VÚPSV rilsa
VÝZKUMNÝ ÚSTAV PRÁCE A SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚCÍ
RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR LABOUR AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

The low-skilled unemployed in the main ALMP tools in 2014

Markéta Horáková

RILSA Prague

November 2017

SUMMARY

Targeting of the main ALMP tools in 2014 (with respect to the group of low-skilled unemployed)

The study is focused on analysis of participation of the low-skilled jobseekers in three main ALMP provisions in 2014 (training - programmes selected by the participants themselves as well as those provided by the labour office, subsidized jobs in private sector and public works).

We use a specific research design when assorting the group of unemployed population: our population (basic set of unemployed according to OKpráce dataset for 2014) is constructed on the basis of the combination of the stock of unemployed at the beginning of a monitored period (629.274 applicants on January 1, 2014) and inflows into the unemployment during the monitored period (another 418.561 applicants being registered at the labour office at any time during 2014). Even if this research design is not common in foreign studies and contribute to some statistical bias of the share of participants in active programmes compared with the group of unemployed (the percentage of participants is lower or underestimated), we considered it beneficial as it allows a relevant assessment of the targeting of individual programmes as well as their effects (it allows us to capture better the group of all jobseekers who had at least the theoretical chance/probability to enter some of the ALMP measure in 2014). In the analysis we only monitor "new" programme participants and assess their structure with respect to basic socio-demographic characteristics, especially the level of education (described by the ISCED levels). Subsequently, we compare the structure of the group of participants with the overall structure of unemployed in order to show how the representation of specific groups of applicants corresponds (or not) to their representation in unemployment (this is expressed by the indexes of targeting). We look in more detail on the characteristics of the low-skilled unemployed and we analyse the extent to which active labour market programmes target specific categories within a low-skilled group (i.e. those with the ISCED level 0-2 at most).

Data analysis approves some general trends which have been observed in the task of ALMP´s target groups for a long time but it also brought some new and interesting results from the perspective of implementing the labour market policy and its potential impacts. For example it has been shown that training programmes as well as the job creation support in the private sector tend to focus on people with less barriers on the labour market (i.e. middle and younger age groups, people with no health restrictions, semiskilled jobseekers with the high school diploma, the short or middle-term unemployed). At the same time, there is a lack of tailor-made programmes for specific groups with more disadvantages in the labour market. These programmes could strengthen not only the motivation but also the knowledge and practical skills of hard-to-place groups and ensure them inclusion on the labour market over the long term period (programmes of lifelong learning, certified courses credible for employers and, in particular, education and training programmes implemented and provided directly by the employers).

On the contrary, public works are more rather to be concentrated on people with multiple disadvantages in the labour market, such as the low-skilled, jobseekers with health problems, older people and the long-term or repeatedly unemployed. Thus, targeting of public works differs significantly from other ALMP measures and this may be related to a certain degree of segmentation within active measures – there are not any other suitable and sufficiently strong ALMP programmes that could overcome the multiple disadvantages of some applicants (ALMP tools can contribute to segmentation of the labour market rather than overcome it).

In relation to low level of education some findings confirming the above mentioned trends were identified. Public works are the domain of the low-skilled (they account more than one third of all the participants in public works in contrast to less than one tenth of

participants in subsidized jobs in private sector). Thus, public works are increasingly being earmarked as specific segment of active labour market policy for the unemployed with significant disabilities, despite the fact that they do not contribute to permanent employment. This measure was focused mainly on the long-term (index 1,3) and repeatedly unemployed low-skilled (index 1,6 for jobseekers with 5 or more previous unemployment spells) as well as on older low-skilled jobseekers (index 1,5 for 55-59 years old). These categories tend to be overrepresented in the programme of public works.

The low-skilled are less likely to participate in training as well as in the programme of subsidized jobs in the private sector. In other words, people with more educational difficulties suffer from the suitable tailor-made training programmes which could respect their specific needs and overcome skills barriers (long-term and/or modular training and work experience programmes combining theory with practice provided by the employers themselves). They are also less attractive for private employers and even the state subsidy cannot increase their attractiveness.

In 2014 most of the low-skilled jobseekers entered all the provisions within 3-12 months of registration with the labour office. In contrast to all participants, however, the low-skilled were more often included in active measures even after a longer period of unemployment, i.e. the share of the long-term unemployed with low level of education was higher in all instruments. It seems that active labour market provisions for the low-skilled are usually used rather as a curative tool focused on discontinuing of long-term unemployment period (possibly also in order to eliminate the risk of deadweight). On the other hand, the finding also implicates, that public employment services are working with some form of profiling of the unemployed, albeit more intuitive than formalized one.

1. Targeting of the main ALMP tools in 2014 (with respect to the group of low-skilled unemployed)

Active labour market programmes combined with other social policy support tools and activation measures have played an important role in the previous period of the economic recession. In many Western countries, it has been shown that the effectiveness and efficiency of active policy measures are linked with the appropriate timing of an intervention on the one hand and with its proper targeting on the other. Hence, the mechanism of targeting active labour market policy (ALMP) tools is considered to be an important and responsible activity of public employment services. It should be a subject of monitoring and evaluation culture as active labour policy instruments themselves are. Analysis of a structure of programme participants helps to verify the distribution of individual programmes and their targeting on the disadvantaged groups on the labour market (Caliendo et al. 2005). Therefore, the diversity of the characteristics of programme participants needs to be reflected in the differentiated effects of such programmes, or, in other words, the significance of the impacts of active labour market policy tools must always be interpreted in relation to the knowledge of the characteristics of their participants (Eichhorst 2016).

Methodological framework in brief

In the following text we use a specific research design when assorting the group of unemployed population: our population (basic set of unemployed according to OKpráce dataset for 2014) is constructed on the basis of the combination of the stock of unemployed at the beginning of a monitored period (629.274 applicants on January 1, 2014) and inflows into the unemployment during the monitored period (another 418.561 applicants being registered at the labour office at any time during 2014). Even if this research design is not common in foreign studies and contribute to some statistical bias of the share of participants in active programmes compared with the group of unemployed (the percentage of participants is lower or underestimated), we considered it beneficial as it allows a relevant assessment of the targeting of individual programmes as well as their effects (it allows us to capture better the group of all jobseekers who had at least the theoretical chance/probability to enter some of the ALMP measure in 2014).

We analyse key characteristics of participants in three main programmes: training (programmes selected by the participants themselves as well as those provided by the labour office[1]), subsidized jobs in private sector and public works. These are traditionally measures most attended by the unemployed (in 2014 almost 25 % of all the ALMP participants attended some form of training and another 41 % participated in the provision of subsidized jobs either in private or public sector). In the analysis we only monitor "new" programme participants, i.e. those who newly entered the programme realised in 2014 (we exclude some of "old" attenders who have continued participation in the programme starting in the period before). We assess their structure with respect to basic socio-demographic characteristics, especially the level of education (described by the ISCED levels). Subsequently, we compare the structure of the group of participants with the overall structure of unemployed in order to show how the representation of specific groups of applicants corresponds (or not) to their representation in unemployment. This is expressed by the indexes of targeting selected measures to the individual groups of

[1] Since 2012, jobseekers can choose the training programme themselves (so-called "selected training programme"). The applicant picks the type of educational activity as well as the training facility/institution in which the training will take place. The labour office could reimburse him the costs associated with the training programme up to a maximum of 50.000 Kc (approximately 1.920 Euros) over three years. The indisputable advantage of such measure is the possibility of jobseekers free choice. However, a major disadvantage of the provision is the fact, that if the unemployed chooses training programme on his own decision, he is not entitled to higher unemployment benefits.

participants - the representation of the selected group in active programme corresponds with its representation in unemployment when index of targeting oscillate the value 1; conversely the representation of the selected group in active programme does not correspond with its representation in unemployment when index of targeting is over the value 1 (the group is overrepresented in the program) or under the value 1 (the group is underrepresented in the program). In the second part of our analysis the attention is particularly paid to the group of low-skilled participants (i.e. those with the ISCED level 0-2 at most). We look in more detail on the characteristics of the low-skilled unemployed and we analyse the extent to which active labour market programmes target specific categories within a low-skilled group.

Participation of unemployed in the main ALMP measures in 2014

Table 1 demonstrates the overall structure of unemployed population in the Czech Republic in 2014 as the starting point for analysing the focus of selected labour market measures. On the beginning of 2014 and during the same year public employment services registered a total of 1.047.835 jobseekers of which 36 % where long-term unemployed (i.e. longer than 12 months). The share of long-term unemployed continues to decline in the context of economic recovery in the CR. In relation to the basic sociodemographic characteristics it is evident that younger jobseekers with no health problems, more often men and semi-skilled people are predominant among the short-term unemployed. On the contrary, the group of the long-term unemployed includes mainly older people with significantly worse health status and low qualification. At the same time, the level of education is a key characteristic which in the Czech Republic influences the position of individual on the labour market and determine his/her current as well as future chances for employment. It is true, that the lower the level of education the individual achieves, the greater the risk of unemployment he/she faces. This applies especially for the long-term unemployed as table 1 shows – the low-skilled jobseekers represent the 18,8% share in the short-term unemployment, but more than 30% share in the long-term one. Data from the Czech statistical office further indicate increasing share of the Czech population with higher secondary education (almost 70 % in 2015)[2] and very low share of individuals with at most lower secondary education for the long period of time (the share of low-skilled in the Czech population is the lowest among OECD countries, i.e. 14 % in the Czech Republic compared to 24 % in OECD, OECD 2016). As the same data accomplish very high unemployment rate of the low-skilled (it traditionally reaches 22-25 % in contrast to only 2-3% unemployment rate of people with tertiary education), we can conclude that the level of education proposes the competitive advantage to the Czech inhabitant to a greater extent than to a resident of any other OECD country.

[2] For the Czech Republic large heterogeneity among the group of semi-skilled people is characteristic. Almost 70 % of the Czech population has education in the ISCED level 3, but there are huge differences between people who attended apprenticeships (approximately 60 %) and those who completed their higher secondary education with the leaving examination. While in the first case they are predominantly manual workers sometimes with rather higher risk of unemployment, in the latter case they are more likely to be workers with a general (portable) education with a certificate more attractive to employers.

Table 1 **Structure of all jobseekers registered at PES in 2014**

	Short-term unempl.		Long-term unempl.		Total	
	number	**%**	**number**	**%**	**number**	**%**
GENDER						
Female	313 381	46,7	194 430	51,6	507 811	48,5
Male	357 739	53,3	182 285	48,4	540 024	51,5
EDUCATION						
Pre-primary (ISCED 0)	1 665	0,2	1 884	0,5	3 549	0,3
Primary (ISCED 1)	1 579	0,2	2 167	0,6	3 746	0,4
Lower secondary (ISCED 2)	122 762	18,4	111 222	29,5	233 984	22,3
TOTAL low-skilled	**126 006**	**18,8**	**115 273**	**30,6**	**241 279**	**23**
Upper secondary (ISCED 3)	465 307	69,3	238 937	63,4	704 244	67,2
TOTAL semi-skilled	**465 307**	**69,3**	**238 937**	**63,4**	**704 244**	**67,2**
Tertiary – bachelor (ISCED 6)	29 571	4,4	6 464	1,8	36 035	3,4
Tertiary – master (ISCED 7)	48 575	7,2	15 533	4,1	64 108	6,1
Tertiary – doctor (ISCED 8)	1 661	0,3	508	0,1	2 169	0,2
TOTAL high-skilled	**79 807**	**11,9**	**22 505**	**6**	**102 312**	**9,8**
AGE						
15-19 years	27 771	4,1	5 135	1,4	32 906	3,1
20-24 years	131 875	19,6	31 800	8,4	163 675	15,6
25-29 years	105 294	15,7	34 486	9,2	139 780	13,3
30-34 years	79 780	11,9	37 452	9,9	117 232	11,2
35-39 years	84 826	12,6	47 223	12,5	132 049	12,6
40-44 years	67 361	10	44 260	11,7	111 621	10,7
45-49 years	52 905	7,9	42 289	11,2	95 194	9,1
50-54 years	50 293	7,5	46 322	12,3	96 615	9,2
55-59 years	49 835	7,4	60 489	16,1	110 324	10,5
60+ years	21 180	3,1	27 259	7,2	48 439	4,6
HEALTH STATUS						
No health problems	592 807	88,3	258530	68,6	851 337	81,2
Health restrictions	41 455	6,2	62 202	16,5	103 657	9,9
Partial disability (I. degree)	24 915	3,7	36 849	9,8	61 764	5,9
Full disability (II. and III. degree)	11 943	1,8	19 134	5,1	31 077	3
NUMBER OF UNEMPL. SPELLS						
Current unempl. only	174 374	26	66 746	17,7	241 120	23
1 previous unempl. spell	115 702	17,2	61 579	16,3	177 281	16,9
2 previous unempl. spells	91 283	13,6	55 230	14,7	146 513	14
3 previous unempl. spells	71 880	10,7	46 474	12,3	118 354	11,3
4 previous unempl. spells	55 980	8,3	37 221	9,9	93 201	8,9
5+ previous unempl. spells	161 901	24,1	109 465	29,1	271 366	25,9
CUMULATIVE DURATION OF PREVIOUS UNEMPL.						
Without previous unempl.	174 374	26	66 746	17,7	241 120	23
Short-term previous unempl. (up to 3 months)	59 737	8,9	22 412	5,9	82 149	7,8
Middle-term previous unempl. (3-12 months)	146 878	21,9	60 618	16,1	207 496	19,8
Long-term previous unempl. (12+ months)	290 131	43,2	226 939	60,2	517 070	49,3
Total	**671 120**	**100**	**376 715**	**100**	**1 047 835**	**100**

Source: OKpráce dataset for 2014

The structure of participants in the main ALMP tools in 2014 and indexes of their targeting are presented in tables 2 and 3. Data in such tables approve some general trends which have been observed in the task of ALMP´s target groups for a long time. For example it has been shown that training programmes as well as the job creation support in the private sector tend to focus on people with less barriers/handicaps on the labour market (i.e. middle and younger age groups, people with no health restrictions, semiskilled jobseekers with the high school diploma, the short or middle-term unemployed).

In *training programmes* women accounted for an absolute majority of participants (57,1 %, i.e. index of targeting 1,2). The most of training participants were upper secondary school graduates (40,1 %, i.e. index of targeting 1,5), middle aged people (age group of 35-39 represented more than 15 % of all trainees, i.e. index of targeting 1,3) and applicants with good health dispositions (82,9 % of training participants did not report any health problems, i.e. index of targeting 1). The training programmes that jobseekers chose on their own decision[3] were more often an opportunity for men (65,1 %) and young people (the participants of "selected training programme" were most likely to come from the 20-35 years age group, in the 35-44 years age category the two groups of training participants were rather balanced and the group of people aged 45 and over prevailed among the attenders of training programmes provided by the labour office as well). The educational structure of both training programmes participants (selected as well as provided) was rather balanced as was the distribution of individual categories according to the health status. It turns out that jobseekers with relatively good characteristics participate more often in the programme of training, especially those selected by the unemployed himself. They do not face such serious and long-term problems in the labour market and that is why they could be more activated and motivated for searching the job. At the same time, there is a lack of tailor-made programmes for specific groups with more disadvantages in the labour market. These programmes could strengthen not only the motivation but also the knowledge and practical skills of hard-to-place groups and individuals and ensure them inclusion on the labour market over the long term period (programmes of lifelong learning, certified courses credible for employers and, in particular, education and training programmes implemented and provided directly by the employers).

Subsidized jobs in private sector are more often focused on women (57,1 %, i.e. index of targeting 1,2), people with at least higher secondary education (almost 90 %, i.e. index of targeting for higher secondary and tertiary educated was equally 1,5), rather young age groups (most often aged 20-39 years, i.e. index of targeting equal or higher than 1) and jobseekers with good health. As in the case of training programmes, subsidized jobs in the private sector are rather to be targeted on the unemployed with better working prospects (who are preferred by the employers).

Targeting of *public works*, on the other hand, differs significantly from other ALMP measures. Public works are often attended by people with multiple disadvantages in the labour market, such as the low-skilled (index of targeting on jobseekers with ISCED 0-2 level of education was 1,5 – i.e. almost 35 % of all the participants in public works have lower secondary education at most), jobseekers with health problems (more than tenth of participants were disabled, i.e. index of targeting 1,4 for people partially disabled in degree I and index of targeting 1,1 for people fully disabled in degree II or III[4]), older people (most often at the age of 45 years and over, index of targeting were 1,2 for 45-49 years

[3] The sum of the number of participants in selected and provided training programmes (second and third columns in table 2) does not correspond exactly to the total number of unemployed attending training programmes (first column in table 2). This is due to the fact that some unemployed were able to undergo both types of programmes during 2014 (or the attribute of participation were ascribe them for both of types of training programmes). Such persons were 286 in the whole unemployed population, 35 among the low-skilled.

[4] In the Czech legislation the invalidity is defined as the loss or reduction of individuals working capacity due to serious illness or injury. It is divided into three stages: I. degree – drop in working capacity by at least 35 %, II. degree – drop in working capacity by at least 70 % and III. degree – drop in working capacity by 70 % or more. The degree of reduction in individuals working capacity used to be assessed by a certificated physician. At the first stage, the individual is entitled to a partial disability pension scheme, in the case of the second or third degree of invalidity to a full disability pension scheme.

old, 1,4 for 50-54 years old and 1,7 for 55-59 years old) and the long-term or repeatedly unemployed (only 4,8 % of participants in public works did not experience early registration at labour office compared to 48,4 % of attenders with five or more previous records). This may be related to a certain degree of segmentation within active measures – there are not any other suitable and sufficiently strong ALMP programmes that could overcome the multiple disadvantages of some applicants (ALMP tools can contribute to segmenting the labour market rather than resolving/overcoming it).

In relation to low level of education, general tendencies can be described as follows:

- *public works* are the domain of the low-skilled: unemployed with at most lower secondary education (ISCED 0-2) account for almost 35 % of all the participants in the programme of public works compared with only 9% share of such educational group in subsidized jobs in private sector;
- index of targeting of public works for the low-skilled is the higher the lower the educational level unemployed reached: this applies across the entire educational scale but it is particularly noticeable for the group of the low-skilled (i.e. index of targeting for people with lower secondary education is 1,5, but 2 for jobseekers with primary education and 3,3 for unemployed with pre-primary education only) – public works are increasingly being earmarked as specific segment of active labour market policy for the unemployed with significant disabilities, despite the fact that they do not contribute to inclusion on the labour market over the long term period;
- the low-skilled are less likely to participate in *training*, either in programmes selected by the jobseekers themselves or ones provided by the labour office: only 13 % of all the trainees were low-skilled (ISCED 0-2) compared to 75 % of semi-skilled (ISCED 3) and 11,5 % of high-skilled (ISCED 6-8) – people with more educational difficulties suffer from the suitable tailor-made training programmes which could respect their specific needs and overcome skill barriers;
- the least-used measure in the case of the low-skilled is the programme to support *job creation in the private sector*: in 2014 only 9,4 % of the participants of subsidized jobs were low-skilled (index of targeting for the low-skilled was 0,4 compared with 1,1 for the semi-skilled and 1,5 for the high-skilled) – unemployed with low level of education are less attractive for private employers and even the state subsidy cannot increase their attractiveness;
- the indexes of all programmes targeting on the low-skilled are very low and indicate that the group of unemployed with low level of education is underrepresented in all the main ALMP tools except the programme of public works.

Table 2 **Structure of all the new participants in the main ALMP tools in 2014 (according to basic socio-demographic characteristics)**

GENDER (%)	**Training (total)**	**Training (selected by a particip.)**	**Training (provided by the LO)**	**Subsidised jobs in private sector**	**Public works**
Female	57,1	34,9	62,7	57,1	41,4
Male	42,9	65,1	37,3	42,9	58,6
Total N (= 100 %)	29 366	6 252	23 400	31 242	18 232
EDUCATION (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
Pre-primary (ISCED 0)	0,2	0,1	0,2	0,1	1
Primary (ISCED 1)	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,8
Lower secondary (ISCED 2)	12,8	13,3	12,7	9,2	33,1
TOTAL low-skilled	**13,1**	**13,5**	**13**	**9,4**	**34,9**
Upper secondary (ISCED 3)	75,4	75,1	75,4	76,3	63
TOTAL semi-skilled	**75,4**	**75,1**	**75,4**	**76,3**	**63**
Tertiary – bachelor (ISCED 6)	3,9	3,9	3,9	6,3	1
Tertiary – master (ISCED 7)	7,4	7,3	7,4	7,8	1,1
Tertiary – doctor (ISCED 8)	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0
TOTAL high-skilled	**11,5**	**11,4**	**11,5**	**14,3**	**2,1**
Total N (= 100 %)	29 366	6 252	23 400	31 242	18 232
AGE (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
15-19 years	1,2	1	1,2	2,3	1,9
20-24 years	12,5	16,2	11,6	23	10,5
25-29 years	11,6	14,3	10,9	15,2	7,6
30-34 years	11,4	13,3	10,9	11,1	9,3
35-39 years	15,8	15,8	15,9	13,2	12,1
40-44 years	13,1	13,3	13	10,1	11,1
45-49 years	10,9	9,5	11,3	7,4	10,6
50-54 years	12,3	9	13,1	8	12,6
55-59 years	9,8	6,3	10,6	8,2	18,3
60+ years	1,5	1,4	1,5	1,6	5,9
Total N (= 100 %)	29 366	6 252	23 400	31 242	18 232
HEALTH STATUS (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
No health problems	82,9	86,1	82,1	88,5	79,4
Health restrictions	9,7	7,2	10,3	6,3	9,5
Partial disability (I. degree)	5,2	4,5	5,3	3,6	8
Full disability (II. and III. degree)	2,2	2,1	2,2	1,5	3,2
Total N (= 100 %)	29 366	6 252	23 400	31 242	18 232
NUMBER OF UNEMPL. SPELLS (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
Current unempl. only	19,6	20,1	19,4	28,5	8,4
1 previous unempl. spell	18	17,1	18,3	19,7	10,9
2 previous unempl. spells	15,7	15,1	15,8	14,7	11,1
3 previous unempl. spells	12,4	12,7	12,4	11,3	10,8
4 previous unempl. spells	9,4	8,8	9,5	8,1	10,4
5+ previous unempl. spells	25	26,2	24,6	17,7	48,4
Total N (= 100 %)	29 366	6 252	23 400	31 242	18 232
CUMULATIVE DURATION OF PREVIOUS UNEMPL. (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
Without previous unempl.	19,6	20,1	19,4	28,5	8,4
Short-term previous unempl. (up to 3 months)	8,7	9,3	8,6	9,6	3,6
Middle-term previous unempl. (3-12 months)	22,7	23,4	22,5	22,3	12,6
Long-term previous unempl. (12+ months)	49,1	47,2	49,5	39,6	75,4
Total N (= 100 %)	29 366	6 252	23 400	31 242	18 232

Source: OKpráce dataset for 2014

Table 3 **Participation of new entrants in the main ALMP tools in 2014 (indexes of targeting measures to individual groups of participants)**

GENDER (%)	**Training (total)**	**Training (selected by a particip.)**	**Training (provided by the LO)**	**Subsidised jobs in private sector**	**Public works**
Female	1,2	0,7	1,3	1,2	0,9
Male	0,8	1,3	0,7	0,8	1,1
EDUCATION (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
Pre-primary (ISCED 0)	0,7	0,3	0,7	0,3	3,3
Primary (ISCED 1)	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	2
Lower secondary (ISCED 2)	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,4	1,5
TOTAL low-skilled	**0,6**	**0,6**	**0,6**	**0,4**	**1,5**
Upper secondary (ISCED 3)	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,1	0,9
TOTAL semi-skilled	**1,1**	**1,1**	**1,1**	**1,1**	**0,9**
Tertiary – bachelor (ISCED 6)	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,9	0,3
Tertiary – master (ISCED 7)	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,3	0,2
Tertiary – doctor (ISCED 8)	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	0,0
TOTAL high-skilled	**1,2**	**1,2**	**1,2**	**1,5**	**0,2**
AGE (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
15-19 years	0,4	0,3	0,4	0,7	0,6
20-24 years	0,8	1	0,7	1,5	0,7
25-29 years	0,9	1,1	0,8	1,1	0,6
30-34 years	1	1,2	1	1	0,8
35-39 years	1,3	1,3	1,3	1	1
40-44 years	1,2	1,2	1,2	0,9	1
45-49 years	1,2	1	1,2	0,8	1,2
50-54 years	1,3	1	1,4	0,9	1,4
55-59 years	0,9	0,6	1	0,8	1,7
60+ years	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	1,3
HEALTH STATUS (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
No health problems	1	1,1	1	1,1	1
Health restrictions	1	0,7	1	0,6	1
Partial disability (I. degree)	0,9	0,8	0,9	0,6	1,4
Full disability (II. and III. degree)	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,5	1,1
NUMBER OF UNEMPL. SPELLS (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
Current unempl. only	0,9	0,9	0	1,2	0,4
1 previous unempl. spell	1,1	1	1,1	1,2	0,6
2 previous unempl. spells	1,1	1,1	1,3	1,1	0,8
3 previous unempl. spells	1,1	1,1	1,4	1	1
4 previous unempl. spells	1,1	1	1,4	0,9	1,2
5+ previous unempl. spells	1	1	0,4	0,7	1,9
CUMULATIVE DURATION OF PREVIOUS UNEMPL. (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
Without previous unempl.	0,9	0,9	0,8	1,2	0,4
Short-term previous unempl. (up to 3 months)	1,1	1,2	1,1	1,2	0,5
Middle-term previous unempl. (3-12 months)	1,1	1,2	1,1	1,1	0,6
Long-term previous unempl. (12+ months)	1	1	1	0,8	1,5

Source: OKpráce dataset for 2014

2. Detailed analysis of the group of low-skilled participants in the main ALMP tools

Low qualification is one of the most challenging problems of the Czech labour market, despite the fact that it does not cover such a large group of population, as indicated above. It is also a key factor influencing the risk of long-term and/or repeated unemployment. It is caused by the persistent weaknesses of the Czech education system (the lack of links between education and the labour market, poor permeability of education system, difficult returns to education especially for older people, lower quality of some educational programmes, low prestige of the teaching profession etc.), the traditional attitude of the Czech population towards education as well as the lack of effective tools of active labour market policy, especially those focused on education and training.

In 2014 statistical data captured a total of 214.279 unemployed with the ISCED 0-2 level of education[5]. Such group of the low-skilled consisted mostly of men (52 %) and people with various types of health problems (14,1 % of them were physically disadvantaged and another almost 10 % fully or partially disabled) (table 4, grey column). In relation to the age it is interesting that a large proportion of the low-skilled unemployed were younger people aged 20-34 years (38,8 %), although the group of older applicants aged over 50 years was also plentiful (i.e. a quarter of all the low-skilled). For older generations the low level of education seems to be more common than for the younger one (in this case, it might be a group of early leavers and younger people who have experienced an overlap of barriers to access to the labour market including, for example, poor health, caring responsibilities and/or ethnicity). Nevertheless, statistical data show really unambiguously strong relationship between the level of education and the length of unemployment and number of previous unemployment spells: more than 60 % of the low-skilled experienced repeated unemployment in their previous career lasting cumulatively often several years. In other words, only less than one fifth of all unemployed with the ISCED 0-2 level of education did not undergo any previous unemployment spell (on the contrary, more than a third of them were unemployed for the fifth time or more). It is confirmed that the level of education is an important factor not only for entering the unemployment but also for remaining in it for a long time.

Table 4 further indicates that in 2014 a total of 13.146 low-skilled (i.e. 5,5 %) participated in some of the main selected ALMP tools. This share is not so high, but it corresponds with our specific research design as well as with the lack of sufficiently strong/intensive labour market programmes for such target group (for comparison, the total share of the unemployed attending selected ALMP measures reached 7,5 %). Men were predominant in all the measures, apparently in the training programmes selected by jobseekers themselves and public works (however, there are generally slightly more men than women among the low-skilled). Also, in all the provisions monitored the share of people with health problems was balanced – it was 20 % of the total low-skilled participants in each programme. Other sociodemographic characteristics of low-skilled attenders were different according to the type of active tool.

As mentioned in previous subchapter, in 2014 the low-skilled participated especially in the programme of *public works*. This measure was focused mainly on the long-term and repeatedly unemployed low-skilled (the share of the low-skilled participants with 5 or more previous unemployment spells was 8 percentage points higher and the share of the low-skilled with the previous long-term unemployment experience 7,5 percentage points higher in contrast to the population of jobseekers as a whole). Also the index of targeting public

[5] The structure of the low-skilled unemployed population is not put down into the separate table, but is a part of the tables capturing the structure of participants of the main ALMP measures (i.e. grey columns in tables 4, 6 and 7). According to this, it is possible to compare promptly visually the structure of low-skilled participants in selected instruments with the structure of the unemployed population with the ISCED 0-2 level of education in the above-mentioned tables.

works refers to such finding – it is 1,1 for people with 4 previous unemployment spells, 1,6 for jobseekers with 5 or more previous unemployment spells and 1,3 for the long-term unemployed (table 5). These categories were overrepresented in the programme of public works. In relation to the age, it is evident that especially unemployed aged 45 years and over participated in public works in 2014 (their share on the whole public works participants was 35 % with the index of targeting 1,2 for 45-49 years old, 1,4 for 50-54 years old and 1,5 for 55-59 years old). The category of young low-skilled jobseekers aged 20-24 years was also relatively well represented. This category is, however, heavily represented in the low-skilled unemployed population, the index of targeting public works on young low-skilled people aged 20-24 years was therefore rather low (0,7).

Entirely different findings resulted from the analysis of *subsidised jobs in the private sector*. The focus on young and middle aged groups and short and middle-term unemployed in this programme was above standard. There were almost 57 % of participants aged 20-39 years in subsidised jobs and with the increasing age the share of attenders gradually declined. However, the index of targeting oscillated around the value 1 and above for all age groups except two extreme ones (the youngest up to 19 years and those over 60 years). It seems that if low-qualified individuals enter the programme of job support (and this is not easy as we showed – even in 2014 the number of participants of subsidised jobs in the private sector was halfway compared to those in public works), age is no longer a differentiating factor. Rather frequently (i.e. more often than in the case of other selected measures), participants of subsidized jobs were firstly and short or middle-term unemployed (17,7 % of them did not experienced any unemployment spell in their previous life/career and the share of participants with the cumulative length of previous unemployment up to 12 months was almost another 20 %).

As in the previous case, *training programmes* were more often entered by low-skilled jobseekers with rather better working prospects, such as people without health problems (index of targeting 1,1), younger groups (only young people up to 19 years and older jobseekers aged 55 and over show the index of targeting training programmes under the value 1) and individuals with shorter period of previous cumulative unemployment (index of targeting on middle-term unemployed 1,3 and 1,1 on short-term unemployed). This was rather apparent in the case of training programmes selected by participants themselves, but differences was not so huge (more than average difference was obvious only within the group of participants aged 50 years and over: such group participated specifically in the programme of training provided by the labour office and less in the selected training programme (probably they prefer to rely on public employment services offers because of having more suitable information about the situation on the local labour market and/or educational and training institutions and their programmes as well)).

Table 4 **Structure of all the new LOW-SKILLED participants in the main ALMP tools in 2014 (according to basic socio-demographic characteristics)**

GENDER (%)	**Training (total)**	**Training (selected by a particip.)**	**Training (provided by the LO)**	**Subsidised jobs in private sector**	**Public works**	**Unempl.**
Female	44,7	23	50,5	49,3	38,6	48
Male	55,3	77	49,5	50,7	61,4	52
Total N (= 100 %)	3 859	846	3 048	2 931	6 356	241 279
AGE (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**	**Unempl.**
15-19 years	4,1	1,5	4,7	3,8	4,2	8,2
20-24 years	18	19,7	17,5	20,4	12,3	16,7
25-29 years	15,1	16,7	14,8	12,9	9,1	11,8
30-34 years	11,8	13,4	11,5	11	9,1	10,3
35-39 years	14,4	15,8	14,1	12,4	10,6	11
40-44 years	9,4	9,9	9,3	8,2	9,5	8,5
45-49 years	9	8,7	9	9,6	10,4	8,7
50-54 years	9,4	6,4	10,1	9,1	12,4	8,9
55-59 years	7,6	6,1	8	10,8	17	11,3
60+ years	1,2	1,7	1	1,8	5,5	4,6
Total N (= 100 %)	3 859	846	3 048	2 931	6 356	241 279
HEALTH STATUS (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**	**Unempl.**
No health problems	81,3	81,8	81,1	83,1	82	76,1
Health restrictions	11,5	10,2	11,9	9,7	9,1	14,1
Partial disability (I. degree)	4,9	5,1	4,9	4,9	6,3	6,7
Full disability (II. and III. degree)	2,3	3	2,1	2,2	2,5	3,2
Total N (= 100 %)	3 859	846	3 048	2 931	6 356	241 279
NUMBER OF UNEMPL. SPELLS (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**	**Unempl.**
Current unempl. only	14	14,1	14	17,7	6,6	18,9
1 previous unempl. spell	13,2	11,2	13,8	14,1	8,8	13,4
2 previous unempl. spells	12,5	11,2	12,9	12,9	8,5	12,3
3 previous unempl. spells	11,7	11,7	11,7	11	9,9	10,9
4 previous unempl. spells	9,3	7,6	9,6	10,6	9,9	9,4
5+ previous unempl. spells	39,2	44,2	37,9	33,7	56,4	35,1
Total N (= 100 %)	3 859	846	3 048	2 931	6 356	241 279
CUMULATIVE DURATION OF PREVIOUS UNEMPL. (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**	**Unempl.**
Without previous unempl.	14	14,1	14	17,7	6,6	18,9
Short-term previous unempl. (up to 3 months)	5,3	5	5,4	6,2	2,5	4,9
Middle-term previous unempl. (3-12 months)	17,2	16,3	17,4	16,7	8,1	13,7
Long-term previous unempl. (12+ months)	63,5	64,7	63,1	59,4	82,8	62,5
Total N (= 100 %)	3 859	846	3 048	2 931	6 356	241 279

Source: OKpráce dataset for 2014

Table 5 **Participation of new LOW-SKILLED entrants in the main ALMP tools in 2014 (indexes of targeting measures to individual groups of low-skilled participants)**

GENDER (%)	**Training (total)**	**Training (selected by a particip.)**	**Training (provided by the LO)**	**Subsidised jobs in private sector**	**Public works**
Female	0,9	0,5	1,1	1	0,8
Male	1,1	1,5	1	1	1,2
AGE (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
15-19 years	0,5	0,2	0,6	0,5	0,5
20-24 years	1,1	1,2	1	1,2	0,7
25-29 years	1,3	1,4	1,3	1,1	0,8
30-34 years	1,1	1,3	1,1	1,1	0,9
35-39 years	1,3	1,4	1,3	1,1	1
40-44 years	1,1	1,2	1,1	1	1,1
45-49 years	1	1	1	1,1	1,2
50-54 years	1,1	0,7	1,1	1	1,4
55-59 years	0,7	0,5	0,7	1	1,5
60+ years	0,3	0,4	0,2	0,4	1,2
HEALTH STATUS (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
No health problems	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,1
Health restrictions	0,8	0,7	0,8	0,7	0,6
Partial disability (I. degree)	0,7	0,8	0,7	0,7	0,9
Full disability (II. and III. degree)	0,7	0,9	0,7	0,7	0,8
NUMBER OF UNEMPL. SPELLS (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
Current unempl. only	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,9	0,3
1 previous unempl. spell	1	0,8	1	1,1	0,7
2 previous unempl. spells	1	0,9	1	1	0,7
3 previous unempl. spells	1,1	1,1	1,1	1	0,9
4 previous unempl. spells	1	0,8	1	1,1	1,1
5+ previous unempl. spells	1,1	1,3	1,1	1	1,6
CUMULATIVE DURATION OF PREVIOUS UNEMPL. (%)	**T total**	**T selected**	**T provided**	**Sub. jobs**	**P. works**
Without previous unempl.	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,9	0,3
Short-term previous unempl. (up to 3 months)	1,1	1	1,1	1,3	0,5
Middle-term previous unempl. (3-12 months)	1,3	1,2	1,3	1,2	0,6
Long-term previous unempl. (12+ months)	1	1	1	1	1,3

Source: OKpráce dataset for 2014

It is important to monitor also the timing of intervention which is considered to be characterised by the length of unemployment (registration) before entering active provisions. The aspect of when it is suitable and eligible to make an offer for the unemployed to enter some of active labour market measures is very considerable. It shows how the length of pre-programme registration matter as the criterion for the selection of participants. Relatively short length of pre-programme unemployment could be understood as active measures are used in preventative way to suffer disadvantaged groups from the risk of the long-term unemployment. On the contrary, long length of unemployment before entering the programme means that active provisions are usually used as a curative tool focused on discontinuing of long-term unemployment.

In table 6a we present structure of the low-skilled participants in ALMP measures according to duration of their previous pre-programme unemployment. We found that in 2014 the most of the low-skilled jobseekers entered all the provisions within 3-12 months of registration with the labour office (the half of all participants). Similar results were found in the group of ALMPs participants as a whole (table 6b). The finding is positive as it has shown that public employment services do not endorse the offer of an active measure, but they do not want to hurry it at the same time (possibly in order to eliminate the risk of deadweight). In contrast to all participants, the low-skilled were more often included in active measures even after a longer period of unemployment, i.e. the share of the long-term unemployed with low level of education was higher for all instruments (there were 38,9 % low-skilled long-term unemployed in training compared to 30,2 % long-term unemployed participants as a whole, similarly 38,6 % low-skilled long-term unemployed in subsidised jobs in the private sector compared to 30,3 % long-term unemployed and 21,9 % low-skilled long-term unemployed in public works compared to 19,7 % long-term unemployed as a whole).

Short-term unemployment only (up to 3 months of registration) was sufficient to enter the programme of training selected by the participants themselves (23,4 % of low-skilled participants) and, surprisingly, also the programme of public works (25 % of low-skilled participants). It may be linked with intentional offers of public works to some jobseekers (either low-skilled) who are not currently unemployed for too long, but periods of unemployment are more often repeated and their length tends to cumulate in their working history (as table 4 refers). This implicates that public employment services are working with some form of profiling of the unemployed, albeit more intuitive than formalized one.

Table 6a **Timing of the intervention – the structure of new LOW-SKILLED participants in the main ALMP measures in 2014 according to the length of current/monitored evidence (i.e. the length of evidence before entering the active labour market programme)**

Duration of current unemployment	Training (total)	Training (selected by a particip.)	Training (provided by the LO)	Subsid. jobs in private sector	Public works	Unempl.
Up to 1 months (0-30 days)	2,8	5	2,3	1,4	11	3,5
1-2 months (31-60 days)	5,8	8,7	5	3,4	6,9	5
2-3 months (61-90 days)	6,9	9,7	6,2	4	7,1	5,4
TOTAL: entry into the programme within 3 months of registration (short-term unemployment)	**15,5**	**23,4**	**13,5**	**8,8**	**25**	**13,9**
3-6 months (91-180 days)	19,2	22,1	18,4	14,3	23,7	16,3
6-9 months (181-270 days)	15,1	15,6	14,8	23,6	17,6	12,2
9-12 months (271-365 days)	11,3	9,6	11,6	14,7	11,8	9,8
TOTAL: entry into the programme within 3-12 months of registration (middle-term unemployment)	**45,6**	**47,3**	**44,8**	**52,6**	**53,1**	**38,3**
12-15 months (366-455 days)	7,4	6,3	7,7	9,5	6,8	6,6
15-18 months (456-545 days)	5,7	4,4	6,1	5,9	4,4	5,2
18-21 months (546-635 days)	4,4	2	5,1	5,9	2,3	4,1
21-24 months (636-730 days)	3,6	3,5	3,7	3,8	1,4	4
over 24 months (731 days and over)	17,8	13,1	19,1	13,5	7	27,8
TOTAL: entry into the programme within 12 months of registration and over (long-term unemployment)	**38,9**	**29,3**	**41,7**	**38,6**	**21,9**	**28,4**
Total (N = 100 %)	3 859	846	3 048	2 931	6 356	241 279

Source: OKpráce dataset for 2014

Table 6b **Timing of the intervention – the structure of ALL the new participants in the main ALMP measures in 2014 according to the length of current/monitored evidence (i.e. the length of evidence before entering the active labour market programme)**

Duration of current unemployment	Training (total)	Training (selected by a particip.)	Training (provided by the LO)	Subsid. jobs in private sector	Public works	Unempl.
Up to 1 months (0-30 days)	3,8	5,6	3,3	1,6	9,4	4,8
1-2 months (31-60 days)	7,1	10,9	6,1	4	7,1	7,1
2-3 months (61-90 days)	8,2	11,3	7,4	4,6	7,9	7,4
TOTAL: entry into the programme within 3 months of registration (short-term unemployment)	**19**	**27,8**	**16,8**	**10,1**	**24,4**	**19,3**
3-6 months (91-180 days)	22,2	25,1	21,4	17,7	25,2	20,5
6-9 months (181-270 days)	17,1	16,2	17,3	25,5	19	13,9
9-12 months (271-365 days)	11,5	10,3	11,8	16,4	11,6	10,4
TOTAL: entry into the programme within 3-12 months of registration (middle-term unemployment)	**50,8**	**51,7**	**50,5**	**59,6**	**55,9**	**44,8**
12-15 months (366-455 days)	7,5	5,9	7,9	9,1	6,5	6,4
15-18 months (456-545 days)	4,9	3,8	5,2	5,6	3,7	4,7
18-21 months (546-635 days)	3,5	2,3	3,8	4,1	2,2	3,5
21-24 months (636-730 days)	2,6	2,1	2,8	2,9	1,4	3,2
over 24 months (731 days and over)	11,7	6,6	13	8,6	5,8	18,1
TOTAL: entry into the programme within 12 months of registration and over (long-term unemployment)	**30,2**	**20,6**	**32,6**	**30,3**	**19,7**	**35,9**
Total (N = 100 %)	29 366	6 252	23 400	31 242	18 232	1 047 835

Source: OKpráce dataset for 2014

For the general overview it is necessary to analyse also the participation of low-skilled jobseekers from the hard-to-place (disadvantaged) groups. These groups are defined on the bases of aforementioned sociodemographic characteristics. However, in fact, public employment services workers also take into account the definition of the Employment Act and they put figure of some applicants being disadvantaged into the separate variables. While the procedure does not show the extent to which such workers accept this characteristic as a criterion for the process of selection of the programme participants, it allows us to see the extent of disadvantaged groups in the unemployed population as well as in specific active measures. Tables 7a and 7b capture the structure of the whole set of participants in the main active tools (table 7b) and specifically the low-skilled (table 7a) according to their appurtenance to some of disadvantaged groups. Similarly, indexes of targeting measures to these groups of applicants are outlined. Both tables show very similar trends in most groups. Therefore, our interpretation is related to the low-skilled participants but valid also for the participants as a whole. The only reasoned exception is the group of graduates (especially tertiary graduates) who were not represented among the low-skilled.

Findings from the table 7a indicate that the focus on hard-to-place groups of low-skilled vary considerably across different programmes. Applicants aged 50 years and over represented in 2014 the largest number of low-skilled participants in all measures (mainly in public works – 34,2 % and subsidized jobs in the private sector – 21,5 %). Nevertheless, due to their strong representation in the low-skilled group of unemployed, programmes were targeted on such category less significantly (indexes of targeting below the value 1 for all tools except public works). Also, a group of parents caring for children under 15

years of age was also considerably included in the programmes (indexes of targeting higher than the value 1 for all tools except public works). The category of persons unemployed for more than 6 months show a large disproportion in the data of participation: it was widely represented in training (27,4 %, index of targeting 0,8) but only slightly in the programme of public works (0,4 %, index of targeting 0) and subsidized jobs in the private sector (1,3 %, index of targeting 0) (but this is rather to be explained by the imperfection of statistical data used[6]). Groups of pregnant women and mothers as well as individuals up to 20 years of age were underrepresented in active measures (indexes of targeting 0,5 or below). Programmes were also equally focused on the disabled (indexes of targeting slightly under the value 1).

Table 7a **Hard-to-place groups of LOW-SKILLED participants in the main ALMP tools in 2014**

	T total	T sel.	T prov.	S. jobs	P. works	Unempl.
Structure of the new LOW-SKILLED participants in the main ALMP measures (according to the membership of a specific hard-to-place groups)						
Individuals up to 20 years of age	4,1	1,7	4,7	4,5	5	8,3
Individuals over 50 years of age	18,8	15,2	19,7	21,5	34,2	25,4
Women – pregnant, nursing, mothers of children up to 9 months	0,8	0,6	0,9	0	0	1,9
Persons caring for children under 15 years of age	12	6,9	13,4	12,4	9,4	10,2
Jobseekers with unemployment over 6 months	27,4	17,4	30	1,3	0,4	32,7
People with disabilities	8	8,6	7,7	7,8	8,9	10,5
Persons requiring special assistance	0,6	0,1	0,7	0,4	0,8	1
Other persons – increased need for care	0,8	0,4	1	0,3	0,3	0,7
Participation of new LOW-SKILLED entrants in the main ALMP tools in 2014 (indexes of targeting measures to specific hard-to-place groups of participants)						
Individuals up to 20 years of age	0,5	0,2	0,6	0,5	0,6	x
Individuals over 50 years of age	0,7	0,6	0,8	0,8	1,3	x
Women – pregnant, nursing, mothers of children up to 9 months	0,4	0,3	0,5	0	0	x
Persons caring for children under 15 years of age	1,2	0,7	1,3	1,2	0,9	x
Jobseekers with unemployment over 6 months	0,8	0,5	0,9	0	0	x
People with disabilities	0,8	0,8	0,7	0,7	0,8	x
Persons requiring special assistance	0,6	0,1	0,7	0,4	0,8	x
Other persons – increased need for care	1,1	0,6	1,4	0,4	0,4	x

Source: OKpráce dataset for 2014

[6] Probably not all long-term (low-skilled) unemployed are included in the variable "Specific group – jobseekers with unemployment over 6 months".

Table 7b **Hard-to-place groups of ALL participants in the main ALMP tools in 2014**

	T total	T sel.	T prov.	S. jobs	P. works	Unempl.
Structure of all the new participants in the main ALMP measures (according to the membership of a specific hard-to-place groups)						
Individuals up to 20 years of age	1,1	1	1,1	3,1	2,5	3,3
Individuals over 50 years of age	24,0	17,1	25,7	17,5	36,2	24,6
Graduates	4,3	4,7	4,2	14,5	2,8	6
Tertiary graduates up to 30 years of age	1	0,8	1	4,4	0,2	1,7
Women – pregnant, nursing, mothers of children up to 9 months	0,5	0,2	0,5	0	0	1,1
Persons caring for children under 15 years of age	15	9,2	16,4	12,4	11,4	9,6
Jobseekers with unemployment over 6 months	21,1	12,6	23,3	1,3	0,5	22
People with disabilities	8	7	8,3	5,4	11,5	9,3
Persons requiring special assistance	0,2	0,1	0,2	0,1	0,6	0,4
Other persons – increased need for care	0,3	0,1	0,4	0,1	0,3	0,3
Participation of all the new entrants in the main ALMP tools in 2014 (indexes of targeting measures to specific hard-to-place groups of participants)						
Individuals up to 20 years of age	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,9	0,8	x
Individuals over 50 years of age	1	0,7	1	0,7	1,5	x
Graduates	0,7	0,8	0,7	2,4	0,5	x
Tertiary graduates up to 30 years of age	0,6	0,5	0,6	2,6	0,1	x
Women – pregnant, nursing, mothers of children up to 9 months	0,5	0,2	0,5	0	0	x
Persons caring for children under 15 years of age	1,6	1	1,7	1,3	1,2	x
Jobseekers with unemployment over 6 months	1	0,6	1,1	0,1	0	x
People with disabilities	0,9	0,8	0,9	0,6	1,2	x
Persons requiring special assistance	0,5	0,3	0,5	0,3	1,5	x
Other persons – increased need for care	1	0,3	1,3	0,3	1	x

Source: OKpráce dataset for 2014

Conclusion

Data analysis approves some general trends which have been observed in the task of ALMP´s target groups for a long time but it also brought some new and interesting results from the perspective of implementing the labour market policy and its potential impacts. For example it has been shown that training programmes (not only these selected by participants themselves, but also standard programmes provided by the labour office) as well as the job creation support in the private sector tend to focus on people with less barriers/handicaps on the labour market (i.e. middle and younger age groups, people with no health restrictions, semiskilled jobseekers with the high school diploma, the short or middle-term unemployed). It turns out that jobseekers with relatively good characteristics participate more often in the programme of training, especially those selected by the unemployed himself. They do not face such serious and long-term problems in the labour market and that is why they could be more activated and motivated for their job search. At the same time, there is a lack of tailor-made programmes for specific groups with more disadvantages in the labour market. These programmes could strengthen not only the motivation but also the knowledge and practical skills of hard-to-place groups and ensure them inclusion on the labour market over the long term period (programmes of lifelong learning, certified courses credible for employers and, in particular, education and training programmes implemented and provided directly by the employers).

On the contrary, public works are more rather to be concentrated on people with multiple disadvantages in the labour market, such as the low-skilled, jobseekers with health problems, older people and the long-term or repeatedly unemployed. Thus, targeting of public works differs significantly from other ALMP measures and this may be related to a certain degree of segmentation within active measures – there are not any other suitable and sufficiently strong ALMP programmes that could overcome the multiple disadvantages of some applicants (ALMP tools can contribute to segmenting the labour market rather than resolving/overcoming it).

In relation to low level of education some findings confirming the above mentioned trends were identified. Public works are the domain of the low-skilled, thus, they are increasingly being earmarked as specific segment of active labour market policy for the unemployed with significant disabilities, despite the fact that they do not contribute to creation of permanent employment. This measure was focused mainly on the long-term and repeatedly unemployed low-skilled as well as on older low-skilled jobseekers. These categories tend to be overrepresented in the programme of public works.

The low-skilled are less likely to participate in training as well as in the programme of subsidized jobs in the private sector. In other words, people with more educational difficulties suffer from the suitable tailor-made training programmes which could respect their specific needs and overcome skills barriers (long-term and/or modular training and work experience programmes combining theory with practice provided by the employers themselves). They are also less attractive for private employers and even the state subsidy cannot increase their attractiveness.

Timing of intervention was another important feature of ALMP´s measures targeting. We found that in 2014 the most of the low-skilled jobseekers entered all the provisions within 3-12 months of registration with the labour office. In contrast to all participants, however, the low-skilled were more often included in active measures even after a longer period of unemployment, i.e. the share of the long-term unemployed with low level of education was higher in all instruments. It seems that active labour market provisions for the low-skilled are usually used rather as a curative tool focused on discontinuing of long-term unemployment period (possibly also in order to eliminate the risk of deadweight). On the other hand, the finding also implicates, that public employment services are working with some form of profiling of the unemployed, albeit more intuitive than formalized one.

References

Caliendo, M., Hujer, R., Thomsen, S. 2005. *Identifying Effect Heterogeneity to Improve the Efficiency of Job Creation Schemes in Germany*. IAB-Discussion Paper. The Institute for Employment Research: Nuremberg.

Eichhorst, W. 2016. *Evaluating Labour Market Policy*. IZA Discussion Paper Series No. 9966, Bonn: IZA.