

Barrett, Alan; McGuinness, Séamus; O'Brien, Martin; O'Connell, Philip

**Working Paper**

## Immigrants and Employer-provided training

ESRI Working Paper, No. 313

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

The Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI), Dublin

*Suggested Citation:* Barrett, Alan; McGuinness, Séamus; O'Brien, Martin; O'Connell, Philip (2009) : Immigrants and Employer-provided training, ESRI Working Paper, No. 313, The Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI), Dublin

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/50074>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



## Immigrants and Employer-provided Training

**Alan Barrett<sup>1</sup>, Séamus McGuinness, Martin O'Brien  
and Philip O'Connell**

*Abstract:* Much has been written about the labour market outcomes for immigrants in their host countries, particularly with regard to earnings, employment and occupational attainment. However, much less attention has been paid to the question of whether immigrants are as likely to receive employer-provided training relative to comparable natives. As such training should be crucial in determining the labour market success of immigrants in the long run it is a critically important question. Using data from a large scale survey of employees in Ireland, we find that immigrants are less likely to receive training from employers, with immigrants from the New Member States of the EU experiencing a particular disadvantage. The immigrant training disadvantage arises in part from a failure on the part of immigrants to get employed by training-oriented firms. However, they also experience a training disadvantage relative to natives within firms where less training is provided.

*Corresponding Author:* Alan.Barrett@esri.ie

*Keywords:* Immigrants; employer-provided training; Ireland

*JEL classification:* J24; J6

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to acknowledge the funding provided by the Irish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences under the Government of Ireland Thematic Research Project Grants Scheme.

# **Immigrants and Employer-provided Training**

## *Section 1: Introduction*

Much has been written about the labour market outcomes of immigrants across countries and over time. Studies often find that immigrants experience labour market disadvantages relative to natives soon after arrival in their host countries (Chiswick, 1978). Such disadvantages are seen through lower wages or higher unemployment propensities for immigrants, usually controlling for relevant labour-market characteristics of individuals. Some studies show reductions in the relative disadvantage of immigrants as they spend longer in their host countries (Chiswick, Lee and Miller, 2005). Other studies show persistence in disadvantages (Borjas, 1985).

Other aspects of the experience of immigrants in their host country labour markets have generally received less attention. In this paper, we aim to contribute to addressing this by conducting an analysis of the extent to which immigrants receive employer-provided training, relative to comparable natives. Given the importance of such training in facilitating immigrants to fully integrate into host country labour markets, any findings of lower access to training for immigrants would have important implications. For example, it could be that a persistence of any initial earnings disadvantage for immigrants could be related in part to a failure to benefit from employer-provided training.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we provide a brief overview of the literature on the question of which employees are more likely to receive employer-provided training. We will also provide details of the limited work on immigrants and training. In Section 3, we present details of the data that we use to analyse our core question, namely, are immigrants more or less likely to receive employer-provided training. In Section 4, we present our results. As will be seen, we do find evidence of a lower incidence of training among immigrants, with interesting patterns emerging across different groups of immigrants. Section 5 contains our conclusions.

## *Section 2: Literature*

O’Connell and Jungblut (2008) in their review of the international literature, argue that participation in training at work is highly stratified. Those with higher skills or educational attainment are more likely to participate in training, including employer-provided training. Larger firms and those that pay higher wages are also more likely to train their employees. Part-time workers, those on temporary contracts and older workers are less likely to receive training. O’Connell and Jungblut thus argue that those with the greatest need for training tend to receive less of it, presumably to their long-run disadvantage.

The dominant theoretical framework informing most research on training has been the human capital approach. This approach, deriving from Becker (1975), assumes that individual workers undertake training, and employers invest in training, on the basis of their estimates of future returns (including employment prospects, wages and productivity gains). The human capital approach emphasises the distinction between “general” training – of use to both current and future employers – and “specific” training, linked closely to the current job and of use only to the current employer. In this approach it is expected that employers will not pay for general training, because they cannot recoup the cost – other employers would be free to “poach” trained employees and reap the benefits of enhanced productivity. If, as a result of this market failure, employees have to pay the full cost of general training – whether directly or through reduced wages – it is likely that there will be under-investment in training.

However, empirical evidence tends not to support this hypothesis. The empirical literature has found that the theoretical distinction is difficult to operationalise and that many employers pay for *both* general and specific training. O’Connell and Jungblut (2008) summarise findings from Germany, Ireland, Sweden, the UK and the US that show that the vast majority of job-related training appears to be employer paid, at least partially. A growing stream of work challenges the human capital approach, focussing in particular on its key assumption that labour markets are perfectly competitive. If markets were perfectly competitive, workers with training would be more likely to move, and all workers would be treated similarly. One stream of work points to the importance of institutions – such as unions and labour

market regulation (e.g. Acemoglu and Pischke, 1999). Booth, Francesconi and Zoega (2003) show that unions can have a positive or negative impact on training depending on union strategy and the manner in which unions negotiate on training and wages.

For most workers in advanced industrial societies the employment contract entails an ongoing and relatively long-term relationship that may differ in important respects from the competitive labour market assumed in the Becker model (Barrett and O'Connell, 2001). This turns our attention to the demand side of the labour market and to the social organisation of work. The segmented labour market approach focuses more on the characteristics of jobs rather than individuals and argues that different labour market sectors impose structural limitations both on the returns to education and experience and on the career prospects of workers (Doeringer and Piore, 1971; Gordon, Edwards and Reich, 1982). At their simplest, labour market segments can be dichotomised, with the primary market consisting of well paid and secure employment as opposed to jobs in the secondary market which are poorly paid and are of a precarious nature with few or no prospects for upward mobility. From this perspective, workers in the secondary labour market are less likely to participate in job-related training, and the returns to such training are lower. Workers in the primary segment(s) are more likely to receive training, the returns are higher, and such training is likely to be associated with upward mobility, perhaps in an internal labour market.

We now turn to the literature that looks specifically at immigrants and their receipt of training relative to natives. We should firstly ask what theory will predict on the issue but in truth theory can point in either direction. As the human capital model views the issue of training in the context of the costs and benefits to both employees and employers, this allows us to identify some critical issues. For example, if immigrants see their stay in the host country as being temporary, they will be less inclined to invest in training which is specific in nature as the pay-off period will be restricted. Similarly, if employers believe that immigrant workers are more likely to leave, they will be less inclined to provide training. Alternatively, if training allows immigrants to acquire location-specific human capital that they are lacking, then the pay-off can be high.

If we are thinking in terms of segmented labour market theories (Doeringer and Piore, 1971), then predictions become more clear-cut. Under this theory, secondary labour markets are characterised by jobs which offer lower wages, fewer fringe benefits and poorer working conditions, including a lower incidence of training. If such secondary markets exist and if immigrants are more heavily concentrated in them, then immigrants will be less likely to be in receipt of training.

The empirical literature on the question of the relative receipt of employer-provided training across immigrants and natives is thin, but three papers from Australia (Miller, 1994; Kennedy et al, 1994; Van den Heuvel and Wooden, 1997) point firmly in the direction of immigrants being less likely to receive training. This is especially true for immigrant groups with different linguistic backgrounds to the native population. Taking Van den Heuvel and Wooden (1997) as an example, they explore the issue using Australian data from 1993. By estimating logit regressions of training receipt, they show how immigrants in Australia from non-English speaking countries have lower incidences of training and that the gap relative to natives is more pronounced among immigrants from these countries who also report having weak English language skills.

Hum and Simpson (2003) look at the issue in Canada and also find a lower incidence of training among immigrants relative to natives. They go on to explore how training receipt among immigrants differs according to age at arrival in Canada. They show that training decreases with age of arrival and note that this is consistent with the argument that human capital acquired in the home country has a reduced value in the host country. Shields and Wheatley-Price (1999a and 1999b) look at differences by ethnic group, as opposed to immigrants, in the UK. They show that members of ethnic minorities are less likely to receive training, on average. One third of the difference can be explained by the characteristics of the individuals (in the case of men) but the remaining two-thirds cannot be explained by characteristics.

### *Section 3: The Data*

The data used in this study comes from Ireland's National Employment Survey (NES) from March 2006. The 2006 NES is a workplace survey, covering both the public and private sectors, which was conducted by Ireland's official statistical office, Central Statistics Office (CSO)<sup>2</sup>. The information contained in the NES was collected from a matched employee-employer survey. The employer sample was drawn using the CSO Central Business Register (CBR). Selected firms were asked to draw a systematic sample of employees from their payroll. Approximately 8,000 enterprises<sup>3</sup> were contacted of which 4,845 responded resulting in employee information on 67,766 individuals. After the elimination of employees with information missing on some variables, part-time students and also the restriction of our sample to those of standard working age, the final sample for this study was just over 50,000 employees. When analysing the employee sample, cross-sectional weights were applied to ensure that the data was representative of the general population of employees in employment.

The employer questionnaire collected some limited information on firm size and sector that was incorporated into our models. Employees were issued with a separate survey within which they were asked to provide information on their age, gender, educational attainment, employment status (part-time or full-time), length of time in paid employment and also other job-related characteristics (for example, trade union membership, supervisory role, tenure with current employer).

Employees were also asked whether or not they had received employer-provided training during the course of the preceding year, 2005. They were asked a broad question about whether or not they had participated in any "company or company sponsored training courses in 2005". They were also asked a more detailed question about types of training, such as training through participation in quality circles, job rotation etc. If an individual responded positively to any of the questions about participation in company training, we coded that person as having received

---

<sup>2</sup> While the NES survey was of enterprises with 3 plus employees, the results were calibrated to the Quarterly National Household Survey (QNHS) employment data for employees (excluding agriculture, forestry and fishing), which covers all employees.

<sup>3</sup> Only employers with more than three employees were surveyed and the data were collected at the enterprise level.

employer-provided training. This is used as a binary dependent variable in the analysis below.

In terms of migration, each individual's country of origin was coded in a very detailed way that allowed us to separate out migrants into UK, Pre-accession EU (other than UK), New Member States of the EU (hereafter referred to as NMS)<sup>4</sup>, non-EU/English speaking and non-EU/non English speaking. The fact that the survey was conducted in March 2006 but that the training questions related to the year 2005 generated a concern that many immigrants would not have received training because they were very recent arrivals. In order to account for this, we excluded people who had entered zero in their response to the question on tenure and so we are only looking at individuals, both natives and migrants, with at least one year of tenure with their current employer. This restriction also has the advantage of removing any confusion surrounding individuals who changed jobs in early 2006 and who have answered the questions on training in 2005 with reference to their new employer.

#### *Section 4: Results*

In Table 1, we present some descriptive statistics showing how the incidence of participation in employer-provided training varies across groups. Of our sample of 50,154 individuals, almost 60 percent report participation in employer-provided training in 2005. There is essentially no difference in the incidence by gender. However, the likelihood of receiving increases by level of education. It is also the case that the incidence of training is higher among fulltime employees relative to parttime employees, among members of professional bodies relative to non-members and among union members relative to non-union. The incidence of training is also higher in the public sector relative to the private sector.

According to the raw data, immigrants are less likely to be in receipt of training relative to natives although the difference is not large. However, there is obviously a need to look at this issue in a multivariate context so that we can distil whether or not this small difference persists when controlling for other characteristics. We know

---

<sup>4</sup> This refers to the 10 countries which joined the EU on 1May 2004. Citizens of these countries had full access to Ireland's labour market from the date of accession.



from a series of papers that immigrants in Ireland are generally a highly educated group (see, for example, Barrett et al, 2006). For this reason, we might have expected them to have a higher incidence of training. In addition, we also know that immigrants from different regions have very different labour market experiences (Barrett and McCarthy, 2007). Hence, when undertaking multivariate analyses, we need to look across different immigrant groups as well as looking at immigrants as a whole.

In Table 2, we report the results from probit regressions in which the dependent variable is equal to one in the individuals reports that they received some form of training in 2005 and zero if not. Before looking at the immigrant coefficients, we will briefly consider the other coefficients to see if the models are producing results that are generally consistent with what would be expected.

Looking at Model 1 in Table 2, we can see that the pattern of results is essentially what would be expected based on the existing literature. Tenure and experience have a negative impact on training receipt; this is consistent with a human capital view which would see reduced pay-off periods as lowering the potential value of additional training. Full-time employees, members of professional bodies and union members are all shown to have a greater likelihood of receiving training. Similarly, employees in larger companies are also more likely to receive training.

Turning to the coefficient on the immigrant dummy, we see that it is negative and significant. In terms of a marginal impact, immigrants are 3 percent less likely to receive employer-provided training. While this result is interesting to a degree, earlier research on immigrants in Ireland has shown that the labour markets outcomes for different immigrant groups vary considerably<sup>5</sup>. For this reason, it is important to look separately at the different groups and we do this in Model 2. Once we do this we see the different outcomes emerging. The only coefficient that is significant across the five immigrant categories is that of the NMS countries. In addition, the marginal impact for this group, at 13 percent, is substantially higher than that estimated of immigrants as a whole. Of the other groups of immigrants, only those from non-EU/non-English-speaking countries appear to experience a lower incidence of

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, see Barrett and McCarthy (2007) and Barrett et al (2008) on earnings and Barrett and Duffy (2008) on occupational attainment.

employer-provided training relative to native workers. In Model 3, we add controls for occupation and sector to explore the possibility that our observations arise from a concentration of NMS immigrants in low-training occupations and sectors. While both the estimated coefficient and marginal impact for NMS immigrants fall when these controls are added, we are still observing a significant gap between natives and NMS immigrants in terms of receipt of employer-provided training. In the case of immigrants from non-EU/non-English speaking countries, the estimated coefficient is no longer significant in Model 3.

Barrett et al (2008) demonstrate that observed wage impacts adjust significantly when account is taken of sample selection bias. Thus it seems, at least in respect to wages, some immigrant groupings are not randomly distributed in terms of their personal characteristics and, when account is taken of this, the observed immigrant wage penalty increases significantly. In the same vein, if it proves to be the case that immigrants possess characteristics that result in higher ex ante training probabilities, then failure to adjust for these influences will lead to some under-estimation of the immigrant training disadvantage.

Here, we account for selection effects by estimating matching models whereby the principal characteristics of immigrants are initially identified through a probit model. Immigrants are then matched on the basis of their predicted probabilities, or propensity scores, with natives holding similar characteristics and the training incidences of the two groups are then compared. In terms of the matching technique adopted, we apply Nearest Neighbour with replacement.

With respect to their dominant characteristics, immigrants were found to possess lower levels of tenure and labour market experience, more likely to hold post-secondary or post-graduate qualifications and were less likely to work in the public sector or be members of professional bodies or trade unions. Post matching analysis revealed that we were able to successfully match natives and immigrants on all key characteristics<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Results available from the authors.

The estimates generated by the matching process are presented in Table 3. While some differences are apparent, most notably, no significant impact was found for non-EU / non-English speaking migrants. Generally speaking the results align well with those in Table 3 suggesting that selection bias is not an important factor in this regard.

Barrett et al (2008) have shown how the wage disadvantage experienced by immigrants from the NMS countries in Ireland is not uniform across educational categories or across occupations. Instead, no disadvantage is present for immigrants with low levels of skills, as indicated by occupations and education levels, and is highest for those with higher levels of skill. Given this, it is of interest to explore whether the disadvantage in training for immigrants is similarly correlated with education and occupation.

In Table 4, we present the coefficients on immigrant dummy variables from regressions run within educational categories. The models are equivalent to Model 3 of Table 2, although with the education categories dropped. As can be seen, the training disadvantage is quite concentrated when viewed in this way, both in terms of nationalities and in terms of educational groups. Of the 25 nationality/education cells in Table 4, only three contain significant coefficients. Two of these relate to NMS immigrants. It appears that the training disadvantage is not present at either the lower and or highest ends of the education distribution but instead is concentrated around immigrants with post-secondary educations and primary degrees.

In Table 5, we present the coefficients from the analysis conducted within occupations. As with the education-base regressions, the training disadvantage is again seen to be concentrated. Looking specifically at NMS immigrants, we see how the disadvantage arises generally at towards the upper end of the occupational distribution, although not at the very top. This mirrors the results from the education analysis. However, there is also a clear training disadvantage for this group at the lowest end of the occupational ladder. We know from previous research (Barrett and Duffy, 2008) that NMS immigrants are often well educated but in low skill jobs. This pattern may explain the apparent discrepancy between the Tables 4 and 5, if NMS immigrants with post-secondary qualifications, for example, are working in elementary occupations.

We expand the analysis further in Tables 6, 7 and 8. In Table 6, Model 1, we include two sets of interactions between (a) the immigrant dummy variables and firm size and (b) the immigrant dummy variables and whether the immigrant is a union member. Before looking at the coefficients on the interactions, it should be noted that their inclusion has an impact on a number of the immigrant dummy coefficients. In Table 2 Model 3, only the immigrants from the NMS were found to experience a training disadvantage. However, in Table 6 Model 1, we now see that immigrants from the EU-13 and from non-EU-English-speaking countries also experience the disadvantage. In the case of both, we find significant interaction effects. Immigrants from both categories who work in large firms have higher likelihoods of receiving training relative to the base. It is possible that this positive effect arises from US and EU-13 nationals working in multinationals in Ireland. In contrast, there appears to be a penalty to union membership for these immigrants. In the case of the NMS immigrants, the inclusion of the interactions has no effect on the immigrant dummy coefficient and neither of the interaction terms is significant.

In model 2 and 3 of Table 6, we introduce a union-density variable which is a dummy variable equal to one if 50 percent or more of the employees in the firm are union members and zero otherwise. The inclusion of this variable is intended to capture the possible effect that a strong union presence in a firm might have on training provision generally and on immigrants in particular. As can be seen, the inclusion of this variable has little impact. The one exception to this is with regard to the interaction between immigrants from non-EU/non-English countries and the union density variable. This interaction term suggests a large and negative effect. One possible explanation would be the fact that the health service is both heavily unionised and a large employer of nationalities such as Filipinos (nurses) and Indians (doctors)<sup>7</sup>.

As a final extension of the analysis, we address the following questions: to what extent are immigrants less likely to be employed in training intensive firms and, secondly, are immigrants employed in training intensive firms less likely to receive employer-provided training than natives? We define a training intensive firm as one

---

<sup>7</sup> We should note that while these may be non-English speaking countries, the immigrants from them may well be good English speakers.

where 50 per cent or more employees received training in 2005. We then regress worker characteristics on this variable in order to identify those factors that most heavily influence an individual's likelihood of being employed in a training intensive firm, the results are presented in table 7. The models are well specified and indicate that an individual's probability of being employed in a training intensive firm increases with education with the results suggest that training intensive firms tend to be larger and have lower levels of trade-union density. Critically our models indicates that immigrants are indeed less likely to be employed in training intensive organisations with the disadvantage specific to immigrants from new member states and non-EU non English speaking countries.

In order to test the second hypothesis, we divide our sample of employees into two groups; those working training intensive firms and the rest. We then rerun the probit training regressions within each group. The results are shown in Table 8, with only the immigrant dummy coefficients presented. A number of striking results emerge. First, there is no training disadvantage for immigrants relative to natives if they are employed in training intensive firms. Indeed, in the case of immigrants from non-EU/English speaking countries there is actually a greater likelihood of training. In contrast, the training disadvantage of immigrants is apparent in the firms that are less intensive trainers. As with earlier tables, we see again the disadvantage experienced by immigrants from both the EU-13 and the NMS. However, these groups are now joined by immigrants from the UK.

### *Section 5: Conclusions*

A number of findings have emerged from our analysis of the relative likelihood of immigrants and natives receiving employer-provided training. Our baseline analysis (Table 2, Model 3) showed that only immigrants from the EU's New Member States suffered a training disadvantage. These results were robust to the influences of selection bias. Within this NMS group, the training disadvantage was experienced only by those with post secondary education and primary degrees. The inclusion of interactions terms between the immigrant dummy variables and the variables union membership, union density and firm size had essentially no impact on the NMS immigrant coefficient. However, when we divided the sample into employees and

training intensive and non-intensive firms, not only were immigrants from NMS less likely to be employed in a training intensive firms, a further training disadvantage was experienced by this group employed in non-training intensive firms.

For other immigrants, a more mixed picture emerges with training disadvantages arising for very specific sub-groups. For example, immigrants from non-EU/English speaking countries working as process, plant and machine operatives were shown to be 26 percent less likely to receive training when compared to natives in the same occupations. Immigrants from the EU-13 were found to be 32 percent less likely to receive training relative to natives, once interactions were controlled for which picked up the effect of EU-13 immigrant working in large firms.

At one level, these results point to a labour market disadvantage facing immigrants from the NMS in particular. When combined with earlier findings on their lower levels of earnings and poorer occupational attainment, the findings here add to a set of poor labour market outcomes. But on a broader level, the findings also point to a diversity of experience both within the NMS immigrants and across other immigrant groups. Such diversity of outcomes is likely to be related in turn to a diversity of processes. In some cases, the lower rate of receipt of employer provided training may result from decisions on the part of immigrants while in other cases, the decisions of employers may be the key determinant. Clearly, much more needs to be done to gain a deeper understanding of the labour market outcomes of immigrants beyond the well-researched areas of earnings and occupational attainment.

## Tables

**Table 1: Raw Probabilities**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>% (Broad) Training</b>	<b>Mean if Train</b>	<b>Mean if No Train</b>
TOTAL	50154	59.5		
Male	26114	59.8		
Female	24040	59.2		
<i>Highest Level of Educational Attainment</i>				
Primary	3745	36.4		
Secondary	17977	47.4		
Post-Secondary	5320	52.4		
Tertiary	18066	73.0		
Postgrad	5046	79.2		
Earnings per hour (€)			22.19	16.09
	SD		17.51	10.66
	N		29588	20049
Tenure (years)			9.88	9.39
			9.54	9.15
Experience (years)			15.91	16.14
			11.22	11.89
Full-time	43598	62.0		
Part-time	6556	43.2		
Professional body membership	7934	85.9		
No professional body membership	42220	54.6		
Union membership	16636	68.9		
No union membership	33518	54.9		
Public sector	12349	74.7		
Private sector	37805	54.6		
Immigrant	4261	56.9		
Native	45893	59.8		

**Table 2: Probit regressions, dependant variable: “broad” training**

	<i>Model 1</i>		<i>Model 2</i>		<i>Model 3</i>	
	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>
Constant	-1.03*** 0.03		-1.02*** 0.03		-0.34*** 0.09	
Immigrant:	-0.11*** 0.02	-0.03				
UK			-0.02 0.04	-0.01	-0.01 0.04	-0.01
EU13			-0.07 0.05	-0.03	-0.08 0.06	-0.03
NMS			-0.33*** 0.05	-0.13	-0.23*** 0.05	-0.09
Non-EU/English Speaking			0.09 0.08	0.03	0.06 0.08	0.02
Non-EU/Non- English Speaking			-0.12*** 0.04	-0.05	-0.04 0.05	-0.02
Tenure	-0.01*** 0.00	-0.00	-0.01*** 0.00	-0.00	-0.01 0.00	-0.01
Supervisor	0.48*** 0.01	0.17	0.48*** 0.01	0.17	0.44*** 0.02	0.16
Secondary*	0.21*** 0.03	0.08	0.21*** 0.03	0.08	0.16*** 0.03	0.06
Postsec*	0.32*** 0.03	0.11	0.32*** 0.03	0.11	0.27*** 0.03	0.10
Tertiary*	0.61*** 0.03	0.22	0.61*** 0.03	0.22	0.44*** 0.03	0.16
Postgrad*	0.70*** 0.03	0.23	0.70*** 0.03	0.23	0.49*** 0.03	0.17
Experience	-0.01*** 0.00	-0.00	-0.01*** 0.00	-0.00	-0.01*** 0.00	-0.00
Experience Sq	0.00** 0.00	0.00	0.00** 0.00	0.00	0.00*** 0.00	0.00
Full Time	0.26*** 0.02	0.10	0.26*** 0.02	0.10	0.23*** 0.02	0.09
Professional Body	0.54*** 0.02	0.19	0.54*** 0.02	0.19	0.46*** 0.02	0.16
Male	0.04*** 0.01	0.02	0.04*** 0.01	0.02	0.07*** 0.02	0.03
Union	0.18*** 0.02	0.07	0.18*** 0.02	0.07	0.18*** 0.02	0.07
Public Sector	0.01 0.02	0.01	0.01 0.02	0.01	-0.40*** 0.03	-0.15
Firm Size: ln(emp)	0.12*** 0.00	0.05	0.12*** 0.00	0.05	0.12*** 0.00	0.05
Sector Controls					X	
Occupation Controls					X	



N	49,420	49,420	49,420
Pseudo-R <sup>2</sup>	0.14	0.14	0.16
Observed			
Probability	0.60	0.60	0.60
Predicted			
Probability (at the mean)	0.62	0.62	0.62

Note: \* implies significance at the 10% level; \*\* implies 5% and \*\*\* implies 1%

---

**Table 3: PSM Estimates (Nearest Neighbour)**

---

Migrant	-0.04***	
	0.01	
UK		0.01
		0.01
EU13		-0.00
		0.02
NMS		-0.13***
		0.03
Non-EU/English Speaking		0.06*
		0.04
Non-EU/Non-English Speaking		-0.03
		0.03

---

**Table 4: Probit regressions by education level, dependant variable: “broad” training**

	<i>Primary</i>		<i>Secondary</i>		<i>Post-Secondary</i>		<i>Tertiary</i>		<i>Postgraduate</i>	
	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>
UK	0.16		-0.06		0.05		0.01		-0.12	
	<i>0.15</i>	0.06	<i>0.07</i>	-0.02	<i>0.10</i>	0.02	<i>0.07</i>	0.00	<i>0.11</i>	-0.03
EU13	-0.15		-0.32**		0.10		-0.13		0.18	
	<i>0.23</i>	-0.06	<i>0.12</i>	-0.12	<i>0.16</i>	0.04	<i>0.09</i>	-0.04	<i>0.12</i>	0.04
NMS	-0.05		-0.09		-0.33***		-0.31***		-0.23	
	<i>0.18</i>	-0.02	<i>0.09</i>	-0.04	<i>0.10</i>	-0.13	<i>0.09</i>	-0.11	<i>0.17</i>	-0.07
Non-EU/English Speaking	0.33		0.18		-0.13		0.00		0.15	
	<i>0.52</i>	0.13	<i>0.16</i>	0.07	<i>0.28</i>	-0.05	<i>0.11</i>	0.00	<i>0.20</i>	0.04
Non-EU/Non-English Speaking	0.12		-0.08		0.07		-0.05		0.04	
	<i>0.15</i>	0.05	<i>0.10</i>	-0.03	<i>0.15</i>	0.03	<i>0.07</i>	-0.02	<i>0.14</i>	0.01
N	3,557		17,760		5,229		17,882		4,992	
Pseudo- R <sup>2</sup>	0.08		0.10		0.1		0.13		0.11	
Observed Probability	0.37		0.48		0.53		0.73		0.79	
Predicted Probability (at the mean)	0.36		0.48		0.53		0.76		0.82	

**Table 5: Probit regressions by occupation level, dependant variable: “broad” training**

<i>UKSOC</i>	Managers and Senior Officials		Professional Occupations		Associate Professional and Technical Occupations		Administrative and Secretarial Occupations		Skilled Trades Occupations		Personal Service Occupations		Sales and Customer Service Occupations	
	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>
UK	-0.09 <i>0.11</i>	-0.03	0.06 <i>0.09</i>	0.02	-0.11 <i>0.12</i>	-0.04	0.07 <i>0.09</i>	0.03	-0.15 <i>0.16</i>	-0.06	-0.07 <i>0.16</i>	-0.03	-0.20 <i>0.28</i>	-0.08
EU13	0.41* <i>0.22</i>	0.11	0.06 <i>0.12</i>	0.02	-0.65*** <i>0.15</i>	-0.23	0.10 <i>0.11</i>	0.04	-0.39 <i>0.39</i>	-0.14	0.04 <i>0.26</i>	0.02	-0.21 <i>0.28</i>	-0.08
NMS	-0.38 <i>0.35</i>	-0.14	-0.41** <i>0.20</i>	-0.12	-0.47* <i>0.28</i>	-0.17	-0.22 <i>0.16</i>	-0.09	-0.20 <i>0.13</i>	-0.07	-0.07 <i>0.18</i>	-0.03	-0.24 <i>0.19</i>	-0.09
Non-EU/English Speaking	0.32 <i>0.29</i>	0.09	-0.04 <i>0.15</i>	0.01	-0.18 <i>0.23</i>	0.05	-0.16 <i>0.17</i>	0.06	-0.04 <i>0.45</i>	-0.01	-0.26 <i>0.42</i>	-0.10	0.13 <i>0.36</i>	0.05
Non-EU/Non-English Speaking	0.31 <i>0.32</i>	0.09	-0.28** <i>0.11</i>	-0.08	-0.10 <i>0.15</i>	-0.03	0.27* <i>0.15</i>	0.11	-0.23 <i>0.17</i>	-0.09	0.19 <i>0.13</i>	0.07	-0.01 <i>0.20</i>	-0.00
N	4,523		10,529		4,787		10,501		3,379		2,959		3,075	
Pseudo- R <sup>2</sup>	0.16		0.10		0.10		0.16		0.08		0.11		0.11	
Observed Probability	0.70		0.81		0.74		0.53		0.46		0.53		0.47	
Predicted Probability (at the mean)	0.74		0.83		0.76		0.54		0.45		0.54		0.47	

**Table 5 continued: Probit regressions by occupation level, dependant variable: “broad” training**

Process, Plant and Machine Operatives		Elementary Occupations	
<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>
0.01	0.00	0.03	0.01
<i>0.11</i>		<i>0.11</i>	
-0.47**	-0.18	-0.06	-0.02
<i>0.21</i>		<i>0.16</i>	
-0.07	-0.03	-0.29***	-0.11
<i>0.11</i>		<i>0.09</i>	
-0.75**	-0.26	0.04	0.02
<i>0.34</i>		<i>0.25</i>	
-0.40***	-0.15	-0.04	-0.01
<i>0.15</i>		<i>0.09</i>	
4,719		4,940	
0.09		0.08	
0.46		0.43	
0.45		0.42	

**Table 6: Probit regressions with interactions, dependant variable: “broad” training**

	<i>Model 1</i>		<i>Model 2</i>		<i>Model 3</i>	
	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>
Constant	-1.02*** 0.05		-0.34*** 0.09		-0.34*** 0.09	
Immigrant:						
UK	-0.10 0.09	-0.04	-0.01 0.04	-0.01	-0.10 0.10	-0.04
EU13	-0.83*** 0.15	-0.32	-0.08 0.06	-0.03	-0.82*** 0.15	-0.32
NMS	-0.29** 0.14	-0.12	-0.23*** 0.05	-0.09	-0.32** 0.14	-0.12
Non-EU/English Speaking	-0.39* 0.21	-0.15	0.06 0.08	0.02	-0.38* 0.08	-0.15
Non-EU/Non-English Speaking	0.06 0.11	0.02	-0.04 0.05	-0.02	0.01 0.12	0.02
Tenure	-0.01 0.00	-0.01	-0.01 0.00	-0.01	-0.01 0.00	-0.01
Supervisor	0.44*** 0.02	0.16	0.44*** 0.02	0.16	0.44*** 0.02	0.16
Secondary*	0.17*** 0.03	0.06	0.16*** 0.03	0.06	0.16*** 0.03	0.06
Postsec*	0.27*** 0.03	0.10	0.27*** 0.03	0.10	0.27*** 0.03	0.10
Tertiary*	0.45*** 0.03	0.16	0.44*** 0.03	0.16	0.44*** 0.03	0.16
Postgrad*	0.49*** 0.03	0.17	0.49*** 0.03	0.17	0.49*** 0.03	0.17
Experience	-0.01*** 0.00	-0.00	-0.01*** 0.00	-0.00	-0.01*** 0.00	-0.00
Experience Sq	0.00*** 0.00	0.00	0.00*** 0.00	0.00	0.00*** 0.00	0.00
Full Time	0.23*** 0.02	0.09	0.23*** 0.02	0.09	0.23*** 0.02	0.09
Professional Body	0.46*** 0.02	0.16	0.46*** 0.02	0.16	0.46*** 0.02	0.16
Male	0.07*** 0.02	0.03	0.07*** 0.02	0.03	0.07*** 0.02	0.03
Union	0.20*** 0.02	0.07	0.18*** 0.02	0.07	0.18*** 0.02	0.07
Public Sector	-0.39*** 0.03	-0.15	-0.40*** 0.03	-0.16	-0.40*** 0.03	-0.15
Firm Size: ln(emp)	0.11*** 0.00	0.05	0.12*** 0.00	0.05	0.12*** 0.00	0.05
Trade Union Density			0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01

		0.02	0.02	
<b>INTERACTIONS</b>				
UK*Firm size	-0.02 0.02	-0.01	0.02 0.02	0.01
EU13*Firm size	0.18*** 0.03	0.07	0.17*** 0.03	0.07
NMS*Firm size	0.02 0.03	0.01	0.03 0.03	0.01
Non-EU/English Speaking*Firm size	0.12** 0.05	0.04	0.10** 0.05	0.04
Non-EU/Non-English Speaking*Firm size	-0.01 0.03	-0.00	0.00 0.03	0.00
UK*TU member	-0.00 0.10	0.00		
EU13*TU member	-0.47*** 0.18	-0.18		
NMS*TU member	0.06 0.18	0.02		
Non-EU/English Speaking*TU member	-0.41** 0.21	-0.16		
Non-EU/Non-English Speaking*TU member		-0.20		
UK*TU density			0.01 0.10	0.01
EU13*TU density			-0.21 0.17	-0.08
NMS*TU density			-0.13 0.18	-0.05
Non-EU/English Speaking*TU density			-0.18 0.21	-0.07
Non-EU/Non-English Speaking*TU density			-0.36** 0.14	-0.14
Sector Controls	X	X	X	
Occupation Controls	X	X	X	
N	49,420	49,420	49,420	
Pseudo-R <sup>2</sup>	0.16	0.16	0.16	
Observed Probability	0.60	0.60	0.60	
Predicted Probability (at the mean)	0.62	0.62	0.62	

**Table 7: Probit for employment in training intensive firms**

	<i>Model 1</i>	
	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>Coef.</i>
Constant	-0.94***	-0.93***
	0.03	0.09
Immigrant:	-0.11***	
	0.02	
UK		0.02
		0.04
EU13		-0.09*
		0.06
NMS		-0.29***
		0.05
Non-EU/English Speaking		0.10
		0.09
Non-EU/Non-English Speaking		-0.11**
		0.05
Tenure	-0.01***	-0.01***
	0.00	0.00
Supervisor	0.11***	0.11***
	0.02	0.02
Secondary*	0.12***	0.12***
	0.03	0.03
Postsec*	0.25***	0.25***
	0.03	0.03
Tertiary*	0.42***	0.42***
	0.03	0.03
Postgrad*	0.53***	0.54***
	0.04	0.03
Experience	-0.00	-0.00***
	0.00	0.00
Experience Sq	0.00	0.00
	0.00	0.00
Full Time	0.22***	0.22***
	0.02	0.02
Professional Body	0.22***	0.22***
	0.03	0.02
Male	-0.02	-0.02
	0.02	0.02
Union	-0.07***	-0.07***
	0.02	0.02
Public Sector	-0.20***	-0.20***
Occupation Controls	0.04	0.04
Firm Size: ln(emp)	0.28***	0.28***
N	49420	49420
Sector Controls	X	X



Pseudo-R <sup>2</sup>	0.32	0.32
-----------------------	------	------

**Table 8: Probit regressions for employees in training intensive and non-intensive firms, dependant variable: “broad” training**

	<i>(Intensive)</i>		<i>(non-intensive)</i>	
	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>dF/dx</i>
UK	0.02 <i>0.05</i>	0.01	-0.12* <i>0.07</i>	-0.04
EU13	0.11 <i>0.08</i>	0.03	-0.30*** <i>0.10</i>	-0.09
NMS	-0.11 <i>0.08</i>	-0.03	-0.22*** <i>0.07</i>	-0.07
Non- EU/English Speaking	0.19* <i>0.11</i>	0.05	-0.14 <i>0.14</i>	-0.04
Non- EU/Non- English Speaking	-0.04 <i>0.07</i>	-0.01	-0.03 <i>0.07</i>	-0.01
N	32,146		17,274	
Pseudo-R <sup>2</sup>	0.08		0.09	
Observed Probability	0.78		0.27	
Predicted Probability (at the mean)	0.80		0.25	

Note: Controls as per Table 2, Model 3, included in regressions but not reported

## References

Acemoglu D. and Pischke, J-S. (1999) "Beyond Becker: Training in Imperfect Labour Markets." *The Economic Journal*, 109, F112-142.

Barrett, A. and D. Duffy, (2008), "Are Ireland's Immigrants Integrating into its Labour Market?", *International Migration Review* Vol. 42 No. 3

Barrett, A. and Y. McCarthy (2007), "Immigrants in a Booming Economy: Analysing their Earnings and Welfare Dependence", *Labour: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations* Vol. 21 No. 4-5

Barrett, Alan, Séamus McGuinness and Martin O'Brien (2008) "The Immigrant Earnings Disadvantage across the Earnings and Skills Distributions: The Case of Immigrants from the EU's New Member States in Ireland", IZA Discussion Paper No. 3479

Becker, Gary S. (1964), *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with special Reference to Education*, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research

Booth, A., Francesconi, M., and Zoega, G., (2003), "Unions, Work-related Training and Wages: Evidence for British Men." *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, Vol. 57, No. 1, Pp. 68-91.

Borjas, George J. (1985), "Integration, Changes in Cohort Quality and the Earnings of Immigrants", *Journal of Labor Economics* Vol. 3 pp. 463-489

Chiswick, Barry R. (1978), "The Effect of Americanisation on the Earnings of Foreign-born Men", *Journal of Political Economy* Vol. 86 pp. 897-921

Chiswick, Barry R., Yew Liang Lee and Paul Miller (2005), "Longitudinal Analysis of Immigrant Occupational Mobility: A Test of the Immigrant Integration Hypothesis", *International Migration Review* Vol. 39 pp. 332-353

Doeringer, Peter B. and Michael J. Piore (1971), *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books

Gordon, D., Edwards, R., and Reich, M., (1982) *Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labour in the United States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hum, Derek and Wayne Simpson (2003), "Job-related Training Activity by Immigrants to Canada", *Canadian Public Policy* Vol. 29 No. 4 pp 469-490

Kennedy, S., R. Drago, J. Sloan and M. Wooden (1994) "The Effect of Trade Unions on the Provision of Training: Australian Evidence", *British Journal of Industrial Relations* Vol. 32 No. 4 pp 565-560

Miller, Paul W. (1994), "Gender discrimination in Training: An Australian Perspective", *British Journal of Industrial Relations* Vol. 32 No. 4 pp 539-564

Mincer, Jacob (1974), *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research

O'Connell, P., and Junblut, J-M., (2008), "What do we Know about Training at Work?" in K.U. Mayer and H. Solga, (eds) *Skill Formation: Interdisciplinary and Cross-National Perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Van den Heuvel, Audrey and Mark Wooden (1997), "Participation of non-English-Speaking-Background Immigrants in Work-related Training", *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol. 20 No. 4 pp 830-848

Year	Number	Title/Author(s) ESRI Authors/Co-authors <i>Italicised</i>
2009		
	312	Did the Celtic Tiger Decrease Socio-Economic Differentials in Perinatal Mortality in Ireland? <i>Richard Layte and Barbara Clyne</i>
	311	Exploring International Differences in Rates of Return to Education: Evidence from EU SILC <i>Maria A. Davia, Seamus McGuinness and Philip, J. O'Connell</i>
	310	Car Ownership and Mode of Transport to Work in Ireland <i>Nicola Commins and Anne Nolan</i>
	309	Recent Trends in the Caesarean Section Rate in Ireland 1999-2006 <i>Aoife Brick and Richard Layte</i>
	308	Price Inflation and Income Distribution <i>Anne Jennings, Seán Lyons and Richard S.J. Tol</i>
	307	Overskilling Dynamics and Education Pathways <i>Kostas Mavromaras, Seamus McGuinness, Yin King Fok</i>
	306	What Determines the Attractiveness of the European Union to the Location of R&D Multinational Firms? <i>Iulia Siedschlag, Donal Smith, Camelia Turcu, Xiaoheng Zhang</i>
	305	Do Foreign Mergers and Acquisitions Boost Firm Productivity? <i>Marc Schiffbauer, Iulia Siedschlag, Frances Ruane</i>
	304	Inclusion or Diversion in Higher Education in the Republic of Ireland? <i>Delma Byrne</i>
	303	Welfare Regime and Social Class Variation in Poverty and Economic Vulnerability in Europe: An Analysis of EU-SILC <i>Christopher T. Whelan and Bertrand Maitre</i>
	302	Understanding the Socio-Economic Distribution and Consequences of Patterns of Multiple Deprivation: An Application of Self-Organising Maps <i>Christopher T. Whelan, Mario Lucchini, Maurizio Pisati and Bertrand Maitre</i>

- 301 Estimating the Impact of Metro North  
*Edgar Morgenroth*
- 300 Explaining Structural Change in Cardiovascular Mortality  
in Ireland 1995-2005: A Time Series Analysis  
*Richard Layte, Sinead O'Hara and Kathleen Bennett*
- 299 EU Climate Change Policy 2013-2020: Using the Clean  
Development Mechanism More Effectively  
*Paul K Gorecki, Seán Lyons and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 298 Irish Public Capital Spending in a Recession  
*Edgar Morgenroth*
- 297 Exporting and Ownership Contributions to Irish  
Manufacturing Productivity Growth  
*Anne Marie Gleeson, Frances Ruane*
- 296 Eligibility for Free Primary Care and Avoidable  
Hospitalisations in Ireland  
*Anne Nolan*
- 295 Managing Household Waste in Ireland:  
Behavioural Parameters and Policy Options  
*John Curtis, Seán Lyons and Abigail O'Callaghan-Platt*
- 294 Labour Market Mismatch Among UK Graduates;  
An Analysis Using REFLEX Data  
*Seamus McGuinness and Peter J. Sloane*
- 293 Towards Regional Environmental Accounts for Ireland  
*Richard S.J. Tol , Nicola Commins, Niamh Crilly, Sean  
Lyons and Edgar Morgenroth*
- 292 EU Climate Change Policy 2013-2020: Thoughts on  
Property Rights and Market Choices  
*Paul K. Gorecki, Sean Lyons and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 291 Measuring House Price Change  
*David Duffy*
- 290 Intra-and Extra-Union Flexibility in Meeting the  
European Union's Emission Reduction Targets  
*Richard S.J. Tol*
- 289 The Determinants and Effects of Training at Work:  
Bringing the Workplace Back In  
*Philip J. O'Connell and Delma Byrne*
- 288 Climate Feedbacks on the Terrestrial Biosphere and the

- Economics of Climate Policy: An Application of *FUND*  
*Richard S.J. Tol*
- 287 The Behaviour of the Irish Economy: Insights from the HERMES macro-economic model  
*Adele Bergin, Thomas Conefrey, John FitzGerald and Ide Kearney*
- 286 Mapping Patterns of Multiple Deprivation Using Self-Organising Maps: An Application to EU-SILC Data for Ireland  
*Maurizio Pisati, Christopher T. Whelan, Mario Lucchini and Bertrand Maitre*
- 285 The Feasibility of Low Concentration Targets: An Application of *FUND*  
*Richard S.J. Tol*
- 284 Policy Options to Reduce Ireland's GHG Emissions  
  
Instrument choice: the pros and cons of alternative policy instruments  
*Thomas Legge and Sue Scott*
- 283 Accounting for Taste: An Examination of Socioeconomic Gradients in Attendance at Arts Events  
*Pete Lunn and Elish Kelly*
- 282 The Economic Impact of Ocean Acidification on Coral Reefs  
*Luke M. Brander, Katrin Rehdanz, Richard S.J. Tol, and Pieter J.H. van Beukering*
- 281 Assessing the impact of biodiversity on tourism flows: A model for tourist behaviour and its policy implications  
*Giulia Macagno, Maria Loureiro, Paulo A.L.D. Nunes and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 280 Advertising to boost energy efficiency: the Power of One campaign and natural gas consumption  
*Seán Diffney, Seán Lyons and Laura Malaguzzi Valeri*
- 279 International Transmission of Business Cycles Between Ireland and its Trading Partners  
*Jean Goggin and Iulia Siedschlag*
- 278 Optimal Global Dynamic Carbon Taxation  
*David Anthoff*
- 277 Energy Use and Appliance Ownership in Ireland  
*Eimear Leahy and Seán Lyons*

- 276 Discounting for Climate Change  
*David Anthoff, Richard S.J. Tol and Gary W. Yohe*
- 275 Projecting the Future Numbers of Migrant Workers in  
the Health and Social Care Sectors in Ireland  
*Alan Barrett and Anna Rust*
- 274 Economic Costs of Extratropical Storms under Climate  
Change: An application of FUND  
*Daiju Narita, Richard S.J. Tol, David Anthoff*
- 273 The Macro-Economic Impact of Changing the Rate of  
Corporation Tax  
*Thomas Conefrey and John D. Fitz Gerald*
- 272 The Games We Used to Play  
An Application of Survival Analysis to the Sporting Life-  
course  
*Pete Lunn*
- 2008**
- 271 Exploring the Economic Geography of Ireland  
*Edgar Morgenroth*
- 270 Benchmarking, Social Partnership and Higher  
Remuneration: Wage Settling Institutions and the  
Public-Private Sector Wage Gap in Ireland  
*Elish Kelly, Seamus McGuinness, Philip O'Connell*
- 269 A Dynamic Analysis of Household Car Ownership in  
Ireland  
*Anne Nolan*
- 268 The Determinants of Mode of Transport to Work in the  
Greater Dublin Area  
*Nicola Commins and Anne Nolan*
- 267 Resonances from *Economic Development* for Current  
Economic Policymaking  
*Frances Ruane*
- 266 The Impact of Wage Bargaining Regime on Firm-Level  
Competitiveness and Wage Inequality: The Case of  
Ireland  
*Seamus McGuinness, Elish Kelly and Philip O'Connell*
- 265 Poverty in Ireland in Comparative European Perspective  
*Christopher T. Whelan and Bertrand Maitre*
- 264 A Hedonic Analysis of the Value of Rail Transport in the  
Greater Dublin Area



- Karen Mayor, Seán Lyons, David Duffy and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 263 Comparing Poverty Indicators in an Enlarged EU  
*Christopher T. Whelan and Bertrand Maitre*
- 262 Fuel Poverty in Ireland: Extent,  
Affected Groups and Policy Issues  
*Sue Scott, Seán Lyons, Claire Keane, Donal McCarthy  
and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 261 The Misperception of Inflation by Irish Consumers  
*David Duffy and Pete Lunn*
- 260 The Direct Impact of Climate Change on Regional  
Labour Productivity  
Tord Kjellstrom, R Sari Kovats, Simon J. Lloyd, Tom  
Holt, *Richard S.J. Tol*
- 259 Damage Costs of Climate Change through Intensification  
of Tropical Cyclone Activities:  
An Application of FUND  
Daiju Narita, *Richard S. J. Tol* and *David Anthoff*
- 258 Are Over-educated People Insiders or Outsiders?  
A Case of Job Search Methods and Over-education in UK  
Aleksander Kucel, *Delma Byrne*
- 257 Metrics for Aggregating the Climate Effect of Different  
Emissions: A Unifying Framework  
*Richard S.J. Tol*, Terje K. Berntsen, Brian C. O'Neill, Jan  
S. Fuglestedt, Keith P. Shine, Yves Balkanski and Laszlo  
Makra
- 256 Intra-Union Flexibility of Non-ETS Emission Reduction  
Obligations in the European Union  
*Richard S.J. Tol*
- 255 The Economic Impact of Climate Change  
*Richard S.J. Tol*
- 254 Measuring International Inequity Aversion  
*Richard S.J. Tol*
- 253 Using a Census to Assess the Reliability of a National  
Household Survey for Migration Research: The Case of  
Ireland  
*Alan Barrett and Elish Kelly*
- 252 Risk Aversion, Time Preference, and the Social Cost of  
Carbon  
*David Anthoff, Richard S.J. Tol* and Gary W. Yohe

- 251 The Impact of a Carbon Tax on Economic Growth and Carbon Dioxide Emissions in Ireland  
*Thomas Conefrey, John D. Fitz Gerald, Laura Malaguzzi Valeri and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 250 The Distributional Implications of a Carbon Tax in Ireland  
*Tim Callan, Sean Lyons, Susan Scott, Richard S.J. Tol and Stefano Verde*
- 249 Measuring Material Deprivation in the Enlarged EU  
*Christopher T. Whelan, Brian Nolan and Bertrand Maitre*
- 248 Marginal Abatement Costs on Carbon-Dioxide Emissions: A Meta-Analysis  
Onno Kuik, Luke Brander and *Richard S.J. Tol*
- 247 Incorporating GHG Emission Costs in the Economic Appraisal of Projects Supported by State Development Agencies  
*Richard S.J. Tol and Seán Lyons*
- 246 A Carbon Tax for Ireland  
*Richard S.J. Tol, Tim Callan, Thomas Conefrey, John D. Fitz Gerald, Seán Lyons, Laura Malaguzzi Valeri and Susan Scott*
- 245 Non-cash Benefits and the Distribution of Economic Welfare  
*Tim Callan and Claire Keane*
- 244 Scenarios of Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Aviation  
*Karen Mayor and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 243 The Effect of the Euro on Export Patterns: Empirical Evidence from Industry Data  
*Gavin Murphy and Iulia Siedschlag*
- 242 The Economic Returns to Field of Study and Competencies Among Higher Education Graduates in Ireland  
*Elish Kelly, Philip O'Connell and Emer Smyth*
- 241 European Climate Policy and Aviation Emissions  
*Karen Mayor and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 240 Aviation and the Environment in the Context of the EU-US Open Skies Agreement  
*Karen Mayor and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 239 Yuppie Kvetch? Work-life Conflict and Social Class in Western Europe

*Frances McGinnity and Emma Calvert*

- 238 Immigrants and Welfare Programmes: Exploring the Interactions between Immigrant Characteristics, Immigrant Welfare Dependence and Welfare Policy  
*Alan Barrett and Yvonne McCarthy*
- 237 How Local is Hospital Treatment? An Exploratory Analysis of Public/Private Variation in Location of Treatment in Irish Acute Public Hospitals  
*Jacqueline O'Reilly and Miriam M. Wiley*
- 236 The Immigrant Earnings Disadvantage Across the Earnings and Skills Distributions: The Case of Immigrants from the EU's New Member States in Ireland  
*Alan Barrett, Seamus McGuinness and Martin O'Brien*
- 235 Europeanisation of Inequality and European Reference Groups  
*Christopher T. Whelan and Bertrand Maitre*
- 234 Managing Capital Flows: Experiences from Central and Eastern Europe  
*Jürgen von Hagen and Iulia Siedschlag*
- 233 ICT Diffusion, Innovation Systems, Globalisation and Regional Economic Dynamics: Theory and Empirical Evidence  
*Charlie Karlsson, Gunther Maier, Michaela Trippl, Iulia Siedschlag, Robert Owen and Gavin Murphy*
- 232 Welfare and Competition Effects of Electricity Interconnection between Great Britain and Ireland  
*Laura Malaguzzi Valeri*
- 231 Is FDI into China Crowding Out the FDI into the European Union?  
*Laura Resmini and Iulia Siedschlag*
- 230 Estimating the Economic Cost of Disability in Ireland  
*John Cullinan, Brenda Gannon and Seán Lyons*
- 229 Controlling the Cost of Controlling the Climate: The Irish Government's Climate Change Strategy  
*Colm McCarthy, Sue Scott*
- 228 The Impact of Climate Change on the Balanced-Growth-Equivalent: An Application of *FUND*  
*David Anthoff, Richard S.J. Tol*
- 227 Changing Returns to Education During a Boom? The Case of Ireland

*Seamus McGuinness, Frances McGinnity, Philip O'Connell*

- 226 'New' and 'Old' Social Risks: Life Cycle and Social Class Perspectives on Social Exclusion in Ireland  
*Christopher T. Whelan and Bertrand Maitre*
- 225 The Climate Preferences of Irish Tourists by Purpose of Travel  
*Seán Lyons, Karen Mayor and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 224 A Hirsch Measure for the Quality of Research Supervision, and an Illustration with Trade Economists  
*Frances P. Ruane and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 223 Environmental Accounts for the Republic of Ireland: 1990-2005  
*Seán Lyons, Karen Mayor and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 2007** 222 Assessing Vulnerability of Selected Sectors under Environmental Tax Reform: The issue of pricing power  
*J. Fitz Gerald, M. Keeney and S. Scott*
- 221 Climate Policy Versus Development Aid  
*Richard S.J. Tol*
- 220 Exports and Productivity – Comparable Evidence for 14 Countries  
*The International Study Group on Exports and Productivity*
- 219 Energy-Using Appliances and Energy-Saving Features: Determinants of Ownership in Ireland  
*Joe O'Doherty, Seán Lyons and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 218 The Public/Private Mix in Irish Acute Public Hospitals: Trends and Implications  
*Jacqueline O'Reilly and Miriam M. Wiley*
- 217 Regret About the Timing of First Sexual Intercourse: The Role of Age and Context  
*Richard Layte, Hannah McGee*
- 216 Determinants of Water Connection Type and Ownership of Water-Using Appliances in Ireland  
*Joe O'Doherty, Seán Lyons and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 215 Unemployment – Stage or Stigma?  
Being Unemployed During an Economic Boom  
*Emer Smyth*
- 214 The Value of Lost Load  
*Richard S.J. Tol*

- 213 Adolescents' Educational Attainment and School Experiences in Contemporary Ireland  
*Merike Darmody, Selina McCoy, Emer Smyth*
- 212 Acting Up or Opting Out? Truancy in Irish Secondary Schools  
*Merike Darmody, Emer Smyth and Selina McCoy*
- 211 Where do MNEs Expand Production: Location Choices of the Pharmaceutical Industry in Europe after 1992  
*Frances P. Ruane, Xiaoheng Zhang*
- 210 Holiday Destinations: Understanding the Travel Choices of Irish Tourists  
*Seán Lyons, Karen Mayor and Richard S.J. Tol*
- 209 The Effectiveness of Competition Policy and the Price-Cost Margin: Evidence from Panel Data  
Patrick McCloughan, *Seán Lyons* and William Batt
- 208 Tax Structure and Female Labour Market Participation: Evidence from Ireland  
*Tim Callan, A. Van Soest, J.R. Walsh*
- 207 Distributional Effects of Public Education Transfers in Seven European Countries  
*Tim Callan, Tim Smeeding and Panos Tsakloglou*