooperation between actors on horizontal axes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>hierarchy</li> <li>market</li> <li>negotiation, network (i.e. social pacts)</li> <li>other</li> </ul> Relevance of non-state actors <sup>a</sup>									

<p><b>Governance ‘hard’ or ‘soft’ forms of coordination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ employment/educational guarantee as social right (binding)</li> <li>○ involvement of social partners/ other non-state actors <sup>a</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- designing youth guarantee</li> <li>- implementing youth guarantee as mandatory (law) /informal /no involvement</li> </ul> </li> </ul>									
<p><b>OUTCOMES</b></p>									
<p>Improvement of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ youth unemployment</li> <li>○ NEET rate</li> <li>○ Educational attainment (stratification)</li> </ul> <p>by gender/migration/early parenthood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Segmentation of labour market <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- distribution of flexible forms of employment</li> <li>- low wage employment</li> <li>- according to sector/profession</li> <li>- according to age and gender</li> </ul> </li> </ul>									

<sup>a</sup> Please note the important actors

## 4 Annex

### **4.1 Guidelines for analysis of policy documents**

On the basis of secondary analysis and the analysis of policy documents, the national adaption of the proposed interview guideline for policy experts should be elaborated within each country.

Sources for analysis of policy documents:

*National implementation plans of the Youth Guarantee*

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1090&langId=en>

*Operational Programs (at national and/or regional level)*

<http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=576&langId=en>

*Partnership agreements*

[http://ec.europa.eu/contracts\\_grants/agreements/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/agreements/index_en.htm)

*National policy documents*

Such as policy/program evaluations, secondary country-based literature, newspaper articles. policy documents of the different organisations/ministries etc.

### **4.2 Guidelines for analysis of interviews with national key experts**

Identifying and approaching interviewees:

To identify the interviewee it might be helpful to take the actual policy measure in the framework of the Youth Guarantee as a point of departure. Four to five national key stakeholders from agencies involved in the implementation of the Youth Guarantee should be selected for interviews. We suggest the following agencies:

1. *Government agencies* which are in charge of policy making such as Ministry of Labour and/or Education (where appropriate at regional level); public authority in charge of establishing and coordinating the Youth Guarantee
  - Questions about functioning of the policies, target groups etc.

2. *Government committees* such as Affairs of the European Union, Youth or Labour and Social Affairs (where appropriate at regional level)
  - Questions about origin and effects of the policy, functioning of the policies etc.
3. *Public employment services* and / or *private employment offices* with a comprehensive understanding of the selected program
  - Questions about program implementation
4. *Social partners* such as trade unions, employers' organisations, Chamber of Commerce
  - Questions about participation and influence in policies and measures
5. *Other relevant stakeholders*<sup>6</sup> such as youth organisations, social welfare organisations or others

As the country context differs, the national team will know best which agencies to approach for interviews. However, make sure to give reasons for the approach chosen.

#### When approaching the interviewees:

- Adapt contact letters to the individual respondents
- Link to the Negotiate webpage
- Follow ethical rules and guidelines in your country

It is up to you if you conduct the interviews as face to face interviews, as skype interviews or as phone interviews. Please add a written summary of each expert interview to your country report. Please make sure that the summary addresses all parts of the interview guideline and that you include at least 2-3 citations from each expert in the report.

#### Interview Guideline

The questions will give you an orientation. However, the questions need to be adapted to the specific country context and institutional setting. In case the European YG does not apply to your country (Norway, Switzerland and possibly Greece), please adapt questions to the national context. However, when interviewing, please make sure to also ask questions regarding the 2-3 particular measures in the context of YG/selected out of the program of measures in your country.

---

<sup>6</sup> The firm level can be included, but is not requested in general. Please give reasons why to include the firm level and why this is relevant in your country. Please consider that we do not have many expert-interviews, and that administrative or collective actors do have priority.

*Government agencies and committees, public employment offices, social partners and other organisations (youth organisation, social welfare organisations)*

#### A. Organisation of the interviewee

- What is the role and mandate of your organisation in relation to EU measures in the field of youth unemployment?
- What are the specific tasks of your department/unit? (policy design, policy implementation, monitoring, evaluation)
- What in your view are important policies in your country to deal with youth unemployment?

#### B Policy discourse on YG and YEI

- Was your organisation involved in devising policy measures? Which other stakeholders were involved? Did they promote different goals to implement the YG? Which goals have successfully pushed through?
- What were the main options discussed when implementing the YG?
- What was the role and impact of the EU in the devising process? What was the role of actors at national, regional and local level?
- In hindsight, what could have been done differently?

#### C Implementation of YG and YEI – and selected measures

Please make sure that the answers to these questions refer to the YG and YEI in general as well as to the selected measures – as far as reasonable

- What have national and federal governments done so far / or are currently doing to implement the YG?
- Are the programs new? Or do they replace a former instrument? What is new and what are the changes?
- How is the qualitative job offer within the YG implemented?
- Which actors are responsible for the implementation and coordination of the program? At which level are the actors located (national, regional, local)?
- How is the program coordinated horizontally? Which policy fields are concerned? Are social services included in policy implementation?
  - To what extent does horizontal coordination across different policy fields (education, labour market, family, and youth policy...) enable better labour market integration of young people at risk such as NEETs and non-registered unemployed, migrants, young men and women with children, people with low educational qualification etc. (depending on the measure)? Are they able to prevent multiple exclusion?
- How is the *partnership approach* implemented in your country? Is your organisation part of it?

- Do you see any differences in measures in the field of youth unemployment that are (co-)financed by the EU or that are financed only by national budget? (Please note, if measures are only co-financed by EU)
- From your perspective, to what extent are these policies successful?
- What are the main challenges in implementing YG measures?
- With respect to vertical and horizontal coordination, what has worked well?

## References

- 6, P.** (2004): Joined-up Government in the Western World in Comparative Perspective: A Preliminary literature Review and Exploration, in: *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14 (1), pp. 103-138.
- 6, P./Leat, D./Seltzer, K./Stoker, G.** (2002): *Towards Holistic Governance. The new Reform Agenda*, Houndmills/ New York: Palgrave.
- Bache, I.** (2012): Multi-level governance in the European Union, in: Levi-Faur, D. (Hrsg.): *Oxford Handbook of Governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 628-641
- Berkel van, R./Graaf de, W./Sirovátka, T.** (2011): *The Governance of Active Welfare States in Europe*, Houndmills/Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- BMAS** (2014): *National Implementation Plan to Establish the EU Youth Guarantee in Germany*, Rostock: Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
- Bonoli, G.** (2001): Political Institutions, Veto Points, and the Process of Welfare State Adaptation, in: Pierson, P. (Hrsg.): *The New Politics of the Welfare State*, Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bonoli, G.** (2010): The Political Economy of Active Labor-Market Policy, in: *Politics & Society* 38 (4), pp. 435-457.
- Bredgaard, T./Larsen, F.** (Hrsg.) (2005): *Employment Policy from Different Angles*, Copenhagen: DJ ðF Publishing Copenhagen.
- Bussi, M./Geyer, L.** (2013): *Youth Guarantees and recent Developments on Measures againts Youth Unemployment. A Mapping Exercise. Background Analysis*. ETUI.
- Casey, B. H.** (2004): The OECD Jobs Strategy and the European Employment Strategy: Two Views of the Labour Market and the Welfare State, in: *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 10 (3), pp. 329-352.
- Champion, C./Bonoli, G.** (2012): Institutional Fragmentation and Coordination Initiatives in Western European Welfare States, in: *Journal for European Social Policy* 21 (4), pp. 323-334
- Clasen, J./Clegg, D.** (Eds.) (2011): *Regulating the Risk of Unemployment. National Adaptions to Post Industrial Labour Markets in Europe*, Houndmills/Basingstoke, Hampshire: Oxford University Press.
- Costamagna, F.** (2013) *The European Semester in action: Strengthening economic policy coordination while weakening the social dimension? . Working Paper-LPF 2013.05/Centro Einaudi. Laboratorio di Politica Comparata e Filosofia Pubblica. Turin.*  
<http://www.centroeinaudi.it/lpf/working-papers/wp-recent.html>, download 05/01/2016.
- Council (2013).** Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth Guarantee (2013/C 120/01).
- Catalano, S. L./Graziano, P.** (2016): The Local Usages of Europe in Social Cohesion Policies: A Comparative Analysis, in: Heidenreich, M./Rice, D. (Hrsg.): *Integrating Social and Employment Policies in Europe. Active Inclusion and Challenges for Local Welfare Governance*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, S. 185-210
- Dingeldey, I.** (2007): Between Workfare and Enablement: The Different Paths to Transformation of the Welfare State, in: *European Journal of Political Research* 46 (6), pp. 823-851.

- Dingeldey, I.** (2011): Der aktivierende Wohlfahrtsstaat. Governance der Arbeitsmarktpolitik in Dänemark, Großbritannien und Deutschland, Frankfurt: Campus.
- Escudero, V./ Lopez Mourelo, E.** (2015): The Youth Guarantee program in Europe: Features, implementation and challenges. Research Department Working Paper Nr. 4, Geneva: ILO.
- Europäische Kommission/Eurydice/Cedefop** (Ed.) (1995): Strukturen der allgemeinen und beruflichen Bildung in der Europäischen Union, Brüssel/ Luxemburg: EGKS-EG-EAG.
- European Commission** (2015a): Addressing Youth Unemployment in the EU. Addressing youth unemployment in the EU (26/02/2015) Catalog N. :KE-02-15-145-EN-N <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=7740&type=2&furtherPubs=no>; download 02/05/2016.
- European Commission 2015b**: Frequently Asked Questions about the Youth Guarantee. URL: <https://www.google.de/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwjYvuytubHMAhUBlcAKHftPAbgQFggjMAE&url=http%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fsocial%2FblobServlet%3FdocId%3D11423%26langId%3Den&usg=AFQjCNE7OEP9EyrF01W3SuQl4b6vKR0MTA&bvm=bv.120853415,d.bGs>, download 28.04.2016.
- Falkner, G./Treib, O./Hartlapp, M./Leiber, S.** (2005): Complying with Europe. EU Harmonisation and Soft Law in the Member States, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Finn, D./Knuth, M./Schweer, O./Somerville, W.** (2005): Reinventing the Public Employment Service: The Changing Role of Employment Assistance in Britain and Germany., London: Anglo-German Foundation for the Study of Industrial Society.
- Giddens, A.** (1998): Equality and the Social Investment State, in: Hargreaves, I./Christie, I. (Hrsg.): Tomorrow's Politics. The Third Way and Beyond, London: Demos, pp. 25-40.
- Gilbert, N./Van Voorhis, R. A.** (Hrsg.) (2001): Activating the Unemployed. A Comparative Appraisal of Work-Oriented Policies, New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers
- Graaf de, W./ Sirovátka, T.** (2012). Governance reforms and their impacts on the effects of activation policies, in: International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, Vol. 32 (5/6), pp.353 - 363.
- Greve, B.** (Hrsg.) (2012): The Times They Are Changing? Crisis and the Welfare State, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Heidenreich, M./Aurich-Beerheide, P.** (2014): European Worlds of Inclusive Activation: The Organisational Challenges of Coordinated Service Provision, in: International Journal of Social Welfare 23), S. 6-22
- Heidenreich, M./Rice, D.** (Hrsg.) (2016): Integrating Social and Employment Policies in Europe. Active Inclusion and Challenges for Local Welfare Governance, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Hemerijck, A.** (2013): Changing Welfare States, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenson, J.** (2010): Diffusing Ideas After Neoliberalism: The Social Investment Perspective in Europe and Latin America, in: Global Social Policy 10 (1), pp. 59-84.
- Marks, G.** (1993): Structural policy and multi-level governance in the EC, in: A, C./Rosenthal, G. (Hrsg.): The State of the European Community: The Maastricht Debate and Beyond, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, pp. 391-411.
- Marks, G./Hooghe, L.** (2004): Contrasting visions of multi-level governance, in: Bache, I./Mathew, F. (Hrsg.): Multi-level Governance, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 15-30.

- Minas, R.** (2014): One-Stop Shops: Increasing Employability and Overcoming Welfare State Fragmentation?, in: *International Journal of Social Welfare* 23), S. 40-53
- Morel, N./Palier, B./Palme, J.** (Hrsg.) (2012): *Towards a Social Investment Welfare State?*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Nolan, B.** (2013): What Use is 'Social Investment'?, in: *Journal of European Social Policy* 23 (5), pp. 459-468.
- OECD** (1990): *Labour Market Policies for the 1990s*, Paris: OECD.
- Pierson, P.** (2000): Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics, in: *American Political Science Review* 94 (2), pp. 251-267.
- Powell, J. J. W./Solga, H.** (2008): *Internationalization of Vocational and Higher Education Systems - A Comparative-Institutional Approach*. WZB Discussion Paper SP I 2008-501, Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin.
- Scharpf, F.** (2000): *Interaktionsformen Akteurzentrierter Institutionalismus in der Politikforschung*, Opladen: UTB.
- Schmidt, V. A./ Radaelli, C. M.** (2006). Policy Change and Discourse in Europe: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. *West European Politics* 27(2). pp. 183–210.
- Schmidt, V. A.** (2010). Taking Ideas and Discourse Seriously: Explaining Change Through Discursive Institutionalism as the Fourth 'new Institutionalism', *European Political Science Review*, 2(1), pp. 1-25.
- Schmitter, P. C./Kim, S.** (2005): The experience of European integration and the potential for Northeast Asia integration, in: *East-West Center Working Papers* 10), pp. 1-23.
- Stephenson, P.** (2013): Twenty years of multi-level governance: Where Does It Come From? What Is It? Where Is It Going?, in: *Journal of European Public Policy* 20 (6), pp. 817-837.
- Thelen, K.** (1999): Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics, in: *Annual Review of Political Science* 2 (1), pp. 369-404.
- Torfig, J.** (1999): Towards a Schumpeterian Workfare Postnational Regime: Path-Shaping and Path-Dependency in Danish Welfare State Reform, in: *Economy and Society* 28 (3), pp. 369-402.
- Wallace, C./Bendit, R.** (2009): Youth Policies in Europe: Towards a Classification of Different Tendencies in youth Policies in the European Union, in: *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 10 (3), pp. 441-458.

**NEGOTIATE –**  
Negotiating early job-insecurity and  
labour market exclusion in Europe

[www.negotiate-research.eu](http://www.negotiate-research.eu)  
twitter: @NEGOTIATE\_EU  
Facebook: negotiateEU

NOVA - Norwegian Social Research, Oslo  
and Akershus University College  
of Applied Sciences  
(HiOA NOVA)

Bjørn Hvinden  
E-mail: [bjorn.hvinden@nova.hioa.no](mailto:bjorn.hvinden@nova.hioa.no)

## CONSORTIUM MEMBERS

