Journal of Economic and Social Policy

Volume 14 | Issue 1 Article 3

6-1-2011

The Continuing Training Sector in France and the Role of Non-profit Organisations

Franck Bailly
CARE (ea 2260) Equipe Mondialisation et Regulations. Department of Economics, University of Rouen, 3 Avenue Pasteur, 76186 Rouen Cedex, France

Karine Chapelle
CARE (ea 2260) Equipe Mondialisation et Regulations. Department of Economics and Administration, University of Le Havre, 25 rue Philippe Lebon BP 1123, 76063 Le Havre Cedex, France.

Follow this and additional works at: http://epubs.scu.edu.au/jesp

Recommended Citation
Bailly, Franck and Chapelle, Karine (2011) "The Continuing Training Sector in France and the Role of Non-profit Organisations," *Journal of Economic and Social Policy*: Vol. 14: Iss. 1, Article 3.
Available at: http://epubs.scu.edu.au/jesp/vol14/iss1/3

ePublications@SCU is an electronic repository administered by Southern Cross University Library. Its goal is to capture and preserve the intellectual output of Southern Cross University authors and researchers, and to increase visibility and impact through open access to researchers around the world. For further information please contact epubs@scu.edu.au.

The Continuing Training Sector in France and the Role of Non-profit Organisations

Abstract
In a context in which private firms are asserting their claims to social responsibility, the ability of non-profit organisations to provide a credible alternative is attracting increasing attention. Are the doubts that are emerging justified? In other words, are non-profit organisations losing their specificity? Drawing on an analysis of an original database relating to a key sector in the knowledge-based economy, we show that non-profit organisations do indeed differ in certain respects from for-profit organisations. In other respects, however, their behaviour does not demonstrate a particularly highly developed social conscience.

Keywords
non-profit organisations ; continuing training sector

This article is available in Journal of Economic and Social Policy: http://epubs.scu.edu.au/jesp/vol14/iss1/3

Introduction

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) has long been a topic for debate in the USA, both in the public sphere and in academic circles. The origin of these debates is generally traced back to the studies by Bowen, an economist at the University of Illinois (Gond and Igalens, 2008). In France, and more widely in Europe, the situation is different. Here, companies' responsibility to the wider society has been explicitly discussed only for the past ten years or so. There are undoubtedly many reasons why this is so. Not the least of them is the erosion of the welfare state, which used to take responsibility for some of the issues to which companies are now being asked to respond (Capron and Quairel-Lanoizelé, 2008).

In conjunction with the development of the business world's awareness of environmental and social concerns, the ability of non-profit organisations (NPOs) to adopt social values and practices has been called into question. These doubts have been nurtured by the use of commercial funding, which has been suspected of undermining NPOs' *raisons d'être* (James, 2004 ; Tuckman, 1998; Weisbrod, 1998). The professionalisation of non-profit organisations, and in particular the recruitment of employees who differ little in their characteristics from those of private, profit-making companies, with the loss of 'the campaigning spirit' that might entail, has also been implicated. Finally, the constraints imposed by the environment in which NPOs operate have also given rise to fears of a possible homogenisation of behaviour (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, 1991; Enjolras, 1995, 1996).

For all that, does this dual tendency – increased social awareness among companies (Capron and Quairel-Lanoizelé, 2008), on the one hand, and the risk of a loss of social awareness among NPOs, on the other – necessarily lead us to conclude that non-profit organisations are losing their specificity? This is the question we will be attempting to answer. Previous studies have, for the most part, adopted a theoretical perspective. We will be taking a different approach in our analysis, which is empirically grounded. We draw on an original database relating to the continuing training sector in France that has as yet been little analysed. Over and above the mere existence of a database, which is seldom the case in studies of NPOs (Salamon and Wojciech Sokolowski, 2005), our investigation of this sector is justified by the strategic role that it plays or will be called on to play in economies based increasingly on knowledge (Foray, 2006), particularly through lifelong learning (Keeley, 2007). Despite this strategic role, the continuing training sector is still relatively unknown (Cahuc and Zylberberg, 2006). It has not attracted much attention from economists specialising in non-profit organisations, despite their desire to take into account the changes that have taken place in contemporary

societies (OECD, 2003). In an attempt to fill this gap, we will attempt to ascertain whether or not non-profit organisations can be said to have retained their specificity by answering the following questions: What is the relative importance of NPOs in this sector? What is the nature of their output? What is the nature and composition of their financial and human resources and how do these resources correlate with each other? The answers we will give to these questions have important implications for economic policy. Those implications will be outlined in the final section.

The statistical source and the approach to its analysis

Each year, for auditing purposes, the French Ministry of Labour conducts a nationwide census of the organisations in France that offer continuing training. For this audit operation, the training providers have to fill in a government document entitled "Bilan Pédagogique et Financier" (pedagogical and financial report - BPF). Apart from the fact that they have rarely been analysed[1], the BPFs offer two advantages. Firstly, they cover all continuing training providers, regardless of their legal status, which means that they can be used to make comparisons. Secondly, they provide a record of many kinds of information, particularly information relating to financial and human resources, target groups and activities other than continuing training carried out by the organisation.

In view of the wealth of data available, we decided to structure our analysis around five topics. The first two are standard themes in studies of NPOs, the aim being to evaluate the relative importance of each category of organisation within the continuing training sector and the composition of their human and financial resources. The others are covered less frequently. Here we will be analysing the characteristics of the groups of training recipients, which is a measure of the nature of the output of the continuing training providers. We also propose to estimate labour productivity and to analyse the influence of funding on workforce structure. The decision to give priority to these topics led us to look at only one year (2004)[2] in order to ensure that the results remain manageable. This is the last year for which we have data available. It also meant that we have not elaborated on the geographical dimension. Longitudinal and spatial analyses therefore still remain to be conducted.

[1] To our knowledge, the existing studies have covered only a subsection of the organisations in the sector. Cf., for example, Vero J., Rousset, P., 2003, "L'offre de formation continue. Regard des prestataires sur leur activité". *Bref Cereq*, n°199.

[2] In France, this data is not freely available. In order to gain access to it, applications have to be made to the relevant government departments, which is time consuming.

Because of their intended administrative purpose, the data contained in the BPFs do not necessarily correspond to the data that researchers would have wished to use in an ideal situation. Let us therefore define the data that we shall be using and any limitations it may present: (1) The forty or so legal statuses initially recorded (cf. Table 8 in appendix) have been regrouped into three categories: non-profit organisations, for-profit organisations and public and quasi-public organisations. (2) In the BPFs, the target groups are recorded as follows: unemployed, employees, private individuals and a residual category that includes the other types of possible target groups. The disadvantage of this classification is that it does not allow us to identify directly the most socially vulnerable groups[3], which are generally considered to be the target groups of NPOs. Nevertheless, we can assume that unemployed face greater social difficulties than many employee[4]. (3) In addition to continuing training, some organisations may be involved in other activities. The BPFs record four categories: initial training, audits and consultancy, production of goods and production of services. These other activities are recorded only in binary form (yes/no). The BPFs also ask every organisation to indicate the proportion of their turnover generated by continuing training. This is the complement of the proportion accounted for by the other activities, which gives an indication of their relative importance. (4) The financial resources are categorised according to five possible sources: funding from public bodies, funding from business organisations, funding from private individuals, funding from organisations that collect and administer continuing training funds from companies, and funding from other training organisations through subcontracting. Lastly, there is a residual category that covers other possible sources of financing. (5) For human resources, the BPFs record only the people providing the training. These are divided into four categories: voluntary trainers, salaried trainers on permanent contracts, salaried trainers on fixed-term contracts, occasional trainers providing less than 30 days of training per year and self-employed trainers.

For the year 2004, the database lists 44,163 organisations that provide continuing training. We were able to calculate the indicators on which our analysis is based for 40,750 of these (92 percent of the total number of organisations). We were thus able to ensure that our initial population is highly representative.

[3] Which could be captured through e.g. income or receipt of basic income support.

[4] To be absolutely thorough, we should note that the BPFs also record the target groups according to the level of qualification to which the training leads. This kind of categorisation does not appear to us to be any more relevant than the distinction between unemployed and employees for identifying socially vulnerable groups. In addition, it does not indicate the level of qualification before training, only the level on completion.

The relative importance of non-profit organisations

The relative importance of non-profit organisations (NPOs) can be ascertained according to a number of criteria. We shall be looking at four: (a) the share of NPOs in the total number of organisations providing continuing training; (b) the share of people receiving their training from NPOs in the total number of people trained in the sector; (c) the NPO budget as a share of the total budget for the sector; (d) the share of trainers working for NPOs in the total number of trainers in the sector.

As shown in Table 1, NPOs constitute the second largest category of training provider, accounting for 27 percent of the total number of organisations within the continuing training sector, a long way behind the for-profit providers (69 percent). The relative importance of the for-profit providers is also confirmed by their proportion of the total budget and number of people trained. Nevertheless, the NPOs play a far from negligible role. Whereas the for-profit organisations account for 46 percent of the total budget for the sector, the NPOs account for 37 percent. Similarly, while one in two people is trained in a for-profit organisation, one in three is trained in an NPO. By contrast, the role of public and quasi-public organisations is negligible. However, the image of a bipolar sector for continuing training split between for-profit organisations, on the one hand, and non-profit organisations, on the other, needs to be qualified when one considers the number of trainers. In fact, while 30 percent of them work in public and quasi-public organisations, the NPOs are still the main employer in this sector, with 38 percent of the total number of trainers[5], just ahead of the for-profit organisations (31 percent).

The output of NPOs

Looking at Table 2, it appears that a small proportion of providers in the sector focus exclusively on continuing training: 26 percent of providers on average. However, this figure is a little higher for NPOs (33 percent) than for for-profit organisations (24 percent). For public and quasi-public providers the figure is 27 percent. Nevertheless, the proportion of turnover generated by the provision of continuing training is approximately the same for the three categories of organisation (26 percent).

Table 2 also shows that for NPOs, diversification primarily takes the form of service provision: this applies to more than 4 in 10 providers. This is followed by

[5] Including volunteer trainers.

initial training and audits and consultancy services (around 20 percent). Service provision is also the predominant area of diversification among for-profit providers, concerning one in two of these organisations. The next most common area of diversification for for-profit organisations is audits and consultancy (35 percent). Public and quasi-public organisations are more likely to provide initial training and services (45 percent and 36 percent of them respectively are engaged in these areas).

Focusing solely on continuing training, what are the characteristics of the groups receiving training? As shown in Table 3, the NPOs train more people per year on average than the for-profit organisations (472 compared with 305) but considerably fewer than the public and quasi-public organisations (more than 1234 people per year). Most of the continuing training provided by the NPOs is aimed at people in employment. On average, employed people represent 51 percent of the total number of people trained by NPOs. This percentage falls to 48 percent for the public and quasi-public organisations. However, it is the for-profit organisations that concentrate the most on this target group, since 79 percent of the people they train are employees.

Nevertheless, the NPOs and, to a still greater extent, the public and quasi-public organisations, focus more than the for-profit organisations on training unemployed. So it can be seen that 5 percent of people trained by for-profit organisations are unemployed, compared with 16 percent for the NPOs and 24 percent for the public and quasi-public organisations. Finally, private individuals represent a small proportion of training recipients, regardless of the category of organisation.

NPOs' human and financial resources

The NPOs have greater resources available to them than the for-profit providers. Their average budget is actually twice as high and they have three times the number of trainers. Nevertheless, there is no comparison between their resources and those enjoyed by the public and quasi-public providers, as highlighted in tables 4 and 5.

The composition of the training providers' financial resources is a reflection – albeit not wholly symmetrical – of the groups for which they cater. Funding from public bodies accounts for one-third of NPOs' budget (this is their primary source of funding) and accounts for 45 percent of the budget of public and quasi-public organisations. This finding should be viewed in conjunction with these providers' greater focus on the unemployed, whose training is financed by public funds. It should also be noted that NPOs have the highest levels of funding from private individuals – more than double the share that this

kind of funding represents for for-profit providers. Perhaps this should be seen as another expression of NPOs' social sympathies, which lead them to cater for a less affluent population? The for-profit providers, in line with the importance they attach to training employees, obtain most of their resources from business organisations. This represents 50 percent of their budget. The proportion of funding received from other training organisations is also greatest for the for-profit organisations (14 percent). This means that for-profit organisations are more likely than the other categories of provider to be subcontractors.

As regards human resources, Table 5 shows that the use of volunteers is undoubtedly one of the greatest differences between the providers: volunteers represent almost 20 percent of trainers in NPOs and less than 5 percent of trainers in public and quasi-public organisations and for-profit providers. In the case of for-profit providers, the presence of volunteers is probably accounted for by work placement students or assistance provided by spouses or family members in small organisations. However, there are also other differences evident in the structure of the workforce.

For instance, it can be seen that the NPOs and the public and quasi-public providers make greater use than for-profit providers of salaried trainers on fixed-term contracts (12 percent and 17 percent respectively) and of occasional trainers who provide just a few hours' training (18 percent and 39 percent respectively). The instability of these employment forms, combined with a greater share of volunteers, undoubtedly helps to give the non-profit sector an unprofessional image. Using these less stable employment forms may also be interpreted as resorting more to precarious forms of labour, which in turn calls into question the NPOs' social sympathies, at least when it comes to their internal practices. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the NPOs, like the other providers, use salaried trainers on permanent contracts in nearly 30 percent of cases. Finally, we note that the for-profit organisations use a significant proportion of self-employed trainers: almost one in two trainers is self-employed, compared with just under 20 percent for the NPOs. This may explain why the average number of trainers (6) is so low for the for-profit providers. These self-employed trainers may be the managers of the organisation or even organised as members of the liberal professions.

Estimation of labour productivity

On average, the NPO trainers train fewer people than the trainers in for-profit organisations: an NPO trainer trains 41 people on average, compared with more than double this figure for a trainer in a for-profit organisation (Table 6). This finding can be seen as an indication of lower labour productivity within the NPOs. It may be explained by the inefficiency entailed in the instability of

the workforce structure used by the providers (trainers on fixed-term contracts and occasional trainers) and the low level of professionalism of the volunteers. However, this finding does need to be qualified. On the one hand, it may also be explained by the characteristics of the target group: the NPOs train a greater proportion of unemployed – a group that is probably more difficult to train. On the other hand, this indicator assumes that the number of people trained is the only measure of productivity. Yet in the area of training, as with other service activities (Gadrey, 1994, 2003 . Spithoven, 2000), output is diverse. It may consist of the number of people trained, but also, for instance, the speed and quality of labour market integration for unemployed, career advancements made possible by the training received by employees, renewed self-confidence for private individuals, etc., which are all elements that the BPFs do not allow us to assess.

Correlation between financing structure and workforce structure

As mentioned above, the BPFs distinguish between five categories of trainers and six possible sources of finance. Instead of representing the thirty correlation coefficients for each category of organisation, we considered it more useful to focus our analysis on a comparison between NPOs and for-profit organisations, noting the correlations between their main sources of finance and the type of trainer they use most often. Looking at the highest correlation coefficients, it is clear (Table 7) that public funding has a positive influence on the employment status and stability of NPOs' workforces. An increase in the share of public funding brings with it a decrease in the share of volunteer trainers and therefore an increase in the share of salaried trainers. It also leads the NPOs to stabilise their workforces by increasing the proportion of trainers on permanent contracts and lowering the proportion of self-employed trainers.

The behaviour of for-profit organisations appears to mirror that of the NPOs fairly closely. The highest coefficients relate to the correlations between the share of private funding, which is the most important source of finance for for-profit organisations, and the share of self-employed trainers and trainers on permanent contracts (the categories of trainer that the for-profit organisation use the most). It can be noted that funding from business organisations has a positive influence on the use of trainers on permanent contracts, and a negative effect on the use of self-employed trainers. This latter finding can be explained by the fact that self-employed trainers are, by the very nature of their contracts, less well integrated into the organisation. Thus it can be argued that, here too, there is a stabilising effect on the workforce sought by for-profit training providers when their principal source of funding is increased.

The economic policy implications

The results presented above show that non-profit organisations are not strictly comparable to the other categories of service providers. As far as economic policy is concerned, this specificity has at least two major implications.

The first concerns the French system of continuing training and the place of NPOs in that system. Continuing training in France is targeted essentially at three groups: job seekers, employees and private individuals. Now the system is often criticised for favouring the most highly qualified workers and, conversely, ignoring the groups experiencing the greatest difficulties (Cahuc and Zylberbreg, 2006), particularly job seekers (Dares, 2004). Our results, which suggest that non-profit organisations attach relatively greater importance to jobseekers than private providers, are evidence that should not be ignored in attempts to reduce these inequalities. They should encourage those in charge of economic policy to conserve and see to the upkeep of the various elements that make up the specificity of NPOs.

The evolution of our societies towards knowledge-based economies is likely to make this an even more pressing need. Afterall, if NPOs' social awareness is reflected in greater concern for individuals excluded from the labour market, i.e. jobseekers, then it is surely possible to contemplate its extension to individuals affected by forms of exclusion other than unemployment, in particular in knowledge-based economies exclusion based on access to knowledge. Can we not therefore envisage NPOs helping to train individuals with lower levels of educational attainment or those who have already failed on several occasions to complete training programmes or even concentrating on providing very specific training programmes that would not be profitable for private providers?

This objective seems all the more necessary since NPOs apparently fulfil a different role to that played by public providers, which also offer continuing training. Although non-profit organisations are similar to public providers in certain respects (for example, in the share of public resources, labour productivity and the importance attached to training jobseekers), they differ from them in the total number of people they train, the numbers of trainers employed and the budgets available to them. It is not unreasonable to suppose that these differences reflect the fact that NPOs serve particular segments of the continuing training market, ones that are not well served by the public providers[6].

[6] This point merits further investigation. Do the activities of NPOs supplement those of public providers, as Weisbrod (1975) assumes, or are they an extension of them (Salamon, 1987)?

The second implication concerns the means that might be deployed in order to preserve this specificity of the NPOs. Action could be taken at several different levels. Firstly, the high share of public funds in NPOs' budgets could make them a privileged means of action. In France, however, service providers compete with each other for these public funds. This brings with it the risk that non-profit organisations will adopt behaviours close to those of for-profit organisations in order to obtain these funds, as suggested by the theories of institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) and commercialism (Weisbrod, 1998). In order to avoid such a pitfall, it seems to us that the public authorities should pay particular attention to the criteria they use to select the various providers that will be funded. The aim should be to ensure that a multiplicity of criteria are adopted in order to reflect the fact that different providers have different objectives and sympathies and operate in different ways. For example, as already noted, labour productivity, which compares the number of individuals trained to the number of trainers, is lower in non-profit organisations than in private providers. This should not necessarily be interpreted as an indication that NPOs perform at a lower level. It may equally well suggest that labour productivity is not an indicator that can easily be used to evaluate the work actually carried out by non-profit organisations, which goes beyond the mere provision of training to include efforts to give individual trainees renewed confidence and a desire to make plans for their own futures. Such 'outputs' are difficult to capture through this indicator's single numerator.

The second means of action to be considered is human resources. As we have noted, non-profit organisations make greater use of precarious employment forms (fixed-term contracts and casual work) than for-profit organisations. Quite apart from the discrepancy between the social values espoused by NPOs and their actual practices, the use of these unstable employment forms raises the question of their social effectiveness. Can trainers really take responsibility effectively for difficult groups, such as people who have been out of the labour market for long periods, if they are not themselves employed by the training provider on a long-term basis? In light of the results shown in Table 7, the establishment of durable organisations, in which the existence of public funding plays a particularly significant role, seems to be an important tool in labour force stabilisation. Nevertheless, while the development of waged employment in NPOs and, more particularly, of a stable waged workforce would seem to be necessary from the point of view of effectiveness, it also brings with it the risk that NPOs might lose their specificity as a result of isomorphism with for-profit organisations (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, 1991), particularly when their respective employees have been the recipients of similar initial training. From this point of view, questions might well be asked about the appropriateness of the very significant expansion in France of

university courses aimed at future employees of NPOs, and especially managerial staff. These courses are often post-graduate programmes taken after a common undergraduate training shared by students in more 'standard' subjects, such as finance or human resource management, for example. This homogenisation of training may lead employees in NPOs to analyse problems in the same way as those in for-profit organisations and to put forward the same solutions (Enjolras, 1996), thereby causing NPOs to lose their specificity.

At a third and final level, the desire to preserve the specificity of non-profit organisations raises the question of which economic policy measures should be taken in order to facilitate the establishment of such organisations. A recent empirical study on the continuing training sector (Bailly and Chapelle, 2009) revealed that the vast majority of NPOs are set up without any capital contribution. And if any capital is contributed, it consists largely of the founders' own personal contributions, which tend to be smaller than those made by the founders of for-profit organisations. Thus public support does not seem to be a major factor in the establishment of NPOs. Nevertheless, state aid seems to be crucial to obtaining other resources, particularly from banks, in that the absence of such aid reduces access to these other funds (Bailly and Chapelle, 2009). Moreover, according to Chapelle (2008), public subsidies for the establishment of NPOs would enable them to increase their output and improve their allocative efficiency without reducing the influence of their social motivations. Finally, the fact that NPOs are often set up without any capital contribution could be seen as a reflection of the relative ease in legal terms with which NPOs can be established in France. In light of our results, this seems to us to be another point very much worth preserving.

Concluding remarks

Modern society's adherence to the knowledge-based economy, a desire to develop life-long learning and the significance of unemployment levels lead to a number of hopes being pinned on continuing training. However, despite its strategic role, this sector remains relatively unknown, particularly with regard to the place of NPOs within it. Against a background of (claims of) greater awareness of social concerns on the part of companies and doubts about the existence of such motivations on the part of the NPOs, it is clear from our analysis that the latter differ from the former in terms of the role they play in the continuing training sector. Their greater sensitivity to jobseekers who, of all the groups they cater for, are probably the most vulnerable, is evidence of this, as is the interest they have in training individuals. However, our results also reveal that the NPOs employ staff on precarious contracts, which may not appear to be particularly evident of good social behaviour. The question of how to interpret such behaviour, in other words the specificity (or otherwise) of NPOs,

emerges here in all its complexity. From this point of view, the results we have obtained from a database that has not yet been much analysed enable us to identify a number of avenues for future investigation.

Although non-profit organisations have been extensively investigated from a theoretical point of view, a particular effort to do so empirically seems to us essential. The question is, after all, a pretty basic one, for at least three reasons. Firstly, it is important from an academic viewpoint, since it questions the validity of the presuppositions – the existence of a specificity – of most of the theoretical and empirical analyses (Anheier and Mertens, 2003). Secondly, it is important to the identity of the non-profit sector, which claims and asserts the existence of such a specificity (Enjolras, 1999). Lastly, it has significant implications. For example, if non-profit organisations do not differ from for-profit organisations, is there not a risk that they will pay less attention to the most vulnerable members of society (Leiter, 2005)? Or again, are the financial advantages they are able to enjoy justified (James, 2004; Weisbrod, 1998)?

Appendix

Table 1: Relative importance of continuing training providers

Category of provider	Total number of organisations	%	Total number of people trained (X 10,000)	%	Budget in Euros (x 10,000)	%	Total number of trainers	%
Public and quasi-public	1499	3.7	185	11.8	145511	17.3	161943	30.3
For-profit	28127	69	857	54.7	384994	45.7	166949	31.3
Non-profit	11124	27.3	525	33.5	311522	37	205391	38.4
Total	40750	100	1567	100	842027	100	534283	100

Source: Bilans pédagogiques et financiers (BPF) - DARES. Our calculations.

Table 2: Products and services produced by continuing training providers

Category of provider	% of organisations providing only continuing training	% of turnover from continuing training	% of providers engaged in the following in addition to continuing training:			
			Initial training	Audits and consultancy	Production of Goods	Provision of other services
Public and quasi-public	26.8	27.2	44.6	27.4	4	36.2
For-profit	23.6	26.5	11.2	34.9	11.9	49.3
Non-profit	**33.4**	**27**	**21.3**	**19.8**	**4.3**	**41.3**
Total	26.4	26.6	15.2	30.5	9.5	46.6

Source: Bilans pédagogiques et financiers (BPF) - DARES. Our calculations.

Table 3: Share of unemployed and employees in total number of people

Category of provider	Average number of people trained per year	Unemployment as % of people trained	Employees as % total number of people trained	Private individuals as % total number of people trained	Other categories as % total number of people trained	Total
Public and quasi-public	1234	23.8	48.3	10.6	17.3	100
For-profit	305	5.1	78.6	5.8	10.5	100
Non-profit	**472**	**16**	**51**	**12.4**	**20.6**	**100**
Total	385	8.7	70	7.8	13.5	100

Source: Bilans pédagogiques et financiers (BPF) - DARES. Our calculations.

Table 4: Financial resources of providers of continuing training

Category of provider	Average budget in euros	percentage of total resources accounted for by:						
		Public funding	Funding from Businesses	Funding from collecting organisations	Funding from private individuals	Funding from other training organisations	Other Outputs	Total
Public and quasi-public	970722	44.9	19.8	15.6	9.7	3.8	6.2	100
For-profit	136877	9.8	50.3	15.8	6.7	14.5	2.9	100
Non-Profit	**280045**	**30.7**	**26.3**	**15.2**	**13.4**	**7.2**	**7.2**	**100**
Total	206633	16.8	42.6	15.7	8.6	12.1	4.2	100

Source: Bilans pédagogiques et financiers (BPF) - DARES. Our calculations.

Table 5: Human resources of providers of continuing education

Category of provider	Average number of trainers	Voluntary trainers as % of total number of trainers	Trainers on fixed -term contracts as % of total number of trainers	Occasional trainers as % of total number of trainers	Self-employed trainers as % of total number of trainers	Trainers on permanent contracts as % of total number of trainers	Total
Public and quasi-public	108	4.2	16.2	39.3	11	29.3	100
For-profit	6	2.7	4	9.4	50	33.9	100
Non-Profit	**18**	**18.8**	**12.4**	**18**	**17.2**	**33.6**	**100**
Total	13	7.2	6.8	12.9	39.6	33.5	100

Source: Bilans pédagogiques et financiers (BPF) - DARES. Our calculations.

Table 6: Indicator of labour productivity

Category of provider	Number of people trained per trainer
Public and quasi-public	30
For-profit	88
Non-Profit	**41**
Total	73

Source: Bilans pédagogiques et financiers (BPF) - DARES. Our calculations.

Table 7: Correlation coefficients

Category of provider	Share of public funding and share of voluntary trainers	Share of funding from businesses and share of voluntary trainers	Share of public funding and share of trainers on permanent contracts	Share of funding from businesses and share of trainers on permanent contracts	Share of public funding and share of self-employed trainers	Share of funding from businesses and share of self-employed trainers	Share of public funding and share of occasional trainers	Share of funding from businesses and share of occasional trainers
For-profit	-0.0163	-0.0131	-0.0138	0.1789	-0.0047	-0.1895	-0.0040	0.0722
Non-Profit	-0.1061	-0.0505	0.1304	0.0323	-0.1324	0.0478	-0.0261	0.0513

Source: Bilans pédagogiques et financiers (BPF) - Dares. Our calculations.

Table 8: Composition of different categories of organisation

Status	percentage
AFPA	1.8
CFA	0.9
Social security	1.1
GRETA	16.4
Secondary education (not GRETA)	0.4
Higher education	8.2
CNAM	0.1
Other educational establishments	1.9
CNED	0.1
Ministry of Health	13.2
Ministry of Agriculture	10.8
Chamber of commerce & industry	10.6
Guild chamber	6.1
Farmers' association	5.1
Various public establishments	4.0
CFPC	0.3
Municipal services	1.1
Other administrative bodies	17.9
Total (1) N=1499	100
Freelance trainer	36.3
Limited liability company (SARL)	47.0
Limited company (SA)	14.4
General partnership (SNC)	0.5
Limited partnership	0.1
Partnership limited by shares	0
Non-trading company	0.7
De facto corporation	0.1
Participation organisation	0
ASFO	0.5
Economic interest group (GIE)	0.4
Total (2) N=28127	100
Association loi 1901	65.7
Non-profit private training	1.1
Adult education association	0.2
Local authority organisation	0.1
Other associations	20.6
Union association	2.1
Tertiary social organisation	0.3
Cooperative	0.9
Friendly society	0
Foundation	0.1
Other non-profit status	8.9
Total (3) N=11124	100
Total (1+2+3) N=40750	

Source: Bilans pédagogiques et financiers (BPF) - Dares. Our Calculations

Abbreviations

AFPA:	Association pour la formation professionnelle des adultes – government body promoting adult vocational training
ASFO:	Association de formation – training association
Association loi 1901:	A type of non-profit organisation
CFA:	Centre de formation continue – centre for continuing training
CNAM:	Conservatoire national des arts et métiers – a public scientific, cultural and professional educational establishment
CNED:	Centre national d'enseignement à distance – national educational body organising correspondence courses
CFPC:	Centre de formation professionnelle continue – further vocational training centre
GRETA:	Groupements d'établissements pour la formation continue – state body organising adult training programmes

References

Anheier H., Mertens S. (2003) "International and European Perspectives on the on-profit Sector: Data, Theory and Statistics". In OECD *The Non-profit Sector in Changing Economy,* Paris and Washington, D.C.: pp. 269-292.

Bailly F., Chapelle K (2009). "Is Non-Profit Entrepreneurship Different from Others? A Survey Data Analysis on Motivations and Access to Funds" in *The entrepreneurial Society: How to fill the Gap between Knowledge and Innovation,* Auken Howard van, Bonnet Jean, Garcia Domingo, *forthcoming.*

Cahuc P., Zylberberg A. (2006) "La Formation Professionnelle Des Adultes: Un Système À La Dérive", Report for the Centre for Economic Observation of the Paris Chamber of Commerce and Industry (CCIP).

Capron M., Quairel-Lanoizelée F. (2008) " La Responsabilité Sociale D'entreprise", La découverte.

Chapelle K., (2008), "Non-Profit And For-Profit Entrepreneurship: A Trade-Off Under Liquidity Constraint", *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 6 (1), pp. 55-80.

Dares, (2004**), "**les chomeurs accèdent deux fois moins que les salariés à la formation continue, mais pour des durées quatre fois plus longues ", *remières synthèses*, n°51 (2)**.**

Dimaggio P.J., W.W. Powell (1983) " The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields ", A*merican Journal of Sociology*, 48 (2), pp. 147-160.

Dimaggio P.J., W. W. Powell (1991) "The Iron Cage Revisited : Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality" in DiMaggio P. J., Powell W. (eds) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. University of Chicago Press, pp. 63-82.

Enjolras B. (1995) " Comment Expliquer La Présence D'organisations À But Non Lucratif Dans Une Économie De Marché ? L'apport De La Théorie Économique" *Revue Française d'Economie*, 4 (10), pp. 37-66.

Enjolras B. (1996) " Associations Et Isomorphisme Institutionnel " *R.E.C.M.A.*, n°261, pp. 68-76.

Enjolras B. (1999) " Mécanismes Économiques Et Spécificités Associatives " In Bloch-Lainé F. (Sous La Direction De) *Faire Société. Les Associations Au Cœur Du Social*. Editions Syros, pp. 109-125.

Foray D. (2006) *The Economics of Knowledge*. MIT Press Ltd, Economic Theory & Philosophy.

Gadrey J. (1994) "The Embeddedness Of Service "Products" In Value Systems" *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 23 (3), pp. 261-271.

Gadrey J. (2003) "L'invention De L'utilité Sociale Des Associations En France: À La Recherche De Conventions, De Régulations, De Critères Et De Méthodes D'évaluation". *Paper presented at CIRIEC-Canada conference,*

May 2003.

Gond J.-P., Igalens J. (2008), "La Responsabilité Sociale De L'entreprise", P.U.F. James E. (2004) " Commercialism and the Mission of Nonprofits" In Frumkin.

P., Imber J. B. (eds) *In Search Of The Nonprofit Sector*. New Brunswick, N.J. and London; Transaction, pp. 73-84.

Keeley, B. (2007) " Human Capital. How What You Know Shapes Your Life", OECD.

Leiter J. (2005) "Structural Isomorphism in Australian Nonprofit Organizations" *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 16 (1).

O.E.C.D. (2003) " *The Non-Profit Sector In A Changing Economy* ", Paris and Washington, D.C.

Salamon L. (1987). "Of Market Failure, Voluntary and Third party of Government Relations in the Modern Welfare State" *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 16 (1), pp. 29-49.

Salamon L., Wojciech Sokolowski S. (2005) "Nonprofit Organizations: New Insights from QCEW Data", *Monthly Labor Review*, September, 128 (9).

Spithoven A.H.G.M. (2000) "An Explanation For Rising Share Of Services In Employment", *International Journal of Social Economics*, 27 (12), pp. 1205-1230.

Tuckman H. (1998) "Competition, Commercialization, and the Evolution of Nonprofit Organizational Structures". In Weisbrod B. (eds) *To profit or not to profit: The commercial transformation of the nonprofit sector*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 25-45.

Vero J., Rousset, P., (2003), "L'offre de formation continue. Regard des prestataires sur leur activité". *Bref Cereq*, n°199.

Weisbrod B (1975) " Toward a Theory of the Voluntary Nonprofit Sector in a Three sector Economy" in *Altruism, Morality, and Economic Theory*, Phelps Edmund. (ed). Russell Sage Fondation, pp. 171-195.

Weisbrod B. (1998) (eds) *To profit or not to profit: The commercial transformation of the nonprofit sector*. Cambridge University Press.