

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Wiji Arampulam with Alison L Booth & Mark L Bryan

Article Title: Are there asymmetries in the effects of training on the conditional male wage distribution

Year of publication: 2008

Link to published version: <http://www.popecon.org/index.php>

Publisher statement: The original publication is available at www.springerlink.com

Are there Asymmetries in the Effects of Training on the Conditional Male Wage Distribution?*

by

Wiji Arulampalam
Department of Economics
University of Warwick
Coventry CV4 7AL
United Kingdom
Fax: +44 (0)24 7652 3032
Email: wiji.arulampalam@warwick.ac.uk

Alison L Booth
Economics Program
Research School of Social Sciences
H C Coombs Bldg
The Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200
Australia
Fax: +61 2 6125 0182
And
The University of Essex
Email: alison.booth@anu.edu.au

Mark L Bryan
Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER)
University of Essex,
Colchester CO4 3SQ
United Kingdom
Fax: +44 (0)1206 873151
Email: markb@essex.ac.uk

Abstract

Recent studies have used quantile regression (QR) techniques to estimate the impact of education on the location, scale and shape of the conditional wage distribution. We conduct a similar investigation of the role of work-related training. We utilise both ordinary least squares and QR techniques to estimate associations between work-related training and wages for private sector men in ten European Union countries. For the majority of countries, the association between training and hourly wages varies little across the conditional wage distribution. However, there are considerable differences across countries in mean associations between training and wages.

JEL: J24, J31, C29

Keywords: private sector training, education, quantile regression.

*Corresponding author is Mark Bryan, markb@essex.ac.uk

For helpful comments we thank the Editor, two anonymous referees, Marco Francesconi, Amanda Gosling, Kevin Hallock, Jennifer Smith, Ian Walker, and seminar participants at the Institute for Social and Economic Research at the University of Essex and the European Association of Labour Economists Conference 2004. The paper is a revised version of our 2004 IZA Discussion Paper No.984 of the same name. We are grateful for financial support from the Leverhulme Trust under the Award F/00213/H “Training in Europe: Its Causes and Consequences”.

1. INTRODUCTION

The mean returns to various forms of human capital have been extensively investigated in the labour economics literature, especially the returns to formal education and work-related training.¹ Relatively recently, attention has shifted to exploring the degree to which education might be associated with more complex changes in the conditional wage distribution. Arias, Hallock and Sosa-Escudero (2001), Gonzales and Miles (2001) and Martins and Pereira (2004) estimate the returns to education across the conditional wage distribution using quantile regression (QR) techniques. Martins and Pereira (2004) use cross-sectional data from a variety of different data sources covering 15 European countries plus the USA and find that “returns to schooling increase over the wage distribution”. Martins and Pereira, as well as Arias *et al.*, point out the implications of these results, that increased education may be associated with a widening of the (conditional) wage distribution, and may not always improve the prospects of low-earning workers as much as hoped by policy makers. In related studies, Budria and Pereira (2005) and Angrist, Chernozhukov and Fernandez-Val (2006) use QR techniques to disaggregate the returns to education by education level. They find that the widening returns to education over the wage distribution are driven largely by the widening returns to college-educated individuals.

Our purpose in the present paper is to see if there is also an upward-sloping profile for training across the conditional wages distribution. Education and work-related training are complementary, as numerous studies attest (see Arulampalam, Booth and Bryan, 2004 and references therein). Hence we might expect to observe an upward sloping profile when we graph the training association across quantiles of the conditional wage

¹ For surveys of articles estimating the mean returns to training, see Ashenfelter and Lalonde (1996) and for the mean returns to education, see Card (1999).

distribution.² We also wish to document how observed training associations differ across the European Union (EU) countries for which we have harmonised data.³ Using the first six waves of the European Community Household Panel (ECHP), we carry out this analysis for private sector men in ten European Union countries.

In a perfectly competitive labour market, there are good reasons to expect that percentage returns to investment in similar forms of human capital might be the same across the conditional wage distribution. If capital and labour markets function according to the competitive paradigm and if human capital is general, any individual investment in human capital should yield equal percentage returns across the distribution.

However, it is possible that skills packages offered by firms to workers might differ across the wage distribution in ways that are unobservable to the econometrician. For example, any complementarities between unobserved ability and work-related training might result in an upward-sloping profile when we graph the training correlation across quantiles of the conditional wages distribution. Moreover, training courses offered by firms to workers are likely to vary in their degree of specificity or generality. Training that is specific and partially firm-financed will produce lower individual wage-returns than self-financed general training. Using the harmonised ECHP data, we can measure the more formal types with our training measure and on-the-job training with our tenure measure. But we cannot hope to capture the skill-mix heterogeneity of training courses offered by firms, not least because the training indicators typically combine different training types

² Although there has been a recent surge in the estimation of wage equations using quantile regression techniques (see Fitzenberger, *et al*, 2001, for some applications), to our knowledge there are no studies investigating the association between work-related training and the conditional wage distribution.

³ There is an extensive literature on the evaluation of particular labour market programmes, using a variety of techniques. For example, Heckman *et al.* (1994) estimate the average effects of training on the treated, Heckman *et al* (1997) look at the distribution of treatment effects using a non instrumental variable (IV) framework, and Abadie *et al* (2002) examine the training effect on different quantiles of the wage distribution using the IV framework. More recently Lechner and Melly (2007) develop bounds estimators of quantile training effects. Our interest here is in work-related training and not in a labour market program. Since we do not have a suitable instrument, we do not treat training as endogenous.

(heterogeneous treatments) into a single training measure. Analogously, the quality of training courses is unobserved by the econometrician and yet might well affect the profile of training returns across the conditional wages distribution. Lastly, monopsonistic models of work-related training suggest that in imperfectly competitive labour markets there will be a wedge between wages and marginal productivity that is increasing in training intensity (see Acemoglu and Pischke, 1999). Since this is unobserved in the vast majority of data sets, this too might affect the profile of training returns across the conditional wages distribution.

In summary, for all these reasons we wish to see if the returns to training events vary across the conditional wages distribution. In the next section we describe our data source, estimating sub-samples, and the principal variables used in our analysis. In Section 3 we outline the econometric model, while in Section 4 we first present the OLS results and then the QR estimates from two specifications. The final section draws some conclusions.

2. THE DATA AND EXPLANATORY VARIABLES

2.1. The Data Source and the Sample

Our data are from the first six waves of the European Community Household Panel (ECHP), a large-scale survey collected annually since 1994 in a standardised format that facilitates cross-country comparisons. The ECHP was specifically designed to be harmonised at the input stage: in most countries a standard questionnaire was used, with harmonised definitions and sampling criteria. Although a standardised questionnaire does not overcome the nuances of interpretation and meaning between different languages, the harmonised format greatly facilitates cross-country comparisons.

[Insert Table 1 near here]

We include in our analysis the ten European countries listed in Table 1. We have only five waves for Austria and four waves for Finland, as they joined the ECHP after 1994. For Britain we use only the first five waves because the format of the training question altered from 1998 onwards (for further details, see Booth and Bryan, 2007). We omit Greece and Portugal from our estimation owing to apparent gaps in the training data and because of the smaller estimating sub-samples with usable information. We also omit Germany because the training variables are not comparable to the other countries.⁴ The ECHP data for Britain were adapted from existing national household surveys, while the other countries used the full harmonised questionnaire. Sample sizes are reported in Column [1] of Table 1 and in Column [7] of the Data Appendix Table.

In earlier work using the ECHP, we found that training incidence is typically significantly higher in the EU public sector than the private (Arulampalam, Booth and Bryan, 2004). This finding came as no surprise, since private sector firms are more likely than the public sector to be constrained by the need to make profits, and so they may be less willing to finance training through fears of losing trained workers to rival non-training firms. Our preliminary testing showed that it is inappropriate to pool private and public sector workers, since the coefficients across the sub-groups differ significantly, as might be expected given that public and private sector employers typically have different objective functions. We therefore only focus on the private sector in this study. We also consider only men, although in a separate study we investigate the gender wage gap using QR techniques and the ECHP data (Arulampalam, Booth and Bryan, 2007).

It is well-known that EU countries differ with regard to their vocational training and education systems. We wish to avoid conflating work-related training with initial

⁴ The ECHP includes two datasets for Germany: the six-wave dataset (derived from the GSOEP survey), which excludes many shorter training spells (communication from DIW), and the original three-wave dataset. In the three-wave dataset, interview dates are treated as confidential, so it is not possible to construct job tenure or know whether training was before or after the previous interview.

vocational education or training. We therefore exclude from our analysis individuals under the age of 25 years, paid apprentices, and those on special employment-related training schemes (apprentices and those on special training schemes account for only 1.1% of the sampled age group). We also exclude workers aged 55 years or more. This is because, among older workers, there may be differential withdrawal from the labour force depending on, for example, how early retirement schemes operate.

For each country, our estimating sub-sample therefore comprises employed private sector men who are: (i) between the ages of 25 and 54 years and working at least 15 hours per week; (ii) not employed in agriculture; (iii) with valid observations for the principal variables used in the wage equations; and (iv) with sequences of continuous observations starting from the first wave in the sample in order to have a complete training record (see also Data Appendix). Individuals can be present for a minimum of two waves (including the first wave) and a maximum of six waves for all countries except for Austria and Britain (where the maximum is five) and Finland (where the maximum is four). For the econometric model described in Section 3, we require a complete record of training for each individual and so we drop any observations which follow a break in the data. Therefore, if an individual is observed in waves 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6, we use waves 1, 2 and 3 only.

The restriction of working at least 15 hours per week was necessary because of the nature of the ECHP data, where – in the first two waves – we were unable to distinguish individuals regularly working fewer than 15 hours from those out-of-the labour force. In addition, some important variables like firm size and tenure are only available for individuals working 15 hours or more. Thus our estimating sub-samples will under-represent low-hours part-timers (though for most countries these represent only a tiny fraction, under 3%, of male workers).

We include in our analysis the ten European countries listed in the tables and estimate the models using pooled person-year observations. Because of the definition of the training variable, individuals stay in the sample continuously until they fail to give an interview, which results in an unbalanced panel with different individuals contributing different numbers of observations.

2.2. *The Training Variable*

The form of the training question, harmonised across countries in the ECHP, is as follows: “Have you at any time since January (in the previous year) been in vocational education or training, including any part-time or short courses?” Although separate training courses within the reference period are not identified, respondents are asked for the *overall* duration and start/end dates of the training. Since the reference period may overlap with the reference period of the previous wave, to avoid double counting, where possible we use the start and end dates to identify training events specific to each wave.⁵ Our training variables are then based on indicators of *completed* training events. As we discuss below, we estimate two specifications of the econometric model. The first uses the cumulative count of completed events since the first wave of the sample, while the second specification uses an indicator for a completed training event in the last 12 months. Most studies simply examine the impact of training incidence (and sometimes intensity) on wages, but not the number of events. Exceptions are Lillard and Tan (1992), Arulampalam, Booth and Elias (1997), Blundell et al. (1999), Arulampalam and Booth (2001), and Booth and Bryan (2007). Lillard and Tan (1992: p31) note that multiple training occurrences

⁵ The modal interview month is October, corresponding to a reference period of 22 months. The British data do not include training dates. However they are derived from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), where the reference period only slightly exceeds one year. Since events are generally very short in Britain, there should be little chance of double counting. For France, we do not use training dates as they are missing for the majority of events. For the Netherlands, the end dates of training are not available so we use start dates only to identify events begun since the previous interview. Notice that we are unable to use the duration data since there are a number of missing observations for some countries, and for that reason we focus on events rather than duration.

within a period are typically not known from US survey data. We follow Lillard and Tan (1992) in our first specification, in using the accumulated sum of all training events, where there is only one event measured at each wave owing to the nature of our data.

The framing of the training question suggests that the training responses should be interpreted as more formal courses of instruction, rather than informal on-the-job training (for which we control – at least in part – using job tenure). A separate question asks about “general or higher education”. Participation in these more general courses is very low (average annual take-up by 25-54 year olds is less than 1%) so we are confident that our results are not affected by interactions with countries’ differing formal educational systems.

Our measure of work-related training is based on a harmonised questionnaire and there are two additional reasons why it is likely to be robust across countries. First, there is typically much less regulation of work-related training than initial training and education. Second, as noted above the incidence of general education after age 25 is very low (typically less than 2%), so there is little danger of confusing training and education.

Table 1 reports information about completed training courses for private sector men by country. The first column gives the number of observations for each country, while the second column reports the mean number of waves for each country. The third column reports training incidence for completed courses only. For example, the first row of Table 1 shows that the Austrian sub-sample comprises 786 private sector men who are observed in three waves on average and of whom 15% have completed a training course in any year. The mean accumulated training count is simply the product of the second and third columns. The figures in the third column show that training incidence differs considerably across countries. We can identify three high-incidence countries – Britain, Denmark and Finland – where each year around 30% or more of individuals complete training courses.

In contrast Austria, Belgium and France form a group of medium-incidence countries, where each year between 10% and 15% of men complete training courses. Finally, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain have incidence below 10%.

Though our sample is limited to men in the private sector, the cross-country pattern summarised in Table 1 is similar to that found in analysis of overall training (Arulampalam *et al.*, 2004). The ranking also compares reasonably well (especially for the high incidence countries) with the cross-country comparisons using different data sources reported in OECD (1999); and with International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS) data on continuing training for several countries featured in OECD (2003).

2.3. Hourly Wages

The dependent variable is the log of the average hourly wage, including overtime payments, in the respondent's main job. The log wage was calculated from the ECHP variables as the log of normal gross monthly earnings (including overtime payments) from the main job, scaled to a weekly basis and then divided by weekly hours (including overtime) in the main job. No specific information is provided on overtime hours and premia. The characteristics of each country's unconditional log wage distribution, deflated to 1999 prices, are reported in Table 2. The deflators are the European Union's harmonised indices of consumer prices (HICP; see *Eurostat Yearbook*, 2002). To allow cross-country comparisons of consumption wages, the log wage figures were converted to purchasing power parity (PPP) units, using the scaling factors supplied with the ECHP. The first column shows substantial variation in mean wages across countries, from a high of 2.77 log points in the Netherlands down to 2.15 log points in Spain (with 2.18 log points in Britain). But there are also differences in the dispersion of wages, as shown by the standard deviations in the second column. By this measure, the country with the lowest dispersion (0.30) is Denmark, while Ireland has the highest dispersion (0.53). It is notable that Spain

has the lowest mean and one of the highest standard deviations (0.50). The remaining columns show the median, the 10th and 90th percentiles, and in the last column the difference between the 90th and the 10th percentiles. This measure of dispersion shows a similar pattern to the standard deviation: Spain, Britain, Ireland and France stand out as countries with high hourly wage dispersion.

[Insert Table 2 near here]

2.4. Other Explanatory Variables

The education, industry and occupation variables in the ECHP are all coded according to standard, internationally comparable definitions. Education levels are defined according to UNESCO's International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED). ISCED was intended for education policy analysis and was designed to be invariant to differences in national education systems. The ECHP distinguishes between education completed to the lower secondary stage (ISCED 0-2), upper secondary education (ISCED 3) and post-secondary or tertiary education (ISCED 5-7). ISCED 0-2 forms the base or omitted dummy variable in our regression results reported in Section 4.

The data on industrial sector are categorised according to the European Union's Classification of Economic Activities in the European Community (NACE), while occupation is defined using the International Standard Classification of Occupation (ISCO-88).

The other controls are demographic attributes and job characteristics expected to affect earnings. We include dummy variables for age and job tenure bands, any unemployment experienced since 1989, marital status, health problems affecting daily life, highest educational levels, fixed term or casual employment, part-time work, establishment size, one-digit occupation and industry, year and, where the data allow, region. We also include a separate control for training started in the current year but uncompleted at the

survey date. Where there were non-trivial numbers of missing observations for variables like industry and region, we include these cases in the regression but control for the missing values using dummy variables (see Data Appendix for details).

3. THE ECONOMETRIC MODEL

There is an extensive literature that estimates the impact of training on expected log wages using a linear regression framework (see *inter alia* references in Ashenfelter and Lalonde, 1996; and Arulampalam and Booth, 2001). Here, we deviate from this common practice by looking at the associations of training and other covariates with wages at different quantiles of the wage distribution. The linear conditional quantile regression model was first introduced by Koenker and Bassett (1978); for a recent survey of these models, see Buchinsky (1998), and Koenker (2005). The main advantage of a quantile regression (QR) framework is that it enables one to model the effects of the covariates on the location, scale and shape of the conditional wage distribution, unlike the linear regression model (least squares) that only allows one to look at the effect on the location (the conditional mean). Our dependent variable in all equations is the log wage, which for brevity we sometimes refer to as the wage.

We consider two different specifications, which might be viewed as polar. They are discussed below. The first assumes a non-decaying effect of training receipts and the second assumes rapidly decaying training effects. Unfortunately, due to data limitations, we are unable to allow for more flexible decaying effects of training, such as those analysed by Arulampalam et al. (1997) using the National Child Development Survey.

Specification 1:

Here we assume that effects of training receipts do not decay over time. To capture this, we include a cumulative count of *completed* events since the first wave. Therefore the training variable, in this model, increases by one for every year that the individual is in

receipt of training between two waves. Unfortunately, we do not have information on the complete history of training received by individuals in the sample. In panel data models estimating the effect of training on the conditional mean wage, it is customary either to first difference the equation prior to estimation or to use within-group deviations to account for individual specific unobservables, which also allows one to control for training effects prior to the start of the spell. In order to account for initial unobservables in our QR model, we therefore, include the residual (e_{it}) from a reduced form OLS regression (excluding the training variable) of the log wage estimated at wave 1 (just prior to our observation period). The purpose of this wage residual is to control for the role of unobservable skills (such as previous training) acquired before the sample period. Since the effect of previous skills may vary over the conditional wage distribution, we allow the coefficient to differ across quantiles. We do not work with the first differenced equation here since our interest is in charting the effects of training on different parts of the conditional wage distribution, and not the effects on annual wages growth. Moreover, the first differenced equation is hard to interpret in the QR case because the difference of the wage quantile is not the same as the quantile of the differenced wage. Hence, with our QR model in levels, we interpret our results as the effects of training on the distribution of wages, conditional on initial unobservables.

Specification 2:

In contrast to the first specification, the second specification assumes that the effect of training only lasts for a period. Under this assumption, the appropriate training variable is

the training received in the last 12 months and therefore no control for initial condition is included in this specification.⁶

Note that, if the underlying model were truly a location model - in the sense that the changes in explanatory variables causing only a change in the location of the distribution of w and not in the shape of the distribution - then all the slope coefficients would be the same for all quantiles. Note that quantile regression models are more general than simple linear regression model allowing for heteroskedastic errors, since the QR model allows for more general dependence of the distribution of the dependent variable on the regressors instead of just the mean and the variance alone. We use Stata 9 to estimate the coefficients of our QR model. To account for the use of repeated observations on individuals, the standard errors are calculated using a block-resampling method involving 500 replications (Fitzenberger, 1998; Fitzenberger and Kurz, 2003). As a benchmark for our QR results, we also present OLS estimates of the wage equation in Section 4.1 below before discussing the QR estimates in Section 4.2 for *Specification 1*. We discuss *Specification 2* results in Section 4.3.

4. RESULTS

4.1. OLS Estimates of *Specification 1*

The first column of Table 3 reports the OLS estimates of accumulated work-related training events and the two highest educational qualification dummy variables, with the base for education being lower secondary education (ISCED 0-2). Other controls included in the estimation are listed in the notes under the table. As explained above, we define a

⁶ Specification 1 includes e_{i1} to pick up any unobserved training that occurred in and prior to wave 1 and it also includes accumulated training to pick up the history of training subsequently. But e_{i1} is not included in Specification 2, on the tacit assumption that history does not matter. But if we assume history does not matter, we should only use the latest training receipt rather than using accumulated training in the model. Thus Specifications 1 and 2 are polar: Specification 1 assumes a non-decaying effect of training receipts and Specification assumes a rapid decaying of training effects.

training event as a wave in which training was received, and these are summed across waves for each observation.

[Insert Table 3 near here]

Table 3 reveals an interesting pattern of partial correlations between training and wages. The highest estimated association between wages and each training event is 8.5% in Ireland. Thus each additional experience is associated with nearly 9% higher wages in Ireland, while for some countries the training coefficients are not statistically different from zero (Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands). Significant associations of about 3-5% higher wages per event are found for Austria, Finland, France, and Spain. A small statistically significant association of 0.9% per training event was found in Denmark. Note that two countries with the highest training incidence – Britain and Denmark– are also amongst the countries with lower training-wage associations, of approximately one percent per event for Denmark and just over one percent per event for Britain. It is interesting to compare our estimates with those of Bassanini et al (2005), who pooled all countries in the ECHP dataset and who included as controls country dummies, gender, age, age-squared, year, education, marital status and industrial dummies. In our specifications we included more explanatory variables (in particular more job characteristics) and allowed the impact of these to vary across countries. This has resulted in a much smaller estimated training effect than in Bassanini et al (2005). Of course our sample is also different, since we focus only on private sector men and so our estimates are not strictly speaking comparable.⁷

In summary, our OLS estimates reveal that there are quite considerable differences in *ceteris paribus* associations between wages and training across our sample of EU

⁷ In an interesting paper also using the ECHP, Bassanini and Brunello (2008) utilise data for 7 countries from the 1996 wave to explore the degree to which training incidence is correlated with wage compression. Our estimates are not directly comparable with theirs, since they pool cross-country data and partition full-time men aged 30-60 years into clusters (by country, education level, occupation and sector) in order to test the degree to which cluster-specific measures of the training wage premium are correlated with general training incidence.

countries. These OLS results highlight the potential importance of cross-country heterogeneity in employer-provided and vocational training systems, discussed in Lynch (1994) and Booth and Snower (1996), *inter alia*. There is in fact very little comparative work investigating the extent and economic impact of work-related training, in part because harmonised data facilitating comparisons became available only recently (OECD, 1999). We next turn to investigating whether there are *intra*-country differences in such associations across the conditional wage distributions, and whether or not these *intra*-country differences vary across countries.

4.2. *QR Estimates of Work-related Training using Specification 1*

Table 3 shows the quantile regression estimates of the training effects (the partial derivative of the conditional quantile or mean log wage with respect to training), as measured by the coefficient on the training receipt dummy, for five different conditional quantiles (0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75 and 0.90). We also control for residuals from a wave 1 log-wage regression, as described in Section 3. The coefficients on the residuals (not reported) are highly significant in all equations. Note that we do not necessarily expect these coefficients to equal one, as would be the case if they represented fixed effects shifting only the location of the conditional distribution. Instead, the residuals are estimates of previous skills and we allow their impact to vary across the wage distribution. Typical coefficient estimates range from 0.4 to 0.7, suggesting that unobserved skills acquired before the observation period have a persistent effect on wages and that it varies across the distribution.

Figure 1 also presents the estimated effects for each of the quantiles of the log wage distribution, along with the 95% confidence band around the estimates. Superimposed on the plots is a dotted horizontal line representing the OLS estimates of the effect of training on expected log wages. If the QR estimates of the association of training with wages are

the same across the conditional wage distribution, the implication is that training only affects the location of this conditional wage distribution.

[Insert Figure 1 near here]

Inspection of Figure 1 reveals first, that the QR estimates are fairly uniform across the conditional wages distributions in seven countries and there are noticeable slopes in the other three countries: Belgium (downward sloping), and Britain and Denmark (upward sloping). For example, in Britain the QR estimates range from 1.1% at the 10th percentile to 2.2% at the 90th percentile (see also Table 3), while the OLS estimate of the training-wages association is 1.4%, as already reported. Differences in the training coefficients across quantiles suggest that training may be associated with expanded or compressed conditional wage distributions. The larger coefficients at higher quantiles in Britain and Denmark indicate that training is associated with increased dispersion of the conditional wage distribution, *ceteris paribus*. The reverse result is found for Belgium, where the estimates are smaller at the higher quantiles. Effectively this suggests that training is associated with a reduced dispersion of the conditional wage distribution in these countries, *ceteris paribus*.

However, a second feature of Figure 1 is that the confidence bands are quite wide, and the OLS estimates lie within the QR confidence bands for all of our countries. This is evidence against significant differences in the estimates across the wages distribution (note that this does not mean that the association between training and wages is best quantified by OLS, since with OLS the effects of *all* covariates are assumed to have only location shifts). Furthermore, inspection of Table 3 reveals that, for two countries, there are no statistically significant associations between training and wages across the entire wages distribution. This is the case for Italy and the Netherlands (whose OLS coefficients are also not statistically different from zero).

In summary, we find that the training effect is fairly uniform across the conditional wage distribution within a country. Moreover, this finding is repeated for the vast majority of the EU countries we investigated. This is an interesting result, and one that is counter to the results found in other studies for another important form of human capital, education. However, our results do suggest that there are considerable differences in *mean returns* to training across countries.

So far we have focussed on the training associations, but it is also interesting to examine the coefficients associated with the controls for upper secondary and tertiary education. These are also presented in Table 3. The estimates reveal that only for Denmark is the association between upper secondary education and wages increasing across the wages distribution. By contrast, relative to the base of lower secondary education, the association between tertiary education and wages is clearly increasing across the log wage distribution in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, the Netherlands and Spain. In two other countries – Ireland and Italy – the association between tertiary education and wages is essentially flat over the distribution, while it actually declines in Britain and Finland.⁸

4.3. Robustness Check: QR Estimates using Specification 2

Table 4 shows the quantile regression estimates of the training effects based on estimating *Specification 2*, in which training from an individual's past is assumed to be discounted to zero. Thus in *Specification 2* the training variable is now training received in the last 12

⁸ Martins and Pereira (2004), using different non-harmonised data sets and employing years of schooling as their measure of education, found that returns to schooling increased over the wage distribution for their 16 different countries. Our results for tertiary education provide some support for their findings, although our specification includes many more explanatory variables along with a control for pre-sample unobservables. As is typical for studies that estimate the returns to schooling, Martins and Pereira used very few controls (experience and its square). Such a parsimonious specification is inappropriate for our purposes, where the focus is on training received after entering the labour market. Their estimating samples also included men in both public and private sectors aged 15-65 working at least 35 hours per week. See also Angrist, Chernozhukov and Fernandez-Val (2004), who find, using three US census datasets, that over time the returns to college graduates have been increasing across the distribution. Budria and Pereira (2005) use a variety of European data sources and also find that the returns to tertiary education are typically increasing across the distribution.

months and no control is included for initial conditions. This is the approach commonly used in the literature, when only the training received since the last wave is allowed to have an effect on current wages.

It is instructive to compare the OLS estimates from each Specification, presented in the first column of Tables 3 and 4. The highest estimated association between wages and each training event is now 16.4% in Ireland, as compared with just 8.5% before. In general, with the exception of Denmark, Finland, France and the Netherlands, the estimated training effect from an additional course is typically twice as large in Specification 2 as it is in Specification 1. Given the fact that individuals who are trained in one wave are also likely to have a higher training probability in earlier waves, this is arguably over-estimating the true training effect and might be considered as an upper bound.

[Insert Table 4 near here]

Now consider the QR estimates of Specification 2, presented in Tables 4 and illustrated in Figure 2. Since the OLS results suggest that the training associations are overestimated when previous training (both observed and unobserved) is omitted, we might expect that this omitted heterogeneity would also affect the pattern of associations across the conditional wage distribution. This could be the case if previously acquired skills were remunerated differently across the conditional wage distribution, perhaps because of differences in their quality or general-specific mix. It could also occur if the correlation of past and current training varies over the wage distribution. By contrast, if previously acquired skills have no differential effect over the distribution, then we would expect the pattern of training associations to remain broadly similar to Specification 1.

[Insert Figure 2 near here]

Comparing Figures 1 and 2, we see that the pattern of training effects is generally very similar to Specification 1. The exceptions are Britain and Ireland, where the

association of training and wages now declines across the conditional distribution, compared to an increase (Britain) and a flat pattern (Ireland) in Specification 1. This suggests that in these two countries previously acquired skills have a bigger impact at the bottom compared to the top of the distribution. Once we hold constant this previous ‘history’ (Specification 1), the differential effect across the distribution disappears (and in fact reverses slightly in Britain). In the eight other countries, our estimates across quantiles are not sensitive to omission of previously acquired skills.

As was found for the OLS comparison, the QR estimates are also typically larger here than were found for Specification 1. In summary, our results support the conclusions reached from Specification 1 even though the magnitude has altered. In general the training effect is fairly uniform across the conditional wage distribution within a country, with Ireland and Britain as exceptions. Our results are suggestive of some cross-country heterogeneity in the correlation between training and wages, indicating the need for individual country studies to explore both median and other QR approaches.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we used quantile regression techniques to investigate the degree to which work-related training affects the location, scale and shape of the conditional wage distribution. Using the first six waves of the European Community Household Panel, we investigated these issues for private sector men in ten European Union countries. Our results for training suggest that, for the majority of countries, associations between training and wages are similar across the conditional wage distribution.

We also controlled for highest educational qualification, using harmonised measures. Overall, our results provide support to previous findings that education is associated with increased dispersion of the conditional wage distribution, although we find that the effect appears to operate through tertiary education rather than upper-secondary

education. Budria and Pereira (2005), using a variety of non-harmonised European data sources, find a similar result, as also do Angrist, Chernozhukov and Fernandez-Val (2006), using three US census datasets.

In contrast to these findings for education, while we found positive associations between training and wages, we did not typically observe an upward sloping profile across quantiles of the conditional wage distribution. This suggests that there may be different forces at work in the relationship between training and wages. For example, there could be unobserved heterogeneity with regard to training content or training costs. For example Almeida and Carneiro (2006) find, using data for Portugal, that direct costs represent the bulk of training costs and that foregone productivity accounts for less than 25% of the total costs of training. They suggest that the estimated coefficient to training in a wage equation is therefore unlikely to be an estimate of the true return to training. Such direct training costs are unobservable in the ECHP survey data. However, since such explanations can only be speculative in this context, we do not pursue them further here.

Finally, our OLS results were also of interest in their own right. We found considerable cross-country differences in *mean associations between* training and wages. Using Specification1, which we suggest is a lower bound, the highest was found for Ireland, with around 9% higher wages per event. The smallest associations were found in Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands, where the associations were statistically insignificant. Significant associations of about 3-5% higher wages per event were found for Austria, Finland, France, and Spain. Note that two of the countries with the highest training incidence – Britain and Denmark – are also amongst the countries with the lowest wage associations, of approximately one percent per event.

References

- Abadie A, Angrist J, Imbens G (2002) Instrumental variables estimates of the effect of subsidized training on the quantiles of trainee earnings. *Econometrica* 70(1):91-117.
- Acemoglu D, Pischke J-S (1999) The Structure of Wages and Investment in General Training. *Journal of Political Economy* 107(3):539-572
- Almeida R, Carneiro P (2006) The Return to the Firm Investment in Human Capital. IZA Discussion Paper No. 1937.
- Angrist J, Chernozhukov V, Fernandez-Val I (2006) Quantile Regression under Misspecification, with an Application to the US Wage Structure. *Econometrica* 74(2):539-563.
- Arias O, Hallock K, Sosa-Escudero W (2001) Individual heterogeneity in the returns to schooling: instrumental variables quantile regression using twins data. In: Fitzenberger B, Koenker R, and Machado JAF (eds.) *Economic Applications of Quantile Regression*. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg New York 7-40
- Arulampalam W, Booth AL (2001) Learning and earning: do multiple training events pay? A decade of evidence from a cohort of young British men. *Economica* 68(271):379-400.
- Arulampalam W, Booth AL, Bryan ML (2004) Training in Europe. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 2(2/3):346-360.
- Arulampalam W, Booth AL, Bryan ML (2007) Is There a Glass Ceiling over Europe? An Exploration of Asymmetries in the Gender Pay Gap across the Wages Distribution. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 60(2):163-186.
- Arulampalam W, Booth AL, Elias P (1997) Work-related training and earnings growth for young men in Britain. *Research in Labor Economics* 16:119-47.

- Ashenfelter O, Lalonde RJ (eds) (1996) *The Economics of Training*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham Northampton.
- Bassanini A, Booth AL, Brunello G, De Paola M, and Leuven E (2007) 'Workplace Training in Europe'. Chapters 8-12 in Brunello G, Garibaldi P, Wasmer E. *Education and Training in Europe*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bassanini A, Brunello G (2008) Is Training More Frequent When Wage Compression is Higher? Evidence from the European Community Household Panel. *Labour Economics* 15(2):272-290
- Blundell R, Dearden L, Meghir C (1999) *The determinants and effects of work-related training in Britain*. IFS report R50, Institute for Fiscal Studies, London
- Booth AL, Bryan ML (2007) Who Pays for General Training in Private Sector Britain?. *Research in Labour Economics* 26:85-123
- Booth AL, DJ Snower (eds) (1996) *Acquiring Skills: Market Failures, their Symptoms, and Policy Responses*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Buchinsky M (1998) Recent advances in quantile regression models. *Journal of Human Resources*. 33(1):88-126
- Buchinsky M (2001) Quantile regression with sample selection: estimating women's return to education in the U.S. In: Fitzenberger B, Koenker R, Machado JAF (eds.) *Economic Applications of Quantile Regression*. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg New York 87-113
- Budria S, Pereira PT (2005) Educational Qualifications and Wage Inequality: Evidence for Europe. IZA Discussion Paper No. 1763.
- Card D (1999) The causal effect of education on earnings. In: Ashenfelter O, Card D (eds) *Handbook of Labor Economics, Volume 3A*. Elsevier, Amsterdam 1801-1863

- Fitzenberger B (1998) The moving blocks bootstrap and robust inference for linear least squares and quantile regressions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 82(2):235-287.
- Fitzenberger B, Koenker R, Machado JAF (eds.) *Economic Applications of Quantile Regression*. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg New York
- Fitzenberger B, Kurz C (2003) New insights on earnings trends across skill groups and industries in West Germany. *Empirical Economics* 28:479-514
- Garcia J, Hernandez PJ, Lopez-Nicolas A (2001) How wide is the gap? An investigation of gender wage differences using quantile regression. In: Fitzenberger B, Koenker R, Machado JAF (eds.) *Economic Applications of Quantile Regression*. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg New York 149-167
- Gonzales X, Miles D (2001) Wage inequality in a developing country: decrease in minimum wage or increase in education returns. In: Fitzenberger B, Koenker R, Machado JAF (eds.) *Economic Applications of Quantile Regression*. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg New York 135-148
- Heckman J, Smith J, Clements N (1997) Making the most out of social experiments: accounting for heterogeneity in programme impacts. *Review of Economic Studies* 64(4):487-535.
- Heckman J, Smith J, Taber C (1998) Accounting for dropouts in evaluations of social experiments. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 80(1):1-14
- Koenker R (2005) *Quantile Regression*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Koenker R, Bassett G (1978) Regression quantiles. *Econometrica* 46(1):33-50
- Lechner M, Melly B (2007) Earnings Effects of Training Programs. CEPR Discussion Paper No. 6400, Centre for Economic Policy Research, London
- Lillard LA, Tan HW (1992) Private sector training: who gets it and what are its effects? *Research in Labor Economics* 13:1-62

Lynch LM (ed) (1994) *Training and the Private Sector: International Comparisons*.

University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Martins PS, Pereira PT (2004) Does education reduce wage inequality? Quantile regression

evidence from 16 countries. *Labour Economics* 11(3):355-371

OECD (1999) *Training of Adult Workers in OECD Countries: Measurement and Analysis*.

In: *OECD Employment Outlook 1999*. OECD, Paris 134-175

OECD (2003) Upgrading workers' skills and competencies. In: *OECD Employment*

Outlook 2003. OECD, Paris 237-296

**Table 1: Training Participation across Europe for Private Sector Men in
Employment Aged 25-54 Years**

	Number of men observed	Mean number of observed waves	Annual training incidence (completed)	Mean accumulated training count
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
Austria	786	3.01	0.15	0.45
Belgium	492	3.10	0.10	0.31
Britain	986	3.41	0.39	1.33
Denmark	626	3.44	0.37	1.27
Finland	740	2.40	0.29	0.70
France	1448	3.41	0.11	0.38
Ireland	544	3.26	0.05	0.16
Italy	1092	3.44	0.03	0.10
Netherlands	908	3.93	0.05	0.20
Spain	1204	3.35	0.08	0.27

Note: column [3] reports the average proportion of men who have completed a training course since the previous interview; column [4] indicates the mean number of courses completed over the panel (which equals the product of columns [2] and [3]).

Table 2: Log hourly wage distributions in purchasing power parity (PPP) units

	Mean [1]	St dev [2]	Median [3]	10 th percentile [4]	90 th percentile [5]	90-10 differential [6]
Austria	2.348	0.385	2.311	1.947	2.807	0.859
Belgium	2.497	0.353	2.444	2.107	2.914	0.806
Britain	2.180	0.465	2.502	1.964	3.108	1.144
Denmark	2.743	0.302	2.715	2.397	3.180	0.783
Finland	2.342	0.397	2.298	1.918	2.848	0.931
France	2.340	0.450	2.277	1.862	2.925	1.063
Ireland	2.380	0.532	2.380	1.833	2.966	1.133
Italy	2.234	0.335	2.204	1.874	2.618	0.744
Netherlands	2.766	0.396	2.744	2.421	3.219	0.798
Spain	2.154	0.505	2.104	1.580	2.855	1.275

Notes: The log wage was calculated from the ECHP variables as $\log(\text{wage}) = \log(\text{PI211MG} * (12/52) / \text{PE005A}) = \log(\text{normal gross monthly earnings from main job including overtime} * (12/52) / \text{hours in main job including overtime})$. It was then deflated to 1999 prices using harmonised indices of consumer prices (HICP) from the Eurostat Yearbook 2002, and converted to purchasing power parity (PPP) units using the ECHP variable PPPxx (where xx is the year). The above statistics are based on the intercept estimate in the regression of log wage on a set of wave dummies. The omitted category was wave 5. The reported numbers in [2] refer to the regression standard error.

Table 3 – Wage Effects of Training and Education (*Specification 1*)

	OLS	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
Austria						
Training	0.034	0.015	0.033	0.035	0.028	0.044
Upper secondary educ	0.074	<i>0.059</i>	0.089	0.090	0.093	<i>0.060</i>
Tertiary educ	0.172	0.130	0.178	0.177	0.211	0.233
Belgium						
Training	0.010	0.019	0.022	0.014	-0.012	-0.012
Upper secondary educ	0.023	-0.009	<i>0.023</i>	0.008	0.023	0.071
Tertiary educ	0.147	0.124	0.135	0.135	0.125	0.171
Britain						
Training	0.014	0.011	0.008	<i>0.014</i>	0.020	0.022
Upper secondary educ	0.037	0.058	0.067	0.064	0.046	0.031
Tertiary educ	0.117	0.129	0.138	0.137	0.118	0.112
Denmark						
Training	<i>0.009</i>	0.005	0.007	0.011	0.0089	0.008
Upper secondary educ	0.072	<i>0.045</i>	0.070	0.069	0.106	0.105
Tertiary educ	0.129	0.094	0.113	0.123	0.154	0.196
Finland						
Training	0.031	0.049	0.019	0.030	0.020	0.027
Upper secondary educ	0.058	0.095	0.077	0.027	0.003	<i>0.049</i>
Tertiary educ	0.137	0.159	0.131	0.098	0.081	0.146
France						
Training	0.036	0.050	0.038	0.032	0.031	0.032
Upper secondary educ	0.110	0.110	0.113	0.107	0.104	0.130
Tertiary educ	0.276	0.252	0.253	0.247	0.284	0.300
Ireland						
Training	0.085	0.109	0.088	0.101	0.070	<i>0.068</i>
Upper secondary educ	0.102	0.091	0.076	0.110	0.129	0.107
Tertiary educ	0.216	0.216	0.205	0.229	0.224	0.219
Italy						
Training	-0.011	-0.008	-0.005	-0.003	-0.006	0.006
Upper secondary educ	0.037	0.056	0.055	0.046	0.043	0.016
Tertiary educ	0.266	0.290	0.297	0.257	0.238	0.254
Netherlands						
Training	0.002	0.000	-0.007	0.003	0.003	-0.001
Upper secondary educ	0.046	0.014	<i>0.024</i>	0.033	0.024	<i>0.040</i>
Tertiary educ	0.297	0.224	0.230	0.254	0.258	0.292
Spain						
Training	0.026	0.020	0.039	0.039	<i>0.028</i>	<i>0.029</i>
Upper secondary educ	0.088	0.076	0.074	0.081	0.085	0.106
Tertiary educ	0.206	0.184	0.184	0.206	0.210	0.216

Notes: (a) The training variable is the cumulative count of *completed* events since the first wave. (b) Bold (bold and italics) type denotes significance at 5% (5-10%) level at least. (c) Upper secondary education corresponds to International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) level 3. Tertiary education corresponds to ISCED levels 5-7. The base for education is ISCED 0-2, as noted in the text. (d) Other controls are dummies for age and job tenure bands, training started in the current year but uncompleted at the survey date, unemployment since 1989, marital status, health problems affecting daily life, fixed term or casual employment, part-time work, establishment size, one-digit occupation and industry, year and, where available, region. The residual from wave 1 reduced form regression is also included in all the models estimated - see Section 3 for further details.

Table 4 – Wage Effects of Training and Education (Specification 2)

	OLS	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
Austria						
Training	0.063	<i>0.042</i>	0.079	0.057	0.067	0.038
Upper secondary educ	0.071	0.065	0.091	0.094	0.095	0.060
Tertiary educ	0.190	0.119	0.214	0.242	0.308	0.244
Belgium						
Training	0.021	<i>0.073</i>	0.041	0.001	-0.010	-0.002
Upper secondary educ	0.016	0.011	0.007	0.011	0.050	0.015
Tertiary educ	0.129	0.117	0.124	0.145	0.134	0.105
Britain						
Training	0.029	0.060	0.077	0.039	-0.003	-0.003
Upper secondary educ	<i>0.037</i>	<i>0.064</i>	<i>0.045</i>	<i>0.045</i>	0.028	0.054
Tertiary educ	0.099	0.096	0.086	0.103	0.100	0.099
Denmark						
Training	0.000	0.005	0.002	0.003	-0.005	-0.016
Upper secondary educ	0.053	<i>0.039</i>	<i>0.040</i>	0.040	0.059	0.092
Tertiary educ	0.125	0.097	0.097	0.086	0.128	0.222
Finland						
Training	0.037	<i>0.034</i>	<i>0.038</i>	0.048	0.037	0.037
Upper secondary educ	0.048	0.090	0.066	0.041	0.044	0.052
Tertiary educ	0.119	0.166	0.139	0.088	<i>0.080</i>	0.146
France						
Training	0.042	0.070	<i>0.048</i>	<i>0.052</i>	0.042	0.027
Upper secondary educ	0.113	0.119	0.107	0.110	0.115	0.138
Tertiary educ	0.278	0.248	0.263	0.272	0.270	0.281
Ireland						
Training	0.164	0.300	0.210	0.162	0.136	0.113
Upper secondary educ	0.093	0.108	0.082	0.111	0.124	0.106
Tertiary educ	0.233	<i>0.153</i>	0.186	0.275	0.275	0.204
Italy						
Training	0.018	0.017	-0.025	0.032	0.025	0.056
Upper secondary educ	0.031	0.043	0.041	0.045	0.044	0.031
Tertiary educ	0.257	0.223	0.283	0.281	0.280	0.217
Netherlands						
Training	-0.009	-0.013	0.003	0.004	-0.021	-0.036
Upper secondary educ	0.043	0.013	0.017	0.022	0.013	0.016
Tertiary educ	0.284	0.205	0.233	0.236	0.211	0.209
Spain						
Training	0.075	0.102	0.081	0.081	0.075	<i>0.067</i>
Upper secondary educ	0.082	0.093	0.083	0.056	0.065	0.081
Tertiary educ	0.208	0.165	0.182	0.185	0.193	0.254







Notes: (a) The training variable is the training received in the last 12 months. (b) Bold (bold and italics) type denotes significance at 5% (5-10%) level at least. (c) Upper secondary education corresponds to International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) level 3. Tertiary education corresponds to ISCED levels 5-7. The base for education is ISCED 0-2, as noted in the text. (d) Other controls are dummies for age and job tenure bands, training started in the current year but uncompleted at the survey date, unemployment since 1989, marital status, health problems affecting daily life, fixed term or casual employment, part-time work, establishment size, one-digit occupation and industry, year and, where available, region.

DATA APPENDIX: Selection of estimating samples





Unless otherwise stated, we applied the initial selection described in Section 2 of the text. We then dropped observations with missing or invalid data on the variables in the wage equations, that is principally: training, fixed term or casual contract, occupation, industry, region, establishment size, tenure, part-time status, education, health status and marital status. Where the number of missing values was non-trivial (typically where this would have necessitated a drop in sample size of 5% or more as a consequence), we also included a dummy variable for missing value observations in order to preserve the sample sizes. Finally, we kept only continuous sequences of observations from the first wave (ECHP wave 1) to ensure a complete record of training for each individual. The table details the number of observations remaining at each of these selection stages.

[1] Country	[2] Initial no. of obs after first selection	[3] No. of obs with valid data	[4] Addition al selections used	[5] Included missing value dummies	[6] Included waves	[7] No. of obs [ind] after selection of continuing spells	[8] Other comments
Austria	3189	3029			3-6	2366 [786]	.
Belgium	3406	2680		Size	2-6	1524 [492]	.
Britain	5569	4246	Wave 6 deleted.	Industry, Fixed Term/Casual contract	2-5	3366 [986]	Training not dated.
Denmark	3249	3126		Industry	2-6	2152 [626]	
Finland	2386	2282		Industry, Occupation	4-6	1775 [740]	
France	7483	6589		Fixed Term/ Casual, Size, Occupation, Industry	2-6	4936 [1448]	Training is not dated.
Ireland	2729	2643		Region	2-6	1774 [544]	
Italy	6944	6173			2-6	3757 [1092]	
Netherlands	7038	6719		Industry	2-6	3569 [908]	No training finish dates available.
Spain	6445	6296		Region	2-6	4032 [1204]	

Figure 1: The association of training and wages across the wage distribution
(Specification 1)



**Figure 1 Continued: The association of training and wages across the wage distribution
(Specification 1)**



**Figure 2: The association of training and wages across the wage distribution
(Specification 2)**




Figure 2 Continued: The association of training and wages across the wage distribution
(Specification 2)

