



**HAL**  
open science

# Does skill obsolescence increase the risk of employment loss?

Jim Allen, Andries de Grip

► **To cite this version:**

Jim Allen, Andries de Grip. Does skill obsolescence increase the risk of employment loss?. *Applied Economics*, 2011, pp.1. 10.1080/00036846.2011.570727 . hal-00711453

**HAL Id: hal-00711453**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00711453>**

Submitted on 25 Jun 2012

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



## Does skill obsolescence increase the risk of employment loss?

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-2010-0268.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Aug-2010
Complete List of Authors:	Allen, Jim; Maastricht University, ROA De Grip, Andries; Maastricht University, ROA
JEL Code:	J24 - Human Capital Skills Occupational Choice Labor Productivity < J2 - Time Allocation, Work Behavior, and Employment Determination/Creation < J - Labor and Demographic Economics, J26 - Retirement Retirement Policies < J2 - Time Allocation, Work Behavior, and Employment Determination/Creation < J - Labor and Demographic Economics
Keywords:	human capital development, training, on-the-job learning, skill obsolescence, labour market participation

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

For Peer Review

# Does skill obsolescence increase the risk of employment loss?

**Jim Allen\* and Andries de Grip\*\***

\* Research Centre for Education and the Labour Market (ROA),  
Maastricht University, the Netherlands.

\*\* ROA, Maastricht University, and IZA, Bonn, Germany.

## 1. Introduction

Older workers may face a decreasing productivity due to rapid changes in the world of work. The main motor of such change are the innovations based on information technology that are introduced all over the economy (Machin and Van Reenen, 1999). These innovations change the skills required in many jobs (Dickerson and Green, 2004). Therefore, the skills workers already possess will tend to lose their relevance for the labour market, and their place will be taken by skills that were previously less important or not required at all (Welch and Ureta, 2002). This skill obsolescence will lead to increasing job insecurity over the life course, making it difficult to maintain an adequate level of labour market participation of older workers. Although pension schemes often encourage early retirement of workers whose productivity is waning, involuntary early retirement is widespread, particularly in Continental Europe (Dorn and Sousa-Poza, 2010)

In this article, we analyze whether information technology induces skill obsolescence and loss of work, and how this is related to workers' participation in training and learning on the job. We will compare two conceptual models on the relationships between technological change, training participation, on-the-job learning, skill obsolescence and the chance of losing employment. The first model is a *static model*, in which training participation is exogenous. This model reflects the conventional

1  
2  
3 wisdom on skill obsolescence and the probability of employment loss (cf. OECD 2001).  
4  
5 The second model is a *dynamic model* in which skill obsolescence reinforces life-long  
6  
7 learning, driven by technological change that takes place in the workplace. The latter  
8  
9 model predicts that when workers experience skill obsolescence more or less  
10  
11 continuously in their job, this may indicate a healthy dynamic situation in which  
12  
13 technological change and the concomitant on-the-job learning create their own learning  
14  
15 process.  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 Using panel data on older workers, we find that workers who experience skill  
21  
22 obsolescence appear to learn more on the job and participate more often in training.  
23  
24 Moreover, those who are employed in IT-intensive jobs are more likely to learn on-the-  
25  
26 job. Remarkably, perceived skill obsolescence is not related to a higher probability of  
27  
28 losing employment, whereas training participation decreases the risk of losing  
29  
30 employment. These results are consistent with the dynamic model of skill obsolescence  
31  
32 and employment loss we developed in this paper. Furthermore, we find that when  
33  
34 workers with long job tenures decrease their training participation, this is an early  
35  
36 indicator of future job loss.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 These findings contribute to the literature on the labour market withdrawal of  
42  
43 older workers by emphasizing that skill obsolescence as well as investments in training  
44  
45 and on-the-job learning are all more or less structural characteristics of jobs that are  
46  
47 highly challenging and dynamic, and prevent that older workers withdraw from the  
48  
49 labour market at an early age.  
50  
51

## 52 53 54 55 **2. Two models of skill obsolescence** 56 57 58 59 60

1  
2  
3 In this section, we will develop two conceptual models that could explain skills  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

In this section, we will develop two conceptual models that could explain skills  
obsolescence. First we will describe a static model, and then we will develop a more  
dynamic model that includes the learning of workers who face shifts in skill demanded in  
their jobs.

### *Static model of skill obsolescence*

We start from the worker-job matching assumption that the performance of a given  
worker in a given job is a function of the overlap between the skills actually possessed by  
a worker and the skills needed to do the job (e.g. Jovanovic, 1979). Only the skills  
required in the job contribute to the worker's performance. In contrast, the remaining part  
of the worker's skills does not contribute to a worker's productivity in the job.

Over time, technological change can induce shifts in the skills needed to perform  
in a given job. If we assume for the moment that the worker's own skill level remains  
relatively static, this will change the worker-job match. In principle, the shift in the skills  
needed in the job can be in any direction with respect to the existing skills of the  
incumbent. This means that changes in the job tasks resulting from technological change  
could lead to either an improvement or deterioration in the match between actual and  
required skills. However, there are vastly more ways in which a change can lead to  
deterioration in the match than ways in which a change can lead to an improvement.  
Consequently, it is safe to assume that, in the aggregate, a change in the skills demanded  
will lead to a decrease in the volume of skills that are productively utilized.

Such a change has serious consequences for both the employee and the employer.  
From the point of view of the employee, underutilization of skills has strong unwanted

1  
2  
3 effects on earnings (see for example Van Smoorenburg and Van der Velden, 2000). By  
4  
5 contrast, the major concern of employers will be about skill shortages, which lead  
6  
7 directly to loss of potential output. In the ensuing discussion, we will concentrate on  
8  
9 effects relating to skill shortages.  
10  
11

12  
13 As a result of the deterioration in a worker's performance, the worker's hold on  
14  
15 his or her job may become less secure. This particularly holds when wages are rigid (cf.  
16  
17 Weiss and Garloff, 2009). Compared to the initial situation, the employer has a greater  
18  
19 incentive to dismiss the current worker, and replace him or her by a worker with more  
20  
21 appropriate skills (Van Loo, De Grip and De Steur, 2001). Obviously, the worker's  
22  
23 prospects of obtaining a similar or better position after dismissal will be bad. We would  
24  
25 therefore expect that a higher skill gap increases the risk that the worker has to move to a  
26  
27 worse job, or lose employment altogether. This risk is likely to be particularly great in  
28  
29 countries such as the Netherlands where demand shifts away from unskilled labour tend  
30  
31 to be absorbed more by a lower job security than through wage adjustments (Maurin and  
32  
33 Postel-Vinay, 2005).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 There are of course less drastic measures that can be used to reduce the skill gap  
41  
42 following technological change. Where change is accompanied or followed by formal  
43  
44 training, this can offset the negative effects of the change in required skills. If the  
45  
46 acquisition of new skills is sufficient to at least offset the shift in skill requirements as a  
47  
48 result of technological change, the worker's job security is not likely to be compromised,  
49  
50 and may even improve. However, if training does not take place, or is insufficient to  
51  
52 offset the shift in skill requirements, the worker may face a risk of losing his or her job.  
53  
54 This risk could accumulate during a worker's career. Recalling that this conceptualization  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of the relation between technological change, skill obsolescence and training  
4 participation is based on the assumption that the worker's own skills remain relatively  
5 static except during periods of formal training, we call this the *static model* of skill  
6 obsolescence. Figure 1 summarizes the relations postulated by this model.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12  
13  
14  
15 FIGURE 1 here  
16

17  
18  
19  
20 *Dynamic model of skill obsolescence*  
21

22 When we drop the assumption that skill levels are static, a different model of the relation  
23 between technological change, skill obsolescence and labour market participation arises.  
24 Both the decision to train and the decision to organize work in such a way as to promote  
25 learning by doing may not be independent of technological change. On this point it is  
26 crucial to note that changes that are expected to give rise to skill mismatches according to  
27 the static model could create their own learning situation: workers in organizations  
28 undergoing change are likely to be exposed to a wider variety of experiences from which  
29 they can learn new skills. In addition, both employers and workers may respond or  
30 anticipate the changes in technology by making greater investments in training (cf.  
31 Acemoglu, 1997). In other words, workers may more or less automatically learn new  
32 skills as the skill requirements arise. Jobs may be deliberately structured so as to provide  
33 learning opportunities (e.g. Eraut, 2000). This *learning potential of the job* (Rosen, 1972)  
34 is likely to be greatest in cases where the learning of new skills is deemed most  
35 necessary, i.e. in precisely those jobs where skill requirements are also changing rapidly.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 Whereas jobs characterized by repetitiveness, hierarchical control mechanisms and low



1  
2  
3 levels of autonomy may stifle learning opportunities for workers, more complex jobs  
4  
5 with shifting job contents offer ample opportunities for lifelong learning. This suggests  
6  
7 that, rather than a situation in which the size of the skill gap after technological change is  
8  
9 dependent on investments in training and on-the-job learning, these investments may in  
10  
11 fact be dependent on the size of the initial skill gap and the new skill requirements  
12  
13 resulting from technological change.  
14  
15

16  
17 If formal and informal learning are indeed endogenous to technological change,  
18  
19 this also changes the expected relation between obsolescence and labour market  
20  
21 participation. If workers in changing organizations are continuously updating their skills  
22  
23 to meet the changing requirements, they should be no more at risk of losing their jobs  
24  
25 than workers in more stable organizations. This *dynamic model* is summarized in Figure  
26  
27 2.  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 FIGURE 2 here  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 The figure shows that of the effects predicted by the static model, only the predicted  
40  
41 positive relation between previous and current skill obsolescence remains in the dynamic  
42  
43 model. However, even this superficial similarity might have a different interpretation in  
44  
45 the two models. Whereas the static model views previous obsolescence as a burden that  
46  
47 has to be overcome above and beyond the additional obsolescence induced by  
48  
49 technological change, the dynamic model implies that, in some cases at least, skill  
50  
51 obsolescence is a more or less structural characteristic of the job. Far from being a  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 problem, in such jobs the perceived ‘obsolescence’ may be an indication of a healthy and  
4  
5 dynamic situation with a high learning potential (Cf. Bartel and Sicherman, 1993).  
6  
7

8 As ‘old obsolescence’ is eliminated by investments in training and/or on-the-job  
9  
10 learning, ‘new obsolescence’ will pop up to take its place, which will stimulate the  
11  
12 worker and/or the employer to invest in further training, and so on. If this is the case, this  
13  
14 has some important implications. Firstly, the development of human capital by  
15  
16 participating in training and/or on-the-job learning will not reduce the skills gap.  
17  
18 Secondly, the skill obsolescence perceived by the worker will not increase a worker’s risk  
19  
20 of losing employment, as it merely indicates that a worker is employed in a dynamic job.  
21  
22 Thirdly, although the dynamic model predicts no indirect effect of training on the  
23  
24 probability of employment loss, it does predict a direct negative effect. This is because  
25  
26 training is regarded as an investment, which both employers and employees would like to  
27  
28 recoup by extending the employment relationship.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 **3. Data and variables**

#### 39 *Data*

40  
41 For our analyses on the relationships between technological change, skill obsolescence  
42  
43 and investments in human capital, we make use of data from the *OSA Labour Supply*  
44  
45 *Panel*. The OSA Labour Supply Panel consists of a representative biannual survey among  
46  
47 a representative sample of the Dutch working age population. Due to the relatively high  
48  
49 rate of panel attrition, which is compensated by adding new respondents in each new  
50  
51 wave, we only use the panel character of the OSA data in a limited way. In order to  
52  
53 increase the number of available cases in the analyses – which is particularly important  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 because most of the dependent variables we consider are quite heavily skewed dummy  
4 variables - we treat each wave as an independent sample, and pool data over the three  
5 successive waves of 1994, 1996 and 1998. To the data for each of these waves we add an  
6 indicator of skills obsolescence for the same respondents two years earlier, as well as an  
7 indicator of their labour market participation two years later. For example, the data for  
8 working respondents in the 1994 wave includes information on whether or not they  
9 suffered from skills obsolescence in 1992, and on whether or not they were still in paid  
10 employment in 1996<sup>1</sup>.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 The data from the three waves is pooled, resulting in a pooled data set containing  
23 4,683 usable cases, comprising a main body of variables in the reference year, with the  
24 relevant variables from the previous and subsequent waves appended<sup>2</sup>. This is shown in  
25 Figure 3.<sup>3</sup> To correct for the multiple occurrence of individual respondents we use the 'Cluster'  
26 option in STATA to estimate robust standard errors in our multivariate analyses.

27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
FIGURE 3 here

61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

In order to focus on the part of the workforce that is most at risk of losing its place in the labour market due to skill obsolescence, we include only respondents aged between 40 and 62 at the time of the survey. The reason for choosing 62 as an upper bound is that then all respondents are still below the official mandatory retirement age of 65 two years later, when we again measure their labour market participation.<sup>4</sup>

*Variables*

1  
2  
3 In the analyses, *skill obsolescence* (both in the previous and current periods) is indicated  
4 by a respondent's answer to the following question: *How do you consider the relation*  
5 *between your knowledge and skills and your job?* Following the typology of skill  
6 obsolescence developed in De Grip and Van Loo (2002) that distinguishes between  
7 technical and economic obsolescence of skills, we consider those who reported either an  
8 'obsolescence of skills' or a 'skill shortage' in the period in question as workers who face  
9 skill obsolescence in their job. The reported 'obsolescence of skills' will particularly refer  
10 to technical obsolescence or depreciation of skills due to the wear of skills resulting from  
11 the natural ageing process, illness or injury, whereas skill shortages will include  
12 economic skill obsolescence due to external developments (such as changes in the  
13 technologies applied or changes in the organisation) which lead to new skill demands for  
14 a worker's job. *Loss of work* is indicated by respondents who were in paid employment in  
15 the reference period but not two years later. Technological change is indicated by the *IT-*  
16 *intensity* of a worker's job measured by the percentage of employees in the respondent's  
17 occupational group who used a personal computer in their work (Cf. Jorgenson, 2001). At  
18 first sight, one might wonder whether an aggregate measure of computer use adequately  
19 captures the kind of change we are interested in. We argue that an aggregate measure is  
20 in fact more appropriate than an individual measure, since a computer-intensive  
21 infrastructure forms part of the environment that allows – or forces – firms to innovate.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Building on Sieben et al. (2009), we include the variable *on-the job learning*  
49 indicated by the time that the respondent expects to be needed for a comparably educated  
50 new employee to learn how to do the job. We need to emphasize here that the indicator  
51 does not refer to the actual induction time of the worker when he or she started in the job,  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 but estimates the time a hypothetical replacement would need to learn the ropes. On the  
4  
5 basis of the dynamic model, we assume that jobs that require a substantial amount of  
6  
7 initial learning are knowledge or skill-intensive jobs, of which learning is more or less a  
8  
9 structural characteristic. Of course, this assumption does not hold according to the static  
10  
11 model, which if anything would predict that a lot of learning early on would reduce the  
12  
13 need for later learning. This contrast makes this variable especially suitable for a  
14  
15 comparison of the two models. *Training participation* (both previous and current) is  
16  
17 indicated by (the natural logarithm of) the number of courses followed in the relevant  
18  
19 two-year period. In the case of previous training this is the two years prior to the  
20  
21 reference year. In the case of current training it is the period of a year prior and a year  
22  
23 subsequent to the reference period.<sup>5</sup> As control variables in several analyses we include  
24  
25 *tenure* (both a linear and a quadratic term), *occupational level*, *gender*, *age*, *cohort*  
26  
27 (survey year), *firm size*, and *economic sector*. Table 1 shows the means and standard  
28  
29 deviations of the interval level variables and the percentage distributions of the dummy  
30  
31 variables used in the analysis.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
TABLE 1 here

#### 4. Estimation results

In the analyses that follow, we will test the applicability of the static and the dynamic model on the relations between the IT-intensity, training participation, on-the-job learning, skill obsolescence and loss of employment. First, we analyze the determinants of the skill obsolescence workers perceive in their current job. Second, we analyze the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

determinants of workers' probability of unemployment or labour market withdrawal in the subsequent period. As the results of these analyses support the dynamic model, we further test two other predictions of this model, namely that the IT-intensity and previous skill obsolescence are related to on-the-job learning as well as a worker's training participation.

### *A. Current Skill Obsolescence*

In the first analysis, we attempt to explain skill obsolescence in the current period. According to the static model, perceived skill obsolescence will be positively related to both previous skill obsolescence and IT-intensity, and negatively related to training participation. The dynamic model also predicts a positive effect of previous obsolescence – albeit for a different reason – but predicts no significant effect of either IT-intensity or training participation. This model does predict a positive effect of the amount of on-the-job learning on perceived skill obsolescence. The results of the analysis of the skill obsolescence workers perceive in their job are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2 here

The estimation results provide strong support for the dynamic model, and little or no support for the static model. The only result that is consistent with the static model - that previous skill obsolescence is a strong predictor of current skill obsolescence – is also predicted by the dynamic model. However, contrary to the predictions of the static model but consistent with those of the dynamic model, IT-intensity and training participation

1  
2  
3 have no effect, while on-the job learning has a positive effect on current skill  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

have no effect, while on-the job learning has a positive effect on current skill  
obsolescence.

### *B. Loss of work*

Having established that the pattern of determinants of skill obsolescence is more  
consistent with the dynamic than with the static model, we now turn to the effects of skill  
obsolescence on the risk of losing employment in the subsequent period. The static model  
predicts that skill obsolescence will increase this risk substantially, as the loss of  
productivity related to obsolescence makes the worker's grip on employment increasingly  
tenuous. By contrast, the dynamic model predicts no such effect; because both  
obsolescence and learning are regarded as more or less structural characteristics of jobs,  
workers who experience obsolescence will not be more likely to lose their job than those  
who don't. Also in contrast to the static model is the predicted effect of training  
participation. According to the static model, any effect of training on the risk of losing  
one's work will be indirect, through its supposed effect on skill obsolescence. By  
contrast, the dynamic model predicts a direct negative effect of training participation on  
losing one's job. This is because training is regarded as an investment, which both  
employers and employees would like to recoup by extending the employment  
relationship. Table 3 shows the results of this analysis.

TABLE 3 here

1  
2  
3 Again, the results are more in line with the dynamic model than with the static model.  
4  
5 Skill obsolescence has no effect on the risk of losing one's work. On the other hand,  
6  
7 training participation does significantly reduce the risk of losing employment. Even  
8  
9 though training does not have a net effect on perceived skill obsolescence, it does reduce  
10  
11 the risk of losing employment, as expected in the dynamic model.  
12  
13

14  
15 An interesting effect not directly predicted by either model is that of tenure.  
16  
17 Tenure shows a negative linear effect and positive quadratic effect on the risk of losing  
18  
19 employment. The negative linear effect suggests that, up to a point, additional experience  
20  
21 in a job adds to security in that job. This could be related to progressive acquisition of  
22  
23 human capital by learning on the job, although it could also indicate that the legal claim  
24  
25 to one's position gets stronger over time. However, as time progresses, the effect of  
26  
27 tenure on the probability of job loss becomes smaller, eventually leading to a higher risk  
28  
29 of job loss for those who are more than 18 years employed in the same job. This suggests  
30  
31 that a concentration of experience in a particular job eventually leads to stagnation and  
32  
33 lower employability in the longer term. Since we have controlled for age – which has the  
34  
35 expected positive effect on the chance of losing employment related to (early) retirement  
36  
37 -, this result cannot be attributed to life-cycle effects. Remarkably, women also have a  
38  
39 higher chance of losing employment than men.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 *C. On-the job learning*

49

50 As the results so far strongly support the dynamic model, we will proceed by testing a  
51  
52 number of more specific predictions of this model. The dynamic model predicts that  
53  
54 technological change as well as the perception of skill obsolescence will contribute  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 positively to on-the-job learning. The estimation results presented in Table 4 confirm  
4  
5 these expectations: both the IT-intensity and previous skill obsolescence positively affect  
6  
7 on-the-job learning.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 TABLE 4 here  
14  
15

#### 16 17 18 *D. Training participation*

19  
20 A final prediction of the dynamic model is that training participation is also  
21  
22 endogenously influenced by both previous obsolescence and IT-intensity. In addition, the  
23  
24 model predicts that the on-the-job learning will have a positive effect on training  
25  
26 participation.  
27  
28

29  
30  
31  
32 TABLE 5 here  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 The estimation results presented in Table 5 show that the prediction that a higher IT-  
38  
39 intensity leads to greater levels of training participation is not confirmed by the analysis.  
40  
41 Workers in IT-intensive jobs are not more likely to invest in formal training than other  
42  
43 workers. However, the estimation results confirm the expectation that workers' training  
44  
45 participation is positively influenced by prior skill obsolescence, as well as the  
46  
47 opportunities for on-the job learning. The latter finding reinforces the view that learning  
48  
49 requirements and opportunities are a structural characteristic of certain jobs. Even in the  
50  
51 case of older workers we analyze, the tendency to invest in training is strongly related to  
52  
53 on-the-job learning.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Although the effects of tenure and tenure squared are not statistically significant, the direction and size of the coefficients is consistent with the earlier results for probability of job loss as shown in Table 3. The latter show that workers become more secure in their jobs when they achieve more tenure. However, in time the effect of tenure on the probability of job loss becomes smaller, eventually leading to a higher risk of job loss. The coefficients in Table 5 suggest that participation in training may undergo a similar trend and reversal. In this case, the reversal takes place after 14 years, compared to 18 in the case of job loss. Although we must be cautious about interpreting non-significant results, this may indicate that when workers with long tenures decrease their efforts to keep their skills up-to-date, this is an early indicator of job loss due to a concentration of experience.

## 5. Conclusions

In this paper we developed a static as well as a dynamic model to explain the relationships between technological change, skill obsolescence, training and informal learning on the job and labour market exit. The static model treats learning processes as exogenous, and assumes a basically sequential causal chain, whereby technological innovations give rise to skill obsolescence that, in the absence of compensatory learning, leads to an increased risk of early exit from the labour market. By contrast, the dynamic model treats learning processes as endogenous to organizations that face a need to develop and change. In this model, skill obsolescence is largely structural by nature. That is to say, changes in skill requirements and the learning of new skills keep each other

1  
2  
3 roughly in balance. As a consequence, this model does not predict an effect of skill  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

roughly in balance. As a consequence, this model does not predict an effect of skill  
obsolescence on the probability of early labour market exit.

The results of our empirical analyses provide virtually no support for the static  
model. The only result that was consistent with this model – that previous skill  
obsolescence is positively related to current skill obsolescence – is also predicted by the  
dynamic model. The other predictions of the static model are not borne out by the  
analyses. Workers in IT-intensive jobs are not more likely to perceive skill obsolescence  
than workers in less IT-intensive jobs. Nor does training participation reduce perceived  
obsolescence. Finally, and most tellingly, workers' skill obsolescence has no significant  
effect on the risk of loss of employment in the following period.

We found more evidence supporting the dynamic model. The above-mentioned  
absence of an effect of skill obsolescence on the chance of losing employment is  
consistent with this model. Whereas the static model views previous obsolescence as a  
burden that has to be overcome above and beyond the additional obsolescence induced by  
technological change, the dynamic model implies that skill obsolescence may be a more  
or less structural characteristic of many jobs. Moreover, training participation was found  
to have a significant negative effect on the probability of losing employment. However,  
contrary to the predictions of the static model, training participation does not reduce  
perceived skill obsolescence. This is consistent with the idea, incorporated in the dynamic  
model, that the training that is related to technological innovations represents an  
important investment in human capital, which employers and employees have an interest  
in recouping through a longer employment duration (cf. Bartel and Sicherman, 1993). A  
similar result is observed for job tenure. Initially, longer job tenure has a negative effect

1  
2  
3 on the chances of loss of employment, indicating that workers accumulate valuable  
4 additional human capital through work experience. This effect decreases over time,  
5  
6 however, and after about 18 years additional tenure actually increases the probability of  
7  
8 employment loss, indicating that the experience build-up no longer dominates the  
9  
10 depreciation of the worker's skills.  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 On-the-job learning is found to be related with perceived skill obsolescence,  
16  
17 which supports the dynamic model. Moreover, those employed in IT-intensive jobs are  
18  
19 more likely to learn on the job. Furthermore, on-the job learning has a positive influence  
20  
21 on training participation. These results are consistent with the idea that skill obsolescence,  
22  
23 and investments in training as well as on-the-job learning are all more or less structural  
24  
25 characteristics of jobs that are highly challenging and dynamic. In this view, the skill  
26  
27 obsolescence that workers in these jobs perceive may remain relatively constant: as new  
28  
29 skills are acquired to fill a prior skill gap, and new requirements are thrown up, which  
30  
31 necessitates further learning in a subsequent period. Because this is driven by changes  
32  
33 that increase the net productive potential of jobs, this does not lead to an increased risk of  
34  
35 loss of employment. Instead, by stimulating further investments in the human capital of  
36  
37 the workers who are employed in these jobs, it decreases the probability that these  
38  
39 workers lose their employment.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

## 51 **References**

52  
53 Acemoglu, D. (1997). 'Training and Innovation in an Imperfect Labour Market', *Review*  
54  
55 *of Economic Studies*, 64: 445-464.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Bartel, A.P. and Sicherman, N. (1993) 'Technological Change and Retirement Decisions  
4 of Older Workers', *Journal of Labor Economics*, 11: 162-183.  
5  
6  
7  
8 De Grip, A. and Van Loo, J. van (2002) The Economics of Skills Obsolescence: A  
9 review. In: A. de Grip, J. van Loo and K. Mayhew (eds.) The Economics of Skills  
10 Obsolescence: Theoretical Innovations and Empirical Applications, *Research in*  
11 *Labor Economics*, 21: 1-26.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Dickerson, A. and Green, F. (2004). The growth and valuation of computing and other  
18 generic skills, *Oxford Economic Papers*, 56: 371-406.  
19  
20  
21  
22 Dorn, David and Sousa-Poza, Alfonso (2008) "'Voluntary' and 'involuntary' early  
23 retirement: an international analysis', *Applied Economics*, 42: 427 – 438.  
24  
25  
26  
27 Eraut, M (2000) 'Non-formal learning and tacit knowledge in professional work'', *British*  
28 *Journal of Educational Psychology* 70: 113-136.  
29  
30  
31  
32 Jorgenson, D.W.(2001). 'Information technology and the U.S. economy', *American*  
33 *Economic Review* 91:1-32.  
34  
35  
36 Jovanovic, B. (1979) 'Job Matching and the Theory of Turnover', *Journal of Political*  
37 *Economy*, 87: 972-990.  
38  
39  
40  
41 Machin, S. and J. van Reenen (1998). 'Technology and Changes in Skill Structure.  
42 Evidence from Seven OECD Countries', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113:  
43 1215-1244.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Maurin, E. and Postel-Vinay, F. (2005) 'The European Job Security Gap', *Work and*  
49 *Occupations*, 32, 2: 229-252.  
50  
51  
52  
53 McQuaid, R.W, and Lindsay, C. (2005). 'The Concept of Employability: Transcending  
54 the Orthodoxies of Supply and Demand, *Urban Studies*, 42: 197-219.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Neuman, S. and Weiss, A. (1995) On the Effects of Schooling Vintage on Experience  
4  
5 Earnings Profiles: Theory and Evidence. *European Economic Review*, 39(5): 943-  
6  
7 955.  
8  
9  
10 OECD (2001) *Economics and Finance of Lifelong Learning*, Paris: OECD.  
11  
12 Rosen, S. (1972) Learning and Experience in the labor market, *Journal of Human*  
13  
14 *Resources*, 7: 326-342.  
15  
16  
17 Rosen, S. (1975) Measuring the Obsolescence of Knowledge. In: F.T. Juster (ed)  
18  
19 *Education, Income and Human Behaviour*. New York: Carnegie Foundation,  
20  
21 pp.199-232.  
22  
23  
24 Sieben, I., De Grip, A., Longen, J., and Sørensen, O. (2009) 'Technology Selection, and  
25  
26 Training in Call Centers', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 62: 553-572.  
27  
28  
29 Van Loo, J., De Grip, A., and De Steur, M. (2001) 'Skills Obsolescence, Causes and  
30  
31 Cures', *International Journal of Manpower*, 22: 121-137.  
32  
33  
34 Van Smoorenburg, M.S.M. and Van der Velden, R.K.W. (2000) 'The Training of School-  
35  
36 leavers: Complementarity or Substitution?', *Economics of Education Review*, 19:  
37  
38 207-217.  
39  
40  
41 Weisberg, B.A. (2002). 'New Technologies, Skills Obsolescence, and Skill  
42  
43 Complementarity', in: A. de Grip, J. van Loo and K. Mayhew (eds.) *The*  
44  
45 *Economics of Skills Obsolescence: Theoretical Innovations and Empirical*  
46  
47 *Applications*, *Research in Labor Economics*, 21: 101-118.  
48  
49  
50 Weiss, M. and Garloff, A. (2009) 'Skill-biased technological change and endogenous  
51  
52 benefits: the dynamics of unemployment and wage inequality', *Applied*  
53  
54 *Economics*, 1-11.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Welch, F. and Ureta, M (2002) ‘The Obsolescence of Skill’, in: A. de Grip, J. van Loo and K. Mayhew (eds.) *The Economics of Skills Obsolescence: Theoretical Innovations and Empirical Applications*, *Research in Labor Economics*, 21, 51-81.

For Peer Review

FIGURE 1: Static model of skill obsolescence and employment loss





FIGURE 2: Dynamic model of skill obsolescence and employment loss





1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**FIGURE 3: The pooled dataset**

Previous skill obsolescence	Main body of variables	Subsequent labour market participation
1992	1994	1996
+	+	+
1994	1996	1998
+	+	+
1996	1998	2000
=	=	=
1992+1994+1996	1994+1996+1998	1996+1998+2000

For Peer Review

**TABLE 1: Descriptive statistics of variables used in the analyses**

<i>Variable</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>
Skill obsolescence	4.4	-	-
Loss of work	6.8	-	-
IT-intensity (% in occupational group)	-	57.63	31.42
Previous training participation	-	0.41	0.85
Current training participation	-	0.43	0.90
On-the-job learning	-	6.42	2.27
Previous skill obsolescence	5.6	-	-
Tenure (years)	-	14.27	10.09
<i>Low</i>	35.7	-	-
<i>Intermediate</i>	32.9	-	-
<i>High</i>	31.4	-	-
Gender (female)	37.4	-	-
Age	-	48.07	5.49
<i>Cohort 1994</i>	30.5	-	-
<i>Cohort 1996</i>	32.1	-	-
<i>Cohort 1998</i>	37.4	-	-
Firm size	19.6	-	-
<i>10-99 employees</i>	39.0	-	-
<i>&gt;= 100 employees</i>	41.4	-	-
Economic sector			
<i>Agriculture, forestry and fisheries</i>	2.9	-	-
<i>Manufacturing and mining</i>	20.5	-	-
<i>Business services</i>	31.6	-	-
<i>Public services</i>	45.0	-	-

SOURCE: OSA Labour Supply Panel, 1992-2000

**TABLE 2: Logit estimation of skill obsolescence in the current job**

	B	Robust S.E.
Constant	-3.117**	0.836
IT-intensity	0.003	0.003
Previous training participation	0.025	0.034
On-the-job learning	0.113**	0.043
Previous skill obsolescence	1.478**	0.225
Tenure	0.017	0.026
Tenure-squared/100	-0.073	0.077
Occupational level (ref. intermediate level)		
• <i>Low level</i>	-0.473*	0.231
• <i>High level</i>	-0.177	0.174
Gender (female)	-0.064	0.185
Cohort (reference 1996)		
• <i>1994</i>	-0.107	0.172
• <i>1998</i>	-0.646**	0.187
Age	-0.008	0.015
Firm size (ref. category 10-99 employees)		
• <i>&lt; 10 employees</i>	-0.129	0.223
• <i>&gt;= 100 employees</i>	-0.149	0.166
Economic sector (ref, manufacturing and mining)		
<i>Agriculture, forestry and fisheries</i>	-0.250	0.531
<i>Business services</i>	0.163	0.209
<i>Public services</i>	-0.256	0.215
N= 4,528; Pseudo R <sup>2</sup> = 0.056		* = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01

**TABLE 3: Logit estimation of loss of work**

	B	Robust S.E.
Constant	-11.670**	0.953
IT-intensity	0.001	0.003
Previous training participation	-0.109*	0.043
On-the-job learning	-0.056	0.036
Skill obsolescence	0.184	0.354
Tenure	-0.061**	0.024
Tenure-squared/100	0.166**	0.062
Occupational level (ref. intermediate level)		
• <i>Low level</i>	-0.092	0.201
• <i>High level</i>	-0.235	0.202
Gender (female)	0.579**	0.177
Cohort (reference 1996)		
• <i>1994</i>	0.356*	0.174
• <i>1998</i>	0.014	0.195
Age	0.182**	0.017
Firm size (ref. category 10-99 employees)		
• <i>&lt; 10 employees</i>	-0.195	0.221
• <i>&gt;= 100 employees</i>	0.118	0.175
Economic sector (ref, manufacturing and mining)		
<i>Agriculture, forestry and fisheries</i>	-0.188	0.477
<i>Business services</i>	0.145	0.209
<i>Public services</i>	-0.339	0.227
N= 3.236; Pseudo R <sup>2</sup> = 0.155      * = $p < 0.05$ ; ** = $p < 0.01$		

**TABLE 4: Regression analysis of on-the-job learning**

	B	Robust S.E.
Constant	5.935**	0.433
IT-intensity	0.009**	0.002
Previous skill obsolescence	0.421*	0.171
Occupational level (reference intermediate level)		
• <i>Low level</i>	-1.302**	0.113
• <i>High level</i>	0.344**	0.101
Cohort (reference 1996)		
• <i>1994</i>	0.308**	0.073
• <i>1998</i>	0.192*	0.081
Age	0.013	0.008
Firm size (ref. category 10-99 employees)		
• <i>&lt; 10 employees</i>	-0.222	0.139
• <i>&gt;= 100 employees</i>	0.297**	0.090
Economic sector (ref, manufacturing and mining)		
• <i>Agriculture, forestry and fisheries</i>	0.068	0.349
• <i>Business services</i>	-0.425**	0.120
• <i>Public services</i>	-0.947**	0.114

N= 3.131; Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.180\* =  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* =  $p < 0.01$

**TABLE 5: Regression analysis of training participation**

	<i>B</i>	<i>Robust S.E.</i>
Constant	-2.316**	0.482
IT-intensity	0.003	0.002
Previous skill obsolescence	0.601**	0.233
On-the-job learning	0.139**	0.020
Tenure	0.022	0.015
Tenure-squared/100	-0.080	0.042
Occupational level (reference intermediate level)		
• <i>Low level</i>	-0.276*	0.123
• <i>High level</i>	-0.065	0.126
Cohort (reference 1996)		
• <i>1994</i>	-0.320**	0.081
• <i>1998</i>	-0.063	0.064
Age	-0.036**	0.009
Firm size (ref. category 10-99 employees)		
• <i>&lt; 10 employees</i>	-0.432**	0.124
• <i>&gt;= 100 employees</i>	0.045	0.112
Economic sector (ref, manufacturing and mining)		
• <i>Agriculture, forestry and fisheries</i>	-0.552**	0.212
• <i>Business services</i>	-0.169	0.134
• <i>Public services</i>	0.200	0.138
N= 3.235; Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = 0.060		* = $p < 0.05$ ; ** = $p < 0.01$

## NOTES

---

1. As more recent waves of the OSA Panel lack data on variables needed in our analysis, we have to restrict the analyses to the period 1992-2000.

2. Because we pool data from different years, some respondents are represented more than once in the data. The data contain a total of 2,594 individual respondents, of which 1,211 appear in only one of related survey years (e.g. 1992, 1994 and 1996), 677 appear twice and 706 in all three years (See figure 4).

2. On average between 25% and 30% of respondents who participated in a given wave do not participate in the subsequent wave. Panel attrition shows little or no relation to key variables like skill obsolescence and on the job training. However, those who participated in training in a given period are somewhat less likely to drop out in the following wave. There is, however, no reason to expect that our results are affected by panel attrition, since this would require that both the dependent variables and at least some of the independent variables are related to the chance of participating in the following wave.

4. For more information on the OSA Panel, see

<http://www.tilburguniversity.nl/osa/datasets>.

5. We use two different indicators of training, which play two different roles in our analyses. Training in the previous period is used as a *predictor* of current skill obsolescence and the chance of losing one's work. Training in the current period is used as a *dependent variable*, with among other things the percentage of computer use, the initial training time needed in the job and previous skill obsolescence as predictors. The fact that these two variables overlap partly does not present a problem, because they never appear together in any analyses.