

**RESTART@WORK: A STRATEGIC PATTERN FOR OUTPLACEMENT  
2012-1-IT1-LEO05-02621**

**Final Guidelines for future adaptations of the R@W protocol for career  
support interventions**

LLP - Leonardo da Vinci Transfer of Innovation 2012-1-IT1-LEO05-02621 - CUP: G92F12000140006

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



## Index

1. Localizing the R@W protocol for use in other countries.....	3	
1.1 Basic concepts in cross-cultural research with examples .....	4	
1.2 Identify moderators and customize the intervention.....	5	
2. Implementing the R@W protocol to foster successful interventions: key factors identified during the localizations in Bulgaria, France and Spain.....	6	
2.1 Context analysis .....	8	
2.2 Qualifications of professionals that designed and delivered the interventions.....	9	
3. Phases of the localization process.....	10	
4. Evaluating the effectiveness of the intervention.....	13	
Annexes .....	14	
References .....	15	

## 1. Localizing the R@W protocol for use in other countries

Fòrema has developed a pattern for outplacement "Restart@Work" to support VET systems to become more attractive for the different target groups and manage the labour market emergencies. Nevertheless, the current situation requires new solutions and European cooperation.

Restart@Work aim was proposed: *to improve the provision of training of partners through the acquisition of tools and models for effective interventions, facing the new demands from the labour market and the target groups, taking advantage of cooperative networks at local and transnational level.* The project involved experts active in the field of training, education and employment services, from private and public sectors, the end users of services for the professional placement and career guidance. The model consists of a matrix describing the process and the key tools used by experts for the implementation of the interventions, the material will also be accompanied by guidelines for the adaptation of the model to different operational contexts, actions of capacity building and training for operators of the partners.

Restart@Work's aims ask to implement a strategy to ensure the expected impact of the results and outputs and to activate effective measures to ensure their sustainability, involving direct and indirect targets. R@W has been successfully transferred and adapted to three different contexts: Bulgaria, France and Spain. This ambitious result has been made possible thanks to the "Guidelines for the cross-cultural transfer of R@W outplacement intervention".

These guidelines summarize the results of the adaptation and experimentation of the R@W protocol for career support interventions that have been conducted during the project and provide a "handy" guide for future localizations. The R@W protocol provides a scheme of action ([Link to "Protocol.Action.Phases.xls" final public document](#)), a step-by-step guide for designing, implementing and evaluating an intervention ([add link to the final public document "R@W Outplacementprotocol.doc"](#)) and a set of tools that proved to be useful in previous experiences with the protocol. Different approaches to localization are suggested for the scheme of action and for the tools. The former –by definition– can be localized without changes, as it highlights the steps for realizing any intervention of this sort. On the other side, the tools may need more attention, especially if results of the interventions will be compared across nations. Hence, a brief introduction of the main issues arising in cross-cultural research involving assessment tools is provided below.

It is key to note that starting from a model developed by Fòrema and therefore on the basis of a shared methodology, three project partners from Spain, Bulgaria and France have adapted the model to the regional and national contexts and the target group. They have also adapted the battery of tools envisaged by the initial model in order to tailor it to the needs of the users and the target group. As regards such tools, which are indeed examples that can be either used, adapted or discarded, partners had the freedom to choose the ones that they considered the most relevant and useful to their needs, to select local/national tools or their own tools or even to neglect some of them and not use them at all.

Thus there are three transfer experiences a model that can serve as inspiration to transfer the model to different realities.

## 1.1 Basic concepts in cross-cultural research with examples

In cross-cultural research, the goal is typically to compare different countries on a specific construct (e.g., general knowledge, intelligence, leadership style, conflict negotiations ...). When researchers find a difference in the measures they collected by means of their tools (e.g. tests of knowledge, tests of intelligence, ...), they have to be sure that this difference can be interpreted as a difference in the underlined construct (e.g. general knowledge) rather than a measurement artefact, i.e. a difference that can be explained, totally or partially, by the tools that have been employed to collect the data.

The “noise” that the measurement tools add to the assessment conducted by practitioners or researcher is called method variance, i.e. variance that comes from the method employed to measure the object of study. When different groups are compared, an assumption is made that the method variance is equal across groups. Otherwise, differences between the groups might be misinterpreted as differences in the construct under investigation rather than a mere method artefact. In cross-cultural research, the term bias is used to indicate disturbances to the interpretation of findings. An example will clarify this point. Van de Vijver&Poortinga (2005) report that in the European Values Survey, the Spanish scores on an item measuring loyalty deviated from the overall pattern of results for this country. Upon closer examination, it appeared that, unlike other languages, the Spanish word for loyalty that was used has the connotation of sexual faithfulness (“fidelidad” was used rather than “lealtad”). This example illustrates why it is advisable to use multiple translators and ask them to converge by consensus on the final version. This error might have been detected by translators who know both countries and are familiar with the intended purpose of the question at hand. Also, the practice of translating and back-translating is useful and might effectively detect such errors. Beyond the semantic meaning (does the term translates back in the same way?), a great deal of attention has to be put on comprehensibility, readability, and style.

But bias might also derive from accurate translations. Suppose you have to measure general knowledge in Italy and in France, and you use the item “What is calvados made of?” You will probably find a large percentage of French people and a much smaller percentage of Italian people know that it is made from apples. How to interpret this result? It would be incredibly wrong to interpret this finding as an indication that French people have more general knowledge than Italian people (which may be, but we need better evidence!). The “noise” that has been introduced by translating (and not adapting) the question is that calvados is typical in France and a market niche in Italy, hence it is less familiar in the latter nation than in the former. This example illustrates why the typical translation/back-translation procedure can miserably fail (but still is useful and should be employed). The question “What is calvados made of?” is very easy to translate and can be translated back and forth in the two languages without any error (at the eyes of a skilled translator).

An important principle that should be followed in adaptation is that “Effects of cultural and linguistic differences that are not important to the intended uses of the tests in the populations of interest should be minimized” (Hambleton, 2001). Hence, translators should be able to identify sources of method bias. Also, translators must have knowledge of both cultures and a general knowledge of the subject matter. In addition, it is useful to have experience with psychological tests, respondents’ motivation, effects of speediness, and so on. Anytime there is a doubt that the adapted question, or sentence, or stimulus is not being understood equally in the two languages, the amount of overlap in the construct measured should be assessed *a-posteriori* (i.e. after a data collection) via construct-validity investigations. These investigations should be conducted by an expert in cross-cultural adaptation.

There are two options for the translation of learning and assessment tools. The first is called “application”, and it is useful when a linguistically appropriate translation also turns out to be

appropriate at the psychological level. The application only needs a good literal translation. Yet, the translators (or her supervisor) have to be able to understand when this is not possible and the “adaptation” option should be preferred. In the “Calvados” example, the translator should have noticed that the object around which the question was built is differently familiar in the two cultures. At this point, the item shall be translated “unfaithfully” in order to preserve as much as possible the original function of the question. For example, asking Italian people “What is Grappa made of?” might have been a valid option. Obviously, in case a cross-cultural comparison will be based on this question the equivalence should be then established *a-posteriori*.

## 1.2 Identify moderators and customize the intervention.

The main goal of the pilot localizations carried out in this project and that of future localizations within the Career Support Network Agreement is to maximize the effectiveness of the interventions. At this regard, there are many aspects that might influence – positively and negatively – the effectiveness of R@W-based interventions. We call these aspects “moderators” of the relationship between the R@W protocol and its localized effectiveness. Some moderators may be out of our control and should therefore be taken for granted.

An example is the number of positions opened in the job market in a determined period in time, which set the top limit to the number of people that can re-enter the job market in the same period of time. Obviously, the effectiveness of R@W-based interventions is strongly influenced by these limits. *These moderators should be identified in the first phase of the localization, detailed in the context analyses (Attachment 3), and used to adapt the intervention in order to maximize efficiency.* Most of these “input” aspects are related to the socio-economic context in which the interventions are carried out and they constitute precious information according to which the R@W-based interventions should be tailored. Other moderating factors are related to the users. Different groups of users might have different needs, and the ability of the intervention of satisfying those needs is one of the major predictor of its effectiveness.

The individual and peculiar characteristics of participants should be assessed during *the design phase* of the intervention (e.g., during training needs analysis, Attachment 2) and used to build *ad-hoc interventions*. The flexibility of the R@W protocol is indeed one of its most effective aspects. It is therefore essential to conduct accurate and thorough *context analysis and training needs analysis*. As far as the latter, R@W-based career support interventions should also be tailored to the final users, so that they can re-enter the job market quickly and effectively. It is critical to have –among others– information regarding their skills (Attachment 1), values (Attachment 5), self-efficacy (Attachment 4) and entrepreneurial competences (Attachment 12). A set of tools for these assessments is provided as an initial prompt together with the description of the R@W protocol (the attachments). Previously localized or native tools should be employed in case the vocational designers think that they could outperform the original tools, because the main goal of the adaptation is maximizing effectiveness rather than comparing different countries. Yet, native tools should not be chosen because of habits (“operators are used with them”) without a reasonable justification of their superiority.

## 2. Implementing the R@W protocol to foster successful interventions: key factors identified during the localizations in Bulgaria, France and Spain

Each partner tested the adapted model in specific target groups. The variety of beneficiaries of this action allowed the partnership to make some interesting considerations on the flexibility and adaptability of the model to different contexts.

Despite the general situation of persisting crisis, some good results were obtained also in terms of contract proposals and new job opportunities for the participants, which encourage the partnership to expand the scope and the impacts of the action in a broader scale.

In the piloting phase, The R@W protocol has been localized and tested with 50 unemployed people ranging from age 15 to 55. Five people left the intervention before the end. Most participants (around 30 of the total participants) were in their last year of secondary school or had just finished secondary school. A minority of participants (10 of the total participants) held a university degree. A minority of participants (12 of the total participants) lost their job and were looking for another one.

Each partner developed its own intervention, localizing the protocol of intervention tools according to the guidelines for transfer. Table 1 provides the tools that were translated, adapted, or substituted by a native tool.

The table below shows how each partner developed its own model, adapting the tools proposed by Fòrema to their own national situation or implementing the same tools proposed by Fòrema

To adapt the model, several important steps were followed. First, the original model R@W presented by Fòrema was translated into every language, in order to know more deeply the communication system and adapt it to each country. Subsequently the model was discussed in relation to the usability of the original attachments and tools to the circumstances of the particular context of each partner.

In this sense a lot of reference was made to the initial context analysis carried out to provide a clear image of the economic situation in the country and the region where the pilot project was implemented.

The result is a model adapted to the criteria and commonly accepted notions of each country and each region. The adapted model took the following form, taking into account that some tools were translated, other adapted and some others were included as native tools, to make the model really useful for participants and adapted to the real context of each country:

Table 1. List of native, translated, and adapted R@W tools

	Tools - Annexes to the model	INDICO			ASSIST NET		UBP		
		A	B	C	A	B	A	B	D
1	Skills assessment	x				x		x	
2	Analysis of training needs			x	x			x	
3	Context analysis	x			x			x	



4	Self efficacy interview	x			x		x		
5	List of job values	x			x			x	
6	Network of relations grid	x			x			x	
7	Recruitment and selection process	x			x			x	
8	Applying for a job		x		x		x		
9	Guide for professional profile description	x			x			x	
10	Template for cover letter		x			x	x		
11	Phases and topics of a job interview		x		x		x		
12	Map of entrepreneurial competences			x	x				x
13	Self evaluation management diamond value		x			x			x
14	Individual file			x		x		x	

Notes: A = translated R@W tool; B = native tool for the same goal; C= adapted R@W tool; D= activity not fulfilled.

The list of adaptations and specific evaluations of the tools are provided in WP4 final report ([add link](#)), together with a SWOT analysis of the pilot actions.

After the pilot actions conducted in Spain, Bulgaria, France and Italy the R@W partnership elaborated a final list of tools to carry out activities foreseen in the realization phase. Some of them were kept in their original version, some merged into a single tool, some were moved to another phase (context analysis), some were removed. A correspondence table to compare initial tools and final tools is provided in annex 1 of these guidelines. The list of final tools is summarized in the following table:

Table 2: list of Restart@Work final tools

N	Tool	Description/notes	Phase
01	Skills assessment		2.2 Analysis of competences, potential and talent of the participant
02	Analysis of training needs		2.3 Identification of individual training needs
03	Self-efficacy Interview		2.4 Self-efficacy assessment
04 a	List of job values		2.6 Motivational analysis
04 b	Motivation style questionnaire	NEW	2.6 Motivational analysis
05	Job search	NEW: merger old tools: 06_Network of relations + 08_applying for a job	2.7 Active job search
06	CV and cover letter	NEW: old 10_template for cover letter + detailed info + CV samples	2.7 Active job search
07	Get ready for the job interview	NEW: merger between old 07_recruitment and selection procedure + 11_phases and topic of a job interview + strategy, faq, further explanations	2.7 Active job search

08	Feedback form	NEW	2.7 Active job search
09	Map of entrepreneurial competences		2.9 Business Start up
10	Self-evaluation management diamond value		2.9 Business Start up
11	Individual file		2.10 Individual career guidance actions

The **SWOT analysis** highlighted some key factors that may prove to be useful for the transfer of the R@W protocol in other nations within the European Career Support Network. The **Strengths** that partners agree to emphasize are the following: the variety of tools, complete training program with a set of instruments in each field, the functionality of the different social groups activities enable teamwork and complementary, flexibility and ease of use of the model and tools, and the fact that the sequence of activities improves motivation and self-efficacy of participants. About the **Weaknesses**, members noted that the range of issues presupposes: experts in all fields, slow presentation and preparation, that the model should be used by qualified coaches and a strong dependence on the economic context and social. Regarding **Opportunities**, all participants think that the pilot results provide a good basis for the presentation of the model to the training institutions and career guidance, and adaptability to other target groups. Referring to the **Threats**, the partners assume that the model could not easily become a practice, due to the limitations and restrictions of agencies nationally recognized, the crisis and the possible decrease in public and private funds to support public policies aiming at facilitating people's access to the labour market; jobs available may not be attractive targets for potential beneficiaries.

## 2.1 Context analysis

The R@W protocol is based on a Plan-Do-Check-Act (Deming, 1986) model of service delivery (which was proposed by Deming in a 1986 book ironically entitled "Out of the crisis"). In the Plan phase, the first activity is *context analysis*, according to which project designers should identify the geographical framework of reference, and collect and analyze data on the 1) economic system (gross regional product, trade, production, capital base), 2) social and demographic systems; 3) labor market and social security policies, including labor market public and private institutions, labor standards, unemployment benefit, re-employment services, training schemes, skills base, education levels and special competencies. The initial definition of the geographical framework under investigation should both consider where the unemployed come from and where they could successfully re-enter the job market.

For example, if major downsizings occur in a region, workers may still find many good-fitting positions opened in another developing region. Then, data regarding the local economic and productive systems should be collected and analyzed. Object of this analysis are production chains, industry clusters, number and size of the firms, gross regional product and development rate, and path-dependences. Industry clusters (or local industrial production systems) are geographically close and interdependent firms and industries that are characterized by buyer-supplier relationships, shared technology and know-how, and shared labor pool and institutions. Examples are "Pharmaceutical and medicine manufacturing", "Cutlery and hand tool manufacturing", or "Olive oil production". Path-

dependence represents the extent to which affordances – the set of decisions available – are limited by decisions made in the past, even if past circumstances might no longer be relevant. It refers to the limits imposed by the productive history of a region or land.

The initial context analysis should provide a *detailed quantitative representation of social and demographic characteristics of people living in the geographical framework compared to those of unemployed people*. Lastly, a detailed analysis of the labor market and of social policies should be conducted. Main aspects of interests in this phase are unemployment rate (e.g., percentage of labor force unemployed for more than 3 months, percentage of unemployed who are looking for a job, percentage of unemployed that no more look for a job – i.e. discouraged workers, percentage of unemployed that do not have the skills to look for a job – i.e. marginally attached workers, ...). In the labor market and social policies analysis special attention should be devoted to the accurate description of unemployment benefits (or compensations), networks of public and private institutions such as employment services, vocational training bodies and/or placement professionals active in the geographical framework, and regional, national and European legislation regarding labor and employment. In addition, the labor market analysis should highlight the foreseen market demand of specific professional profiles (e.g. “web developer”, “key account manager”, “buyer”). Lastly, a first set of funding agencies should be listed in order to help fund raisers in their job before and during the intervention. Activities were typically more individualized at the beginning of the actions (e.g. introduction, training needs analysis and relationship building), balanced between individual and group session in the middle of the intervention (e.g. for training) and again more individualized at the end (e.g. follow-up).

## 2.2 Qualifications of professionals that designed and delivered the interventions.

In the pilot actions of localizations, all activities were conducted by professionals who are experts and trainers in: *special education and career guidance of the disabled, adult education, special pedagogy, pedagogical multimedia resources, employment and socio-professional insertion, ICT and Social Networks, etc.* This turned out to be crucial for the success of the interventions. The professionals were expected to help trainees improving their self-knowledge and self-confidence, increase their interest and motivation, and define their project and goals. Their role was of utmost importance in the implementation of the proposed activities in the R@W, motivate participants to help improve their employability, find training or employment opportunities, teach them new ways to develop their CVs and cover letters, and so on. This is definitely an important point to highlight in these guidelines, which are supposed to foster and support future localizations.

All professionals who took part in this project are characterized by their vast experience in the field of training and implementation of socio-professional activities. This has been key in all processes R@W for the activities obtain good results and to the maintenance of the participants during the duration of the project.

For further applications of the model, it is important to design the relocation action (adaptation model R@W) that there must be a number of people trained so they can implement the action of Career Support. And furthermore, **an interdisciplinary team of professionals is recommended to lead to a successful implementation of the model.**

### 3. Phases of the localization process.

Capitalizing on the three pilot actions carried out in Bulgaria, France and Spain, an updated set of phases that may help in localizing the R@W protocol has been realized. The following is a general analysis carried out during the application of the R@W model in three countries: Bulgaria, France and Spain. These activities are based on the adaptations carried out in order to transfer the model, and on the conclusions that were reached in terms of the control measures collected during the implementation.

To begin, each partner had targeted people with very different characteristics: in France and Bulgaria they were mostly unskilled young people who have not found a first job yet; in addition to that, in Bulgaria part of the participants were disabled - deaf, hard of hearing or cochlear-implanted. While in Spain, the target group was made of people with different educational levels, mainly with higher education and who have been in the labour market before, but that because of the current circumstances they are unemployed. All of them are currently unemployed and looking for career guidance in order to improve their employability skills.

These differences between the target groups allowed coaches and specialists to collect varied and abundant information, which provides the results validity mayor and was the first step to make in order to adapt the model to local circumstances. The activities carried out by partners followed the same pattern: experts conducted individual and group activities, orientation and empowerment sessions directed to participants. In all cases, the group sessions and personal interviews were conducted by career guidance experts. These activities were complementary with respect to the practical use of the R@W and/or native tools.

The activities could be different from one person to another, according to their individual situation or motivation. But globally the participants had been able to take part in the following planned activities:

- Skills assessment and Life satisfaction questionnaire
- Individual consultations
- Self-efficacy
- Communication
- Motivation
- Job Seeking
- Job market
- Enterprise start-up

On the other hand, the actions were carried out taking into high consideration the wishes of the participants. During the implementation of the project, each participant received tutoring and guidance, and received e-mails or phone calls to help him/her solve questions or doubts that emerged during the relocation process. Every participant had the opportunity to seek and receive individual help and support, when needed.



The transfer process of the initial R@W model can be referred to as a **"good practice" that can be helpful to enable further transfers of the model to other contexts and its adaptation to different target groups**. There follows a summary of the phases of the localization process:

1. Define the *problem* and the *actors* involved (possible scenarios exemplified below)
  - a) A big firm is closing and 350 employees need support to re-enter the job market. The firm and the trade union are paying for the intervention (Outplacement scenario).
  - b) The ratio of unemployed people is increasingly high due to a global financial crisis. Public funds are available to tackle the problem (Career Guidance scenario).
  - c) Unemployment is particularly high among young first-time job-seekers. Public funds are available (Vocational guidance scenario).
  - d) Unemployment is particularly high for groups of minorities and/or disadvantaged categories and a private company that is active in the social welfare wants to run an intervention (Special needs scenario).
2. Conduct a *detailed context analysis* [insert links to attachment in the model and examples carried out in this project]
3. Get the designers *acquainted with the R@W protocol* (add links to public version) and its annexes.
4. Follow the R@W protocol to *design the intervention* (identify participants, set goals of the intervention, set phases/methodologies and indicators of effectiveness)
5. *Choose which tools* (Attachments of the R@W protocol) will be used in the intervention, given the goals and the target population.
6. *Localize the tools*. For each of them (sub-phases adapted from Hambleton & Patsula, 1999):
  - a) Decide whether to import the proposed materials, use native materials, or develop new materials. *The decision to use native tools or develop new ones should be made only in the event that superior native tools outperform R@W tools. The choice of using native tools should not be justified by habits or tradition.*
  - b) Select well-qualified translators.
  - c) Translate and/or adapt the material, choosing between application (translation and back-translation) and adaptation (adapt stimuli and questions in order to make them serve the same function as in the original).
  - d) Review the localized version and make necessary revisions.
  - e) Conduct a small tryout of the localized version.
  - f) Carry out a more ambitious field-test.
7. *Select highly qualified professionals* for leading each activity. Different professionals are needed to design the intervention, manage the project, deliver training sessions, conduct psychological assessments (e.g., self-efficacy, motivation, values, ...), provide counselling, and evaluate the intervention at the end.
8. *Get the professionals acquainted with the R@W protocol* and its annexes.
9. *Train these professionals* on the R@W protocol if needed.
10. *Realize the intervention* according to the R@W protocol [add link, same as above]
11. *Evaluate* the intervention.



12. Use the results of the evaluation phase to *refine the protocol* and the tools.
13. *Share the updated protocol* within the European Career Support Network Agreement

#### 4. Evaluating the effectiveness of the intervention

The efficacy (level at which goals have been achieved) and effectiveness (=efficacy/costs) of the R@W intervention is an important part of the R@W protocol. Without adequate evaluations of effectiveness, it is impossible to refine the model according to a continuous improvement approach.

One basic method is to measure the **indicators before and after the intervention**, and then estimate the change, which can be regarded as a measure of efficacy. It would be ideal to have a control group as well: a group of people with similar characteristics that is provided with a non-R@W career support intervention or even without intervention. Yet, this approach is frequently infeasible (but it would assure a higher level of confidence in the results). The measures that have to be implemented before and after the intervention are the indicators that have been identified in the design phase. Specific indicators related to the specific goals of the intervention should be identified and used in the intervention for monitoring purposes. For example, if one of the goals of the intervention is to identify people who can re-enter the job market with their current skills and those that instead need to be trained before re-entering successfully the job market, the **percentage of people taking a training course among those that were identified as in need** is a fundamental indicator.

A few relevant indicators are already included in the R@W protocol: they are only a limited set of the possible options and they help monitor the final goals of any career support intervention. The R@W protocol includes a scale of Life Satisfaction (SWLS, Diener et al., 1985, Diener&Diener, 1995, Pavot&Diener, 1994), which is freely available online at the author's website, is already translated in many languages, and has international norms and cross-cultural comparisons, and a scale that measures participants' perception of ability in looking for a job (Search for Work Self-Efficacy Scale, Avallone et al., 2007) that has already been adapted for use in Spain (Pepe et al., 2010). This scale measures four dimension of self-efficacy in relation to job search: Frustration coping; Exploration; Proactive career planning, and Relational integration. Further indicators may be given by the proportion of participants that exit the interventions before the end (**drop out**) or that **find a job** within 3 or 6 months from the end of the interventions. Another useful indicator of effectiveness is the **number of job interviews** that each participant had 3 and 6 months after the intervention. The more interviews, the more likely they get a job.

The change in subjective indicators (e.g. SWSES and SWLS) may be tested using a dependent t-test for paired samples (described [here](#)). This test will tell us whether the differences may be due to chance, or, alternatively, if it is likely that the indicator is actually different from time 1 to time 2. We can then obtain a standardized measure of effect size that tells us how much –in terms of standard deviations– the two means change between time 1 and time 2. This is easy to compute by taking the difference between the two measures for each subject (Time2-Time1), compute the mean and standard deviation of this new variable, and finally take the ratio between the mean difference and the standard deviation of the differences. This will give us a Cohen's d for the mean difference of repeated measures. When interpreting this measure of effect size, a rule of thumb is to consider absolute values  $<.02$  as a null of very small effect, values in the range  $.2 < d < .5$  as a small to moderate effect, values in the range  $.5 < d < .8$  as a moderate to large effect and values higher than  $.8$  as a large effect. Hence, a hypothetical standardized mean difference of  $.5$  in our participants will tell us that our intervention has had a moderate effect in increasing our indicators. Negative values of d indicate a decrease in our indicators. For example, in the pilot actions that have been carried out to generate the final R@W protocol (and these guidelines), the effectiveness of the interventions has been analyzed using both subjective and objective indicators. As far as the latter, 7 participants out of

[insert number of participants that made it to the end] have found a job within 3 months from the end of the interventions. As far as the former (Table 3), we observed a significant increase in participants' perceived ability inactively dealing with frustrations and in exploring the environment seeking for new job opportunities (for AssistNet and Indico). We also observed a significant increase in participants' perceived ability in actively planning their career (for Indico and UBP). Finally, we observed a significant increase in relational integration in participants of the AssistNet intervention and a significant increase in life satisfaction for UBP. On the whole, results are promising and it seems that the different interventions carried out during the three pilot actions also led to different impacts in participants. For example, it may be hypothesized that the differences between Indico and AssistNet vs UBP with regard to the Frustration Coping and Exploration criteria of effectiveness might be explained by the fact that UBP used native tools with regards to job values, network of relations, recruitment and selection processes activities. Yet, without a control group it is hard to define the causes of these differences.

Table 3 Pre- Post Test evaluation of the interventions. Values in the table represent standardized mean differences (Cohen's d).

	Frustration coping	Exploration	Proactive career planning	Relational integration	Life Satisfaction
AssistNet	<b>1,616</b>	<b>1,143</b>	0,181	<b>1,172</b>	-0,090
Indico	<b>0,740</b>	<b>0,905</b>	<b>0,656</b>	0,333	0,478
UBP	-0,239	0,462	<b>0,734</b>	0,001	<b>0,599</b>

Note: Values in bold are different from zero with  $p < .05$

## ANNEXES

### ANNEX 1

#### R@W Tools correspondence table

INITIAL TOOLS		FINAL TOOLS		
N	Tool	N	Tool	Comments
1	Skills assessment	01	Skills assessment	
2	Analysis of training needs	02	Analysis of training needs	
3	Context analysis	-	-	anticipated
4	Self efficacy interview	03	Self efficacy interview	
5	List of job values	04a	List of job values	
6	Network of relations grid	05	Job searching	
7	Recruitment and selection process	07	Get ready for the job interview	
8	Applying for a job	05	Job searching	
9	Guide for professional profile description	-	-	removed
10	Template for cover letter	06	CV and cover letter	
11	Phases and topics of a job interview	07	Get ready for the job interview	
12	Map of entrepreneurial competences	09	Map of entrepreneurial competences	
13	Self evaluation management diamond value	10	Self evaluation management diamond value	
14	Individual file	11	Individual file	

Brand **new tools** not foreseen in the initial version of the model:

- 04b: Motivation style questionnaire (NEW);
- 08: Feedback form (NEW)

## References

Avallone, F., Pepe, S. & Porcelli, R. (2007). Autoefficacia percepita nella ricerca del lavoro: scale di misura. In Isfol, Bisogni, valori e autoefficacia nella scelta del lavoro. Roma: ISFOL, 133-142.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.

Diener, E. & Diener, M (1995). Cross-Cultural Correlates of Life Satisfaction and Self-Esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.

Pepe, S., Farnese, M. L., Avallone, F., & Vecchione, M. (2010). Work Self-Efficacy Scale and Search for Work Self-Efficacy Scale: A Validation Study in Spanish and Italian Cultural Contexts. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 26(3). 201-210.

Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological assessment*, 5(2), 164.