

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 15097

**The Cost-Effectiveness of Subsidies to
Youth Employment in Italy:
Toward a Preliminary Evaluation**

Bruno Contini

FEBRUARY 2022

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 15097

The Cost-Effectiveness of Subsidies to Youth Employment in Italy: Toward a Preliminary Evaluation

Bruno Contini

University of Torino, Collegio Carlo Alberto and IZA

FEBRUARY 2022

Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but IZA takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The IZA Institute of Labor Economics is an independent economic research institute that conducts research in labor economics and offers evidence-based policy advice on labor market issues. Supported by the Deutsche Post Foundation, IZA runs the world's largest network of economists, whose research aims to provide answers to the global labor market challenges of our time. Our key objective is to build bridges between academic research, policymakers and society.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ISSN: 2365-9793

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Schaumburg-Lippe-Straße 5–9
53113 Bonn, Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Email: publications@iza.org

www.iza.org

ABSTRACT

The Cost-Effectiveness of Subsidies to Youth Employment in Italy: Toward a Preliminary Evaluation

The European Commission has for many years advocated fiscal policies in order to improve the employability of young people. This paper aims at providing a preliminary rough estimate of the cost-effectiveness of rebates on social security contributions granted to employers that Italy has utilized since the Nineties in a variety of forms. My conclusion is that cost-effectiveness is still an open question.

JEL Classification: J08

Keywords: policy evaluation

Corresponding author:

Bruno Contini
LABORatorio R. Revelli
Collegio Carlo Alberto
Via Real Collegio 30
10024 Moncalieri (To)
Italy
E-mail: bruno.contini@unito.it

B. Contini,

The cost-effectiveness of subsidies to youth employment: toward a preliminary evaluation

The European Commission has for many years advocated fiscal policies in order to improve the employability of young people. This paper aims at providing a preliminary rough estimate of the cost-effectiveness of rebates on social security contributions granted to employers that Italy has utilized since the Nineties in a variety of forms.

The analysis takes the lead from previous studies of long term non-employment (LTNE) in Italy (Contini et al, 2017 and 2019). LTNE has been widely neglected in the academic literature: “long-term” refers to up to 15–25 years of absence from the labour market for people in prime age, often followed by full and definitive exit. Many European economies suffer from this dramatic disease: a vast number of people who lose their job only a few months or years after their first hire enter the ranks of the unemployed or leave the workforce altogether, never to regain regular employment for the rest of their life. According to our estimate of Italy’s LTNE, the jobless average duration is 11 years. In the vast majority of cases LTNE is a prelude to lifelong non-employment, unsheltered from the safety nets offered by welfare institutions.

In 2015 A. B. Krueger tackled the problem in the U.S. His conclusion is dramatic “...once a person leaves the labour force, he or she is extremely unlikely to return (*to work*).” While not denying the well-known issues of skill obsolescence and discrimination on the part of the employers, Krueger strongly emphasizes the social problems associated to very long non-employment duration:

Unfortunately most of the academic studies on long term unemployment are scarcely relevant to this particular problem. Indeed, there are countless studies investigating important consequences of long-term unemployment, like skill obsolescence and loss of salary upon re-entry. But the official definition of “long-term unemployment” to which they refer indicates unemployment lasting more than 1 year (seldom 2 years) while the length of jobless duration is seldom investigated. Individuals unemployed for longer periods are counted in official statistics as “out of the labour force” (OLF).

Our statistical analysis used longitudinal employer-employee databases originating from INPS (Social Security) administrative records. The observation period ranges between 1987 and 2012. Survival is estimated by counting each individual since first entry in the labour market and still present in the database at the end of a given observation period. All forms of dependent work and self-employment are observed in our database (including temporary and apprentice contracts). Non-survivors are the individuals who have dropped out, i.e. who have left regular employment and no longer reappear at work in the administrative data. If an individual is missing from the employment records for a period of time however long (additional schooling periods, sickness leaves, military service, all observable in the INPS archives) and then shows up again in the records, he is counted as a survivor.

Analysis was restricted to male workers aged 18–30 at the time of their first job and track their careers in the “regular” labour market for up to 25 years.

Premature and definite exit is very high: out of 100 new male entries in 1987, only 79% survived in 2012, 77% the blue-collars and 81% the white-collars

The following table displays three indicators: the estimated magnitude of uninterrupted long-term non-employment (1,260 individuals), the average LTNE duration (11,6 years) and the ratio of the number of LTNE individuals to the male population of working age (6,5%). The latter provides a better assessment of the relative magnitude of LTNE than its ratio to the total workforce which may

have margins of ambiguity. Italy's unemployment calculated as a percentage of the same denominator yields 7.2% (while the official 2012 male unemployment rate was 5.7%).

Interestingly, the figures for the OLF's in 2012 (1,421,000 individuals) and the LTNE's (1,260,000) are quite close: a reassuring finding as many individuals self-reporting as OLF are likely to be found among the LTNE. The LFS estimates of OLF's have no upper age limit, and therefore it is not surprising to find the latter somewhat more numerous than the LTNE's.

Tab. 1 - LTNE = Long-term non-employment: estimated magnitude and duration in the 1987-2012 observation window (in parenthesis the share of LTNE in each age group)

Age group	LTNE duration (yrs)	LTNE (000) (in parenthesis: % on total)
53++	25-32	91 (7)
47-53	21-24	99 (8)
38-46	16-20	260 (21)
32-37	10-15	361 (28)
26-31	5 -9	405 (32)
16-25	0 - 4	45 (3)
All	Average 11.6	1260 (100)
LTNE / male working age population (%)		6,5 %
Survival 2012: average all workers at end observation period	79%	
Male unempl/ working age population		7,2 %
OLF "out of labour force but willing to take a job"		1421 (LFS estimate)

LTNE estimation could be replicated year after year using observation windows of equal length. This is not possible at this stage as access to the INPS administrative database is now much more restrictive. The embodiment of the true dynamics of the economy in the LTNE model would be a very important and difficult task, but it is out reach for the time being.

Ceteris paribus, the number of successive LTNE cohorts could be of the same order of magnitude as the one displayed here. The older cohorts retire year after year at similar pace (about 200,000 throughout the late 90's and early 2000's) and the number of new young entrants in the labor market (about 150,000) is not changing dramatically aside from the demographic (negative) trend.

A partial, yet useful picture of how the business cycle may affect the estimation of LTNE, can be obtained from the data at hand: the figure depicts the estimated survival of the cohorts entered in 1992 over the 20-year window 1992-2012, and of those entered in 2000 over the 12-year window 2000-2012, as compared to the full 1987-2012 window (fig.1). The impact of the 1992 crisis is clear and suggests that survival at the end of a window of comparable length might be at least 5 p.p. lower than our current estimate. Likewise and perhaps even more for the cohorts entering in 2000.

Fig. 1 - Estimated survival of cohorts entering in 1987, 1992 and 2000




Fig. 2 Survival depends on the timing of labour market entry

A simulation experiment

The simulation model—based on a pseudo-Markovian process with state dependence accounting for longterm joblessness—provides a rough estimate of the long-run impact of policy changes sustained over a period of 10 years.

The *ceteris paribus* assumption implicit in this simulation is, obviously, restrictive. A general equilibrium approach - nowadays out of reach - would improve the reliability of this exploration.

For this simulation we need an estimate of the workers' exit probability from the labor market in presence of the s.s.c. rebates. The LTNE estimate puts it at 4,7% for blue-collar-workers and 3,1% for the white-collars.

The model indicates that in absence of subsidies the number of LTNE's over a period of 10 years would be 1,181.000 (compared to 1,260,00 over the complete 25 yr window, tab 1). Instead, as a result of 10 years of s.s.c. rebates to firms for all newly hired 150,000 individuals, the number of expected LTNE's would be reduced to 721 000 individuals, 460,000 less than the no-subsidies outcome .

Unfortunately no reliable data are available on the number of those who benefited from social security rebates: each year from 1 to 2 million male and female workers between 2010 and 2019 (about 50% each gender), with benefits of varying durations and institutional differences ("temporary and economic benefits", gender and activity related). Even less do we know on the costs involved, about 2700 eu/ year/head, in 2014 and 2015, here too inclusive of all the destinations.¹

¹ Rapporto INPS 2016, pp. 149-152.

For this exploration I have made reasonable hypotheses on the figures involved. The simulation results yield orders of magnitude of the cost effectiveness of the rebates (applying only to male workers), where all the *caveat* apply.

Basic statistics

Male dependent employees, aged 15-65 in year 2000: about 10 million (ISTAT)

Applicants for new jobs: average 150,000 / year (aside from demographic decline)

Monthly wage of new entrants (blue and white collars) = 1,000 eu

Monthly wage of a one-year of tenure's workers (blue and white collars) = 1,100 eu

Social security contributions (s.s.c.) paid by employers = 23,81%

Firing costs = 3 month pay + s.s.c. = 3,714 eu

Reduced s.s.c. for each new entry indicated by EU Commission = 50%

Employer cost of subsidized new hire (monthly) = 1,000 + 50% s.s.c. = 1,119

Employer cost of subsidized retention at end of first year of employment = 1,100 + 50% s.s.c. 119 = 1,219

Estimated survival rates from LTNE count at the end of the 32-year observation window 1980-2012:

Blue-collars employed by small firms = 72%

Blue-collars employed by large firms = 80%

White-collars (small and large employers) = 81%

The probability model

In the econometric Cox model discussed in Contini (2019) the main determinant of premature exit is the labor cost of retaining a newly hired worker vs. that of laying him off (COST). This depends : (i) on the timing of the option, i.e. if it occurs a short time after the hire (say, less than one year) or a much longer time (say, more than 6 years); (ii) on the probability of premature exit if no action is taken; (iii) on the s.s.c. exemptions granted to the employer.

$COST(i,j,t) = [\text{new hire's labor cost to the employer (inclusive of s.s.c. rebate)} + \text{firing cost of the new hire}] / [\text{labor cost of retaining the new hire (inclusive of s.s.c. rebate)} + \text{firing cost of the retained hire}]$

$i > 0$ refers to the individual, j to skill level, and t to time.

$COST(i,j,t)$ yields very significant estimates of the probability of premature exit under different policy scenarios (s.s.c. rebates). For the purpose of this simulation the average values of COST may be used. Namely $COST = 1,05$ corresponding to a hiring rebate at entry equal to one month of s.s.c. (eu 238 per head), and $COST = 1,12$ corresponding to a rebate of eu 476 per head (hiring rebate and retention at the end of the contract).

Tab. 2 Predicted % of delayed premature exit probability estimated by the Cox model (the options are exercised by employers at different times after first hire)

Option excersised	less than 3 years after entry	3-6 years after entry	after 6 years since entry
BLUE COLLARS /SMALL FIRMS	4,7	4,7	12,6
BLUE COLLARS / MED-LARGE FIRMS	4,4	3,1	14,3
WHITE COLLARS / SMALL	2,4	3,0	11,3
WHITE COLLARS / MED-LARGE	1,9	2,5	7,2

The probability of premature exit delayed by the subsidies is estimated as follows:

FUTURE DELAYED SURV = LTNE SURV - (COST * delayed exit probability)

FUTURE DELAYED SURVIVAL delivers an estimate of the number of workers “saved” each year from premature exit, due to the application of s.s.c. rebates

Tab. 2 FUTURE DELAYED SURVIVAL

	Blue-collars in small firms	Blue-collars in large firms	White-collars
annual probability of premature exit estimated by Cox model	0,047	0,031	0,031
LTNE survival	0,72	0,79	0,81
(*) Simulated future survival C =1 (no rebates)	0,72	0,79	0,81
Simulated future survival C= 1,05 (rebate at entry)	0,769	0,821	0,841
Simulated future survival C= 1,12 (rebates at entry and contract termination)	0,773	0,825	0,845

(*) If no rebates are granted - i.e. COST = 1, constant for all workers - the premature exit probability is unchanged and no workers are “saved” from premature exit.

The policy recommended for many years by the EC to enhance youth work consisted of subsidizing the employers with 50% of the monthly social security contribution, which amount to 23,8% of basic pay for both blue and white-collars for three consecutive years. The number of newly hired dependent workers to whom the incentives apply is assumed here to be 150,000, independently of the business cycle. One year of s.s.c. for all costs the public budget eu 1,428/head, for a total of 214 million eu per year, and will deliver about 46,000 new hires each year. But it has also a secondary, indirect joint effect, by “saving” a number of workers already on the job from premature exit. The cost of the policy is eu 4,708 per head (either new hires or “saved” workers), about 19% of their yearly labor cost.

In order to evaluate the impact of rebates on employment I assume that, once the policy is implemented, it will be pursued for a relatively long number of successive three-year periods, each costing the budget 214 million x 3 = eu 642 million, amounting to eu 1,926 million a year from period 3 onward.

	Total budget outlay (million eu)
Year 1 ***	642
Year 2 ***	1,284

Year 3	***	1,926
Year 4	***	1,926
Year 5	***	1,926
....	and so on	

The policy would affect 46,000 individuals a year, either new hires or workers “saved” from premature exit. In either case, from year 3 onward, the number of LTNE’s decreases by 138,000 individuals annually ($46,000 \times 3 = 138,000$), which amounts to 1,38% of total male dependent employment (about 10 million individuals), a significant improvement. The ratio of LTNE’s to male employment would stabilize at 5,1% compared to 6,5% in absence of the subsidies. The annual cost of such a policy is eu 1,926 milion, i.e. eu 13,956, over 50% of the yearly individual labor cost.²

The cost-effectiveness of the s.s.c. rebates is still an open question, in the face of its high public cost. A new young man at work is obviously an important plus. But also the prolonged duration of one person’s job truncated before contract termination (which would put him at risk of almost never getting back at work) is highly “socially valuable”: its impact runs from effects on personal mental and physical health and perhaps on human capital accumulation of future generations. This is also important but eludes any attempt to quantify it.

Tab.3 - Simulation results: how the s.s.c. rebates affect the LTNE’s

Skill level	Firm size	Dependent workers at start of observation period: ISTAT estimates (*)	LTNE survival rate in <u>absence of subsidies</u>	No. LTNE workers prematurely laid off during observation period <u>in absence of subsidies</u>	No. new jobs created and/or workers “saved” from premature exit <u>in presence of subsidies at entry</u>
BLUE	Small		0,72	353,000	17,800
	Large		0,80	305,000	9,500
	ALL	4 million			
WHITE	ALL	3 million	0,81	602,000	18,700
ALL		7 million	0,79	1,260,000	46,000

(*) excluding self-employment

² If the incentives include those aimed at extending the contract beyond one-year termination (eu 476/monthly per head), the number of workers saved from premature exit is only marginally higher (45,730 individuals) at a gigantic public cost amounting to 18,700 eu/ per head.

Bibliography

Abraham K, Haltiwanger J, Sanduski K, Spetzler J (2018) The consequences of long-term unemployment: evidence from linked survey and administrative data, [ILR Review](#).

Battistin, E. Rettore E. (2002), "ELIGIBLE NON-PARTICIPANT AND INELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS AS A DOUBLE CONTROL GROUP IN REGRESSION DISCONTINUITY DESIGNS", [Statistics Canada Proceedings](#)

B. Contini and R. Quaranta, "Long term non-employment: is it a lifetime disease?" [Italian Economic Journal](#) (n.2, 2019)

B. Contini, J. Garcia Perez, T Pusch and R. Quaranta (2020), "Long term non-employment: a comparative exploration on Italy, Germany and Spain. Is it a lifetime disease?" [Politica Economica, Journal of Political Economy](#)

Krueger AL (2015) "How tight is the labour market?", [NBER](#) no.3

Krueger AL, Cramer J, Cho D (2014), "Are the long-term unemployed at the margin of the labor market?" [Brookings Papers on Economic Activity](#)