

Wageindicator



in Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, China, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy,  
India, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Spain, South Africa, South Korea, Sweden,  
United Kingdom, United States  
[www.WageIndicator.org](http://www.WageIndicator.org)

## WIBAR Report No. 3 TRAINING

12/07/2007

Post-conference Update

Wim Sprenger, Kea Tijdens, Maarten van Klaveren, Nuria Ramos Martin

**WAGEINDICATOR SUPPORT FOR TRADE UNION BARGAINING IN EUROPE (WIBAR)**  
Supported by the European Commission in its Industrial Relations and Social Dialogue Program,  
Budget Heading 04030301. Nr 2006/VP001/10017, runs from 08/2006-08/2007<sup>1</sup>

### Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. EU and training: debate and facts.....	2
2.1 EU training policies.....	2
2.2 ETUC and training.....	4
2.3 Training in Europe: some trends.....	5
3. Collective bargaining and training.....	7
4. Training according to <i>WageIndicator</i> data: the views of employees.....	9
4.1 Training across countries.....	9
4.2 Training across industries.....	11
4.3 A closer look at gender, age, educational levels, and contracts.....	14
4.4 The relation between provided and self-paid training.....	17
4.5 Some conclusions.....	17
References.....	18
Appendix.....	20

<sup>1</sup> Sole responsibility lies with the University of Amsterdam/AIAS. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information in this particular or in any other publication or communication.

## 1. Introduction

This is a report in the framework of the WIBAR project. This project aims to promote the input of cross-country, comparative analyses at the level of themes and industries using the *WageIndicator* survey data about wages, working conditions and working hours. The Amsterdam Institute of Advanced Labour Studies (AIAS) / University of Amsterdam has developed the WIBAR project in co-operation with the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC): the project is focused on the European trade union involvement in developing workplace industrial relations and Europe-wide bargaining. ETUC has formulated four major bargaining spearheads and related guidelines for 2006: wages in general and low pay work; working time; gender equality; training and lifelong learning.<sup>2</sup> For the ETUC, the European industrial secretariats and their national trade unions, the need for detailed and industry-specific comparisons is more urgent than ever. The WIBAR project should produce usable tools and intensify dissemination and debate on Europe-wide bargaining.

Section 2 of this report indicates the contours of the European training landscape, by providing information on EU policies (2.1), on the ETUC views on training (2.2), and based on the European Working Conditions Surveys, showing some trends in training in the EU27. Section 3 deals with the relation between collective bargaining and training. In Section 4 we present the outcomes of our analyses on the *WageIndicator* data as far as related to training, by an overview by countries (4.1), an overview across industries (4.2), and a closer look at personal characteristics: gender, age, educational levels, and employment contracts (4.3). Finally, in 4.4, we explore the relation between provided and self-paid training, linking the various training categories with these personal characteristics.

## 2. EU and training: debate and facts

### 2.1 EU training policies

The training systems in the EU differ considerably, both within and across countries. According to Article 150 of the European Community Treaty, "(...) the Community shall implement a vocational training policy which shall support and supplement the action of the Member States while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content and organisation of vocational training." This means that EU policies concerning training should focus on providing conditions for cooperation and exchanging of practices between the member states, while preserving the rights of each member state in terms of the content and organisation of its training system.

The re-launched Lisbon strategy has reinforced the goal of turning the EU into the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world. One of its objectives is the transformation of education and training throughout Europe. In the context of the original Lisbon strategy, in 2001 the Ministers of Education of the Member States adopted a report on the future objectives of education and training systems to be achieved by 2010.<sup>3</sup> A year later, the Education Council and the Commission endorsed a 10-year work programme, Education and Training 2010. This work programme integrates all actions in the fields of education and training at European level, including vocational education and training. The Copenhagen

---

<sup>2</sup> Keune, 2005; ETUC, 2005.

<sup>3</sup> Council of the European Union, 2001.

declaration<sup>4</sup> gives a political mandate to develop concrete priorities on education and training policies at EU level. The three major common goals to be achieved by 2010 are:

- to improve the quality and effectiveness of EU education and training systems;
- to ensure that they are accessible to all;
- to open up education and training to the wider world.

In order to achieve these goals, thirteen specific objectives, covering the various types and levels of education and training (formal, non-formal and informal) and aimed at making a reality of lifelong learning, have been set up. Systems have to improve on all fronts: teacher training; basic skills; integration of information and communication technologies; efficiency of investments; language learning; lifelong guidance; flexibility of the systems to make learning accessible to all; mobility, citizenship education, et cetera. In November 2003, the European Commission adopted a Communication presenting an interim evaluation of the implementation of the Education and Training 2010 programme, calling for accelerated reforms in the years to come and for a stronger political commitment to achieve the Lisbon goals.<sup>5</sup> It was the basis of a 2004 joint interim report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the detailed work programme, emphasising that the EU must catch up with its main competitors in terms of investment and develop comprehensive strategies to make lifelong learning a reality.<sup>6</sup>

The need of stimulating lifelong learning has been paid special attention in the context of the Copenhagen process. The aim is to strengthen the European dimension of information guidance and counseling services, enabling citizens to make use of the vocational learning opportunities available. The idea is to make it possible to link together and build on learning acquired at different stages of life, in both formal and non-formal contexts. The priorities for enhanced cooperation in this area are built on those of the Commission's 2001 Communication on making a European area of lifelong learning a reality,<sup>7</sup> followed by the Council resolutions on lifelong learning (June 2002) and on lifelong guidance (May 2004).

The 2006 Joint Interim Report of the Council and the Commission on progress under the Education and Training 2010 work programme<sup>8</sup> pointed out that particular attention must be given to improving the monitoring of the implementation of lifelong learning strategies, better information, and exchanges of experiences regarding the use of the EU financial instruments to support education and training development. The report underlined that, although many member states have developed lifelong learning strategies, those strategies remain imbalanced. They focus on either employability or re-engaging those who have become alienated from the systems. Little attention has been paid to older and low skilled workers' learning opportunities. The overall conclusion of the 2006 report was that progress concerning social inclusion is too slow and that there is a need to speed up the pace of reforms. Finally, in December 2006 the European Ministers of Vocational Education and Training, the European social partners and the European Commission issued a

---

<sup>4</sup> On 30 November 2002, the Education Ministers of 31 European countries and the European Commission adopted the Copenhagen Declaration on enhanced cooperation in European vocational education and training.

<sup>5</sup> European Commission, 2003.

<sup>6</sup> OJ C 104 of 30.04.2004.

<sup>7</sup> European Commission, 2001.

<sup>8</sup> OJ C 79 of 01.04.2006.

revision of the priorities and strategies of the Copenhagen process in order to enhance the European cooperation in this field.

The support of the member states for European cooperation in vocational training was secured earlier than in the field of education, like is shown by the creation of the CEDEFOP (European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training, 1975) and the Leonardo da Vinci programme (1994). Moreover, it is worth mentioning that in order to facilitate mobility of workers within the EU territory, since 1 January 2000, the EU has developed an initiative called the Europass-Training allowing that training skills acquired in Member States different from the one of origin can be registered in a personal document.

It is worth noting that the European Parliament's Commission of Employment and Social Affairs wants to improve the employability of workers, amongst others by investing in human capital through the improvement of education and skills, while special attention is devoted to innovation and technological development and to new sectors of employment.<sup>9</sup> This commission aims at expanding and improving investments in human capital by setting up efficient strategies for lifelong learning in accordance with the European agreements, such as adequate incentives and mechanisms to divide the costs between governments, enterprises and individuals aiming to substantially diminish the amount of school dropouts. The commission also advocates better accessibility to primary, secondary and higher vocational education as well as more continuous learning in the place of employment during the whole life cycle, especially for low skilled and older workers.<sup>10</sup>

## **2.2 ETUC and training**

The ETUC is rather pessimistic about the actual developments in training. In its document "The coordination of collective bargaining 2007" it stresses the need to promote an equivalent rights approach in different fields among which training "(...) making sure a-typical workers have access to social security, holiday (pay), training and lifelong learning". Given globalisation, ETUC stresses that labour market institutions need to ensure upwards flexibility and upward mobility of workers. A modern labour market should provide access to training for all workers, but the available data do not point into this direction. ETUC observes the actual European labour market to score badly on training developments and employers pay only lip service to the importance of training: they are under-investing in training while the access to training is almost blocked for those who are the most in need of it (low skilled workers, older workers, long term unemployed, temporary workers).

ETUC emphasises that a modern labour market provides access to training for all workers; however, the European labour market scores badly on this issue: "In practice, however, business is under investing in training while the access to training is almost blocked for those who are most in need of it (low-skilled workers, older workers, long-term unemployed, temporary workers)". ETUC reminds of the more than 70% of workers who do not receive any training paid for or provided by their employers, and has to conclude the trend is negative in the EU-15. Following up on the EMF 2005 initiative to set up a common demand on the right to training of five

---

<sup>9</sup> Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (2005a).

<sup>10</sup> Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (2005b), Integrated guideline no. 22.

days a year for each worker, the ETUC plans to engage with affiliates in order to see whether such a common demand would also be possible on the ETUC level. The first step to be set is gathering data from the member unions on the situation of training provided by enterprises in their country and industry. In particular ETUC draws members' attention to sectoral and/or intersectoral agreements which correct the market failure and business underinvestment in training by obliging all firms to contribute to social partner funds which have training of workers as an objective with a special focus on groups at risk in the labour market.<sup>11</sup>

Partly building on the common initiatives to be discussed in Section 3 and partly on own research among affiliates, ETUC pushes for more initiatives in the field of lifelong learning in combination with mobility at national, sectoral and local levels.<sup>12</sup>

### 2.3 Training in Europe: some trends

In most European countries formal education, provided by the state, is targeted towards future entrants on the labour market – youngsters, and sometimes re-entrants. Depending on their educational systems countries have a rather strict separation between education and labour market, or organise education partly in combination with work. Yet, in general governments of the member states do not invest large amounts in educational and training for workers. Exceptions are training activities for unemployed or those with a very weak position in the labour market. In 2003, the EU15 states spent nearly € 26 billion in training unemployed workers and special target groups: almost 40% of their total labour market policy expenditure, the other 60% being used for employment incentives, integration of disabled workers, direct job creation and start-up initiatives.<sup>13</sup> This data underlines the importance of training as an instrument to guide unemployed or special groups of potential workers to the labour market.

Once part of the labour force, workers with an employment contract experience less public spending or facilities to keep up with changes at work, new skills required, possibilities for (upward) mobility. They are dependent on training courses for adults offered by local authorities or commercial suppliers (paid by themselves and in their own time), or on the activities provided, paid and organised by their employer. In fact these activities have to play their part in systems of '*continuous training*' or '*lifelong education*', promoted by the EU and the member states. The conditions in the share delivered by companies vary widely: from training offered freely and in working-time till provisions where workers have to pay themselves – partly – and/or attend the course off duty.

Comparing the results of the Fourth European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS), held in 2005, with its predecessors shows that access to training in Europe has not improved. The levels of training in the EU have not increased since 1995.<sup>14</sup> In the EU27, in 2005 26% of all respondents had undergone training paid by the employer in the previous year,<sup>15</sup> plus about 5% paid by the worker.<sup>16</sup> These figures include the

---

<sup>11</sup> ETUC, 2006.

<sup>12</sup> ETUC, 2007.

<sup>13</sup> Eurostat, 2005.

<sup>14</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, 48; Fourth EWCS Resume, 2007, 1.

<sup>15</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, Annex 3: Statistical tables, q28a\_1. In the EU15 this share was, with 27%, only slightly higher.

<sup>16</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, Fig. 5.14. The EU27 figure for training paid by the employer, about 29%, does not fit with the country data (see previous footnote).

self-employed; of course, the share of training paid by the employer for solely the dependent workforce is, with 29%, higher.<sup>17</sup> Various divisions showed that:

- country averages of the share of those with training paid by the employer in the previous year varied from 53% (Finland) and 51% (Sweden), via 41% for Belgium, 39% in the UK, 36% in Denmark, 32% in the Netherlands, 26% in Poland, 25% in Germany, to 19% in Spain and 16% in Hungary (and 8% in Bulgaria);<sup>18</sup>
- over-all differences by gender remain small: 25% of the male respondents received employer-paid training in the previous year, against 27% of the women;<sup>19</sup>
- those aged 25-39 received more training according to this definition (29%) than workers under 25 of age (21%) and those aged 40-54 (27%) as well as notably the 55 of aged and older (19%);<sup>20</sup>
- workers with a higher educational level received more training: only 10% of those with a primary level of education received training over the previous year compared to 41% of those with a third-level education;<sup>21</sup>
- workers in public administration (44%), education and health care (both 42%) received about twice as much training as those working in the private sector (21% on average, with 24% for manufacturing);<sup>22</sup>
- most training is given to workers on permanent contracts (31%), though the difference with those on fixed-term contracts (29%) is small; workers with a temp agency contract (18%) or with no contract (11%) receive least training of all;<sup>23</sup> moreover, part-time workers receive in the EU27 5%-points less training than their full-time colleagues;<sup>24</sup>
- when training is provided, the average number of paid training days per year is low: 60% received between one and five days and 20% between six and 10 days of training.<sup>25</sup>

It is worthwhile investigating the job-skills match, like that is done in the fourth EWCS: whether workers perceive that their duties correspond well with their skills, or whether they feel under-skilled ('need further training') or over-skilled ('have the skills to cope with more demanding duties'). In the EU27, a small majority (52%) of the respondents states that job and skills corresponds well, 35% feels over-skilled and 13% feels under-skilled. The feeling of being over-skilled varies widely between countries, without a clear pattern. Among the countries covered by the WIBAR project, the UK has the highest score here (43%), followed by Hungary (41%), with a large intermediate group including Spain (35%), Denmark and the Netherlands (both 33%), Belgium and Germany (both 28%), and only 22% felt over-skilled in Finland. Women felt slightly less over-skilled than men (2%pts), and workers aged 55 and older slightly less than the younger age categories.<sup>26</sup> The industry variations are rather limited. Unfortunately, due to a change in the questioning these figures are incomparable with former EWCS outcomes.

---

<sup>17</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, Annex 3: Statistical tables, q28a\_1.

<sup>18</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, Annex 3: Statistical tables, q28a\_1.

<sup>19</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, Annex 3: Statistical tables, q28a\_1.

<sup>20</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, Annex 3: Statistical tables, q28a\_1.

<sup>21</sup> Fourth EWCS Resume, 2007, 6.

<sup>22</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, Table 5.3; Fourth EWCS Resume, 2007, 6.

<sup>23</sup> Fourth EWCS Resume, 2007, 6.

<sup>24</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, Table 5.3.

<sup>25</sup> Fourth EWCS Resume, 2007, 6.

<sup>26</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, Annex 3: Statistical tables, q27.

### 3. Collective bargaining and training

The relation between training of workers and collective bargaining is not a simple one. Collective bargaining can pave the way for training incentives (including remuneration after completion/exams), training facilities (money, time, supply of training), training levels necessary for special jobs and occupations, training rights (quantitative and qualitative), labour market recognition of received training on the job, et cetera. However, the issue who is to follow which training courses, under which conditions and with which implications for pay, job mobility and future training perspectives is in the end mainly decided at the level of individual workers and shop floor managers and supervisors. On the one hand collective agreements in the field of training may make quite some difference for the conditions in which training practices are embedded, on the other hand these agreements cannot prescribe individuals and management to reach agreement on training, and if so, how and which training provisions will be created precisely.

It is often assumed that collective agreements do foster continuous training encourage participation in such training. Yet, research only partially confirms this assumption. Unions in a number of EU member states have managed to negotiate training agreements, but they have not always and for all categories of workers being able to ensure their implementation. It is clearly a mistake to regard training as an inherently non-conflictual issue in labour relations.<sup>27</sup> Various empirical evidence points in this direction. For example, Mytzek-Zühlke analysed for 1999 differences between the vocational training activities of companies in Denmark, Germany, Sweden, and the UK, revealing that only 32% of employees in German companies employing 10 or more workers participated in continuous training, compared with 61% in Sweden, 53% in Denmark, and 49% in the UK. Collectively agreed measures to foster continuous training had a large effect on participation rates in the UK. In Germany, single works agreements on continuous training encouraged such training significantly, whereas collective agreements signed by the social partners showed no effects.<sup>28</sup>

A study of German companies revealed that in 2004 84% of them offered continuous training. About 56% of the employers questioned, however, the increasing need for continuous training. More than two-thirds of them argued that continuous training was also or in particular a responsibility of employees. They wanted their employees to become more proactive in relation to continuous training efforts in order to protect their own employability.<sup>29</sup> Here the dilemmas of continuous training - who is primarily responsible, who pays, who takes the initiative - are reflected. Is training a general necessity for which employers and workers should be jointly responsible, or is it part of firms' HR strategies, leaving the challenge to individual workers?

Here the basis of a conflict between the German IG Metall union and employers in 2006 can be found. Both parties stressed the importance of continuous training for the future of workers and German enterprises: the Confederation of German Employers' Associations (BDA) referred to it as "a future assignment for companies, but also for employees, to ensure competitiveness, innovative capabilities and employability". However, the discord started when it came to implementing this principle. While IG Metall opted for industry-wide collective agreements committing

---

<sup>27</sup> Heyes, 2007, 243.

<sup>28</sup> Cited in Vogel, 2006.

<sup>29</sup> The Cologne Institute, 2005.

employers to determine their labour needs and discuss continuous training schemes with their employees, BDA on the contrary argued that companies need continuous training schemes allowing for fast and individual adjustments in an ever-changing environment. The latter would enable companies to exert their autonomy in decision-making processes with regard to continuous training for managing continuous training at company level.<sup>30</sup>

Without industry-wide agreements the risk of low accessibility of training for less privileged groups of workers seems to grow. This was clearly illustrated by the SERVEMPLOI project, monitoring the progress of women working in the finance and retail sectors of eight member states: Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Spain, Sweden and the UK (1998 - 2001). In both sectors, women in junior positions turned out not to be adequately 'networked' in terms of information technology. This was clearly in contrast to the fact that the organisations these women worked for were highly networked - the retail organisations using computerised check-outs linked with supply-chain management, while in finance women were increasingly working with integrated IT systems in branches and call centres. The researchers found training to vary considerably between countries, ranging from arrangements in Germany whereby vocational training schemes offered adequate preparation to the UK, where some women received no training at all, and to Spain where notably in retail women received little or no training. In all countries, however, on-the-job training and 'shadowing' the work of other employees was commonplace. The project revealed a trend towards decreasing levels of training, with certain types of apprenticeship and vocational training no longer offered to women in junior positions.<sup>31</sup> In fact employers and unions were not divided on the need of training, but merely on the way to achieve it and on the role of social partners. Was training a collective right and an asset for all workers, or were management and HRM deciding on it at individual levels?

What is the influence of collective agreements on training facilities in Europe as a whole? Eurostat's continuing vocational training survey showed that the number of vocational training hours per employee almost doubled when joint agreements were at stake compared to industries or companies without such agreements. The same held true for forerunners France and Ireland and the majority of other countries. In Sweden and of agreement and non-agreement based hours Finland the differences were less than EU average, and in Denmark the numbers of hours were even equal Finland the differences were less than EU average, and in Denmark the numbers of agreement-based on non-agreement based training hours were even equal.<sup>32</sup>

Despite disputes at national and sectoral levels, the European social partners have taken up responsibility to stimulate and co-ordinate common activities in this field. In May 2006 they presented their evaluation report of four years' joint activities to promote the lifelong development of competences and qualifications in Europe. Both parties agreed on the assumption that the development of competences is essential if Europe is to become the most competitive, knowledge-based economy in the world. Therefore they adopted a framework of actions on lifelong learning, highlighting four priorities for action and identifying practical tools for the social partners to use at national, sectoral and company levels. They monitored progress annually and conducted a comprehensive evaluation in 2006. Over 350 selected

---

<sup>30</sup> Vogel, 2006.

<sup>31</sup> Webster *et al*, 2001.

<sup>32</sup> Eurostat, 2002.

social partners' initiatives were monitored, 108 of them aiming at identifying skills needs, 89 at finding ways to validate competences, 53 at informing and guiding companies or workers, and 100 at mobilising resources efficiently. Among the initiatives analysed, over 70 concerned companies' good practice examples and 280 comprised social partners' initiatives at sectoral or national levels. It was decided to build on this work in a work programme 2006-2008.<sup>33</sup>

## 4. Training according to *WageIndicator* data: the views of employees

### 4.1 Training across countries

In this report we will use data from the *WageIndicator* survey to investigate worker experiences concerning recent training. The survey includes three questions on training: *Did you receive training from your employer last year?*; *Did you have any training paid by yourself last year?*, and *Do you think training would be worthwhile?*. The first two jointly cover the same question as put forward in the European Working Conditions Surveys (EWCS's); the third reveals more about training attitudes and expectations of individual employees, irrespective of their actual training situation. Because the questions on training did not produce sufficient data for Denmark, that country is excluded. In this section we present and analyse the results of calculations on the *WageIndicator* dataset covering September 2004-September 2006.<sup>35</sup>

As for the survey question about training received from the employer last year, Table 1 (next page) shows that majorities of employees in Finland (62%), Belgium (62%) and the Netherlands (61%) received training from their employer. In Germany this share was just over half of the workers (52%), in Spain a large minority (42%). These figures are considerably higher, from 14%pts for Finland to 29%pts for the Netherlands, than the scores found by the EWCS 2005 on exactly the same question, though the mutual ranking of these five countries remains the same. Training is the only item in the WIBAR project for which we found differences in outcomes between the *WageIndicator* and other European data sources of this magnitude. We tend to attribute these differences to a selection effect: visitors of the *WageIndicator* most likely will have a larger drive to progress in their job i.e. to be trained than representative samples of the respective workforces.<sup>36</sup>

Most of the received training had a length of less than a week: in Germany, this share was nearly 80%, in Belgium, Finland and the Netherlands about 65%, and only in Spain exactly 50%. Taking into account the substantial training period of at least one month, Spain and the Netherlands (both 7%) revealed the highest amount of this training, resulting in the highest average training length in these two countries. Yet, even here this average remained quite modest and under six days yearly.

---

<sup>33</sup> European Social Partners, 2006.

<sup>35</sup> The first question was asked in Germany from July 2006 on, and in Finland only in the second half of 2005. The second question (on self-paid training) was not asked in Finland. The first two questions on training were not asked in the UK – here we only have comparable data for question three.

<sup>36</sup> This may have been most extremely the case for Spain. With 55% of all respondents, in the Spanish *WageIndicator* survey higher educated are clearly overrepresented.

**Table 1** Frequencies of employer-provided training last year, breakdown by country

	Belgium	Finland	Germany	Netherlands	Spain
No training	38%	33%	48%	39%	58%
1 – 2 days	19%	22%	16%	18%	9%
3 – 6 days	24%	23%	21%	21%	12%
1 – 2 weeks	12%	13%	10%	11%	9%
3 – 4 weeks	4%	4%	3%	5%	5%
1 – 2 months	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%
2 months or more	2%	2%	1%	4%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	9116	3143	4647	40245	5274
Mean number of days	4.49	5.15	3.33	5.73	5.85
Standard deviation	8.72	9.85	7.07	11.36	12.92

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

As for the question about self-paid training last year, Table 2 reveals that a third of the Spanish employees followed training paid by themselves, twice as much as the Dutch and the Belgians. Moreover, longer training courses of at least two months are much more common in Spain (one out of six employees!). We will come back later on the relations between employer-provided and self-paid training.

**Table 2** Frequencies of self-paid training last year per country, breakdown by country

	Belgium	Germany	Netherlands	Spain
No training	82%	74%	83%	67%
1 – 2 days	5%	7%	5%	3%
3 – 6 days	4%	6%	3%	3%
1 – 2 weeks	3%	4%	2%	4%
3 – 4 weeks	2%	2%	2%	3%
1 – 2 months	1%	1%	1%	3%
2 months or more	5%	6%	5%	17%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	8982	4572	38992	4504
Mean number of days	3.69	4.63	3.58	11.48
Standard deviation	12.07	13.27	12.02	20.53

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

The results on the survey question on employees' opinions that training for the job would be worthwhile are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3** Frequencies of employees finding training for their job would be worthwhile, breakdown by country

	Belgium	Finland	Germany	Netherlands	Spain
Never worthwhile	14%	7%	4%	16%	9%
Sometimes worthwhile	24%	23%	13%	28%	11%
Regularly worthwhile	35%	33%	32%	36%	21%
Often worthwhile	20%	27%	36%	17%	26%
Daily (always) worthwhile	7%	10%	16%	3%	33%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	8841	3152	1561	37826	5356
Mean (1=never, ..., 5=daily)	2.81	3.10	3.46	2.63	3.63
Standard deviation	1.11	1.08	1.03	1.03	1.28

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

Table 3 shows that Spanish employees value training by far highest among the five countries compared. Belgian and Dutch employees are comparatively skeptical about the value of training; their Finnish and German colleagues remain in between.

## 4.2 Training across industries

After having presented the frequencies by country as for the three survey questions at stake, we now present differences across industries. Table 4 gives an overview of the shares of workers reporting to have received training from their employer last year, compared by country and industry.

**Table 4 Shares of employees having received at least one day of employer-provided training last year and ranking across industries, breakdown by country**

	Belgium		Finland		Germany		Netherlands		Spain	
Agriculture	51%	11	0%	13	26%	13	41%	13	41%	8
Manufacturing	58%	8	60%	8	52%	8	55%	8	41%	8
Utilities	80%	1	88%	2	59%	4	81%	1	58%	1
Construction	44%	12	53%	12	36%	11	54%	10	31%	12
Wholesale/retail	53%	10	59%	9	42%	10	51%	11	34%	10
Hotels, rest., cater.	40%	13	54%	11	28%	12	43%	12	27%	13
Transport, comm.	57%	9	57%	10	49%	9	56%	7	46%	4
Finance	74%	3	90%	1	68%	1	78%	3	58%	2
Other comm.serv.	67%	6	67%	7	54%	6	66%	6	44%	7
Public sector	77%	2	86%	3	68%	2	78%	2	56%	3
Education	70%	5	74%	5	58%	5	69%	5	45%	5
Health care	72%	4	77%	4	60%	3	72%	4	45%	5
Other	63%	7	68%	6	53%	7	55%	8	33%	11
Total	62%		67%		52%		61%		42%	
N	9116		3143		4647		40245		5274	

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

Although countries differ significantly in the incidence of training provided by employers, large similarities can be observed in the ranking of industries. In all five countries the shares receiving employer-provided training are highest in utilities, finance, the public sector, and in health care (the latter except for Spain). Agriculture, hotels/restaurants/catering, construction and wholesale/retail consistently reveal the lowest shares.

The average numbers of employer-provided training days across industries and countries are presented in Table 5 (next page). Here the ranking of industries is somewhat less consistent. Again, finance and the public sector (though except Spain) are on top, but health care scores lower on training days than in Table 4 on training incidence, and in utilities the scores for Finland and Germany are quite mediocre. Yet, again construction, hotels/restaurants/catering and wholesale/retail show relatively low scores. The training gap of these three industries with others is widened by the combination of low training incidence and low amounts of training days. This time the ranking of agriculture varies across countries. Striking is the low ranking on number of training days of the education sector in Belgium, Germany and Spain.

**Table 5 Average number of employer-provided training days last year and ranking across industries, breakdown by country**

	Belgium		Finland		Germany		Netherlands		Spain	
Agriculture	3.3	11	0.0	13	4.0	3	3.7	12	6.6	3
Manufacturing	4.5	5	4.8	7	3.2	7	5.3	7	6.5	4
Utilities	8.7	1	3.9	10	3.2	7	8.8	3	10.4	1
Construction	3.0	13	3.1	12	1.9	12	4.1	10	4.8	11
Wholesale/retail	3.6	9	4.6	8	2.8	9	4.0	11	3.8	12
Hotels, rest., cater.	3.1	12	3.7	11	1.9	12	3.2	13	3.4	13
Transport, comm.	4.4	6	4.4	9	2.8	9	5.3	8	5.8	7
Finance	5.8	3	6.8	2	5.6	1	9.4	2	8.2	2
Other comm.serv.	5.3	4	5.0	5	3.6	5	6.2	4	6.3	5
Public sector	6.3	2	7.6	1	4.6	2	10.6	1	6.0	6
Education	3.5	10	5.0	5	2.6	11	6.1	5	5.5	9
Health care	3.8	7	5.4	3	3.8	4	5.6	6	5.3	10
Other	3.7	8	5.3	4	3.4	6	4.7	9	5.8	8
N	9116		3143		4647		40245		5274	
Mean number of days	4,5		5,1		3,3		5,7		5,9	
Standard deviation	8,7		9,8		7,1		11,4		12,9	

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

Table 6 provides a breakdown by industry as for the incidence of employees' self-paid training. Here, education ranks first in the four countries covered, followed by health care. The latter industry was also amongst the highest ranking in Table 5 concerning employer-provided training, but the other three forerunners, the public sector, finance and utilities, now show lower rankings, finance notably in Belgium and utilities even in Germany, the Netherlands and Spain. A simple trade-off between received and self-paid training courses does not seem to be at hand: industries with the lowest amounts of self-paid days are dispersed between countries, and on this issue no general pattern across industries emerges.

**Table 6 Shares of employees having at least one day of self-paid training last year and ranking across industries, breakdown by country**

	Belgium		Germany		Netherlands		Spain	
Agriculture	17%	9	21%	9	15%	9	43%	3
Manufacturing	16%	10	23%	7	13%	12	29%	10
Utilities	19%	5	19%	13	15%	9	25%	12
Construction	15%	11	30%	4	13%	12	30%	8
Wholesale/retail	14%	12	22%	8	15%	9	24%	13
Hotels, rest., cater.	18%	6	21%	9	18%	7	27%	11
Transport, comm.	17%	8	20%	12	16%	8	30%	8
Finance	14%	12	31%	3	21%	2	33%	7
Other comm.serv.	22%	3	28%	5	19%	4	35%	6
Public sector	18%	7	24%	6	19%	4	40%	5
Education	28%	1	40%	1	22%	1	48%	1
Health care	24%	2	34%	2	21%	2	42%	4
Other	20%	4	21%	9	19%	4	45%	2
Total	18%		26%		17%		33%	
N	8982		4572		38992		4504	

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

Table 7 shows again the high number of self-paid training days in Spain: in each industry these are two to three times higher than in the other three countries under study. The table also shows that the industry rankings according to numbers of self-paid training days vary widely across countries. Only education scores consistently high, but for example health care shows a more varied ranking than in Table 6.

**Table 7 Average number of self-paid training days last year and ranking across industries, breakdown by country**

	Belgium		Germany		Netherlands		Spain	
Agriculture	2,5	13	1,3	13	2,9	11	15,2	2
Manufacturing	3,2	10	4,0	8	2,6	12	10,2	9
Utilities	3,7	7	3,7	10	4,1	5	9,2	10
Construction	3,1	12	4,5	6	2,2	13	11,1	7
Wholesale/retail	3,3	9	4,3	7	3,4	9	7,5	13
Hotels, rest., cater.	3,8	6	3,6	11	3,8	8	8,0	12
Transport, comm.	4,1	5	3,5	12	3,1	10	8,5	11
Finance	3,2	10	6,0	1	4,8	1	10,9	8
Other comm.serv.	4,2	4	5,9	2	4,2	4	13,0	5
Public sector	4,4	3	4,9	5	4,3	3	12,5	6
Education	4,6	2	5,7	3	4,8	1	17,7	1
Health care	3,7	7	5,0	4	4,1	5	13,5	4
Other	4,7	1	3,8	9	4,1	5	14,5	3
N	8982		4572		38992		4504	
Mean number of days	3,7		4,6		3,6		11,5	
Standard deviation	12,1		13,3		12,0		20,5	

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

The combinations of the incidence and the amounts of self-paid days also vary considerably. A combination of low rankings on both yardsticks shows up for agriculture in Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands, for manufacturing in the Netherlands, for utilities in Germany and Spain, for construction in Belgium and the Netherlands, for wholesale/retail in Belgium and Spain, for hotels etcetera in Germany and Spain, and for transport/communication in Germany.

Table 8 shows the average opinions (on a 5-point scale) of employees whether training would be worthwhile, including the industry ranking.

**Table 8 Average opinion whether training would be worthwhile and ranking across industries, breakdown by country**

	Belgium		Finland		Germany		Netherlands		Spain	
Agriculture	2,7	9	5,0	1	3,7	1	2,4	12	3,8	2
Manufacturing	2,8	4	3,0	7	3,4	8	2,6	7	3,6	5
Utilities	2,8	4	3,8	2	3,4	8	2,7	1	3,9	1
Construction	2,7	9	3,0	7	3,3	11	2,6	7	3,6	5
Wholesale/retail	2,6	12	3,0	7	3,6	3	2,5	10	3,5	10
Hotels, rest., cater.	2,5	13	2,8	13	3,2	13	2,3	13	3,4	13
Transport, comm.	2,8	4	3,1	6	3,5	6	2,5	10	3,6	5
Finance	2,9	2	3,4	3	3,3	11	2,7	1	3,6	5
Other comm.services	3,0	1	3,2	5	3,5	6	2,7	1	3,8	2
Public sector	2,8	4	3,0	7	3,6	3	2,7	1	3,6	5
Education	2,7	9	3,0	7	3,6	3	2,7	1	3,5	10
Health care	2,8	4	3,3	4	3,7	1	2,7	1	3,8	2
Other	2,9	2	3,0	7	3,4	8	2,6	7	3,5	10
N	8841		3152				37826		5356	
Mean opinion	2,81		3,10		3,46		2,63		3,63	
Standard deviation	1,11		1,08				1,03		1,28	

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

These opinions were clearly most positive in Spain and Germany. Within countries they show only limited variations by industry: except for Finland, the differences between the highest and lowest scores are maximum 0.5%points. The rankings by industry show a dispersed pattern. On average, employees from other commercial services value training fairly high, and so do utility workers in four countries (except Germany) as well as agricultural workers in Finland and Germany. Workers in hotels/restaurants/catering everywhere judge training of least value, followed by those in wholesale/retail (except Germany). Construction workers from all five countries, too, value training rather low.

We checked whether opinions on training differed between the category of those who experienced training in the previous year and those who did not. Do workers value training more if they are more familiar with it? In Belgium, Finland and the Netherlands the average scores 'training would be worthwhile' of those with employer-provided training were slightly above those who did not get that training, in Spain they were equal. In Belgium, the Netherlands and Spain the opinions of those with self-paid training ranked also above those with no self-paid training (0.3, 0.2 and 0.2 points respectively). As could be expected, in these three countries those with self-paid training clearly showed on average the most positive opinions.

#### **4.3 A closer look at gender, age, educational levels, and contracts**

The *WageIndicator* data allows us to go more into detail on a series of other differences than those across industries. What about the division of training between men and women, younger and older workers, lower and higher educated, between employees on or without permanent employment contracts? We already noted in Section 2.3. that the fourth EWCS (2005) concluded that women received slightly more employer-provided training than their male colleagues, workers aged 25-39 more than youngsters and older workers, and higher educated much more than lower educated. As to compare these outcomes with ours based on the *WageIndicator* dataset, we broke up the average number of training days employees got by their employer during the previous year for a number of individual characteristics: see Table 9 (next page).

The gender differences show a less favourable picture for female workers than emerges from the EWCS 2005: in four out of five countries the employer-provided training incidence for women was lower than that for men. In Finland it was equal, and here too the average number of training days was slightly higher for women. The latter also held for Spain. In Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands the negative outcomes doubled.

Although we use a somewhat different age division, the *WageIndicator* outcomes concerning age broadly resemble those from the EWCS 2005: the youngest and the oldest categories received less training than those in between, measured by incidence as well as by length. Yet, the underlying country patterns varied. In Belgium and the Netherlands the 25-34 of age were best off, in Finland on the other hand those aging 45 and older, while in Germany and Spain the patterns concerning incidence and length differed: in Germany the incidence of employer-paid training grew with age while the number of training days fell, a pattern that, though less systematically, also showed up in Spain.

**Table 9 Shares of employer-provided training last year and average number of training days by gender, age, education, and employment contract, breakdown by country**

	Belgium		Finland		Germany		Netherlands		Spain	
<b>Gender</b>										
Male	65%	5,1	67%	5,0	55%	3,7	64%	6,2	46%	5,8
Female	59%	3,6	67%	5,3	49%	3,0	58%	5,1	37%	6,0
<b>Age</b>										
< 25 yr	59%	5,4	50%	3,0	43%	3,8	51%	6,1	34%	5,3
25-34 yr	65%	5,4	65%	5,0	53%	3,5	63%	6,1	40%	6,2
35-44 yr	63%	4,1	67%	5,2	54%	3,1	63%	5,6	47%	5,9
45-54 yr	60%	3,6	74%	6,3	52%	3,3	63%	5,2	44%	4,8
>=55 yr	57%	3,2	76%	5,2	51%	2,5	56%	4,2	50%	4,5
<b>Education</b>										
Low education	40%	2,7	58%	4,5	42%	2,9	47%	4,4	30%	3,7
Middle education	58%	4,2	70%	5,4	52%	3,5	60%	5,7	37%	4,8
High education	71%	5,1	79%	5,8	65%	3,8	71%	6,6	50%	7,3
<b>Contract</b>										
No permanent contract	52%	4,4	54%	3,5	40%	2,7	48%	4,8	33%	4,6
Permanent contract	63%	4,5	69%	5,4	54%	3,4	64%	6,0	45%	6,2

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

Most striking are our outcomes concerning educational levels. Fully in line with the EWCS outcomes, in all five countries the incidence and the number of employer-paid training days were clearly lowest for the lower educated, and highest for the high educated. On average both the incidence and the length of training for the high educated were over 1.5 times as large as those for the low educated.

The same kind of systematic differences, though not of this magnitude, can be seen when looking at employment contracts: in all five countries the workers on permanent contracts showed a higher incidence as well as more training days than their colleagues without such contracts.

In Table 10 we present the same information, be it for those with self-paid training.

**Table 10 Shares of self-paid training last year and average number of training days, by gender, age, education, and employment contract, breakdown by country**

	Belgium		Germany		Netherlands		Spain	
<b>Gender</b>								
Male	18%	3,2	23%	3,5	17%	2,9	32%	9,7
Female	18%	4,3	29%	5,7	17%	4,4	36%	13,8
<b>Age</b>								
< 25 yr	18%	4,7	22%	6,6	18%	4,9	27%	11,0
25-34 yr	20%	4,7	27%	5,9	17%	4,0	36%	13,2
35-44 yr	17%	3,3	24%	3,7	17%	3,4	31%	9,7
45-54 yr	18%	2,8	27%	3,1	17%	2,4	29%	8,2
>=55 yr	13%	1,3	29%	2,1	16%	1,7	36%	4,6
<b>Education</b>								
Low education	13%	3,2	21%	4,0	11%	2,2	20%	5,8
Middle education	18%	4,2	31%	6,7	17%	3,8	28%	9,8
High education	20%	3,5	27%	3,1	21%	4,1	43%	14,8
<b>Contract</b>								
No permanent contract	24%	7,0	28%	5,5	20%	5,0	38%	14,0
Permanent contract	18%	3,4	25%	4,5	17%	3,2	32%	10,6

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

As regards gender, the figures clarify that in all four countries female workers invest much more in self-paid training than males. Even if the incidence is the same (in Belgium and the Netherlands), women on average take substantially more self-paid training days than men.

As for age the parallels with the patterns in employer-paid training are quite strong. The incidence is highest among youngsters in the Netherlands and Belgium, while it grows more or less with age in Germany and Spain. In all four countries the length of self-paid training falls with age along the same pattern.

Considering educational levels, the same mechanisms seem at hand as regards employer-paid training, but not fully. Everywhere the incidence of self-paid training is higher among the high educated than among the low educated, but in Germany the score for the middle educated is highest. In Belgium and Germany the length of training is highest among the middle educated too, while the Netherlands and Spain show more training days with more education.

As regards employment contract our results are quite remarkable. Those without a permanent contract consistently display a higher incidence of self-paid training as well as a higher number of days of this kind of training than those with a permanent contract. Obviously the first group tends to invest more in training by themselves.

Besides the supply of facilities or possibilities to use continuous training, a decisive factor for the incidence and length of training may well be the value workers attach to training. Like Table 8, Table 11 shows the average opinions on whether training would be worthwhile, based on a 5-points scale, but broken down for personal characteristics.

**Table 11 Average opinion on whether training would be worthwhile, breakdown by gender, age, education level, and employment contract, breakdown by country**

	Belgium	Finland	Germany	Netherlands	Spain	UK
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	2,9	3,1	3,5	2,7	3,7	3,1
Female	2,7	3,1	3,4	2,6	3,6	3,1
<b>Age</b>						
< 25 yr	2,7	2,7	3,7	2,5	3,5	3,0
25-34 yr	2,9	3,1	3,4	2,7	3,7	3,0
35-44 yr	2,8	3,2	3,5	2,6	3,7	3,2
45-54 yr	2,7	3,2	3,5	2,6	3,6	3,1
>=55 yr	2,7	3,1	3,5	2,3	3,0	2,8
<b>Education</b>						
Low education	2,7	3,1	3,5	2,4	3,6	3,0
Middle education	2,7	3,1	3,5	2,6	3,7	3,1
High	2,9	3,1	3,4	2,7	3,6	3,1
<b>Contract</b>						
No permanent contract	2,8	3,0	3,5	2,7	3,6	3,1
Permanent contract	2,8	3,1	3,5	2,6	3,6	3,1

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

Note: Opinions run from 1=never, .. , 5=daily

A comparison of Table 11 with Tables 9 and 10 learns that the large variations in incidence and length of training, both employer-provided and self-paid, only very partly seem to be linked with variations in opinions concerning training. Table 11 reveals small differences in attitudes between men and women. In some occasions, like for educational level, variations in opinions are even opposed to the direction of variations in the actual use of training.

#### 4.4 The relation between provided and self-paid training

We now turn to the issue of the relation between employer-provided and self-paid training. Table 12 shows that in the four countries for which comparisons are possible, 20-50% of the respondents received training provided by the employer during the previous year; 6-17% paid their training themselves, and 12-16% both received training from the employer and realised self-paid training. A quite significant outcome is that in all countries the workers with self-paid training are more often female, on average younger, less educated and have less often a permanent contract than both the category with training received from the employer and the category with a mix of employer-provided and self-paid training. Notably in Spain the differences with the other categories are large (except for education). Another striking finding is that workers not receiving any training are on average substantially lower educated than the other three categories. As for age, no clear picture emerges, except for Belgium, where the category not receiving training is comparatively old.

**Table 12** Distribution of respondents over training categories, by gender, age, education level, and employment contract, breakdown by country

	Distribution	% female	Mean age	Mean education level (1=low, .., 3=high)	% with permanent employment contract
<b>Belgium</b>					
No training	32%	46%	38.3	2,2	92%
Training received from empl last year	50%	40%	37.3	2,5	95%
Training self-paid last year	6%	46%	36.7	2,3	89%
Training received plus self-paid	12%	40%	36.7	2,6	92%
Total	100%	42%	37.5	2,4	93%
<b>Germany</b>					
No training	36%	52%	36.1	1,6	82%
Training received from empl last year	38%	44%	36.3	1,9	90%
Training self-paid last year	12%	57%	35.9	1,8	82%
Training received plus self-paid	14%	54%	36.5	1,9	87%
Total	100%	50%	36.2	1,8	86%
<b>Netherlands</b>					
No training	34%	49%	35.5	1,9	75%
Training received from empl last year	49%	43%	36.0	2,2	86%
Training self-paid last year	5%	54%	34.1	2,2	67%
Training received plus self-paid	12%	42%	36.1	2,3	83%
Total	100%	46%	35.7	2,1	81%
<b>Spain</b>					
No training	47%	46%	33.9	2,1	74%
Training received from empl last year	20%	33%	34.5	2,4	82%
Training self-paid last year	17%	51%	32.4	2,4	65%
Training received plus self-paid	16%	41%	34.6	2,6	78%
Total	100%	43%	33.9	2,3	75%

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

#### 4.5 Some conclusions

Bargaining for better training facilities and provisions in Europe will have to be differentiated according to countries, industries, personal characteristics of workers,

and workers' use of training facilities. Notably construction and hotels/restaurants/catering show up as industries with low rates of training. We did not find a simple trade-off between employer-provided and self-paid training. In the four countries for which comparisons are possible, 20-50% of the respondents received training from the employer during the previous year; 6-17% paid their training themselves, and 12-16% both received training from the employer and realised self-paid training. In all countries the workers with self-paid training are more often female, on average younger, less educated and have less often a permanent contract than both the category with training received from the employer and the category with a mix of employer-provided and self-paid training. In self-paid training the combination of the incidence and the amount of self-paid days varies widely. A combination of low rankings shows up for agriculture in Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands, for manufacturing in the Netherlands, for utilities in Germany and Spain, for construction in Belgium and the Netherlands, for wholesale/retail in Belgium and Spain, for hotels etcetera in Germany and Spain, and for transport/communication in Germany. Those who receive employer-paid training are not by definition more positive about the value of training. In Belgium, Finland and the Netherlands the average scores 'training would be worthwhile' of those with employer-provided training were slightly above those who did not get that training, in Spain they were equal. In Belgium, the Netherlands and Spain the values attached by those with self-paid training were also above those of their colleagues with no self-paid training (0.3, 0.2 and 0.2%pts respectively). As could be expected, in these three countries those with self-paid training clearly showed on average the most positive opinions.

## References

- Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (2005a) *Report on the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Community programme for employment and social solidarity* A6-0199/2005
- Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (2005b) *Report on the proposal for a Council decision on guidelines for the employment policies of the Member States* A6-1049/2005
- Copenhagen Declaration on enhanced cooperation in European vocational education and training*, 2001
- Council of the European Union (2001) *Report from the Education Council to the European Council, The concrete future objectives of education and training systems*. Brussels, 14 February
- ETUC (2005) *The coordination of collective bargaining in 2006, Resolution adopted by the ETUC Executive Committee in their meeting held in Brussels on 5-6 December 2005*
- ETUC (2006) *The coordination of collective bargaining in 2007, Resolution adopted by the ETUC Executive Committee in their meeting held in Brussels on 7-8 December 2006*
- ETUC (2007) *Mobility on the labour market and lifelong learning* (<http://www.trade-unions.org/a/3707>)
- European Commission (2001) *Communication from the Commission – Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality*. COM (2001)678 final.
- European Commission (2003) *Communication from the Commission - "Education and Training 2010": The success of the Lisbon Strategy hinges on urgent reforms (Draft joint interim report on the implementation of the detailed work programme on the follow-up of the objectives of education and training systems in Europe)*. COM (2003)685 final

- European Social partners (2006) *Work Programme of the European Social partners 2006-2008*
- Eurostat (2002) *Continuing Vocational Training Survey*  
([http://epp.eurostat.cec.eu.int/cache/ITY\\_OFFPUB/KS-BP-02-007/EN/KS-BP-02-007-EN.PDF](http://epp.eurostat.cec.eu.int/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-BP-02-007/EN/KS-BP-02-007-EN.PDF))
- Heyes, J. (2007) Training, Social Dialogue and Collective Bargaining in Western Europe, *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 28(2), 239-258
- Keune, M. (2005) *The Coordination of Collective Bargaining in Europe, Annual Report 2005*. Brussels: ETUC
- Parent-Thirion, A., E. Fernandez Macias, J. Hurley, G. Vermeylen (2007) *Fourth European Working Conditions Survey*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions
- The Cologne Institute for Economic Research (2005) *Fifth survey on continuous training*. Cologne
- Vogel, S. (2006) *Impact of collective agreements on continuous training*. Dublin: European Foundation (EIRO, no. 5)  
(<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2006/05/articles/de0605029i.html>)
- Webster, J. et al (2001) *Innovations in Information Society Sectors – Implications for Women's Work, Expertise and Opportunities in European Workplaces (SERVEEMPLOI). Final Report*. Dublin etc.  
(<http://www.union-network.org/UNIsite/Regions/Europa/Servemploi.html>)

## Appendix

**Table 13 The determinants of employer-provided training, 2004-2006**

	B	S.E.	Sig.	Exp(B)
<b>BELGIUM</b>	-			
Reference: public sector, health care, education	-		0,00	
Agricult, manufacturing, building	-0,97	0,05	0,00	0,38
Trade, transport, hospitality	-1,00	0,05	0,00	0,37
Commercial services	-0,38	0,05	0,00	0,68
Gender (1=female, 0=male)	-0,35	0,03	0,00	0,70
Age	-0,01	0,00	0,00	0,99
Firm size	0,15	0,01	0,00	1,17
Permanent contract (1=yes, 0=no)	0,60	0,07	0,00	1,83
Constant	0,52	0,10	0,00	1,69
Chi-square	1272,75	df (7)	0,00	
Included in Analysis	17428			
Missing Cases	1062			
<b>FINLAND</b>	-			
Reference: public sector, health care, education	-		0,00	
Agricult, manufacturing, building	-1,31	0,14	0,00	0,27
Trade, transport, hospitality	-1,01	0,14	0,00	0,36
Commercial services	-0,56	0,13	0,00	0,57
Gender (1=female, 0=male)	-0,02	0,09	0,85	0,98
Age	0,01	0,00	0,00	1,01
Firm size	0,21	0,02	0,00	1,23
Permanent contract (1=yes, 0=no)	0,60	0,12	0,00	1,83
Constant	-0,18	0,22	0,43	0,84
Chi-square	288,78	df (7)	0,00	
Included in Analysis	3131			
Missing Cases	11740			
<b>GERMANY</b>	-			
Reference: public sector, health care, education	-		0,00	
Agricult, manufacturing, building	-0,74	0,09	0,00	0,48
Trade, transport, hospitality	-0,92	0,11	0,00	0,40
Commercial services	-0,27	0,10	0,01	0,77
Gender (1=female, 0=male)	-0,26	0,06	0,00	0,77
Age	0,00	0,00	0,44	1,00
Firm size	0,17	0,01	0,00	1,19
Permanent contract (1=yes, 0=no)	0,62	0,09	0,00	1,85
Constant	-0,53	0,17	0,00	0,59
Chi-square	427,42	df (7)	0,00	
Included in Analysis	4647			
Missing Cases	68453			

**Table 13 Determinants of employer-provided training, 2004-2006 (cont'd)**

<b>NETHERLANDS</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Sig</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
Reference: public sector, health care, education	-		0,00	
Agricult, manufacturing, building	-0,88	0,02	0,00	0,41
Trade, transport, hospitality	-0,86	0,02	0,00	0,42
Commercial services	-0,27	0,02	0,00	0,76
Gender (1=female, 0=male)	-0,46	0,02	0,00	0,63
Age	-0,01	0,00	0,00	0,99
Firm size	0,16	0,00	0,00	1,17
Permanent contract (1=yes, 0=no)	0,65	0,02	0,00	1,92
Constant	0,31	0,04	0,00	1,36
Chi-square	7194,13	df (7)	0,00	
Included in Analysis	77822			
Missing Cases	8918			
<b>SPAIN</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Sig</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
Reference: public sector, health care, education	-		0,00	
Agricult, manufacturing, building	-0,43	0,06	0,00	0,65
Trade, transport, hospitality	-0,39	0,06	0,00	0,68
Commercial services	-0,20	0,06	0,00	0,82
Gender (1=female, 0=male)	-0,21	0,04	0,00	0,81
Age	0,00	0,00	0,09	1,00
Firm size	0,15	0,01	0,00	1,16
Permanent contract (1=yes, 0=no)	0,44	0,05	0,00	1,56
Constant	-0,90	0,11	0,00	0,40
Chi-square	635,51	df (7)		
Included in Analysis	12066			
Missing Cases	1717			

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

Note: For these analyses the full dataset was used. This explains f.e. the large number of missing cases in Germany, due to the fact that the question is only asked in release 8 and 9.