


**Training and the labour
market: the use of data in
decision-making**



CEDEFOP

**Training and the labour market:
the use of data in decision-making**

Editors: Fernanda Oliveira Reis, Frédérique Rychener

Authors: José Rose, François Pottier

February 1993

First edition, Berlin 1993

Published by:

CEDEFOP

European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training

Jean Monnet House, Bundesallee 22, **D-1000 Berlin 15**

Tel. (030) 88 41 20; Fax (030) 88 41 22 22;

Telex 184 163 eucen d

The Centre was established by Regulation (EEC) No 337/75
of the Council of the European Communities

Preface

The symposium "Training and the Labour Market: The use of data in decision-making", which was organized in March 1991 by the EC Commission (PETRA programme for the vocational training of young people), the research group on education and employment (GREE-CNRS, University of Nancy II) and CEDEFOP is part of the work which CEDEFOP is carrying out on how vocational training systems function in the EC. The symposium provided the opportunity to bring together research workers and statisticians from various Member States, decision-makers and Commission representatives. It gave birth to a number of initiatives both inside and outside CEDEFOP and in so doing has acted as a catalyst in raising questions, in promoting reflection and the exchange of ideas which is indispensable to a comparative approach. Several European research teams took the initiative to set up a "European network on research into social and vocational integration of young people", an activity which CEDEFOP is particularly interested in encouraging and observing. CEDEFOP itself has devoted thought to creating indicators of the relationship between training and employment from a comparative point of view.

This document contains the summary of the work carried out at the symposium as prepared by M. José Rose (GREE-CNRS), a presentation of the network and its activities, compiled by M. François Pottier (CEREQ). To both we would like to extend our cordial thanks.

F. Oliveira-Reis

F. Rychener

Training and the Labour Market: The Use of Data in Decision-making

Report on the Nancy Symposium in March 1992, organized by the GREE, the EEC and CEDEFOP

José Rose

- Research Group on Education and Employment (GREE) -
- Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS)-
- University Nancy II

Introduction

In most Member States of the EEC, numerous studies have been conducted in recent years on the question of the links between initial training and occupational activity. It seemed that the time had come to examine methods of analysis and the use of these methods by policymakers. This was the objective of the Nancy symposium, attended by 40 participants made up of EEC officials, ministerial officials, experts from statistics departments and researchers from the various Member States.

Discussions were to focus on the following aspects:

- the status quo: observation tools, methods, indicators, results;
- the information needs of each agent;
- proposals for new approaches adapted to existing sources able to take account of current changes (closer links between schools and firms, increasing complexity of the integration process) and the various aspects of the problem (quantitative and qualitative, short- and long-term...), which could be generally applicable to the various countries;
- the concept of integration and the respective role of the firms, young people and institutions as agents.

The questions discussed covered theory, methodology and policy.

1) A working party had been convened prior to the actual symposium and each of the participants had been given the task of drawing up a paper. This report is thus based on the contributions of the following: B. Bovin (Denmark), R. Breen (Ireland), V. Cappecchi (Italy), P. Demery (United Kingdom), W. Dickhoff (Netherlands), U. Grünwald (Germany), J. Planas (Spain), J. Rose and Cl. Sauvageot (France) and the statements of all the participants. K. Meier (EEC/Petra), G. Dupont and F. Reis (CEDEFOP), responsible, along with the author, for the coordination of the symposium, also made a major contribution to the drafting of this text.

2) The minutes of the symposium, including all the papers and the summary report, is soon to be published by CEDEFOP.

This report summarizes preparatory work¹ and the discussions at the symposium². Like the symposium, it is structured around the agents in the field of relations between training and employment.

1. The Enterprise Approach

Available data and their use

Although existing information sources are relatively diverse in nature, reflecting the societal differences in training and employment systems, they have nevertheless already contributed significant results, on the basis of which fundamental questions can be raised.

The development of the integration process is familiar today: duration, selectivity, relative position of young people, recruitment channels, mobility... The same applies to the discriminating integration variables: differences according to company size and business sector, the determining influence of human resource management policies (see e.g. the UK case mentioned by P. Demery). On the other hand, it seems expedient to combine, and therefore harmonize, the sources (individual data, administrative or statistical surveys among firms and professional organizations, sectoral or company monographs, forecasting models) and to conduct in-depth, regular research studies.

Key theoretical aspects

Analysis of the practice of integration agents is the first key aspect. What are the respective roles of each of the agents in this field: employers and employers' associations, trade unions, employees, the local environment...? In which fields related to integration do they intervene: mobility, recruitment, promotion, skill management and training? Does the behaviour of the firms actually represent a genuine "policy", a "strategy", or merely a series of ad hoc decisions and reactions to constraints? Further similar questions in this context concern the actual category of the enterprise: its new role in the field of training, development of cultural models...

The second key aspect is analysis of "firms' needs". Constantly used in spontaneous reflection on the integration process ("schools should adapt to the needs of the economy"), this concept is highly contested by researchers. The hierarchy of quantitative needs conceals a high degree of qualitative diversity. Short-term needs, sometimes imperative, cannot be confused with long-term needs, which are more supple, but often unclearly identified due to the lack of

genuine forward planning. The needs at the stage recruitment are not necessarily the same as the actual needs on the job, since the former stem from a market logic and the latter from technical and social labour organization.

Several authors stress the difficulty of pinpointing these needs: the determining influence of the economic climate as far as forecasts are concerned and the advantage of a concerted regional approach, as emphasized by V. Capecchi; the considerable scope of the firms in respect of technical and economic "constraints" and the inevitable time and functional lag between the school and the firm, pointed out by J. Rose.

2. The Young People Approach

Analysis of occupational integration

The conditions governing young people's occupational integration are very familiar in most countries. The elements most frequently used for their description are as follows: type of first employment (skill, precariousness, sector and size of enterprise), the duration of access to the first job, job search techniques, entry and stabilization probability, list of situations from completion of schooling, overall length of the integration process and number of periods of employment or unemployment, match between training specialities and employment. Three types of explanatory variables may be distinguished: individual (sex, age, occupation, social origin, parental occupational status, major events, state of mind), educational (certificate, specialized field, guidance, path) and area-related (local job markets). On this basis, following the example set by J. Planas, more complex variables may be envisaged, e.g. the "social context", the "structural components of routes", "vital components", "attitudes, aptitudes and integration strategies".

All these tools permit identification of the predominant trends common to most countries: late and precarious integration, a transitional process characterized by a succession of periods of different character, considerable differentiations and the risk of marginalization, different strategies according to gender and social origin.

Fundamental questions relating to methodology

With respect to the observation period, the advantage of regular integration and progress surveys was generally stressed, with a preference for longitudinal surveys (integrating quarterly activity schedules) given that integration is a long,

slow and discontinuous process over a period of time. On the other hand, the choice of the survey field and carrier remains open: generation or level of exit? Leavers or new certificate holders? At national or local level? Interviews, postal questionnaires or telephone panels?

The choice of variables is also a delicate matter. Instead of simple variables such as the level and specialized field of training, it would undoubtedly be preferable to use "multidimensional variables" in order to reproduce the interactions and complexity of routes. Moreover, although qualitative aspects are difficult to grasp, they nevertheless remain essential: integration mechanisms, agents' practice. Finally, the concepts must be harmonized in the various countries, simple variables must be found to permit the characterization of situations which are inevitably lacking in transparency and the methods of utilization of the data, notably longitudinal methods, must be improved.

Key theoretical aspects

The concept of integration is in itself called into question as being over-simplified and characterized by an individualistic, instantaneous and "matchist" viewpoint. Integration today is considered as a route, as opposed to a virtually instantaneous point of transit, it is analysed as a process, a socially structured transition, a factor differentiating groups of young people, as one of the forms of mobility. As pointed out by U. Grünewald, two types of transition can therefore be identified (the transition from general to vocational education and the transition from training to working life), with variable courses in the various countries. All this serves to explain certain methodological options: longitudinal approach, joint analysis of all mobilities, consideration of the strategies of the other agents...

3. The Institutional Approach

Although the role of institutions in integration has been given less attention in studies than that of other agents, it is nevertheless crucial since it can be assumed that "the way decisions are taken in the institutions affects integration conditions" (J. Rose).

The role of institutions

The term "institutions" first of all refers to training establishments. With respect to integration, it seems necessary to specify the organization of streams

(hierarchy, bridges) and training achievements (duration and intensity, level and content, location and methods, certificates).

Other institutions are responsible for the guidance and selection of young people. In some countries, e.g. France, these functions are assumed independently: it would therefore be interesting to analyse the influence of guidance services on the course of training programmes and the choices of individuals, the criteria for their decisions and their impact on integration.

A third group of institutions assumes forecasting and planning functions involving various agents who assume both prospecting and evaluation tasks.

Member States already have studies at their disposal on the functioning and role of these various institutions, highlighting certain market trends over recent years. "Growing interpenetration of institutions and functions", "forging closer links between training and production systems", "decentralization of decision-making processes"... It would be interesting to pursue the analysis of specific national characteristics in this field.

Key aspects

Several authors emphasized the fact that institutions do not have the same information needs since these needs vary according to their utilization (information for students, firms or planning agencies) according to the points and levels of decision-making: to quote F. Pottier, "there is no such thing as an ideal survey, but surveys or statistical mechanisms established to reply to a question raised by a given interlocutor". In this respect it may be useful to follow R. Breen's approach and distinguish four levels: instantaneous "supervision" of the situation of young people on the labour market, "analysis" of the impact of the measures, "forecasting" the development of the integration process and the relations between acquired skills and positions in the labour market, "searching" for new tracks. B. Bovin, for her part, underlined the problems in "understanding the decision-making process" (determination of priorities, implementation, evaluation, possible conflicts) and the need to improve communication between data producers and users: "simple and clear presentation", highlighting of "new trends and unexpected results", the interest in "evaluating evaluations".

Two main routes were therefore opened for theoretical reflection. The first concerns the concept of policy evaluation. Recognized today as essential, it nevertheless lacks transparency and reflection is required on the very practice of evaluation, its key aspects, its references, measurement tools (whereby the question of the utility of integration surveys as an indicator of policy effectiveness

is worthy of examination). The second concerns planning: C. Sauvageot, for example, stressed the evolution of practice observed in France, with the transition from an exclusively quantitative method to more complete approaches, better suited to grasp phenomena in their full complexity.

4. Relations between Training and Employment

Dynamics of agents involved

Throughout the symposium, the means of improving information collection were frequently raised: precise definition of objectives and questions, tool evaluation, a permanent dialogue at the various levels, subjects to be covered, useful and less useful data. It was also pointed out that the complexity of each agent needs to be grasped. Thus, young people must be perceived both as individuals, a set of categories and a unified social group. Similarly, "the enterprise as an agent" covers sectoral differences and the complex relations between the social partners. Relations between these agents must also be specified: levels (local, regional, national), nature (trading, contractual, negotiatory), effects (on decision-making, data compilation, planning).

Key aspects of relations between training and employment

The main theoretical problem lies in questioning the "matchist" approach. If integration is analysed as a long, complex process, it is no longer possible to seek a fine and instantaneous match between training and employment.

This is a view shared by many today. The question of matching can in fact be criticized on technical grounds (problems of nomenclatures, hypotheses) and in substance: criticism of the concept of needs, the inevitable gap between the educational and production systems. An alternative approach reflecting the complexity of relations between training and employment, at the same time promoting the decision-making process, remains to be defined.

Moreover, with reference to the current debate among labour economists, one could also question the nature of the relations of work and employment on the basis of the problem of integration. Does the market category reflect mobilities, notably among young people? Are there specific youth markets? Is the deployment of the workforce governed by market or socio-institutional rules?

The combination and confrontation of tools

Particular emphasis was accorded to the wealth of approaches which combine the various tools (opinion polls and analysis of practice, models and qualitative data, monographs and large-scale surveys...) and the various places of observation: young people, firms, institutions... With this in mind, W. Dickoff proposed a distinction between four blocs of data (general education, vocational training, transition, employment) in order to understand "to which labour market status the different types and level of education lead and the vulnerability of the various educational groups on the labour market".

Finally, the question of international comparisons was raised. First of all with respect to guidance: would it not be more effective to establish complex qualitative indicators which each country "would comply with in a different way according to its specific characteristics", rather than trying to seek formally identical indicators at all costs; would it be better to harmonize definitions and indicators, tools or theoretical objectives? Then, with respect to the criteria of comparison of vocational training systems (degrees of decentralization, social partner participation, in-company learning and subordination to the rules of the market) and of employment. And finally, with respect to the interpretation of differences between the various countries and the balance between general trends and fundamental social mechanisms.

Conclusion

As a result of this symposium, a number of provisional conclusions can be drawn in the form of "achievements", "tracks" and "questions".

The main achievements are methodological in nature and concern the nature of surveys (regularity, need for the longitudinal approach, joint surveys among the various agents), the variables (run-down of the variables, the choice of complex indicators, consideration of institutional logics), the approach (the advantage of a permanent dialogue between statisticians and researchers, the need for a precise definition of objectives by those seeking information).

Of the tracks considered propitious, some point in the direction of a more complete analysis of the constituent elements of the relations between training and the labour market: characterization of unemployment, not only by the unemployment rate, but also by its duration and recurrence, analysis of skills in terms of occupational profiles, linking up initial and continuing training, consideration of young people's attitudes, consideration of the costs of integration,

finding tools to permit comprehension of changes, consideration of the question of guidance. Other tracks aim at upgrading the relations among decision-makers (type and place of dialogue, questions to be discussed, means of information utilization) or encouragement of international comparisons: points of confrontation, harmonization methods, interpretation of differences.

Finally, a number of questions need closer examination. The first relates to the production and utilization of data: what priorities should be applied? How can one find the means and places of expressing information needs? How can the effect of socio-economic phenomena on integration be incorporated into analysis? What new planning practices should be introduced? What procedures should be used to evaluate policies and the effectiveness of statistical tools? The second type of question is more theoretical and relates to integration and its relation to mobility as a whole, relations between the agents, the category of firm, the concept of the labour market and of employment and the position of young people in this context, the heterogeneity of young people...

These conclusions testify to the extent of the work already accomplished on the use of data for decision-making in the area of relations between training and the labour market, the advantage of the summary formulated at the symposium and the need to pursue reflection in this field in years to come.

Centre d'études et de recherches sur les qualifications Research network of survey and transition in youth

Summary of the first meeting held in Paris (CNRS-IRESO) 23-25 April 1992
F. Pottier, Co-chairman of the network Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches sur les
Qualifications (CEREQ)

Under the auspices of the EEC and CEDEFOP, the Research Group on Education and Employment (GREE) of the University of Nancy II organized a symposium on "training and the labour market: the use of data in decision-making" in March 1991. The symposium provided an opportunity for a theoretical and methodological evaluation of analyses on the relations between initial training and occupational activity; the linkage between statistical information and decision-making was also studied.¹

The issue was examined at various levels: the evaluation of tools assisting decision-making (surveys, analysis methods, indicators, significant results), analysis of information needs for the various agents in the economic and social world, highlighting of the convergences between countries and new tracks to be followed.

The subject was discussed from three viewpoints: the firms (manpower needs, recruitment, human resource management), individuals (from school to working life) and institutions (programming, evaluation of public policies...).

The approach on the basis of individuals provided a basis for considering the concept of vocational integration and, more widely, of the transition process from school to working life.

There was a general consensus that vocational integration is a process extending from schooling to the first years of working life: "integration today is considered as a route, as opposed to a almost instantaneous point of transit, as a process, a socially-structured transition and a differentiation factor between

1) cf. The minutes of the colloquium (soon to be published by CEDEFOP, Berlin) and in particular the summary report by José Rose, June 1991, GREE, University Nancy II, France

groups of young people, one of a number of forms of mobility”². The elements describing this process are multidimensional: employment and all its various characteristics (status, skills, sector and size of enterprises...), non-employment and its various forms (no working activity, unemployment, various training schemes...). Three types of explanatory variables are generally advanced: individual (sex, age, family and social origin, relational network, personal projects), educational (route, certificate and specialized field of training, training provision) and area-related (local labour market).

Longitudinal surveys are the most apt instruments for examining this process. Most European countries have some experience of such surveys. Very similar in their basic principles (panel or retrospective surveys), they vary in terms of their sample field or size... Such surveys cover relatively wide categories of young school-leavers, age peers, graduates of higher education at regional or national level. The findings of these surveys already constitute a very considerable corpus (cf. the bibliography of the minutes of the Nancy symposium).

With these achievements and in the light of the evident complexity in processing these surveys, José Rose drew up a number of working hypotheses. “Of the tracks considered fruitful, some are geared towards a better analysis of the problem: characterization of unemployment, not only by its rate, but by its duration and its more or less recurrent character, moving from reflection in terms of skills to an analysis of occupational profiles, linking up initial and continuing training, considering young people’s attitudes and projects, taking account of the question of costs, finding tools on the basis of which changes can be understood, as opposed to situations at a given moment, considering the problem of guidance for young people in the educational system and at the point of exit.

Other tracks aim at upgrading relations between decision-makers: specification of the nature of the dialogue, its location, the questions to be answered, reflections on the use of information by decision-makers, seeking forms of collaboration among agents. The third category is aimed at promoting international comparisons: specifying points on which comparison is necessary, interpreting differences among countries, asking what must be harmonized: indicators, tools or objectives”.³

This symposium was the starting point for establishing a “research network on survey and transition in youth”. The activity of this network is based on the utilization and upgrading of longitudinal surveys among young people.

2) José Rose, Summary report op. cit.

What is the reason for this European network on survey and transition in youth?

Studies on transition have developed in all European countries for various reasons. Economic and social changes have affected all the countries and regions of Europe at a different pace throughout the last two decades. The social and vocational transition of young people is linked to this development (longer schooling, later entry into working life, changes in marrying age, increased employment among women...).

Young people have been particularly hit by the rise in unemployment in Europe since the 1970s, albeit to a greater or lesser degree in the various countries/regions. Each country has devised employment policies with varying effects on the social and economic integration of young people. The advent of the Single European Market and the enlargement of the European Community have accelerated the need for comparisons of training and skilling systems.

The institutional links between the educational and production systems have gradually changed with the development of individual and social behaviour and in the light of action by policymakers. This evolution is transforming the modalities of young people's transition.

All the studies conducted in the field point to the need for comparative studies based on longitudinal information about individuals. Given the wealth of existing data, the establishment of a European research network has two purposes: firstly, to establish contacts among researchers engaged in the analysis of the social and vocational transition of young people to promote the dissemination of theoretical and methodological approaches, and secondly to encourage comparative studies between the various Member States of the European Community.

Who should be included in the network? Network and networks?

The network is based on a substantial corpus of existing data and research. For some twenty years, a number of countries or regions have been developing regular longitudinal surveys on the labour market entry of young people. The Scottish young people's survey dates back to 1971, its French counterpart, the "observatoire national français des entrées dans la vie active des jeunes (ONEVEA), was launched in 1976, while the Irish surveys began in 1980. In the course of this period Germany, England and Wales, Italy and the Netherlands

3) José Rose, *op. cit.*, Conclusion

have also carried out similar surveys. More recently, new surveys on specific groups and/or regions have been conducted on an experimental level with the prospect of extension in Belgium, Spain, Portugal and Northern Ireland.

The persons involved in the set-up, monitoring or upgrading of these surveys held a first meeting in Paris from 23-25 April, under the auspices of the CNRS (cf. inset). The aim of this meeting was to set up a European network on transition in youth, by drawing up medium-term research objectives and methodologies for approaches in this field...

The very objective of this network infers very close proximity to two complementary locations of study and research:

- **The Comparative Analysis of Social Mobility in Industrial Nations (CASMIN).** (Young people are merely a very limited sub-set of the persons surveyed, research being focused on mobility in the course of working life);
- **Various teams or research centres which have developed various types of research on youth (behavioural, labour market analysis...).** These teams have drawn up numerous monographs, economic analyses on the functioning of labour markets...

General objectives of the network

The main objective of this network is to provide a European forum for the presentation and discussion of new empirical studies, methodological approaches and new theories on the social and vocational transition of young people between school and working life in the wider sense of the term.

The first meeting with a view to the establishment of a research network on survey and transition in youth took place at the Institut de Recherche sur les Sociétés Contemporaines (IRESCO) of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) 59, rue Pouchet - F-75017 PARIS.

It was organized by the Laboratoire d'Analyse Secondaire et des Méthodes Appliquées à la Sociologie (LASMAS) and the Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches sur les Qualifications (CEREQ).

It was funded by the EC-Commission Task Force Human Resources, Education, Training and Youth, the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS-France), and the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP).

The network is to be a privileged forum for the promotion of new comparative research, involving the following elements:

- the elaboration of an inventory and compilation of information on regular longitudinal surveys among youth, both within and outside the education system;
- examination of possible comparisons on the basis of the available sources (population groups studied, analytical variables, construction of indicators...);
- examination of the possibilities of harmonizing future surveys (survey field, sample size, peer date, survey implementation, surveying methods).

The Paris meeting (23-25 April 1992) and the choice of medium-term objectives

The presentation of existing surveys (cf. table in the annex) and the ensuing studies and research illustrates the extreme diversity and status of progress in the various countries and regions represented.

The concrete objectives and working methods adopted take account of this diversity. They must permit both collective progress, at the same time respecting the implementation of more specifically targeted research at multi- or bilateral levels between or among countries or regions.

A total of three annual colloquies are currently envisaged which the Paris meeting decided would deal with the following subjects:

- the determining factors of vocational transition in 1993⁴. In the course of the first years of their working lives, young people experience a more or less favourable development of their social and vocational integration. In a given labour market context (regional or national market structure, manpower policy, nature of relations between the education and production systems), how do individual, family or social characteristics influence these routes? Analysis is to cover wide youth sub-groups (school-leavers, age peers, graduates of higher education)...;
- the 1994 symposium is to focus on the historical transformations in the processes mentioned above - what are the determining factors of these structural transformations?;

4) to be held in Barcelona (Spain), autumn 1993.

● 1995: the first two colloquies will have devoted particular attention to the various empirical studies, approaches per country or comparisons between a number of countries. At the end of this third year, the emphasis shall be on interpretative models and theoretical approaches permitting consideration of the developments studied.

International comparisons - a plurality of “approaches”

The objective approach

It seems possible today to develop several types of comparative study involving two, three or several countries and covering problems they have in common.

For example, school drop-outs are an area of common concern to the Member States of the Community. The comparative studies conducted between the United Kingdom, Ireland and the Netherlands illustrate, on the one hand, the difficulties in defining this group, and, on the other, that its position on the respective labour markets of each country differs as a result of economic and socio-cultural factors.

In the course of the 1980s, national governments drew up youth employment policies which have already been the subject of national or comparative evaluations. What are the effects of these policies on the vocational paths of young people at the beginning of their vocational lives? Similarly, there was a rapid acceleration in the growth of the numbers of those staying on within education to higher education level at the end of the 1980s in Belgium, France, Italy and Spain. The linkage between study and employment becomes more complex for these new target groups going on to higher education and affects the various aspects of youth transition (social, family, vocational...). What effects of this are to be expected for the organization of higher education courses?

The tool approach

It is firstly a question of applying methodological tools of analysis to longitudinal data. Despite a considerable development of this type of study in the course of recent years, the difficulty in processing longitudinal data remains a serious obstacle to these surveys. Here again, the objective of the network is to pool concrete experiences applicable to studies and research on transition.

It is secondly a question of implementing the longitudinal surveys themselves. An analysis of existing surveys shows that their structure in the final analysis depends on the questions the public authorities put to the researchers. But many organizational elements (date, fields,...) are subsequently chosen at local level

and are thus likely to be appropriate for harmonization between the various Member States of the European Community.

The network may therefore propose and support the forthcoming organization of a coordinated set of longitudinal surveys offering a minimum degree of comparability, thus facilitating comparative studies.

The indicator approach

The longitudinal surveys currently found in the various Member States were each established to answer certain key questions: evaluation of the educational system, evaluation of employment policies and measures to promote the vocational integration of young people.

Each Member State has developed a series of statistical indicators to answer these questions and, more generally, to take account of how mobility works at the beginning of working life.

Within a comparative study, two activities can be conducted in parallel. The first consists of comparing the indicators established in each country to understand the reasons for their similarity or divergence. Secondly, indicators are produced in each country according to the explanatory characteristics used (age, gender, training level...) and the internal disparities of each Member State are examined according to the values shown by these indicators. This disparity itself becomes a subject of comparison between countries (e.g., why is the unemployment rate among women twice that of men in a certain country?...).

This approach goes hand in hand with a considerable input in recent years into the establishment of international educational indicators under the auspices of the OECD.

Theoretical and conceptual aspects have been developed in the various fields, including the results of education on the labour market (R.W. Rumberger)⁵. Considerable scope is left within the proposed conceptual framework as far as the actual establishment of such indicators (definition of indicators and the availability of information for their calculation) is concerned.

New breakthroughs in this field are of direct interest to EUROSTAT which wishes to introduce new indicators on the youth labour market into international statistical publications.

5) R.W. Rumberger, "Les résultats sur le marché du travail des indicateurs de performance de l'enseignement" in General Meeting of INES Project, CERI-INES-OCDE, Sept. 91.

Regular survey of transitions in youth

| Survey | Date started | Frequency | Population sampled | Usual sample size | Time of 1st sweep | Follow up | Method | Main data collated |
|---|--------------|--------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Youth cohort study (England and Wales) | 1985 | Every 1 or 2 years | Birth cohort (eligible to leave school in given session) | Varies (usual. 12 000 - 20 000) | Spring after session when eligible to leave (16-17 years) | 2, at annual intervals | Postal questionnaire | Secondary & post-secondary education Labour market experience Family background attitudes |
| EVA: National Observatory on Entry into working life (France) | | | | | | | | |
| a) decentralized survey | 1983 | Annual | Leavers from secondary education / apprenticeship not continuing education | 100% (subsample of 40 000 biennially analyzed by CEREC) | 7 months after leaving school | None | Postal questionnaire | Labour market destinations |
| b) National retrospective surveys | 1976 | Every 4 years | a) Leavers from secondary education before baccalaureat b) Leavers from baccalaureat c) Leavers from higher education | 10 000 (1/40) 40 000 (1/10) 26 000 (1/5) | 3/4 years after leaving school 3/4 years after leaving school 3/4 years after leaving school | None None None | Interviews Postal Postal | Labour market history since leaving education Labour market history since leaving education Labour market history since leaving education |
| c) Panel study | 1987 | Every 3 or 4 years | Leavers from secondary education or apprenticeship | 4 000 (1%) | 18 months after leaving school | 3, at 6 month intervals | Telephone interviews | Labour market history since school, especially youth programmes |

Regular survey of transitions in youth

| Survey | Date started | Frequency | Population sampled | Usual sample size | Time of 1st sweep | Follow up | Method | Main data collated |
|---|--------------|-----------|--|-------------------|---|---|----------------------|--|
| School leaver survey (Ireland) | 1989 | Annual | Leavers from secondary education | 2 000 | One year after leaving school | Normally none: 1983 sample re-interviewed in 1984 and 1987/88 | Interviews | Secondary & post-secondary education Labour market experience Family background |
| RUBS: Registration of Output and Labour Market position of school leavers (The Netherlands) | 1989 | Annual | a) Leavers from secondary education b) Leavers from higher vocational education | Currently 55 000 | One year after leaving school | None | Postal questionnaire | Secondary & post-secondary education Labour market experience Attitudes |
| Scottish Young People's survey | | | | | | | | |
| a) School leavers survey | 1971 | Biennial | Leavers from secondary education | 6 - 9 000 (10%) | 10 months after leaving school | None | Postal questionnaire | Secondary & post-secondary education Labour market experience Attitudes |
| b) Cohort study | 1985 | Biennial | School year group | 6 - 9 000 (10%) | Spring of first post-compulsory session | One after 2.5 years | Postal questionnaire | Secondary & post-secondary education Labour market experience Attitudes, Leisure and household formation |

Regular survey of transitions in youth

| Survey | Date started | Frequency | Population sampled | Usual sample size | Time of 1st sweep | Follow up | Method | Main data collated |
|---|--------------|-----------|---|--------------------|--|-----------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Point d'appui travail, emploi-formation Centre de sociologie et d'économie régionale Université libre de Bruxelles/Belgique | | | | | | | | |
| a) Orientation survey | 1991 | Variable | Leavers from secondary education | 1 000 | Last year of scolarization | None | Interviews | Labour Market destination |
| b) Retrospective survey | 1984 | Annual | Leavers from secondary education / apprenticeship not continuing education Leavers from higher education | 5 000 2 000 | 1 year or 3 years after leaving school | None | Postal questionnaire | Labour Market destination |

European research network on the integration of young people

Network organizational committee

François POTTIER
(Co-Président)

Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches sur les
Qualifications (CEREQ)
9, rue Sextius Michel
75015 PARIS
France

David RAFFE
(Co-Président)

Centre for Educational Sociology
University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
EDINBURGH EH8 9LW
Scotland, UK

Hans RUTJES
(Secrétaire)

Service bureau Schoolverlatersinformatie
Prinsengracht 185
1015 OS AMSTERDAM
Pays-Bas

Prof. Mateo ALALUF

Institut de Sociologie
Université Libre de Bruxelles
Avenue Jeanne 44
1050 BRUXELLES
Belgique

Inigo ARTECHE

Centro de Investigacion y Documentacion so-
bre Problemas de la Economica el Empleo
(CIDECE)
Getaria 8
SAN SEBASTIAN
Espagne

Dr. Lea BATTISTONI Istituto per lo Sviluppo della Formazione
Professionale dei Lavoratori (ISFOL)
Via G.B. Morgagni 33
00161 ROMA
Italie

Richard BREEN Department of Sociology and Social Policy
The Queen's University of Belfast
BELFAST BT7 1NN
Northern Ireland, UK

Damian HANNAN The Economic and Social Research Institute
4 Burlington Road
DUBLIN 4
Ireland

Prof. Walter MÜLLER Center for European Social Research
Universität Mannheim
6800 MANNHEIM 1
Allemagne

Dr Jordi PLANAS Institut de Ciències de l'Educació
Edifici A
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
08193 BELLATERRA (BARCELONA)
Espanne