Bridging Welfare and Work: Assessing Intensive Job Placement for Minimum Income Recipients*

Yarine Fawaz (CEMFI & Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)
Laura Hospido (Banco de España, CEMFI & IZA) Júlia Martí Llobet (CEMFI)

This draft: February 21, 2025

Abstract

This paper evaluates a program that seeks to improve access to the labour market and employability of vulnerable individuals in situations of social exclusion who receive the Minimum Income Scheme (MIS) and/or the regional minimum incomes. The participants were randomly assigned to three groups (a control group and two treatment groups) to evaluate, through a RCT, whether there was an improvement in the social inclusion, labor market outcomes and subjective well-being of the people in each treatment group relative to the control group. The control group received three training sessions on active job search. Treatment 1 consisted of 4 additional training sessions on active job search, 8 basic skills sessions, individual interviews and 4 job search support sessions with intermediation activities between participants and companies. Treatment 2 added 8 additional digital skills sessions to treatment 1. The results show some significant improvement in the economic conditions of the treated individuals compared to the controls. For the participants in treatment 2, a greater probability of not incurring in default was observed. Regarding access to employment, the results do not show significant improvements either in the short or medium term. However, the proportion of people working without a short-term contract was reduced among the participants in treatment 1, suggesting a positive effect on the formalisation of employment. The intervention had a negative impact on the participants' own perception of their transversal competences, especially among those with lower attendance at the sessions. Finally, a notable improvement in digital skills is evident among the participants in treatment 2, underlining the value of specific training in digital content.

JEL Classification: I32, I38, E24

Keywords: social inclusion, comprehensive care, randomized controlled trial

*This project has been promoted by the General Secretariat for Inclusion (SGI) of the Ministry of Inclusion, Social Security and Migration as part of the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan (PRTR), with funding from Next Generation EU, and implemented by Cáritas Española. This entity has collaborated with the SGI and the research team coordinated by CEMFI and J-PAL Europe in its design and in the provision of information. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of SGI or Cáritas Española. This evaluation report has been carried out using the data available at the time of writing and is based on the knowledge acquired about the project up to that date. The authors appreciate the collaboration throughout the evaluation process from the team of the SGI, especially Henar López and Jesús Prado, and the counterpart, Cáritas Española, in particular Beatriz Iraeta and Pilar Pallero. They also thank the coordination and support team at CEMFI and the Bank of Spain for their collaboration: Samuel Bentolila, Ana García-Hernández, Rubén López Diez and Inés Torres Rojas. Any potential errors in the report are the sole responsability of the authors. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Banco de España or the Eurosystem.

1 Introduction

Despite the more favourable evolution in recent months, unemployment continues to be a problem that affects people in situations of exclusion in particular. According to data from the INE Living Conditions Survey, in 2021, 10% of individuals lived in households with a low employment intensity, that is, households in which their working-age members worked less than 20% of their total work potential during the reference year. In May 2020, the Spanish government introduced the Minimum Income Scheme (MIS), aimed at low-income individuals and households. The Ministry of Inclusion, Social Security and Migration has allocated funds from the Next Generation EU programme to finance and evaluate the impact of a series of projects that complement the MIS with the aim of strengthening the economic resilience and social inclusion of its recipients.

The EMPLEA LAB pilot project, implemented by Cáritas España, a non-profit entity of the Catholic Church, is part of this set of projects and is aimed at improving the labour insertion and employability of people between 16 and 65 years of age, residents of the provinces of Albacete, Barcelona, Cuenca, Girona, Guadalajara, León, Lugo, Menorca, Ourense, Valladolid and Zamora, recipients of the MIS and/or the regional minimum incomes, or who are at risk or in a situation of social exclusion. The aim of this pilot is to check whether people who received close and intense attention, group training in work, transversal and digital skills, as well as support in approaching the local business network, are more likely to find a job than those who do not receive it, in addition to improving their subjective well-being. To select the individuals participating in the project, contact was made with the households receiving the MIS contained in the lists provided by the Ministry, with the people referred by the Social Services of the localities in which the project is implemented, as well as with the participants of Cáritas and other social entities.

To assess the impact of the project, RCTs (Randomized Controlled Trials) were used, which are known to allow a credible estimation of the causal effects of the programs examined (Bouguen et al., 2019). The team of the General Secretariat for Inclusion (SGI) randomly assigned the participants into three groups (one control group and two treatment groups). The randomization was stratified by province, for a total of 11 (Albacete, Barcelona, Cuenca, Girona, Guadalajara, León, Lugo, Menorca, Ourense, Valladolid and Zamora) and was done at the household level (in general, only one individual per household participated in the pilot project).

In the control group (CG), individuals participated in three group training sessions on career guidance, each lasting 1.5 h. In the first treatment group (TG1), individuals participated in a 3-month intensive itinerary with 7 training sessions on active job search (including the 3 sessions of the control group), 8

workshops on improving basic skills, individual interviews with the counsellor and with the intermediary between participants and companies, as well as 4 sessions of support in job search with intermediation activities between participants and companies[1]. In the second treatment group (TG2), in addition to receiving all the sessions of the first treatment group, participants received 8 additional sessions on acquiring digital skills. Intervention with people in situations of or at risk of social exclusion makes it necessary to provide support and coverage for basic needs that are not covered. For this reason, all participants in the project were supported with a grant to facilitate the coverage of expenses such as food, hygiene and clothing, energy supply and transport. All of this was done with financial aid linked to attendance at activities to encourage adherence to and completion of the project activities (5 euros per hour attended, both in group and individual sessions).

The programme started to be implemented in February 2023. Treatment activities were carried out over three months, organised in three sequential waves or editions, extending implementation until the end of November 2023. Since not all individuals received treatment at the same time, randomisation and data collection (at baseline and at endline) were carried out in three waves, one for each group of participants. Table 1 shows the timeline with the dates corresponding to the interventions analysed in this report.

Table 1: EMPLEA LAB pilot project timeline

		Edition 1	Edition 2	Edition 3
Participant recruitment	Start	Nov. 2022	Jan. 2023	Jun. 2023
	Finish	Dec. 2022	Mar. 2023	Jul. 2023
Randomization		Dec. 2022	Mar. 2023	Jul. 2023
Treatment	Start	Feb. 2023	May 2023	Sep. 2023
	Finish	Apr. 2023	Jul. 2023	Nov. 2023
Tests	Baseline (PRE)	Jan. 2023	Apr. 2023	Sep. 2023
	Endline 1 (POST1)	Apr. 2023	Jul. 2023	Nov. 2023
	Endline 2 (POST2)	Jul. 2023	Oct. 2023	Feb. 2024

[1]The details of the group sessions are given in Annex 1. These group activities were very practical in nature, with a workshop format where content was covered and where a lot of work was done on group cohesion, implying the generation of mutual support and a network among the participants themselves. The individual sessions were set according to the itinerary of each person in accordance with their needs for reinforcement in certain areas.

2 Sample description

In total, 2,364 people answered the initial survey. According to the randomization performed by the SGI, 1,055 individuals were part of the control group (44.6%), 656 of the treatment group 1 (27.8%) and 653 of the treatment group 2 (27.6%)[2].

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the stratification variables, the characteristics of the participants and the outcome variables related to the pilot, according to the information collected before the intervention began[3]. The table has six columns: the name of the variable, the number of observations, the mean, the standard deviation, and the minimum and maximum values.

In the sample, 69% of the respondents are women, 75% have Spanish nationality and the average age is 44 years old. More than half of the participants (54%) are looking for work and 65% live in rented accommodation. By province, Barcelona, León and Ourense are the ones with the highest number of participants, with 19%, 14% and 13%, respectively. 62% of those surveyed have completed compulsory education and/or basic FP, while only 7% have obtained university education. 30% of households are single-parent. In addition, 11% of participants have some degree of disability.

[2]During the field work in the third edition, there was an accidental error in the transmission of information about the assignment of some individuals from a parish, which caused 45 cases to be assigned to the wrong group. For this reason, we will present results for both the initial assignment and the actual assignment in the field, and excluding those 45 problematic cases.

[3]Annex 2 details the construction of all outcome indicators, as well as a description of all survey variables included in the calculation of each indicator. Values not answered in the surveys are imputed according to the mean of the variable in each corresponding treatment or control group.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics

	Obs.	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Treatment	2364	0.55	0.50	0.00	1.00
Treatment 1	2364	0.28	0.45	0.00	1.00
Treatment 2	2364	0.28	0.45	0.00	1.00
Stratification variables:					
Edition 1	2364	0.27	0.45	0.00	1.00
Edition 2	2364	0.36	0.48	0.00	1.00
Edition 3	2364	0.36	0.48	0.00	1.00
Albacete	2364	0.07	0.26	0.00	1.00
Menorca	2364	0.05	0.21	0.00	1.00
Barcelona	2364	0.19	0.39	0.00	1.00
Cuenca	2364	0.07	0.26	0.00	1.00
Girona	2364	0.08	0.27	0.00	1.00
Sigüenza-Guadalajara	2364	0.07	0.26	0.00	1.00
León	2364	0.14	0.35	0.00	1.00
Lugo	2364	0.06	0.24	0.00	1.00
Ourense	2364	0.13	0.34	0.00	1.00
Valladolid	2364	0.07	0.26	0.00	1.00
Zamora	2364	0.07	0.25	0.00	1.00

	Obs.	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Characteristics of the participants:					
Age	2364	44.41	10.85	16.00	73.00
Male	2364	0.31	0.46	0.00	1.00
Country of birth	2364	0.51	0.50	0.00	1.00
Nationality	2364	0.75	0.44	0.00	1.00
Compulsory education not completed	2364	0.18	0.37	0.00	1.00
Compulsory education and Basic FP	2364	0.62	0.47	0.00	1.00
Baccalaureate and Higher FP	2364	0.14	0.33	0.00	1.00
University	2364	0.07	0.24	0.00	1.00
Professional certificate	2364	0.28	0.45	0.00	1.00
Non-formal training	2364	0.61	0.46	0.00	1.00
Degree of disability	2364	0.11	0.31	0.00	1.00
People residing in the home	2364	2.91	1.85	0.00	25.00
One-person household	2364	0.18	0.39	0.00	1.00
Single parent household	2364	0.30	0.46	0.00	1.00
Home of a couple with children	2364	0.30	0.46	0.00	1.00
Another type of home	2364	0.21	0.41	0.00	1.00
Property	2364	0.19	0.39	0.00	1.00
Rent	2364	0.65	0.48	0.00	1.00
Other type of housing	2364	0.16	0.37	0.00	1.00
Going to another program	2364	0.12	0.32	0.00	1.00
Unavailable	2364	0.01	0.09	0.00	1.00
Morning schedule availability	2364	0.51	0.49	0.00	1.00
Afternoon schedule availability	2364	0.18	0.38	0.00	1.00
Availability any time	2364	0.30	0.45	0.00	1.00
Active	2364	0.76	0.42	0.00	1.00
Working	2364	0.23	0.42	0.00	1.00
Without contract	2364	0.19	0.38	0.00	1.00
Unemployed, looking for	2364	0.54	0.50	0.00	1.00
Outcome variables:					
Average income in the last 6 months	2364	782.38	421.36	0.00	3200.00
Average number of offers submitted in the last 3 months	2364	1.82	3.97	0.00	30.00
Average number of interviews conducted in the last 3 months	2364	0.20	0.62	0.00	7.67
You have been selected in some process	2364	0.05	0.22	0.00	1.00
You have said no to some offer	2364	0.04	0.19	0.00	1.00
Self-knowledge	2364	-0.00	1.00	-1.53	0.95
Soft skills	2364	0.00	1.00	-1.33	1.75
You have used a digital device	2364	0.92	0.27	0.00	1.00
Have you sent your CV online in the last week using the internet?	2364	0.27	0.44	0.00	1.00
Have you managed to access any job offers online?	2364	0.26	0.44	0.00	1.00
Obtain information from government websites or apps	2364	0.84	0.34	0.00	1.00
Download or print official forms	2364	0.56	0.46	0.00	1.00
Send completed forms	2364	0.38	0.45	0.00	1.00
Able to manage online tasks	2364	2.66	1.21	1.00	4.00
Able to use email	2364	2.98	1.21	1.00	4.00
Able to attach files to an email	2364	2.75	1.32	1.00	4.00
Able to create a Cloud account (Drive)	2364	2.14	1.30	1.00	4.00
Able to create folders on the computer	2364	2.45	1.34	1.00	4.00
Able to use job search applications (infojobs, Job Today...)	2364	2.60	1.30	1.00	4.00
Able to use electronic administration applications	2364	2.58	1.28	1.00	4.00
Able to use communication tools for interviews (Zoom, Teams, Google...)	2364	2.51	1.21	1.00	4.00

3 Balance in experimental groups

Table 3 reports the balance contrasts between the control group and the two treatment groups. All data reflected in this table refer to the survey conducted before the intervention (baseline). The mean value of each variable for each group is reported, as well as the number of observations in each group and the p-value resulting from an F test of equality for all groups, and from the three pairwise mean difference tests. The lower the p-value, the more confidently one can reject the hypothesis that the mean of the variable in both groups is equal. For example, if the p-value is less than 0.05, the hypothesis of equal means can be rejected at a confidence level of 5%.

Panel A shows that the stratification variables (edition and province) are balanced. In Panel B we include individual characteristics and in Panel C we include outcome indicators measured at baseline. All statistical tests in Panels B and C include the randomization strata as controls. As explained above, the variables used in the stratification are edition (1, 2 or 3) and locality (11 cities), so there are a total of 33 randomization strata.

Among the demographic characteristics, the only unbalanced variables are the number of people residing in the home, the composition of the household (one-person and single-parent households), the housing tenure regime (ownership vs. rental), availability at any time, and the employment status of activity and of being unemployed but looking for work. As for the outcome indicators, the unbalanced indicators are the average income in the last 6 months, having been selected in a process in the last month, the ability to use communication tools for interviews, and finally, the indicator of sending completed forms. In the estimates, all these imbalances will be controlled except for availability at any time and for the number of people residing in the home because they are not balanced in only one of the two treatment groups versus the control, while in the regressions we will always include the two treatment groups and the control group.

Table 3: Balancing tests among experimental groups

Panel A: Stratification variables

	(1) Control		(2) Treatment 1		(3) Treatment 2		F-test for equality		(1)-(2)		(1)-(3)		(2)-(3)	
	(N)	(Mean)	(N)	(Mean)	(N)	(Mean)	in all groups		t-test for pairs					
Variable		(Var.)		(Var.)		(Var.)	N	p-value	N	p-value	N	p-value	N	p-value
Edition 1	1055	0.28	656	0.27	653	0.27	2364	0.90	1711	0.71	1708	0.70	1309	0.99
		(0.20)		(0.20)		(0.20)								
Edition 2	1055	0.35	656	0.37	653	0.37	2364	0.78	1711	0.56	1708	0.56	1309	1.00
		(0.23)		(0.23)		(0.23)								
Edition 3	1055	0.37	656	0.36	653	0.36	2364	0.96	1711	0.82	1708	0.82	1309	1.00
		(0.23)		(0.23)		(0.23)								
Albacete	1055	0.07	656	0.07	653	0.07	2364	0.95	1711	0.76	1708	0.83	1309	0.93
		(0.06)		(0.07)		(0.07)								
Menorca	1055	0.05	656	0.04	653	0.04	2364	0.72	1711	0.44	1708	0.65	1309	0.77
		(0.05)		(0.04)		(0.04)								
Barcelona	1055	0.18	656	0.19	653	0.19	2364	0.96	1711	0.87	1708	0.78	1309	0.91
		(0.15)		(0.15)		(0.15)								
Cuenca	1055	0.08	656	0.07	653	0.07	2364	0.81	1711	0.84	1708	0.51	1309	0.68
		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.06)								
Girona	1055	0.08	656	0.08	653	0.08	2364	0.97	1711	0.82	1708	0.89	1309	0.94
		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)								
Sigüenza-Guadalajara	1055	0.07	656	0.07	653	0.07	2364	0.97	1711	0.82	1708	0.97	1309	0.81
		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)								
León	1055	0.14	656	0.14	653	0.14	2364	1.00	1711	0.93	1708	0.97	1309	0.96
		(0.12)		(0.12)		(0.12)								
Lugo	1055	0.06	656	0.06	653	0.06	2364	0.92	1711	0.77	1708	0.70	1309	0.92
		(0.06)		(0.06)		(0.06)								
Ourense	1055	0.13	656	0.13	653	0.13	2364	0. 89	1711	0.69	1708	0.67	1309	0.97
		(0.11)		(0.12)		(0.12)								
Valladolid	1055	0.08	656	0.07	653	0.07	2364	0.97	1711	0.84	1708	0.86	1309	0.98
		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)								
Zamora	1055	0.07	656	0.07	653	0.07	2364	0.98	1711	0.89	1708	0.87	1309	0.98
		(0.06)		(0.06)		(0.06)								

Panel B: Characteristics of the participants

	(1) Control		(2) Treatment 1		(3) Treatment 2		F-test for equality		(1)-(2)		(1)-(3)		(2)-(3)	
	(N)	(Mean)	(N)	(Mean)	(N)	(Mean)	in all groups				t-test for pairs			
Variable		(Var.)		(Var.)		(Var.)	N	p-value	N	p-value	N	p-value	N	p-value
Age	1055	44.40	656	44.41	653	44.42	2364	0.99	1711	0.92	1708	0.99	1309	0.99
		(115.92)		(125.95)		(112.35)								
Male	1055	0.31	656	0.30	653	0.32	2364	0.57	1711	0.46	1708	0.68	1309	0.30
		(0.21)		(0.21)		(0.22)								
Country of birth	1055	0.51	656	0.52	653	0.52	2364	1.00	1711	0.97	1708	0.98	1309	0.97
		(0.25)		(0.25)		(0.25)								
Nationality	1055	0.75	656	0.73	653	0.77	2364	0.31	1711	0.45	1708	0.38	1309	0.12
		(0.19)		(0.20)		(0.18)								
Compulsory education not completed	1055	0.18	656	0.18	653	0.17	2364	0.87	1711	0.73	1708	0.62	1309	0.85
		(0.14)		(0.14)		(0.13)								
Compulsory education and Basic FP	1055	0.62	656	0.62	653	0.62	2364	0.96	1711	0.98	1708	0.82	1309	0.82
		(0.22)		(0.22)		(0.22)								
Baccalaureate and Higher FP	1055	0.14	656	0.13	653	0.14	2364	0.95	1711	0.80	1708	0.98	1309	0.78
		(0.11)		(0.11)		(0.11)								
University	1055	0.06	656	0.07	653	0.06	2364	0.67	1711	0.37	1708	0.79	1309	0.60
		(0.05)		(0.06)		(0.06)								
Professional certificate	1055	0.26	656	0.30	653	0.30	2364	0.22	1711	0.16	1708	0.13	1309	0.92
		(0.19)		(0.21)		(0.21)								
Non-formal training	1055	0.60	656	0.62	653	0.61	2364	0.55	1711	0.30	1708	0.44	1309	0.82
		(0.21)		(0.21)		(0.21)								
Degree of disability	1055	0.10	656	0.11	653	0.11	2364	0.95	1711	0.74	1708	0.88	1309	0.81
		(0.09)		(0.10)		(0.09)								
People residing in the home	1055	2.85	656	3.00	653	2.91	2364	0.20	1711	0.08*	1708	0.41	1309	0.39
		(2.94)		(4.73)		(2.85)								
One-person household	1055	0.20	656	0.17	653	0.17	2364	0.14	1711	0.08*	1708	0.17	1309	0.73
		(0.16)		(0.14)		(0.14)								
Single parent household	1055	0.28	656	0.34	653	0.31	2364	0.06*	1711	0.02**	1708	0.33	1309	0.23
		(0.20)		(0.22)		(0.21)								
Home of a couple with children	1055	0.30	656	0.29	653	0.31	2364	0.73	1711	0.49	1708	0.87	1309	0.46
		(0.21)		(0.20)		(0.21)								
Another type of home	1055	0.21	656	0.21	653	0.21	2364	0.96	1711	0.83	1708	0.96	1309	0.79
		(0.17)		(0.17)		(0.17)								
Property	1055	0.20	656	0.16	653	0.21	2364	0.05**	1711	0.06*	1708	0.44	1309	0.02**
		(0.16)		(0.14)		(0.17)								
Rent	1055	0.64	656	0.68	653	0.61	2364	0.03**	1711	0.10	1708	0.21	1309	0.01***
		(0.23)		(0.22)		(0.24)								
Other type of housing	1055	0.16	656	0.16	653	0.17	2364	0.68	1711	0.91	1708	0.43	1309	0.43
		(0.13)		(0.13)		(0.14)								
Going to another program	1055	0.12	656	0.12	653	0.11	2364	0.94	1711	0.85	1708	0.86	1309	0.74
		(0.10)		(0.10)		(0.10)								
Active	1055	0.75	656	0.80	653	0.76	2364	0.07*	1711	0.02**	1708	0.66	1309	0.08*
		(0.19)		(0.16)		(0.18)								
Working	1055	0.22	656	0.23	653	0.23	2364	0.87	1711	0.81	1708	0.61	1309	0.81
		(0.17)		(0.17)		(0.18)								
Without contract	1055	0.20	656	0.18	653	0.18	2364	0.45	1711	0.22	1708	0.41	1309	0.74
		(0.15)		(0.14)		(0.14)								
Unemployed, looking for	1055	0.53	656	0.57	653	0.52	2364	0.15	1711	0.08*	1708	0.96	1309	0.09*
		(0.25)		(0.24)		(0.25)								
Unavailable	1055	0.01	656	0.01	653	0.01	2364	0.93	1711	0.75	1708	0.97	1309	0.76
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)								
Morning schedule availability	1055	0.50	656	0.52	653	0.52	2364	0.51	1711	0.32	1708	0.36	1309	0.95
		(0.24)		(0.25)		(0.24)								
Afternoon schedule availability	1055	0.18	656	0.18	653	0.20	2364	0.60	1711	0.72	1708	0.33	1309	0.56
		(0.14)		(0.15)		(0.16)								
Availabilty any time	1055	0.32	656	0.29	653	0.28	2364	0.16	1711	0.21	1708	0.08*	1309	0.61
		(0.21)		(0.20)		(0.20)								

Panel C: Outcome variables

	(1) Control		(2) Treatment 1		(3) Treatment 2		F-test for equality		(1)-(2)		(1)-(3)		(2)-(3)	
	(N)	(Mean)	(N)	(Mean)	(N)	(Mean)	in all groups				t-test for pairs			
Variable		(Var.)		(Var.)		(Var.)	N	p-value	N	p-value	N	p-value	N	p-value
Average income in the last 6 months	1055	775.66	656	815.52	653	759.94	2364	0.03**	1711	0.04**	1708	0.44	1309	0.01**
		(166913.56)		(179678.07)		(191438.05)								
Average number of offers submitted in the last 3 months	1055	1.79	656	1.82	653	1.86	2364	0.93	1711	0.82	1708	0.71	1309	0.93
		(15.35)		(14.94)		(17.17)								
Average number of interviews conducted in the last 3 months	1055	0.22	656	0.17	653	0.19	2364	0.28	1711	0.11	1708	0.40	1309	0.52
		(0.43)		(0.28)		(0.39)								
You have been selected in some process	1055	0.05	656	0.04	653	0.07	2364	0.03**	1711	0.70	1708	0.02**	1309	0.02**
		(0.04)		(0.04)		(0.07)								
You have said no to some offer	1055	0.04	656	0.03	653	0.05	2364	0.26	1711	0.50	1708	0.25	1309	0.11
		(0.04)		(0.03)		(0.05)								
Self-knowledge	1055	-0.01	656	0.04	653	-0.02	2364	0.43	1711	0.24	1708	0.97	1309	0.25
		(1.02)		(0.99)		(0.98)								
Soft skills	1055	0.01	656	0.01	653	-0.02	2364	0.83	1711	0.81	1708	0.68	1309	0.52
		(1.00)		(0.99)		(1.01)								
You have used a digital device	1055	0.92	656	0.92	653	0.93	2364	0.77	1711	0.95	1708	0.55	1309	0.53
		(0.07)		(0.08)		(0.07)								
Have you sent your CV online in the last week using the internet?	1055	0.26	656	0.27	653	0.28	2364	0.48	1711	0.54	1708	0.22	1309	0.61
		(0.19)		(0.19)		(0.20)								
Have you managed to access any job offers online?	1055	0.27	656	0.24	653	0.28	2364	0.33	1711	0.25	1708	0.64	1309	0.14
		(0.20)		(0.18)		(0.20)								
Obtain information from government websites or apps	1055	0.84	656	0.83	653	0.83	2364	0.80	1711	0.65	1708	0.52	1309	0.83
		(0.11)		(0.12)		(0.12)								
Download or print official forms	1055	0.56	656	0.56	653	0.55	2364	0.82	1711	0.90	1708	0.51	1309	0.66
		(0.21)		(0.22)		(0.22)								
Send completed forms	1055	0.36	656	0.40	653	0.38	2364	0.09*	1711	0.03**	1708	0.54	1309	0.17
		(0.20)		(0.21)		(0.21)								
Able to manage online tasks	1055	2.64	656	2.70	653	2.67	2364	0.49	1711	0.24	1708	0.52	1309	0.63
		(1.48)		(1.45)		(1.46)								
Able to use email	1055	2.95	656	3.00	653	3.01	2364	0.44	1711	0.34	1708	0.25	1309	0.85
		(1.46)		(1.44)		(1.47)								
Able to attach files to an email	1055	2.72	656	2.79	653	2.75	2364	0.55	1711	0.28	1708	0.61	1309	0.61
		(1.76)		(1.69)		(1.78)								
Able to create a Cloud account (Drive)	1055	2.14	656	2.13	653	2.13	2364	1.00	1711	0.92	1708	0.94	1309	0.99
		(1.67)		(1.68)		(1.71)								
Able to create folders on the computer	1055	2.43	656	2.51	653	2.41	2364	0.35	1711	0.22	1708	0.80	1309	0.19
		(1.81)		(1.78)		(1.82)								
Able to use job search applications (infojobs, Job Today. . .)	1055	2.58	656	2.62	653	2.63	2364	0.70	1711	0.51	1708	0.48	1309	0.95
		(1.68)		(1.63)		(1.74)								
Able to use electronic administration applications	1055	2.59	656	2.62	653	2.53	2364	0.46	1711	0.68	1708	0.35	1309	0.23
		(1.65)		(1.59)		(1.64)								
Able to use communication tools for interviews (Zoom, Teams, Google. . .)	1055	2.45	656	2.54	653	2.57	2364	0.02**	1711	0.06*	1708	0.01**	1309	0.56
		(1.47)		(1.46)		(1.44)								

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.1, p<0.05, p<0.01. Panels B and C include the randomization strata as controls.

4 Degree of participation in the intervention and sample attrition

Table 4 shows the total number of participants who agreed to take part in the evaluation. Of the 2,364 who responded to the initial survey, 1,880 (79.5%) also responded to the first final survey. The percentage is similar among the 656 initially assigned to treatment 1 (79.1% of them responded to the final survey), the 653 initially assigned to treatment 2 (79.2%) and the

1,055 initially assigned to the control (80%). This is relevant for the variables used to construct the outcome indicators, because the sample size is reduced in the regressions presented in the next section. If, instead of the initial assignment in columns (1) and (2), we consider the assignment that occurred in the field after the fortuitous error in the third edition in which 45 cases were assigned to the wrong group, we see that the attrition percentages do not vary (columns (3) and (4)). Finally, if we exclude those 45 problematic cases, the attrition percentage remains at 79% (columns (5) and (6))[4].

The percentages are very similar for the second final survey that was conducted (POST2).

Table 4: Sample size and attrition rate

	Initial assignment			Field assignment			Excluding problematic cases		
	Pre	Post1	Post2	Pre	Post1	Post2	Pre	Post1	Post2
Control	1055	844 (80.0%)	859 (81.4%)	1057	846 (80.0%)	860 (81.3%)	1039	828 (79.7%)	844 (81.2%)
Treatment 1	656	519 (79.1%)	511 (77.9%)	654	517 (79.1%)	510 (78.0%)	642	505 (78.7%)	499 (77.7%)
Treatment 2	653	517 (79.2%)	521 (79.8%)	653	517 (79.2%)	521 (79.8%)	638	502 (78.7%)	509 (79.8%)
Total	2364	1880 (79.5%)	1891 (80.0%)	2364	1880 (79.5%)	1891 (80.0%)	2319	1835 (79.1%)	1852 (79.9%)

To assess whether this difference in sample attrition rate across groups is statistically significant, a regression of the non-conducted final survey binary variable on assignment to each treatment group is estimated, including strata as regressors. Table 5A shows the results in column 1. The coefficient on the treatment variable is 0.008 and is not statistically significant. It is also not statistically significant when we consider each treatment group separately in column 2. In addition, to test whether sample attrition is selective, regressions are estimated, including as additional regressors, family characteristics and the interactions of each of these with the treatment variables. Column 3 shows the estimated coefficients for the interactions. Only the interaction with age is significant at the 5% level. This variable will be an additional control in the short-term effect regressions. In the future, Lee Bounds analysis will be performed on the main results to check that the results are robust to this selective attrition.

Table 5B shows the results of estimating the same regressions, but for the second measure of the project. The coefficient on the treatment variable in column (1) is 0.027 and is statistically significant at the 10% level. It is also statistically significant for Treatment 1 but not for Treatment 2 (column 2). Column 3 shows the estimated coefficients for the interactions. The interaction with Disability is significant at the 10% level. This variable will enter as an additional control in the regressions of the medium-term effect. In the future, Lee Bounds analysis will be performed on the main results to check that the results are robust to this selective attrition.

[4]Technically, we give more credibility to the first (initial) assignment because it is the one that responds to the random assignment designed in the SGI. In any case, given that the error seems to have been fortuitous, the other two assignments should not give very different results, as we will indeed see is the case.

Table 5A: Regressions of the probability of not responding to the first POST survey

First POST survey not completed	(1)	(2)	(3)
Treatment	0.008		0.237
	(0.016)		(0.272)
Treatment 1		0.009	
		(0.020)	
Treatment 2		0.007	
		(0.020)	
Treatment and Male			0.056
			(0.040)
Treatment and Age			-0.004**
			(0.002)
Treatment and Nationality			-0.028
			(0.044)
Treatment and People residing in the home			-0.003
			(0.011)
Treatment and Compulsory education and Basic FP			-0.010
			(0.052)
Treatment and Baccalaureat and Higher FP			-0.104
			(0.065)
Treatment and University			-0.000
			(0.084)
Treatment and Morning schedule availability			-0.045
			(0.226)
Treatment and Afternoon schedule availability			0.012
			(0.228)
Treatment and Availability any time			-0.040
			(0.226)
Treatment and Disability			0.065
			(0.054)
Treatment and One-person household			0.040
			(0.057)
Treatment and Single parent household			0.049
			(0.051)
Treatment and Home of a couple with children			0.016
			(0.054)
Treatment and Property			0.011
			(0.055)
Treatment and Rent			-0.046
			(0.047)
Observations	2364	2364	2364

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses. * p<0.1, p<0.05, p<0.01. All columns include the randomization strata as controls. Columns 2 and 3 also include the non-interacted variables as additional controls.

Table 5B: Regressions of the probability of not responding to the second POST survey

Second POST survey not completed	(1)	(2)	(3)
Treatment	0.027*		0.292
	(0.016)		(0.250)
Treatment 1		0.036*	
		(0.020)	
Treatment 2		0.017	
		(0.019)	
Treatment and Male			0.053
			(0.040)
Treatment and Age			-0.002
			(0.002)
Treatment and Nationality			-0.031
			(0.043)
Treatment and People residing in the home			-0.005
			(0.011)
Treatment and Compulsory education and Basic FP			-0.004
			(0.052)
Treatment and Baccalaureate and Higher FP			-0.032
			(0.064)
Treatment and University			0.009
			(0.086)
Treatment and Morning schedule availability			-0.116
			(0.201)
Treatment and Afternoon schedule availability			-0.043
			(0.203)
Treatment and Availability any time			-0.115
			(0.202)
Treatment and Disability			0.101*
			(0.054)
Treatment and One-person household			-0.037
			(0.056)
Treatment and Single parent household			0.013
			(0.051)
Treatment and Home of a couple with children			-0.000
			(0.053)
Treatment and Property			-0.008
			(0.054)
Treatment and Rent			-0.034
			(0.045)
Observations	2364	2364	2364

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses. * p<0.1, p<0.05, p<0.01. All columns include the randomization strata as controls. Columns 2 and 3 also include the non-interacted variables as additional controls.

5 Hypotheses - Evaluation Scheme

The intervention developed in this project aims to improve the labour inclusion of participants. The list of hypotheses is presented below, as well as the indicators used in each case:

1. Higher income and/or fewer difficulties in making ends meet:
   - HP1a1: Net monthly income (average income over the previous 6 months)
   - HP1b1: Ability to make ends meet (if the household has not been in arrears in the last 12 months)
2. Better access to employment 3 months after starting treatment:
   - HP2a1: Being professionally active
   - HP2a2: Being working
   - HP2a3: Not having a contract in your last job (quality of employment)
   - HP2a4: Being unemployed but looking for work
   - HP2b1: Number of job offers the participant applied for (average over the previous 3 months)
   - HP2b2: Number of job interviews the participant had (average over the previous 3 months)
   - HP2b3: Having been selected in a process
   - HP2b4: Having said no to an offer
3. Awareness of transversal skills to any type of employment:
   - HP3a1: Self-knowledge (three-variable index where the person assesses to what extent they would be able to describe their strengths and weaknesses to obtain a job in the sector of interest or to what extent, with the information they have about themselves at this time, they feel capable of obtaining a job)
   - HP3a2: "Soft" skills (personal and image care, verbal and non-verbal communication, conflict resolution, teamwork skills, emotional management and self-control, planning and time management)
4. Improvement in digital skills for job search:
   - HP4a1: Use of digital devices for job search
   - HP4b1: Sending CV online
   - HP4b2: Access to online job offers
   - HP4b3: Use of public administration applications
   - HP4c1: Ability to manage tasks online, use of email, attachments, cloud, online interview tools

6 Econometric specification

The regression model specified to estimate the causal effect in a randomized experiment is often simply the difference in the variable of interest between each treatment group and the control group, since these groups are statistically comparable due to randomization, conditional on taking into account stratification and unbalanced variables at baseline (this ensures that differences between treatment and control groups before the intervention are accounted for in the analysis). In addition, the analysis that follows presents regressions that control for the baseline, i.e., pre-intervention, value of the dependent variable whenever possible, which improves the precision of the estimates.

Specifically, the base specification of the regressions presented below is as follows:

$$Y_{i,t=1} = \alpha + \beta T_i + \gamma Y_{i,t=0} + X_i'\delta_i + \epsilon_i$$

where $Y_{i,t=1}$ is the dependent variable of interest observed after the intervention for family i, T_i indicates whether the family has been assigned to either of the two treatment groups, $Y_{i,t=0}$ is the initial value of the dependent variable (i.e., before the intervention), X_i is a vector of controls that includes the unbalanced variables in Tables 3, 5A, and 5B, and ϵ_i is the error term.

In addition, a specification such as the following is also considered:

$$Y_{i,t=1} = \alpha + \beta T_{1i} + \mu T_{2i} + \gamma Y_{i,t=0} + X_i'\delta_i + \epsilon_i$$

where $Y_{i,t=1}$ is the dependent variable of interest observed after the intervention for family i, T_{1i} indicates whether the family has been assigned to treatment 1 (=1), T_{2i} indicates whether the family has been assigned to treatment 2 (=1), $Y_{i,t=0}$ is the initial value of the dependent variable (i.e., before the intervention), X_i is a vector of controls that includes the unbalanced variables in Tables 3, 5A, and 5B, and ϵ_i is the error term.

Standard errors are clustered at the household level because in some cases there is more than one participant from the same household.

7 Results

This section presents the results of the evaluation following the structure of the evaluation scheme [5]. All outcome variables have been standardized to have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one [6], except for income and the number of interviews conducted and offers requested. This allows all regression coefficients to be interpreted in terms of standard deviations, which is useful for comparing effect sizes across domains.

7.1 Higher income and/or fewer difficulties in making ends meet

Table 6 shows the results of the intervention on income and on the probability of not defaulting (Table 6A in the short term and Table 6B in the medium term). In all cases, two specifications are presented: one for Treatment and Control, and the other for Treatment 1, Treatment 2 and Control.

Regarding the immediate effect on income (columns 1 and 2 of Table 6A), no statistically significant effect is detected. In the medium term, no effect is reported either (Table 6B). Regarding the effect of the treatment on the probability of not defaulting, in the short term, no statistically significant effect is detected (columns 3 and 4 of Table 6A), while in the medium term, a positive effect of 0.099 standard deviations is found for Treatment 2 (column 4 of Table 6B).

[5] The results in this section are for the initial assignment. In Annex 3, the same results are shown for the actual assignment in the field and for the assignment excluding those 45 problematic cases that were assigned to the wrong group in the third edition. There are no discrepancies between the results of the three assignments, except in exceptional cases that are mentioned in the text.

[6] For indices that combine several indicators, we use Anderson's method (2008), which aggregates the information from a set of variables that attempt to measure a common latent variable. Intuitively, the method calculates a weighted average of all the variables, where the weight assigned to each of them depends on how correlated it is with the others (the lower the correlation, the greater the weight).

These results suggest that participation in Treatment 2 has had a positive impact on the ability of its participants to avoid defaulting in the medium term.

Table 6A: Effect on income and ability to make ends meet (first measurement)

	Income		Not to incur in default	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	24.241		-0.032	
	(15.676)		(0.046)	
Treatment 1		17.891		-0.030
		(18.653)		(0.055)
Treatment 2		30.622		-0.035
		(19.277)		(0.056)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.46	0.46	0.06	0.06
Control mean dep. var.	822.344	822.344	0.020	0.020
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	No	No

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 6B: Effect on income and ability to make ends meet in the medium term (second measurement)

	Income		Not to incur in default	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	23.399		0.045	
	(17.136)		(0.045)	
Treatment 1		21.175		-0.010
		(21.113)		(0.055)
Treatment 2		25.591		0.099*
		(20.507)		(0.054)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.41	0.41	0.08	0.08
Control mean dep. var.	855.697	855.697	-0.018	-0.018
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	No	No

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

7.2 Better access to employment 3 months after starting treatment

Tables 7 and 8 report the results of the intervention on the employment situation. In all cases, two specifications are presented: one for Treatment and Control, and the other for Treatment 1, Treatment 2, and Control.

Table 7 estimates the impact on employment through indicators that measure whether the person is professionally active (working or looking for a job), whether he or she is working, whether his or her last job was without a contract, or whether he or she is unemployed but looking for a job. In the first measurement (Table 7A), the probability of working without a contract is lower for the Treatment group (-0.08 standard deviations, statistically significant at 10%), especially for Treatment 1 (-0.12 standard deviations, statistically significant at 5%). For the coefficients of the other indicators, none of them are statistically significant. For the second measurement (Table 7B), negative effects are observed on the variable working for the Treatment (-0.078 standard deviations, statistically significant at 10%) and for Treatment 1 (-0.140 standard deviations, statistically significant at 1%). The effects on the probability of working without a contract remain negative, but more imprecise.

For the field and without problematic cases assignments in the medium term (Table A.10. and A.11.), we found a positive effect of 0.077 standard deviations on the probability of being looking for a job (statistically significant at 10%).

Table 7A: Effect on employment (first measurement)

	Active		Working		Without contract		Unemployed, looking for	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.010		-0.036		-0.079*		0.044	
	(0.044)		(0.042)		(0.045)		(0.044)	
Treatment 1		0.008		-0.074		-0.125**		0.077
		(0.053)		(0.050)		(0.051)		(0.054)
Treatment 2		0.013		0.002		-0.032		0.011
		(0.053)		(0.051)		(0.055)		(0.053)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.16	0.16	0.21	0.21	0.13	0.14	0.13	0.13
Control mean dep. var.	-0.017	-0.017	0.019	0.019	0.061	0.061	-0.032	-0.032
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 7B: Effect on employment in the medium term (second measurement)

	Active		Working		Without contract		Unemployed, looking for	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.006		-0.078*		-0.034		0.071	
	(0.043)		(0.042)		(0.044)		(0.044)	
Treatment 1		-0.065		-0.140***		-0.016		0.078
		(0.054)		(0.049)		(0.053)		(0.053)
Treatment 2		0.052		-0.018		-0.052		0.064
		(0.050)		(0.052)		(0.052)		(0.053)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.18	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.15	0.13	0.13
Control mean dep. var.	-0.009	-0.009	0.033	0.033	0.032	0.032	-0.040	-0.040
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 8 reports the results of the intervention on job search through indicators of the number of job offers requested, number of interviews conducted, probability of having been selected in a process or probability of having said no to an offer. We also did not detect any statistically significant effect either in the short or medium term.

Table 8A: Effect on job search (first measurement)

	Mean offers		Mean interviews		Have you been selected in any process		Have you said "no" to any offer	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.263		-0.018		-0.019		0.039	
	(0.177)		(0.031)		(0.045)		(0.047)	
Treatment 1		0.229		-0.042		-0.043		0.017
		(0.220)		(0.034)		(0.053)		(0.054)
Treatment 2		0.296		0.006		0.005		0.060
		(0.215)		(0.038)		(0.056)		(0.058)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.17	0.17	0.10	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.04
Control mean dep. var.	1.998	1.998	0.248	0.248	0.001	0.001	-0.027	-0.027
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 8B: Effect on job search in the medium term (second measurement)

	Mean offers		Mean interviews		Have you been selected in any process		Have you said "no" to any offer	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.187		0.012		-0.000		0.022	
	(0.169)		(0.023)		(0.044)		(0.044)	
Treatment 1		-0.256		-0.002		-0.015		-0.021
		(0.206)		(0.027)		(0.054)		(0.051)
Treatment 2		-0.118		0.025		0.015		0.064
		(0.195)		(0.029)		(0.054)		(0.060)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.05
Control mean dep. var.	2.033	2.033	0.195	0.195	-0.018	-0.018	-0.021	-0.021
Initial value dep. var.	Sí	Sí	Sí	Sí	Sí	Sí	Sí	Sí

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

In summary, we found that having participated in the Treatment group, and especially in Treatment 1, has a negative effect on the number of people working without a short-term contract. This effect seems to suggest that participation in Treatment 1 has helped participants who were working without a contract before the start of the project to get one, as the number of people working has neither increased nor decreased. However, we observed a negative effect on the number of people working in the medium term for the Treatment group and Treatment 1, although they are still equally active in seeking employment. It is also important to note that the additional digital skills acquisition sessions of the Treatment group 2 have not contributed to an improvement in the employability of its participants as measured by these indicators.

Annex 4 presents the results obtained with the administrative data on working lives from Social Security[7] in three different measurements. We mainly find an increase in the number of days worked for the Treatment group (third measurement) and specifically in days worked full-time for the Treatment 2 group (second measurement). We also observe a positive effect on work intensity (number of days worked out of the total number of days in the reference period) for the Treatment group (third measurement), as well as for intensity working full-time for the Treatment 2 group (second measurement). In addition, positive and significant effects are reported, both for the Treatment 2 group and for the Treatment (second measurement), on being working full-time. For this last group, the probability of working with an open-ended contract also increases (third measurement).

7.3 Awareness of transversal skills for any type of employment

Table 10 reports the results of the intervention related to the participants' self-knowledge of their own strengths and weaknesses when looking for a job, as well as indicators of "soft" skills (personal and image care, verbal and non-verbal communication, conflict resolution, teamwork skills, emotional management and self-control, planning and time management).

For self-knowledge, in none of the measurements the treatment seems to have been effective in improving this indicator.

[7]The reference dates for each of the three measurements (first, second, third) are also detailed.

However, in the first measurement (Table 9A), if we differentiate by the level of involvement of the participants, a negative and significant effect is observed in the Treatment variable (most notable for Treatment 1) for those who had a presence in the sessions below the average, and a positive and significant effect for those above the average.

Table 9A: Effect on self-knowledge and soft skills (first measurement)

	Self-knowledge				Soft skills			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.059	-0.134*			-0.064*	-0.053		
	(0.039)	(0.070)			(0.036)	(0.065)		
Treatment and frequent attendance		0.156*				-0.007		
		(0.086)				(0.081)		
Treatment 1			-0.072	-0.170**			-0.043	-0.137*
			(0.047)	(0.079)			(0.043)	(0.073)
Treatment 1 and frequent attendance				0.206**				0.202**
				(0.100)				(0.093)
Treatment 2			-0.047	-0.097			-0.084*	0.035
			(0.048)	(0.080)			(0.044)	(0.074)
Treatment 2 and frequent attendance				0.105				-0.216**
				(0.100)				(0.094)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41
Control mean dep. var.	0.023	0.023	0.023	0.023	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 9B: Effect on self-knowledge and soft skills in the medium term (second measurement)

	Self-knowledge				Soft skills			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.050	-0.040			-0.135***	-0.079		
	(0.039)	(0.065)			(0.037)	(0.065)		
Treatment and frequent attendance		0.005				-0.071		
		(0.083)				(0.081)		
Treatment 1			0.046	0.044			-0.132***	-0.112
			(0.047)	(0.075)			(0.044)	(0.073)
Treatment 1 and frequent attendance				0.024				0.001
				(0.098)				(0.093)
Treatment 2			0.054	0.035			-0.139***	-0.046
			(0.048)	(0.075)			(0.046)	(0.075)
Treatment 2 and frequent attendance				0.013				-0.142
				(0.099)				(0.097)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37
Control mean dep. var.	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.065	0.065	0.065	0.065
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

For soft skills (columns 5-8), negative effects are also documented, even in the medium term, which, however, lose significance when the level of attendance of participants at the sessions is taken into account. It should be noted that the use of the actions can be a result of the intervention itself.

7.4 Improvement of digital skills for job searching

Tables 10-12 report the results of the intervention on digital skills for job search.

Table 10A only reports a positive coefficient of 0.089 standard deviations (statistically significant at 10%) for Treatment 1 on mobile phone use. In the medium term, this disappears, but a greater and more significant impact appears in Treatment 2 with the use of the same device (Table 10B). In general, the additional sessions received by the Treatment 2 group compared to 1 do not report significant effects on the use of devices (except the mobile phone).

Table 10A: Effect on the use of devices for job search (first measurement)

	Mobile		Computer		Tablet	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treatment	0.052		0.017		0.015	
	(0.049)		(0.038)		(0.041)	
Treatment 1		0.089*		0.027		0.020
		(0.051)		(0.045)		(0.050)
Treatment 2		0.015		0.007		0.010
		(0.060)		(0.046)		(0.050)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.07	0.07	0.36	0.36	0.23	0.23
Control mean dep. var.	-0.032	-0.032	-0.017	-0.017	-0.009	-0.009
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 10B: Effect on the use of devices for job search in the medium term (second measurement)

	Mobile		Computer		Tablet	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treatment	0.065		0.009		0.004	
	(0.050)		(0.038)		(0.042)	
Treatment 1		0.028		0.010		0.022
		(0.062)		(0.046)		(0.053)
Treatment 2		0.103**		0.008		-0.014
		(0.052)		(0.046)		(0.050)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.04	0.04	0.33	0.33	0.18	0.18
Control mean dep. var.	-0.033	-0.033	-0.009	-0.009	-0.012	-0.012
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 11 shows the effects of the intervention on certain online tasks. No significant effect is detected in the short term (Table 11A). In the medium term (Table 11B), we observe a negative and statistically significant effect at the 10% level of -0.097 standard deviations for sending CVs online. No significant improvement is observed for Treatment Group 2 compared to Treatment Group 1. However, in the short-term field assignment (Table A.24), we find a positive effect for sending CVs online of 0.070 standard deviations (statistically significant at the 10% level).

Table 11A: Effect on online procedures (first measurement)

	Have you sent your CV online?		Have you accessed offers online?		Download forms		Fill out forms	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.058		0.013		-0.002		0.044	
	(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.041)		(0.041)	
Treatment 1		0.050		-0.017		-0.032		0.033
		(0.051)		(0.048)		(0.048)		(0.048)
Treatment 2		0.065		0.043		0.029		0.055
		(0.052)		(0.049)		(0.050)		(0.050)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.19	0.19	0.28	0.28	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.25
Control mean dep. var.	-0.055	-0.055	-0.011	-0.011	-0.016	-0.016	-0.050	-0.050
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 11B: Effect on online procedures in the medium term (second measurement)

	Have you sent your CV online?		Have you accessed offers online?		Download forms		Fill out forms	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.068		-0.001		-0.005		-0.054	
	(0.042)		(0.039)		(0.042)		(0.041)	
Treatment 1		-0.097*		-0.014		-0.052		-0.054
		(0.051)		(0.048)		(0.051)		(0.050)
Treatment 2		-0.038		0.012		0.043		-0.053
		(0.051)		(0.048)		(0.050)		(0.050)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.20	0.20	0.29	0.29	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.23
Control mean dep. var.	0.019	0.019	-0.009	-0.009	-0.017	-0.017	-0.000	-0.000
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 12 reports the effects of the intervention on the ability to perform various generic online tasks. Unlike the two previous tables, in this one we can observe positive and statistically significant effects at 1% in Treatment 2. In the first measurement (Table 12A) we highlight the tasks of: attaching files to an email, creating a cloud account, using applications to search for jobs, using e-government applications and the use of communication tools for interviews. In the second measurement (Table 12B), only the effect for creating a cloud account remains. In this area, the differences between the interventions to which both groups of treated people were assigned are evident in terms of acquired digital skills.

Table 12A: Effect on digital skills (first measurement)

	Online tasks		Email		Attachments		Cloud		Folders		Employment apps		Administration apps		Interview tools	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Treatment	-0.003		0.017		0.040		0.107***		0.041		0.067**		0.061*		0.015	
	(0.034)		(0.033)		(0.031)		(0.033)		(0.030)		(0.034)		(0.033)		(0.036)	
Treatment 1		-0.020		-0.003		0.006		0.050		0.023		0.011		-0.003		-0.051
		(0.040)		(0.040)		(0.038)		(0.039)		(0.037)		(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.043)
Treatment 2		0.015		0.037		0.074*		0.165***		0.059		0.123***		0.126***		0.082*
		(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.038)		(0.040)		(0.037)		(0.041)		(0.040)		(0.044)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.48	0.48	0.50	0.50	0.55	0.55	0.51	0.51	0.56	0.56	0.47	0.47	0.50	0.50	0.43	0.43
Control mean dep. var.	-0.021	-0.021	-0.027	-0.027	-0.041	-0.041	-0.071	-0.071	-0.039	-0.039	-0.059	-0.059	-0.038	-0.038	-0.040	-0.040
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 12B: Effect on digital skills in the medium term (second measurement)

	Online tasks		Email		Attachments		Cloud		Folders		Employment apps		Administration apps		Interview tools	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Treatment	0.016		0.027		0.014		0.072**		0.026		0.028		0.027		-0.002	
	(0.034)		(0.033)		(0.033)		(0.034)		(0.032)		(0.034)		(0.034)		(0.036)	
Treatment 1		-0.000		0.038		0.008		0.042		0.000		-0.006		-0.010		-0.060
		(0.042)		(0.041)		(0.040)		(0.042)		(0.039)		(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.043)
Treatment 2		0.032		0.017		0.019		0.102**		0.051		0.062		0.065		0.055
		(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.040)		(0.042)		(0.039)		(0.041)		(0.043)		(0.044)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.47	0.47	0.49	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.46	0.46	0.53	0.53	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.41	0.42
Control mean dep. var.	-0.040	-0.040	-0.038	-0.038	-0.033	-0.033	-0.057	-0.057	-0.042	-0.042	-0.042	-0.042	-0.023	-0.023	-0.032	-0.032
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

8 Heterogeneity analysis

This section presents the analyses of heterogeneity of the effects based on the different implementation editions. To do so, regressions similar to those in the previous section are specified, but adding the variable for which the heterogeneous effects are to be estimated and also the interaction of said variable with the treatment.

Table 13 reports the heterogeneous results for each of the three implementation editions. The table has 8 columns, which correspond to the four main hypotheses indicated in the evaluation scheme: higher income (columns 1 and 2), better access to employment (columns 3 and 4), self-knowledge of one's transversal skills (columns 5 and 6), and improvement in digital skills (columns 7 and 8).

In terms of improved income and use of digital devices, the second edition appears to have been the most successful in the short term. In terms of access to the labour market, none of the editions has managed to significantly change the proportion of participants who are working compared to the control group. Finally, participants' perception of their job-seeking skills appears to have been particularly negative in the third edition. It is important to note that attendance at the sessions was reduced in editions 2 and 3 compared to the first.

Table 13A: Effects for edition (first measurement)

	Income		Active		Self-knowledge		Mobile	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment and edition 1	16.945		0.055		0.086		-0.043	
	(24.449)		(0.082)		(0.075)		(0.061)	
Treatment and edition 2	49.634**		-0.031		-0.025		0.155*	
	(23.514)		(0.074)		(0.066)		(0.087)	
Treatment and edition 3	6.594		0.014		-0.204***		0.033	
	(30.922)		(0.071)		(0.064)		(0.090)	
Treatment 1 and edition 1		-7.264		0.029		0.131		0.012
		(29.792)		(0.101)		(0.093)		(0.039)
Treatment 2 and edition 1		40.996		0.080		0.041		-0.097
		(29.309)		(0.097)		(0.087)		(0.093)
Treatment 1 and edition 2		57.916**		-0.078		-0.092		0.146
		(27.517)		(0.088)		(0.080)		(0.104)
Treatment 2 and edition 2		41.199		0.016		0.045		0.163**
		(28.689)		(0.089)		(0.076)		(0.080)
Treatment 1 and edition 3		-0.452		0.074		-0.209***		0.099
		(36.742)		(0.084)		(0.072)		(0.089)
Treatment 2 and edition 3		13.546		-0.046		-0.200**		-0.033
		(38.874)		(0.088)		(0.082)		(0.120)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.46	0.46	0.16	0.16	0.32	0.32	0.07	0.07
Control mean dep. var.	822.344	822.344	-0.017	-0.017	0.023	0.023	-0.032	-0.032
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 13B: Effects for edition in the medium term (second measurement)

	Income		Active		Self-knowledge		Mobile	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment and edition 1	35.288		-0.101		-0.054		0.114	
	(26.865)		(0.075)		(0.075)		(0.078)	
Treatment and edition 2	30.905		0.106		0.051		0.031	
	(25.695)		(0.073)		(0.064)		(0.094)	
Treatment and edition 3	5.583		-0.045		-0.152**		0.062	
	(34.802)		(0.073)		(0.067)		(0.075)	
Treatment 1 and edition 1		5.436		-0.207**		-0.069		0.082
		(32.169)		(0.100)		(0.092)		(0.077)
Treatment 2 and edition 1		63.573*		-0.003		-0.040		0.143*
		(34.309)		(0.082)		(0.089)		(0.083)
Treatment 1 and edition 2		39.768		0.035		0.048		-0.074
		(31.420)		(0.089)		(0.074)		(0.141)
Treatment 2 and edition 2		22.246		0.175**		0.053		0.132*
		(29.746)		(0.086)		(0.079)		(0.072)
Treatment 1 and edition 3		14.319		-0.053		-0.124		0.092
		(43.142)		(0.089)		(0.080)		(0.060)
Treatment 2 and edition 3		-3.426		-0.036		-0.181**		0.030
		(41.821)		(0.088)		(0.079)		(0.106)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.41	0.41	0.18	0.18	0.31	0.31	0.04	0.04
Control mean dep. var.	855.697	855.697	-0.009	-0.009	0.020	0.020	-0.033	-0.033
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

9 Conclusions

This pilot project has made it possible to evaluate the effects of a new model of labour insertion for people living in poverty compared to the traditional model. The evaluation is experimental, using stratified randomisation (by edition and locality) to assign participants to each treatment or control group randomly. The initial sample includes 2,364 individuals in 11 Spanish provinces. The specific results show:

- An improvement in the economic situation of the participants in Treatment 2, reflected in an increase in their ability not to incur default.

- A positive impact, especially in Treatment 1, on the acquisition of a contract for those participants who are working and did not have one prior to the start of the intervention. However, a negative effect is observed on the number of people working in the medium term for the Treatment and Treatment 1 groups, although they are still active in seeking employment.
- The treatment has not been effective in improving participants' self-knowledge of their own strengths and weaknesses when looking for a job, nor in improving their "soft" skills. However, greater involvement of participants in the sessions seems to make these negative effects less significant.
- A notable improvement in the digital skills acquired by participants in Treatment 2, although no significant changes are seen in the use of devices or in the procedures carried out online.

These results underline the value of specific training in digital content, as well as the importance of frequent attendance by participants in the sessions offered to them. In the words of one of the people in the treatment group during the discussion sessions when asked if he would participate in the programme again: "With my eyes closed!"

References

[1] Anderson, M. L. (2008). Multiple Inference and Gender Differences in the Effects of Early Intervention: A Reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, and Early Training Projects. Journal of the American Statistical Association 103 (484), 1481– 1495.

[2] Bouguen, A., Huang, Y., Kremer, M., & Miguel, E. (2019). Using randomized controlled trials to estimate long-run impacts in development economics. Annual Review of Economics, 11, 523-561.

Annex 1: List of group sessions

Table A.1: Description of group sessions

	Soft skills applied to job search (2h)	BAE Competencies (2h)
Session 1	Expectations and introduction of skills	
Session 2	Self-knowledge	Action plan and employability (joint session with intermediary)
Session 3	Identifying and debunking limiting beliefs	CV session
Session 4	Time management	Resources for my job search
Session 5	Emotional management	Job interview
Session 6	Verbal and non-verbal communication	Portals for job search
Session 7	Teamwork and conflict resolution	ETT and placement agencies
Session 8	Mindfulness and stress management	Labor rights

	Digital skills (2h)
Session 1	Introduction to digital skills
Session 2	Mobile connectivity, tools and resources
Session 3	Email
Session 4	The Cloud
Session 5	Communication apps and Google Maps
Session 6	Apps BAE: Infojobs, Job Today
Session 7	Social networks
Session 8	Communication with the administration

	Group mediation spaces for mutual support in job searches
Session 1	Offers analysis
Session 2	CV revision and Elevator pitch
Session 3	The interview (joint session with counselor)
Session 4	The Company

Annex 2: Definition of the outcome indicators

The Table A.2 shows the description and the calculation of the outcome indicators used in the analysis, using the original names of the survey variables.

Table A.2: Description of the outcome indicators

Code	Description	Original variable or formula
HP1a1	Net monthly income	Income mean of the 6 previous months: (1/6)x(ING111+ING112+ING113+ ING114+ING115+ING116)
HP1b1	Ability to make ends meet	Home has not been in arrears in the last 12 months: ING220
HP2a1	Access to employment 3	1 if he is working or looking for a job, 0 if not: OCU511-OCU513
HP2a2	months after starting	1 if he is working, 0 if not: OCU511-OCU512
HP2a3	treatment	1 if he had a contract in his last job, 0 if not: OCU614
HP2a4		1 if he is unemployed but looking for a job, 0 if not: OCU513
HP2b1		Average number of job offers the participant applied for in the last 3 months: (1/3)x(OCU411+OCU412+OCU413)
HP2b2		Average number of job interviews the participant had in the last 3 months: (1/3)x(OCU421+OCU422+OCU423)
HP2b3		You have been selected in any process: OCU440
HP2b4		You have said "no" to any offer: OCU430
HP3a1	Awareness of transversal skills for any type of employment	Self-knowledge: Anderson index with 3 components: - I would be able to describe my strengths to obtain a job in the sector of your interest: indicator of EMP711==4 or EMP711==5 - I would be able to describe my weaknesses to obtain a job in the sector of your interest: indicator of EMP712==4 or EMP712==5 - With the information I have about myself at this moment, I feel capable of obtaining a job: indicator of EMP713==4 or EM713==5
HP3a2		"Soft" skills: Anderson index with 3 components: - Personal care and image: "I manage my personal image appropriately in the work environment and adapt to different social situations" indicator - Verbal and non-verbal communication: Indicator of "I communicate easily, naturally and I adapt to different situations and people" - Conflict resolution: Indicator "I seek and promote personal relationships with colleagues, managers or clients" - Teamwork skills: Indicator of "I promote a good group climate, I contribute ideas and support other people" - Emotional management and self-control: Indicator of "With my actions I provide peace of mind and offer constructive solutions to situations of stress or conflict" - Planning and time management: "I am able to organize and plan new tasks" indicator
HP4a1	Digital skills for job search	Use of any digital device for job search: DIG1620, DIG1631-DIG1633
HP4b1		Sending CV online: DIG1520
HP4b2		Access to online job offers: DIG1530

HP4b3		To obtain information from AAPP websites or apps: DIG1641-DIG1643
HP4c1		Capacity to manage online tasks, use of email, attachments, cloud, online tools for interviews: DIG1661-DIG1668

Table A.3 includes the description of the survey variables used in the calculation of each indicator.

Table A.3: Description of the survey variables included in the calculation of indicators

Collection time	Code	Description	Units
Pre-Post	ING111-ING116	Net monthly income (from 1 to 6 months ago)	Euros
Post	ING220	Home in arrears in the last 12 months	Yes/No
Pre-Post	OCU511-OCU512	Employment situation: working	Yes/No
Pre-Post	OCU511-OCU513	Employment situation: active	Yes/No
Pre-Post	OCU614	Employment situation: without contract	Yes/No
Pre-Post	OCU513	Employment situation: unemployed, but looking for a job	Yes/No
Pre-Post	OCU411-413	Job offers that the participant has applied for (from 1 month to 3 months ago)	Nº offers
Pre-Post	OCU421-OCU423	Job interviews that the participant has had (from 1 month to 3 months ago)	Nº interviews
Pre-Post	OCU440	Being selected in any process	Yes/No
Pre-Post	OCU430	Having said no to any offer	Yes/No
Pre-Post	EMP711	Being able to describe my strengths to get a job	1-5
Pre-Post	EMP712	Being able to describe my weaknesses to get a job	1-5
Pre-Post	EMP713	With the information I have about myself at this moment, I feel capable of working	1-5
Pre-Post	EMP810	Presence and personal image	4 categories
Pre-Post	EMP910	Communication	4 categories
Pre-Post	EMP1020	Conflicts resolution	4 categories
Pre-Post	EMP1010	Teamwork	4 categories
Pre-Post	EMP1110	Emotional management and self-control	4 categories
Pre-Post	EMP1410	Planning and time management	4 categories
Post	DIG1610	Level of internet knowledge	1-4
Pre-Post	DIG1620 DIG1631 DIG1632 DIG1633	Have you used any digital device - Mobile - Computer - Tablet	Yes/No
Pre-Post	DIG1520	Have you sent your CV online in the last week using the internet?	Yes/No
Pre-Post	DIG1530	Have you managed to access any job offer online?	Yes/No
Pre-Post	DIG1641 DIG1642 DIG1643	To obtain information from AAPP websites or apps Download and print forms Send completed forms	Yes/No

Pre-Post	DIG1661	Capable of:	1-4
	DIG 1662	- to manage online tasks	
	DIG 1663	- to use email	
	DIG 1664	- to create an account in the cloud (Drive)	
	DIG 1665	- to create folders in the computer	
	DIG 1666	- to use online apps to look for a job	
	DIG 1667	- to use apps from the electronic administration	
	DIG 1668	- to use communication online tools for interviews	

Annex 3: Results with other assignments

Table A.4: Effects on income (first measurement)

	Field assignment		Without problematic cases	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	17.838		21.337	
	(15.664)		(15.796)	
Treatment 1		14.236		14.356
		(18.728)		(18.856)
Treatment 2		21.445		28.373
		(19.141)		(19.431)
Observations	1880	1880	1835	1835
R^2	0.46	0.46	0.45	0.45
Control mean dep. var.	825.786	825.786	820.667	820.667
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.5: Effects on income in the medium term (second measurement)

	Field assignment		Without problematic cases	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	17.089		19.883	
	(17.138)		(17.313)	
Treatment 1		12.740		15.685
		(21.088)		(21.317)
Treatment 2		21.371		24.026
		(20.564)		(20.791)
Observations	1891	1891	1852	1852
R^2	0.41	0.41	0.40	0.40
Control mean dep. var.	859.456	859.456	854.330	854.330
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.6: Effects on not incurring in default (first measurement)

	Field assignment		Without problematic cases	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	-0.017		-0.029	
	(0.046)		(0.047)	
Treatment 1		-0.023		-0.032
		(0.056)		(0.056)
Treatment 2		-0.010		-0.025
		(0.055)		(0.057)
Observations	1880	1880	1835	1835
R^2	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
Control mean dep. var.	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
Initial value dep. var.	No	No	No	No

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.7: Effects on not incurring in default in the medium term (second measurement)

	Field assignment		Without problematic cases	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.044		0.045	
	(0.045)		(0.046)	
Treatment 1		-0.019		-0.012
		(0.055)		(0.056)
Treatment 2		0.107**		0.100*
		(0.054)		(0.055)
Observations	1891	1891	1852	1852
R^2	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
Control mean dep. var.	-0.017	-0.017	-0.023	-0.023
Initial value dep. var.	No	No	No	No

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.8: Effects on employment (first measurement)

	Field assignment							
	Active		Working		Without contract		Unemployed, looking for	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.015		-0.035		-0.080*		0.046	
	(0.044)		(0.042)		(0.045)		(0.044)	
Treatment 1		0.010		-0.076		-0.128**		0.081
		(0.053)		(0.050)		(0.051)		(0.054)
Treatment 2		0.020		0.005		-0.033		0.011
		(0.052)		(0.051)		(0.054)		(0.053)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.16	0.16	0.21	0.21	0.13	0.14	0.13	0.13
Control mean dep. var.	-0.021	-0.021	0.017	0.017	0.060	0.060	-0.034	-0.034
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard erros, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.9: Effects on employment (first measurement)

Assignment without problematic cases								
	Active		Working		Without contract		Unemployed, looking for	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.011		-0.036		-0.077*		0.045	
	(0.044)		(0.043)		(0.045)		(0.045)	
Treatment 1		0.009		-0.074		-0.123**		0.080
		(0.053)		(0.051)		(0.051)		(0.054)
Treatment 2		0.013		0.003		-0.031		0.009
		(0.053)		(0.051)		(0.055)		(0.054)
Observations	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835
R^2	0.17	0.17	0.21	0.21	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.13
Control mean dep. var.	-0.022	-0.022	0.022	0.022	0.059	0.059	-0.040	-0.040
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.10: Effects on employment in the medium term (second measurement)

Field assignment								
	Active		Working		Without contract		Unemployed, looking for	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.001		-0.080*		-0.025		0.077*	
	(0.043)		(0.042)		(0.044)		(0.044)	
Treatment 1		-0.051		-0.141***		0.004		0.091*
		(0.054)		(0.049)		(0.053)		(0.053)
Treatment 2		0.051		-0.020		-0.053		0.064
		(0.050)		(0.052)		(0.051)		(0.053)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.18	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.15	0.13	0.13
Control mean dep. var.	-0.015	-0.015	0.033	0.033	0.025	0.025	-0.044	-0.044
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.11: Effects on employment in the medium term (second measurement)

Assignment without problematic cases								
	Active		Working		Without contract		Unemployed, looking for	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.003		-0.082*		-0.030		0.077*	
	(0.043)		(0.042)		(0.044)		(0.044)	
Treatment 1		-0.062		-0.142***		-0.007		0.083
		(0.054)		(0.050)		(0.054)		(0.054)
Treatment 2		0.056		-0.022		-0.052		0.071
		(0.050)		(0.052)		(0.052)		(0.053)
Observations	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852
R^2	0.18	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.14
Control mean dep. var.	-0.009	-0.009	0.039	0.039	0.030	0.030	-0.045	-0.045
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.12: Effects on job search (first measurement)

Field assignment								
	Mean offers		Mean interviews		Have you been selected in any process		Have you said "no" to any offer	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.283		-0.015		-0.013		0.051	
	(0.178)		(0.031)		(0.045)		(0.046)	
Treatment 1		0.336		-0.030		-0.033		0.025
		(0.225)		(0.035)		(0.054)		(0.054)
Treatment 2		0.231		-0.001		0.007		0.077
		(0.208)		(0.037)		(0.055)		(0.059)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.17	0.17	0.10	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.04
Control mean dep. var.	1.986	1.986	0.247	0.247	-0.004	-0.004	-0.034	-0.034
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.13: Effects on job search (first measurement)

Assignment without problematic cases

	Mean offers		Mean interviews		Have you been selected in any process		Have you said "no" to any offer	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.281		-0.020		-0.020		0.045	
	(0.178)		(0.032)		(0.046)		(0.047)	
Treatment 1		0.312		-0.039		-0.042		0.017
		(0.224)		(0.035)		(0.054)		(0.054)
Treatment 2		0.249		0.000		0.003		0.073
		(0.213)		(0.038)		(0.056)		(0.060)
Observations	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835
R^2	0.18	0.18	0.10	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.04
Control mean dep. var.	1.963	1.963	0.245	0.245	-0.001	-0.001	-0.030	-0.030
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard error, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.14: Effects on job search in the medium term (second measurement)

Field assignment

	Mean offers		Mean interviews		Have you been selected in any process		Have you said "no" to any offer	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.142		0.017		0.013		0.022	
	(0.169)		(0.023)		(0.044)		(0.044)	
Treatment 1		-0.148		0.012		0.000		-0.021
		(0.208)		(0.051)		(0.054)		(0.051)
Treatment 2		-0.137		0.048		0.026		0.065
		(0.193)		(0.054)		(0.054)		(0.060)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.05
Control mean dep. var.	2.007	2.007	0.192	-0.028	-0.027	-0.027	-0.021	-0.021
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.15: Effects on job search in the medium term (second measurement)

	Assignment without problematic cases							
	Mean offers		Mean interviews		Have you been selected in any process		Have you said "no" to any offer	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.163		0.014		0.006		0.023	
	(0.171)		(0.023)		(0.045)		(0.046)	
Treatment 1		-0.213		0.002		-0.008		-0.021
		(0.207)		(0.028)		(0.054)		(0.052)
Treatment 2		-0.114		0.026		0.020		0.067
		(0.197)		(0.030)		(0.054)		(0.061)
Observations	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852
R^2	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.05
Control mean dep. var.	2.003	2.003	0.194	0.194	-0.026	-0.026	-0.018	-0.018
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.16: Effect on self-knowledge (first measurement)

	Field assignment				Without problematic cases			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.029	-0.034			-0.049	-0.112		
	(0.039)	(0.066)			(0.040)	(0.071)		
Treatment and frequent attendance		0.054				0.140		
		(0.081)				(0.087)		
Treatment 1			-0.043	-0.073			-0.056	-0.148*
			(0.047)	(0.076)			(0.047)	(0.080)
Treatment 1 and frequent attendance				0.106				0.199**
				(0.097)				(0.100)
Treatment 2			-0.015	0.003			-0.041	-0.075
			(0.048)	(0.074)			(0.048)	(0.081)
Treatment 2 and frequent attendance				0.005				0.081
				(0.092)				(0.102)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1835	1835	1835	1835
R^2	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.33
Control mean dep. var.	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.17: Effect on self-knowledge in the medium term (second measurement)

	Field assignment				Without problematic cases			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.029	0.018			-0.040	-0.035		
	(0.039)	(0.062)			(0.040)	(0.066)		
Treatment and frequent attendance		-0.052				0.018		
		(0.078)				(0.084)		
Treatment 1			-0.033	-0.002			-0.042	-0.043
			(0.047)	(0.071)			(0.048)	(0.076)
Treatment 1 and frequent attendance				-0.020				0.030
				(0.092)				(0.099)
Treatment 2			-0.026	0.035			-0.038	-0.027
			(0.047)	(0.071)			(0.048)	(0.076)
Treatment 2 and frequent attendance				-0.082				0.007
				(0.094)				(0.100)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1852	1852	1852	1852
R^2	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31
Control mean dep. var.	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.18: Effect on soft skills (first measurement)

	Field assignment				Without problematic cases			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.052	-0.020			-0.061*	-0.038		
	(0.036)	(0.061)			(0.037)	(0.066)		
Treatment and frequent attendance		-0.040				-0.027		
		(0.076)				(0.082)		
Treatment 1			-0.041	-0.116			-0.042	-0.127*
			(0.043)	(0.071)			(0.043)	(0.074)
Treatment 1 and frequent attendance				0.176*				0.191**
				(0.090)				(0.094)
Treatment 2			-0.063	0.067			-0.081*	0.055
			(0.043)	(0.068)			(0.044)	(0.074)
Treatment 2 and frequent attendance				-0.244***				-0.245***
				(0.088)				(0.095)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1835	1835	1835	1835
R^2	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.42
Control mean dep. var.	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.19: Effect on soft skills in the medium term (second measurement)

	Field assignment				Without problematic cases			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.136***	-0.079			-0.138***	-0.083		
	(0.037)	(0.059)			(0.038)	(0.065)		
Treatment and frequent attendance		-0.074				-0.071		
		(0.074)				(0.082)		
Treatment 1			-0.128***	-0.101			-0.132***	-0.119
			(0.044)	(0.067)			(0.044)	(0.074)
Treatment 1 and frequent attendance				-0.012				0.012
				(0.086)				(0.095)
Treatment 2			-0.143***	-0.058			-0.144***	-0.048
			(0.046)	(0.069)			(0.047)	(0.076)
Treatment 2 and frequent attendance				-0.132				-0.154
				(0.089)				(0.099)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1852	1852	1852	1852
R^2	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37
Control mean dep. var.	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.062	0.062	0.062	0.062
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.20:Effect on the use of devices for job search (first measurement)

	Field assignment					
	Mobile		Computer		Tablet	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treatment	0.053		0.000		0.009	
	(0.049)		(0.038)		(0.041)	
Treatment 1		0.090*		0.017		0.007
		(0.051)		(0.045)		(0.050)
Treatment 2		0.016		-0.017		0.012
		(0.061)		(0.046)		(0.050)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.07	0.07	0.36	0.36	0.23	0.23
Control mean dep. var.	-0.031	-0.031	-0.009	-0.009	-0.010	-0.010
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.21: Effect on the use of devices for job search (first measurement)

Assignment without problematic cases						
	Mobile		Computer		Tablet	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treatment	0.053		0.007		0.012	
	(0.050)		(0.038)		(0.042)	
Treatment 1		0.092*		0.016		0.008
		(0.052)		(0.045)		(0.050)
Treatment 2		0.015		-0.001		0.016
		(0.062)		(0.047)		(0.051)
Observations	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835
R^2	0.07	0.07	0.35	0.35	0.22	0.22
Control mean dep. var.	-0.034	-0.034	-0.023	-0.023	-0.018	-0.018
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.22: Effect on the use of devices for job search in the medium term (second measurement)

Field assignment						
	Mobile		Computer		Tablet	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treatment	0.066		0.002		0.001	
	(0.049)		(0.038)		(0.042)	
Treatment 1		0.027		0.010		0.020
		(0.062)		(0.046)		(0.053)
Treatment 2		0.103**		-0.005		-0.017
		(0.052)		(0.047)		(0.050)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.04	0.04	0.33	0.33	0.18	0.18
Control mean dep. var.	-0.033	-0.033	-0.006	-0.006	-0.012	-0.012
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.23: Effect on the use of devices for job search in the medium term (second measurement)

Assignment without problematic cases						
	Mobile		Computer		Tablet	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treatment	0.067		0.006		0.004	
	(0.051)		(0.038)		(0.043)	
Treatment 1		0.028		0.006		0.022
		(0.063)		(0.047)		(0.054)
Treatment 2		0.105**		0.005		-0.013
		(0.053)		(0.047)		(0.051)
Observations	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852
R^2	0.04	0.04	0.33	0.33	0.18	0.18
Control mean dep. var.	-0.035	-0.035	-0.018	-0.018	-0.006	-0.006
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.24: Effects on online procedures (first measurement)

Field assignment								
	Have you sent your CV online?		Have you accessed offers online?		Download forms		Fill out forms	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.070*		0.023		0.017		0.060	
	(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.041)		(0.041)	
Treatment 1		0.068		-0.006		-0.009		0.050
		(0.051)		(0.048)		(0.048)		(0.048)
Treatment 2		0.073		0.052		0.044		0.071
		(0.052)		(0.048)		(0.050)		(0.050)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.19	0.19	0.28	0.28	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.25
Control mean dep. var.	-0.061	-0.061	-0.020	-0.020	-0.031	-0.031	-0.061	-0.061
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.25: Effects on online procedures (first measurement)

Assignment without problematic cases

	Have you sent your CV online?		Have you accessed offers online?		Download forms		Fill out forms	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.067		0.018		0.004		0.054	
	(0.043)		(0.040)		(0.042)		(0.042)	
Treatment 1		0.067		-0.011		-0.024		0.043
		(0.051)		(0.049)		(0.049)		(0.049)
Treatment 2		0.068		0.046		0.031		0.065
		(0.053)		(0.049)		(0.050)		(0.051)
Observations	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835
R^2	0.19	0.19	0.28	0.28	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.25
Control mean dep. var.	-0.065	-0.065	-0.026	-0.026	-0.031	-0.031	-0.055	-0.055
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.26: Effects on online procedures in the medium term (second measurement)

Field assignment

	Have you sent your CV online?		Have you accessed offers online?		Download forms		Fill out forms	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.053		0.017		-0.003		-0.033	
	(0.042)		(0.039)		(0.042)		(0.041)	
Treatment 1		-0.076		0.007		-0.046		-0.032
		(0.051)		(0.048)		(0.051)		(0.050)
Treatment 2		-0.032		0.028		0.039		-0.034
		(0.051)		(0.048)		(0.050)		(0.050)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.20	0.20	0.29	0.29	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.23
Control mean dep. var.	0.010	0.010	-0.022	-0.022	-0.022	-0.022	-0.012	-0.012
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.27: Effects on online procedures in the medium term (second measurement)

	Assignment without problematic cases							
	Have you sent your CV online?		Have you accessed offers online?		Download forms		Fill out forms	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.058		0.004		-0.004		-0.041	
	(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.042)		(0.041)	
Treatment 1		-0.087*		-0.007		-0.050		-0.039
		(0.051)		(0.048)		(0.051)		(0.050)
Treatment 2		-0.029		0.015		0.041		-0.043
		(0.052)		(0.048)		(0.051)		(0.051)
Observations	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852
R^2	0.20	0.20	0.29	0.29	0.20	0.21	0.23	0.23
Control mean dep. var.	0.010	0.010	-0.028	-0.028	-0.025	-0.025	-0.006	-0.006
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.28: Effects on digital skills (first measurement)

	Field assignment															
	Online tasks		Email		Attachments		Cloud		Folders		Employment apps		Administration apps		Interview tools	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Treatment	0.004		0.020		0.046		0.107***		0.030		0.082**		0.076**		0.017	
	(0.033)		(0.033)		(0.031)		(0.033)		(0.030)		(0.034)		(0.033)		(0.036)	
Treatment 1		-0.008		0.005		0.005		0.045		0.004		0.030		0.013		-0.052
		(0.040)		(0.040)		(0.038)		(0.039)		(0.037)		(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.043)
Treatment 2		0.016		0.035		0.087**		0.169***		0.056		0.134***		0.139***		0.087**
		(0.041)		(0.040)		(0.038)		(0.040)		(0.037)		(0.041)		(0.040)		(0.043)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.48	0.48	0.50	0.50	0.55	0.55	0.51	0.51	0.56	0.56	0.47	0.47	0.50	0.50	0.43	0.43
Control mean dep. var.	-0.027	-0.027	-0.030	-0.030	-0.045	-0.045	-0.074	-0.074	-0.035	-0.035	-0.068	-0.068	-0.045	-0.045	-0.042	-0.042
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.29: Effects on digital skills (first measurement)

Assignment without problematic cases

	Online tasks		Email		Attachments		Cloud		Folders		Employment apps		Administration apps		Interview tools	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Treatment	-0.002		0.015		0.042		0.107***		0.041		0.074**		0.068**		0.015	
	(0.034)		(0.033)		(0.031)		(0.033)		(0.031)		(0.034)		(0.034)		(0.036)	
Treatment 1		-0.019		-0.001		0.006		0.045		0.014		0.023		0.003		-0.054
		(0.041)		(0.041)		(0.039)		(0.039)		(0.037)		(0.043)		(0.041)		(0.043)
Treatment 2		0.016		0.031		0.079**		0.170***		0.068*		0.126***		0.135***		0.085*
		(0.042)		(0.041)		(0.039)		(0.041)		(0.037)		(0.041)		(0.040)		(0.044)
Observations	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835
R^2	0.49	0.49	0.51	0.51	0.55	0.55	0.52	0.52	0.57	0.57	0.47	0.47	0.50	0.50	0.43	0.43
Control mean dep. var.	-0.025	-0.025	-0.034	-0.034	-0.048	-0.048	-0.075	-0.075	-0.046	-0.046	-0.075	-0.075	-0.055	-0.055	-0.049	-0.049
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.30: Effects on digital skills in the medium term (second measurement)

Field assignment

	Online tasks		Email		Attachments		Cloud		Folders		Employment apps		Administration apps		Interview tools	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Treatment	0.026		0.032		0.024		0.088**		0.031		0.027		0.037		0.004	
	(0.034)		(0.033)		(0.033)		(0.034)		(0.032)		(0.034)		(0.034)		(0.036)	
Treatment 1		0.012		0.041		0.017		0.067		0.004		-0.001		-0.003		-0.049
		(0.042)		(0.041)		(0.040)		(0.042)		(0.039)		(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.044)
Treatment 2		0.039		0.023		0.030		0.109***		0.058		0.054		0.077*		0.057
		(0.041)		(0.040)		(0.040)		(0.042)		(0.039)		(0.041)		(0.043)		(0.043)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.47	0.47	0.49	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.46	0.46	0.53	0.53	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.41	0.42
Control mean dep. var.	-0.046	-0.046	-0.041	-0.041	-0.038	-0.038	-0.068	-0.068	-0.046	-0.046	-0.043	-0.043	-0.028	-0.028	-0.036	-0.036
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.31: Effects on digital skills in the medium term (second measurement)

Assignment without problematic cases

	Online tasks		Email		Attachments		Cloud		Folders		Employment apps		Administration apps		Interview tools	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Treatment	0.021		0.032		0.020		0.077**		0.031		0.025		0.031		-0.000	
	(0.035)		(0.034)		(0.033)		(0.034)		(0.032)		(0.034)		(0.035)		(0.036)	
Treatment 1		0.008		0.040		0.015		0.051		0.003		-0.007		-0.009		-0.052
		(0.042)		(0.041)		(0.040)		(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.044)
Treatment 2		0.033		0.023		0.025		0.103**		0.059		0.057		0.071		0.051
		(0.042)		(0.040)		(0.041)		(0.042)		(0.039)		(0.042)		(0.043)		(0.044)
Observations	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852
R^2	0.47	0.47	0.49	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.47	0.47	0.53	0.53	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.42	0.42
Control mean dep. var.	-0.047	-0.047	-0.047	-0.047	-0.042	-0.042	-0.068	-0.068	-0.050	-0.050	-0.053	-0.053	-0.036	-0.036	-0.037	-0.037
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors clustered by household, in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.32: Effects by edition (first measurement)

Field assignment								
	Income		Active		Self-knowledge		Mobile	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment and edition 1	16.945		0.055		0.086		-0.043	
	(24.449)		(0.082)		(0.075)		(0.061)	
Treatment and edition 2	49.634**		-0.031		-0.025		0.155*	
	(23.514)		(0.074)		(0.066)		(0.087)	
Treatment and edition 3	6.594		0.014		-0.204***		0.033	
	(30.922)		(0.071)		(0.064)		(0.090)	
Treatment 1 and edition 1		-7.265		0.029		0.131		0.012
		(29.791)		(0.101)		(0.093)		(0.039)
Treatment 2 and edition 1		40.976		0.080		0.041		-0.097
		(29.307)		(0.097)		(0.087)		(0.093)
Treatment 1 and edition 2		57.825**		-0.078		-0.091		0.146
		(27.519)		(0.088)		(0.080)		(0.104)
Treatment 2 and edition 2		41.074		0.017		0.045		0.163**
		(28.687)		(0.089)		(0.076)		(0.080)
Treatment 1 and edition 3		-10.058		0.080		-0.133*		0.100
		(37.155)		(0.085)		(0.071)		(0.089)
Treatment 2 and edition 3		-11.097		-0.028		-0.113		-0.030
		(38.384)		(0.086)		(0.083)		(0.120)
Observations	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880
R^2	0.46	0.46	0.16	0.16	0.32	0.32	0.07	0.07
Control mean dep. var.	825.786	825.786	-0.021	-0.021	0.007	0.007	-0.031	-0.031
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.33: Effects by edition (first measurement)

Assignment without problematic cases

	Income		Active		Self-knowledge		Mobile	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment and edition 1	17.523		0.055		0.086		-0.043	
	(24.458)		(0.082)		(0.075)		(0.061)	
Treatment and edition 2	49.653**		-0.031		-0.027		0.155*	
	(23.513)		(0.074)		(0.066)		(0.087)	
Treatment and edition 3	-3.317		0.016		-0.182***		0.035	
	(32.094)		(0.074)		(0.065)		(0.096)	
Treatment 1 and edition 1		-6.890		0.028		0.131		0.012
		(29.749)		(0.101)		(0.093)		(0.040)
Treatment 2 and edition 1		41.779		0.081		0.041		-0.098
		(29.334)		(0.097)		(0.087)		(0.094)
Treatment 1 and edition 2		57.901**		-0.079		-0.094		0.146
		(27.565)		(0.088)		(0.080)		(0.104)
Treatment 2 and edition 2		41.294		0.017		0.043		0.162**
		(28.674)		(0.089)		(0.076)		(0.081)
Treatment 1 and edition 3		-12.064		0.087		-0.171**		0.107
		(38.415)		(0.087)		(0.073)		(0.095)
Treatment 2 and edition 3		5.379		-0.055		-0.192**		-0.037
		(40.511)		(0.091)		(0.086)		(0.130)
Observaciones	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835	1835
R^2	0.45	0.45	0.17	0.17	0.32	0.32	0.07	0.07
Media control var. dep.	820.667	820.667	-0.022	-0.022	0.020	0.020	-0.034	-0.034
Valor inicial var. dep.	Sí	Sí	Sí	Sí	Sí	Sí	Sí	Sí

Nota: Errores estándar, agrupados por hogar, en paréntesis.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.34: Effects by edition in the medium term (second measurement)

	Field assignment							
	Income		Active		Self-knowledge		Mobile	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment and edition 1	35.288		-0.101		-0.054		0.114	
	(26.865)		(0.075)		(0.075)		(0.078)	
Treatment and edition 2	30.905		0.106		0.051		0.031	
	(25.695)		(0.073)		(0.064)		(0.094)	
Treatment and edition 3	5.583		-0.045		-0.152**		0.062	
	(34.802)		(0.073)		(0.067)		(0.075)	
Treatment 1 and edition 1		5.416		-0.207**		-0.069		0.082
		(32.175)		(0.100)		(0.092)		(0.077)
Treatment 2 and edition 1		63.578*		-0.003		-0.040		0.143*
		(34.316)		(0.082)		(0.089)		(0.083)
Treatment 1 and edition 2		39.745		0.035		0.048		-0.074
		(31.421)		(0.089)		(0.074)		(0.141)
Treatment 2 and edition 2		22.333		0.174**		0.053		0.132*
		(29.745)		(0.086)		(0.079)		(0.072)
Treatment 1 and edition 3		-9.865		-0.013		-0.087		0.092
		(43.126)		(0.089)		(0.081)		(0.060)
Treatment 2 and edition 3		-15.447		-0.039		-0.098		0.031
		(42.028)		(0.088)		(0.078)		(0.106)
Observations	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891	1891
R^2	0.41	0.41	0.18	0.18	0.31	0.31	0.04	0.04
Control mean dep. var.	859.456	859.456	-0.015	-0.015	0.010	0.010	-0.033	-0.033
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.35: Effects by edition in the medium term (second measurement)

Assignment without problematic cases

	Income		Active		Self-knowledge		Mobile	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment and edition 1	35.203		-0.102		-0.055		0.114	
	(26.838)		(0.075)		(0.075)		(0.079)	
Treatment and edition 2	30.701		0.107		0.051		0.031	
	(25.686)		(0.073)		(0.064)		(0.094)	
Treatment and edition 3	-5.861		-0.038		-0.128*		0.066	
	(36.264)		(0.074)		(0.069)		(0.080)	
Treatment 1 and edition 1		5.000		-0.208**		-0.070		0.082
		(32.102)		(0.100)		(0.093)		(0.077)
Treatment 2 and edition 1		63.817*		-0.002		-0.042		0.143*
		(34.307)		(0.082)		(0.089)		(0.083)
Treatment 1 and edition 2		39.228		0.035		0.047		-0.074
		(31.459)		(0.089)		(0.074)		(0.141)
Treatment 2 and edition 2		22.444		0.177**		0.055		0.132*
		(29.721)		(0.086)		(0.079)		(0.072)
Treatment 1 and edition 3		-1.480		-0.042		-0.117		0.098
		(45.000)		(0.092)		(0.083)		(0.064)
Treatment 2 and edition 3		-10.370		-0.034		-0.140*		0.031
		(43.968)		(0.090)		(0.082)		(0.114)
Observations	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852	1852
R^2	0.40	0.40	0.18	0.18	0.31	0.31	0.04	0.04
Control mean dep. var.	854.330	854.330	-0.009	-0.009	0.012	0.012	-0.035	-0.035
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Annex 4: Results with data on working lives from Social Security

From the information contained in the Social Security employment record file, various variables have been calculated that reflect the employment situation of the participants in the different editions of this project.

For the calculated variables, we have four reference periods (PRE, first measurement –POST1-, second measurement -POST2-, third measurement –POSTFINAL-) for each of the three editions:

- Edition 1: from January 1 to 31, 2023 (PRE); from April 1 to 30, 2023 (first measurement); from July 1 to 31, 2023 (second measurement); and from November 1 to 30, 2023 (third measurement).
- Edition 2: from April 1 to 30, 2023 (PRE); from July 1 to 31, 2023 (first measurement); from October 1 to 31, 2023 (second measurement); and from December 1 to 31, 2023 (third measurement).
- Edition 3: from August 1 to 31, 2023 (PRE); from November 1 to 30, 2023 (first measurement); and from January 1 to 31, 2024 (second measurement).

In the case of the state variables at a given time, we take the 10th day of each of the months of the previous reference periods as a reference.

Descriptive statistics of the sample

	Treatment group				
	Observations	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PRE: Nº days worked	1305	5.85	11.64	0.00	31.00
PRE: Nº days worked full-time	1305	3.90	8.71	0.00	31.00
PRE: Labor intensity	1305	0.19	0.38	0.00	1.00
PRE: Full-time labor intensity	1305	0.13	0.28	0.00	1.00
PRE: Working	1305	0.22	0.42	0.00	1.00
PRE: Without contract	1305	0.02	0.15	0.00	1.00
PRE: Permanent contract	1305	0.09	0.29	0.00	1.00
PRE: Full-time contract	1305	0.05	0.22	0.00	1.00
POST1: Nº days worked	1305	7.06	12.45	0.00	31.00
POST1: Nº days worked full-time	1305	4.92	9.67	0.00	31.00
POST1: Labor intensity	1305	0.23	0.41	0.00	1.00
POST1: Full-time labor intensity	1305	0.16	0.32	0.00	1.00
POST1: Working	1305	0.27	0.44	0.00	1.00
POST1: Without contract	1305	0.02	0.15	0.00	1.00
POST1: Permanent contract	1305	0.11	0.31	0.00	1.00
POST1: Full-time contract	1305	0.07	0.26	0.00	1.00
POST2: Nº days worked	1305	8.03	13.14	0.00	31.00
POST2: Nº days worked full-time	1305	5.72	10.39	0.00	31.00
POST2: Labor intensity	1305	0.26	0.42	0.00	1.00
POST2: Full-time labor intensity	1305	0.18	0.34	0.00	1.00
POST2: Working	1305	0.29	0.45	0.00	1.00
POST2: Without contract	1305	0.02	0.15	0.00	1.00
POST2: Permanent contract	1305	0.12	0.33	0.00	1.00
POST2: Full-time contract	1305	0.10	0.30	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Nº days worked	834	7.80	13.04	0.00	31.00
POSTFINAL: Nº days worked full-time	834	5.42	10.20	0.00	31.00
POSTFINAL: Labor intensity	834	0.25	0.43	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Full-time labor intensity	834	0.18	0.33	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Working	834	0.28	0.45	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Without contract	834	0.03	0.17	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Permanent contract	834	0.14	0.35	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Full-time contract	834	0.08	0.26	0.00	1.00
Observations	1305				

	Control group				
	Observations	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PRE: Nº days worked	1051	6.12	11.86	0.00	31.00
PRE: Nº days worked full-time	1051	4.14	8.86	0.00	31.00
PRE: Labor intensity	1051	0.20	0.39	0.00	1.00
PRE: Full-time labor intensity	1051	0.13	0.29	0.00	1.00
PRE: Working	1051	0.23	0.42	0.00	1.00
PRE: Without contract	1051	0.02	0.16	0.00	1.00
PRE: Permanent contract	1051	0.09	0.28	0.00	1.00
PRE: Full-time contract	1051	0.05	0.21	0.00	1.00
POST1: Nº days worked	1051	7.30	12.63	0.00	31.00
POST1: Nº days worked full-time	1051	4.93	9.55	0.00	31.00
POST1: Labor intensity	1051	0.24	0.42	0.00	1.00
POST1: Full-time labor intensity	1051	0.16	0.31	0.00	1.00
POST1: Working	1051	0.28	0.45	0.00	1.00
POST1: Without contract	1051	0.02	0.15	0.00	1.00
POST1: Permanent contract	1051	0.11	0.31	0.00	1.00
POST1: Full-time contract	1051	0.06	0.24	0.00	1.00
POST2: Nº days worked	1051	7.74	12.96	0.00	31.00
POST2: Nº days worked full-time	1051	5.40	10.04	0.00	31.00
POST2: Labor intensity	1051	0.25	0.42	0.00	1.00
POST2: Full-time labor intensity	1051	0.17	0.32	0.00	1.00
POST2: Working	1051	0.29	0.45	0.00	1.00
POST2: Without contract	1051	0.03	0.16	0.00	1.00
POST2: Permanent contract	1051	0.11	0.31	0.00	1.00
POST2: Full-time contract	1051	0.07	0.26	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Nº days worked	667	6.83	12.50	0.00	31.00
POSTFINAL: Nº days worked full-time	667	4.70	9.65	0.00	31.00
POSTFINAL: Labor intensity	667	0.22	0.41	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Full-time labor intensity	667	0.15	0.32	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Working	667	0.25	0.43	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Without contract	667	0.03	0.16	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Permanent contract	667	0.12	0.32	0.00	1.00
POSTFINAL: Full-time contract	667	0.07	0.25	0.00	1.00
Observaciones	1051				

All variables are balanced at the PRE moment.

Balance contrasts between experimental groups

	(1) Control		(2) Treatment 1		(3) Treatment 2		F-test of equality		(1)-(2)		(1)-(3)		(2)-(3)	
	(N)	(Mean)	(N)	(Mean)	(N)	(Mean)	in all groups				t-test for pairs			
Variable		(Var.)		(Var.)		(Var.)	N	p-value	N	p-value	N	p-value	N	p-value
PRE: Nº days worked	1051	6.12	655	5.94	650	5.77	2356	0.14	1706	0.79	1701	0.59	1305	0.82
		(140.58)		(137.16)		(134.00)		0.87						
PRE: Nº days worked full-time	1051	4.14	655	3.95	650	3.84	2356	0.20	1706	0.70	1701	0.53	1305	0.85
		(78.52)		(76.50)		(75.23)		0.82						
PRE: Labor intensity	1051	0.20	655	0.19	650	0.19	2356	0.13	1706	0.79	1701	0.61	1305	0.83
		(0.15)		(0.15)		(0.14)		0.88						
PRE: Full-time labor intensity	1051	0.13	655	0.13	650	0.13	2356	0.19	1706	0.70	1701	0.55	1305	0.87
		(0.08)		(0.08)		(0.08)		0.83						
PRE: Working	1051	0.23	655	0.23	650	0.22	2356	0.08	1706	0.79	1701	0.68	1305	0.91
		(0.18)		(0.18)		(0.17)		0.92						
PRE: Without contract	1051	0.02	655	0.02	650	0.03	2356	0.17	1706	0.64	1701	0.93	1305	0.58
		(0.02)		(0.02)		(0.03)		0.84						
PRE: Permanent contract	1051	0.09	655	0.09	650	0.09	2356	0.05	1706	0.78	1701	0.99	1305	0.81
		(0.08)		(0.08)		(0.08)		0.95						
PRE: Full-time contract	1051	0.05	655	0.05	650	0.05	2356	0.24	1706	0.51	1701	0.97	1305	0.60
		(0.04)		(0.05)		(0.04)		0.79						

We can observe a positive effect (statistically significant at 10%) of 0.93 for the Treatment group on the number of days worked (third measurement). For the Treatment 2 group (second measurement), we also observe an increase in the number of days worked full-time (0.82 days, statistically significant at 10%).

Regarding the impact on the participants' labor intensity[8], we find a positive effect of 0.03 (statistically significant at 10%) for the Treatment group in the third measurement and 0.03 for full-time labor intensity[9] in the Treatment 2 group (second measurement).

Finally, regarding the participants' employment status of being working full-time, we report positive and statistically significant coefficients at 5% of 0.023 and 0.022 (without and with controls) for the Treatment group (second measurement). These effects are higher in level and more precise for the Treatment 2 group (0.038 and 0.037, respectively). The probability of working with a permanent contract also increases in the third measurement for the Treatment group in a statistically significant way at 10%.

No effects are detected in the probability of being working, or in the probability of working without a contract.

[8]It is defined as the quotient between the number of days worked and the number of days in the reference period analyzed.
[9]It is defined as the quotient between the number of full-time days worked and the number of days in the reference period analyzed.

Number of days worked. First measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	-0.027		-0.097	
	(0.371)		(0.371)	
Treatment 1		-0.190		-0.340
		(0.432)		(0.433)
Treatment 2		0.138		0.148
		(0.454)		(0.454)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.51
Control mean dep. var.	7.298	7.298	7.298	7.298
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Number of days worked. Second measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.484		0.416	
	(0.439)		(0.438)	
Treatment 1		0.314		0.187
		(0.533)		(0.532)
Treatment 2		0.656		0.647
		(0.527)		(0.527)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35
Control mean dep. var.	7.737	7.737	7.737	7.737
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Number of days worked. Third measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.934*		0.785	
	(0.544)		(0.540)	
Treatment 1		0.972		0.711
		(0.658)		(0.655)
Treatment 2		0.895		0.859
		(0.661)		(0.656)
Observations	1501	1501	1501	1501
R^2	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.34
Control mean dep. var.	6.826	6.826	6.826	6.826
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Number of days worked full-time. First measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.166		0.115	
	(0.297)		(0.298)	
Treatment 1		-0.021		-0.135
		(0.345)		(0.348)
Treatment 2		0.354		0.366
		(0.371)		(0.369)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.45	0.45	0.46	0.46
control mean dep. var.	4.926	4.926	4.926	4.926
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Number of days worked full-time. Second measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.483		0.430	
	(0.359)		(0.357)	
Treatment 1		0.149		0.065
		(0.426)		(0.425)
Treatment 2		0.820*		0.798*
		(0.444)		(0.443)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.29	0.29	0.30	0.30
Control mean dep. var.	5.400	5.400	5.400	5.400
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Number of days worked full-time. Third measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.713		0.601	
	(0.440)		(0.437)	
Treatment 1		0.710		0.531
		(0.530)		(0.530)
Treatment 2		0.716		0.670
		(0.534)		(0.532)
Observations	1501	1501	1501	1501
R^2	0.28	0.28	0.30	0.30
Control mean dep. var.	4.705	4.705	4.705	4.705
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Labor intensity. First measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	-0.001		-0.003	
	(0.012)		(0.012)	
Treatment 1		-0.006		-0.011
		(0.014)		(0.014)
Treatment 2		0.004		0.005
		(0.015)		(0.015)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.51
Control mean dep. var.	0.240	0.240	0.240	0.240
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Labor intensity. Second measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.016		0.013	
	(0.014)		(0.014)	
Treatment 1		0.010		0.006
		(0.017)		(0.017)
Treatment 2		0.021		0.021
		(0.017)		(0.017)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.35	0.35	0.36	0.36
Control mean dep. var.	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Labor intensity. Third measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.030*		0.026	
	(0.018)		(0.018)	
Treatment 1		0.032		0.023
		(0.022)		(0.021)
Treatment 2		0.029		0.028
		(0.022)		(0.021)
Observations	1501	1501	1501	1501
R^2	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.34
Control mean dep. var.	0.223	0.223	0.223	0.223
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Full-time labor intensity. First measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.005		0.004	
	(0.010)		(0.010)	
Treatment 1		-0.001		-0.004
		(0.011)		(0.011)
Treatment 2		0.011		0.012
		(0.012)		(0.012)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.45	0.45	0.46	0.46
Control mean dep. var.	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.162
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Full-time labor intensity. Second measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.015		0.014	
	(0.012)		(0.012)	
Treatment 1		0.005		0.002
		(0.014)		(0.014)
Treatment 2		0.026*		0.026*
		(0.014)		(0.014)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.29	0.29	0.30	0.30
Control mean dep. var.	0.174	0.174	0.174	0.174
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Full-time labor intensity. Third measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.023		0.020	
	(0.014)		(0.014)	
Treatment 1		0.023		0.017
		(0.017)		(0.017)
Treatment 2		0.023		0.022
		(0.017)		(0.017)
Observations	1501	1501	1501	1501
R^2	0.28	0.28	0.29	0.29
Control mean dep. var.	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Employment situation: working. First measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	-0.004		-0.006	
	(0.014)		(0.014)	
Treatment 1		-0.005		-0.008
		(0.016)		(0.016)
Treatment 2		-0.003		-0.003
		(0.017)		(0.017)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.45	0.45	0.46	0.46
Control mean dep. var.	0.277	0.277	0.277	0.277
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Employment situation: working. Second measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.007		0.004	
	(0.015)		(0.015)	
Treatment 1		-0.002		-0.006
		(0.018)		(0.018)
Treatment 2		0.016		0.015
		(0.019)		(0.019)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.34	0.35	0.35	0.35
Control mean dep. var.	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Employment situation: working. Third measurement.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.023		0.018	
	(0.019)		(0.019)	
Treatment 1		0.028		0.019
		(0.023)		(0.023)
Treatment 2		0.018		0.016
		(0.023)		(0.023)
Observations	1501	1501	1501	1501
R^2	0.31	0.31	0.32	0.32
Control mean dep. var.	0.252	0.252	0.252	0.252
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Working full-time. First measurement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.007		0.006	
	(0.009)		(0.009)	
Treatment 1		-0.001		-0.003
		(0.011)		(0.011)
Treatment 2		0.014		0.014
		(0.011)		(0.011)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27
Control mean dep. var.	0.064	0.064	0.064	0.064
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Working full-time. Second measurement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.023**		0.022**	
	(0.011)		(0.011)	
Treatment 1		0.008		0.006
		(0.013)		(0.013)
Treatment 2		0.038***		0.037***
		(0.014)		(0.014)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15
Control mean dep. var.	0.073	0.073	0.073	0.073
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Working full-time. Third measurement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.009		0.006	
	(0.013)		(0.013)	
Treatment 1		0.016		0.013
		(0.015)		(0.015)
Treatment 2		0.002		-0.001
		(0.015)		(0.015)
Observations	1501	1501	1501	1501
R^2	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.14
Control mean dep. var.	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.067
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Working with permanent contract. First measurement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.001		-0.001	
	(0.008)		(0.008)	
Treatment 1		0.003		0.001
		(0.009)		(0.010)
Treatment 2		-0.001		-0.002
		(0.010)		(0.010)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.61	0.61	0.62	0.62
Control mean dep. var.	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.108
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Working with permanent contract. Second measurement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.014		0.013	
	(0.010)		(0.010)	
Treatment 1		0.014		0.012
		(0.012)		(0.012)
Treatment 2		0.015		0.014
		(0.012)		(0.012)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43
Control mean dep. var.	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.108
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Working with permanent contract. Third measurement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.024*		0.020	
	(0.014)		(0.014)	
Treatment 1		0.027		0.020
		(0.017)		(0.017)
Treatment 2		0.021		0.020
		(0.017)		(0.017)
Observations	1501	1501	1501	1501
R^2	0.34	0.34	0.35	0.35
Control mean dep. var.	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Working without contract. First measurement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.001		0.001	
	(0.003)		(0.003)	
Treatment 1		0.001		0.001
		(0.004)		(0.004)
Treatment 2		0.001		0.001
		(0.004)		(0.004)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
Control mean dep. var.	0.024	0.024	0.024	0.024
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Working without contract. Second measurement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	-0.004		-0.004	
	(0.004)		(0.004)	
Treatment 1		-0.007		-0.007
		(0.005)		(0.005)
Treatment 2		-0.001		-0.001
		(0.004)		(0.005)
Observations	2356	2356	2356	2356
R^2	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63
Control mean dep. var.	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Working without contract. Third measurement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	-0.002		-0.003	
	(0.006)		(0.006)	
Treatment 1		-0.004		-0.005
		(0.008)		(0.008)
Treatment 2		-0.000		-0.000
		(0.007)		(0.006)
Observations	1501	1501	1501	1501
R^2	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52
Control mean dep. var.	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027
Initial value dep. var.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes

Note: Standard errors, clustered by household, in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.