

Informal networks, spatial mobility and overeducation in the Italian labour market

by

Valentina Meliciani

(University of Teramo, e-mail: vmeliciani@unite.it)

and

Debora Radicchia

(ISFOL, e-mail: dradicchia@isfol.it)

Abstract

This paper investigates the impact of the use of the informal recruitment channel (relatives and friends) on the probability of being overeducated in the Italian labour market. We argue that the informal recruitment channel may increase job-education mis-matches both directly (by inducing some workers to undertake careers in industries, professions, or firms where their comparative productive advantage is not fully exploited) and indirectly by negatively affecting spatial flexibility. In order to test these hypotheses, we estimate probit models with self-selection using ISFOL PLUS survey data providing information on labour market entry channels, job related migration and a “subjective” measure of overeducation. We find a robust positive impact of the use of the informal channel on overeducation and a robust negative effect of the use of this channel on migration. On the other hand, we find that migration reduces overeducation only when focusing on private employment or on some geographical areas. Overall these findings suggest that a reform of employment services in Italy is needed in order to favour spatial flexibility, reduce the use of the informal channel and enhancing the quality of job-education matches.

Keywords: overeducation, informal recruitment channel, migration, spatial flexibility

JEL Classification: J24; J61; R23

1. Introduction

Imperfect information leads to various forms of mismatches in the labour market. One of such mismatches is the phenomenon of overeducation denoting a situation in which workers' levels of schooling are not necessary for performing their job. Education-job mismatches have negative consequences for individuals and firms since they lead to lower income levels, higher dissatisfaction, lower productivity and higher turnover. Understanding the determinants of skills underutilisation is, therefore, important for enhancing human capital investment, bringing better competencies into the labour market and increasing living standards.

In Italy, in 2011, 36.9% of people with a secondary degree declared that their level of schooling was not necessary for their job; such percentage was 18.2% among graduates. The Italian labour market is also characterised by strong differences in the distribution and in the quality of jobs over the territory. In 2011 the rate of unemployment was 4.8 in the North, 7.1 in the Centre and 13.7 in the South. In this context of strong spatial imbalances, inter-regional mobility might play a particularly relevant role for overcoming the mismatch between the demand and supply of skills.

Recently few studies have investigated this issue finding different results. Croce and Ghignoni (2011) show that for workers holding an upper secondary degree the risk of overeducation decreases with commuting time, while, among the university graduates migration reduces overeducation. This second result is questioned by Devillanova (2013), showing that when the characteristics of the job (or the endogenous of migration) are controlled for, migration displays no effect (or a positive effect) on overeducation. Finally, Iammarino and Marinelli (2012) find that migration reduces overeducation only in the Northern part of the Italian territory where the most dynamic regional economic and innovation systems are located.

All these studies neglect the possible role of labour market entry channels in affecting migration decisions and overeducation. In Italy, workers find a job mainly through informal channel (family and friends referrals)¹. While, in principle, social ties can be an effective mechanism to overcome information asymmetries, thus allowing for a better matching between employers and employees, most empirical studies on Italian data have found that the use of the personal channel is associated to lower wages (Pistaferrri; 1999; Pellizzari; 2004; Sylos Labini, 2004; Meliciani and Radicchia, 2011) and a higher probability of overeducation (Meliciani and Radicchia, 2011). However, these studies have neglected the possible indirect effects of the informal recruitment channel on education-job

¹In 2011 the percentage of workers finding a job through the informal channel was over 30%.

mismatches through their likely impact on spatial flexibility. The purpose of this paper is to fill this gap by linking the choice of the recruitment channel to migration decisions and to the phenomenon of overeducation. In particular, we estimate probit models with self-selection using ISFOL survey data providing information on labour market entry channels, job related migration and a “subjective” measure of overeducation.

Our main hypothesis is that the use of family and friends referrals limits the extent of job search to the local labour market, thus reducing spatial flexibility and increasing the risk of education-job mismatches. The existence of such an effect would have important consequences on the design of effective policies devoted to reduce skill imbalances, suggesting that this outcome may be achieved not only by improving vocational education and training systems but also by better organising employment services with the purpose of enhancing spatial flexibility.

The remaining of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 discusses two stands of literature that have not communicated so far, i.e. that on spatial mobility and overeducation and that on recruitment channels and job mismatches, and introduces our main research hypotheses. Section 3 discusses the data and methodology. Section 4 presents the results of the empirical analysis. Finally, Section 5 draws the main conclusions and policy implications.

2. Review of the literature and research hypotheses

In this Section we will briefly review two stands of literature that have not communicated so far: that on the relationship between spatial mobility and overeducation and that on the link between the informal recruitment channel and employer-employees mismatches. We will then try to link the main findings of these lines of investigation to introduce our main research hypotheses.

2.1 Spatial flexibility and overeducation

In the economic literature the relevance of the spatial dimension on overeducation has been studied in relationship with international migration and internal mobility (commuting and/or migration across local labour markets)². The results of these two streams of literature differ in terms of the impact of migration on overeducation. In particular, while in the international migration literature several studies established that migrants are characterized by a higher probability of being overeducated relative to the native population in the country of destination, the link between internal migration and overeducation remains uncertain. Some studies, such as Büchel and Battu (2003) or Büchel and Van Ham (2003) have highlighted the role of regional labour market as a potential

² Devillanova (2013) discerns that the two research areas have developed independently, ignoring each other.

explanatory variable of overeducation. The central aspect of the analysis of Büchel and van Ham (2003) consists in analysing which is the role of job opportunities in local labour markets (unemployment rates) and commuting (availability of private transport and commuting time) to explain the probability of being overeducated. In specific, they highlight that an individual searching for job in a particular local labour market has three options when in this market there is no appropriate job for him/her: The first option is not to accept the job and continue the search (unemployment); the second option consists in accepting a job in this local labour market but with lower educational requirements than the ones he/she has (overeducation); and, the third option consists in accepting a job in a different local labour market, probably assuming a commuting distance higher than desired. Their results show that the possibility of acceding to wider geographical areas when searching for job decreases the probability of being overeducated. A similar approach has been used by Hensen et al. (2009), Jauhiainen (2011) and Ramos and Sanromà (2011) with analogous results.

In Italy, only recently there have been some studies analysing the relevance of spatial flexibility in the local labour market on the individual risk of being overeducated. Croce and Ghignoni (2011), using the same data of the present paper, find that, on the overall sample, both variables measuring spatial mobility (commuting time and migration) have a negative and significant coefficient in the overeducation equation, while the distinct regressions for upper-secondary and tertiary graduates show mixed results: the risk of overeducation decreases only with commuting time for upper-secondary graduated, while having moved for working reasons affects the quality of your match only among the university graduates. This second result is questioned by Devillanova (2013) showing that when the characteristics of the job are controlled for, migration displays no effect (or a positive effect) on overeducation. On the contrary, the effect of commuting is statistically significant and robust across different specification, although quantitatively low. Finally, Iammarino and Marinelli (2012), focussing on the impact of interregional migration on job mis-matching of the graduate's professional career, find that migration reduces overeducation only in the Northern part of the Italian territory where the most dynamic regional economic and innovation systems are located.

2.2 The informal recruitment channel and employer-employees (mis)matches

The labour market is characterised by the existence of asymmetric information between employers and employees and by the fact this information is particularly valuable since job relations tend to have a long term character. In this framework social ties can be an effective mechanism to overcome information problems and to allow a better matching between employers and employees.

In fact networks of personal relations are one of the most important channels for finding a job both in Europe and in United States. However empirical studies investigating their impact on workers' remuneration and on other measures of workers' satisfaction have found contrasting results.

Most of the studies that have investigated the motivations and the consequences of using personal contacts as an entry channel in the labour market have focussed on the United States and a great part of these studies has shown the higher wages, higher productivity, lower turnover and higher tenure of referred workers (Cocoran et al., 1980; Datcher, 1983; Simon and Warner, 1992; Korenman and Turner, 1994; Holzer, 1997; Rosenbaum et al. 1999; Marmaros and Sacerdote, 2002). These results are in line with theoretical models predicting that personal contacts increase the probability to get a job and the job remuneration since they reduce information asymmetries and allow a better matching between employers and employees (Montgomery, 1991; Mortensen and Vishwanath, 1994) or because referrals lower monitoring costs since high-effort referees can exert peer pressure on co-workers (Kugler, 2003).

Recently, however, a few studies conducted mainly in Europe (Pistaferrri, 1999; Addison and Portugal, 2002; Pellizzari, 2004; Delattre and Sabatier, 2007), and/or focussing on contacts with friends and relatives and excluding professional ties (Bentolila et al., 2004; Sylos Labini, 2004; Antoninis, 2006) have shown opposite results, finding that people entering the labour market through personal contacts receive on average lower wages. A recent study by Loury (2006) has used information on wages and tenure in order to discriminate between the hypothesis that the use of informal contacts leads to a better match between employers and employees (this would imply longer tenure and higher wages) and the alternative hypothesis that workers rely on informal contacts as a last resort (this would imply longer tenure because of limited opportunities but lower wages). The results of the study show that the two different explanations are simultaneously valid for different types of contacts.

Bentolila et al. (2004) present a model where social contacts induce some workers to undertake careers in industries, professions, or firms where their comparative productive advantage is not fully exploited. Consequently, the labour market may be characterized by a high degree of mismatch, which in turn may depress aggregate productivity and the returns to firms' investment. They also show, with both US and European Union data, that there is indeed a wage discount, of around 3% to 5%, for jobs found through contacts.

Focussing on the Italian case, the empirical studies mainly found a negative impact of the informal recruitment channel on wages. Pistaferrri (1999) using the 1991 and 1993 Survey of Households Income and Wealth conducted by the Central Bank of Italy finds that the use of the informal channel reduces wages (in 1993 from a maximum of about 7% in a more parsimonious

specification to a minimum of about 4% in the specification including firms' size and family background variables). He states that one possible interpretation of this result is that due to high hiring costs firms use informal networks when they have to fill low skill positions. The negative coefficient on the informal channel would therefore reflect lower unobserved skills and abilities.

Pellizzari (2004), using data from the European Community Household Panel covering the period 1994-1999, also finds that in Italy people entering the labour market via personal contacts receive on average lower wages (with a penalty that ranges from 6% in the OLS estimates without job characteristics to about 2% in OLS regressions with job characteristics and in fixed effects estimates). He also finds that wage differentials tend to disappear with tenure, thus concluding that they cannot be due to compensating differentials (other advantages due to the use of the informal channel) but are more likely to depend on mismatches. He explains this result with a model showing that employers invest more in recruitment for high productivity jobs and, therefore, in labour markets where employers invest largely in formal recruitment activities, matches created through this channel are likely to be of average better quality than those created through informal networks. The empirical predictions of the theory are successfully tested using industry-level data on recruitment costs across countries and industries.

Sylos Labini (2004), using data from a survey run by the Italian National Bureau of Statistics ISTAT in 1998 on University graduates, finds that the use of the informal channel has a different impact on wages when distinguishing between family and professional ties, with family contacts leading to a wage discount of about 4% and professional ones to a wage premium of 2.6%. He also finds that family ties tend to reduce the time spent searching. The results are consistent with his model predicting a different impact of professional and family ties on wages.

Mosca and Pastore (2008) find that informal networks bring with them a wage penalty (-6.5%) in the state sector, where formal hiring methods are common, and a wage premium (6.3%) in social cooperatives and religious institutions, where formal hiring methods are not common. They explain this result arguing that nonprofit organisations prefer informal recruitment methods not for nepotistic reasons, but to better select the most motivated workers.

Finally Meliciani and Radicchia (2011), using ISFOL data, find that, while workers entering the labour market via "professional ties" enjoy a wage bonus and a reduction in entry times, those recruited via "family and friends" referrals save on entry times but receive on average lower wages. Moreover, the use of the family channel reduces the returns to education and is associated with the phenomenon of "over-education", suggesting the existence of some mismatches between workers' and jobs' characteristics.

Overall the studies focussing on Italy suggest that, in this country, the use of the informal channel, rather than reducing information asymmetries between employers and employees increases the probability of job-workers mismatches, thus contributing to the phenomenon of overeducation.

2.3 Research hypotheses

On the one hand the literature on spatial flexibility and overeducation has shown that in Italy, or at least some in some parts of the territory, some forms of spatial mobility reduce overeducation. At the same time the literature on the impact of family and friends referrals on the performance of workers in the labour market has found that the use of personal contacts is likely to increase job-workers mismatches. Until now, these two stands of literature have remained separated. However, it is likely that the choice of the recruitment channel impacts on the degree of workers' spatial mobility. In particular, our main hypothesis is that the use of personal contacts as a labour market entry channel reduces the probability of finding a job in distant places with a negative impact on spatial mobility. If migration is inversely related to education-job mismatches, the use of the informal recruitment channel indirectly favours overeducation. Moreover, we also expect a direct (positive) impact of family and friends referrals on overeducation. In fact, the availability of social contacts and the opportunity to find a job more easily may convince a worker to sacrifice his productive comparative advantage, thus creating a mismatch between workers' competencies and their occupational choice (Bentolila et al., 2004; Meliciani and Radicchia, 2011).

Since previous studies have shown that the relationship between migration and overeducation in Italy is not so clear cut, and, in particular, it may vanish when accounting for job characteristics (Devillanova, 2013) or it may be specific to some parts of the territory (Iammarino and Marinelli, 2012), we will distinguish between migration in the public and in the private sector and between migration directed to different areas of the Italian territory (North-West; North-East; Centre and South).

Overall, finding empirical support for our hypotheses would suggest that policies devoted to improve labour market entry channels might have important positive effects on education-job matches, thus increasing the returns to education, labour productivity and the quality of jobs. Moreover, such policies should not neglect the importance of favouring spatial flexibility by enhancing the probability of education-job matches occurring also outside the local labour market.

3. Data and econometric methodology

The study uses data from the survey Isfol Plus³ (Participation Labour Unemployment Survey), focusing on the characteristics and the expectations of over 40.000 individuals in the labour market in Italy in 2011.

The survey collects many information regarding occupational choice, like monthly wage, hours worked per week, job experience, sector of employment, type and size of enterprise, type of contract (permanent or fixed), educational certification, attainment, particular skills and competencies and obviously on geographic mobility. In particular, to measure spatial mobility we have two indicators: commuting (measured as distance from the workplace in minutes) and internal migration for job, directed to different areas of the Italian territory (North-West; North-East; Centre and South).

The workers' self-assessment measure of over education can be constructed from the following question: "is your educational level necessary to perform your job?" and by defining as overeducated those employees with a level of education higher than the compulsory school answering "no" to the above mentioned question.

The survey also gives answers to the question "How did you get your current job?", offering a rich detail of the research methods used, both formal (through private or public employment service, by means of temporary-employment agency, via school or university, or by inserting or answering adverts in newspapers, by applying to the employer directly, by public competition, by starting own business or joining family business) and informal, making a distinction between people who get job by contacts with relatives and friends and through working and professional ties. Respondents can choose only one answer.

The employed group involves 16,115 individuals but we limit our study to the impact of personal contacts on overeducation and spatial flexibility, therefore the initial sample consist of 13,097⁴ employees with a level of education higher than the compulsory school.

³PLUS (Participation Labour Unemployment Survey) is a sample survey on the Italian labour market supply. The Survey annually samples, on average, 40,000 individuals, contacted through a dynamic CATI system without proxy interviews. Since the second wave of the survey (2006), it is characterized by an extensive number of panel observations (about 65%). The survey sample design is stratified over the Italian population aged 18-64. Strata are defined by regions, type of city (metropolitan/not metropolitan), age (5 classes), sex, and employment status (employed, unemployed, student, job retired, other inactive/housewife). The distribution of the sample is obtained through a multi-domain allocation procedure, developed specifically for the project PLUS. The extraction of the sample provides a process for quota. The reference population is derived from the annual averages of the Istat Labour Force Survey. The sixth edition of this annual survey came out in the second half of 2014. The Isfol Plus data are available online by accessing the open data section <http://www.isfol.it/open-data-delle-ricerche/isfol-microdati>.

The table 1 shows how the incidence of over-education differs considerably by spatial flexibility (37% for no migrant and 28% for migrant) suggesting a negative relationship between migration and overeducation. The table also shows that the percentage of individuals that are overeducated changes significantly according to labour market entry channels⁵. In particular, the use of personal contacts increases education-job mismatches. Also the incidence of spatial flexibility (5.6%.) varies by channels: from the maximum of 10% of the public competition and the minimum of 1.30% of private recruitment agencies, but also the use of informal contact (family and friends) reduces the incidence of internal migration to 3.5%. A preliminary descriptive analysis seems to confirm the research hypotheses.

Table 1 – Incidence % of overeducation by spatial flexibility and labour market entry channels.

| <i>Employees with a level of education higher than the compulsory school by entry channels</i> | <i>No spatial flexibility</i> | | <i>Spatial flexibility</i> | | <i>% Spatial flexibility</i> | | <i>Entry channels</i> | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | <i>% Over-education</i> | <i>Std. Dev</i> | <i>% Over-education</i> | <i>Std. Dev</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>Std. Dev</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>Std. Dev</i> |
| Public employment service | 45.17 | 0.498 | 46.63 | 0.499 | 8.76 | 0.283 | 2.92 | 0.165 |
| Temporary-employment agency | 58.88 | 0.492 | 71.30 | 0.452 | 2.97 | 0.170 | 2.54 | 0.154 |
| Private recruitment agencies | 49.94 | 0.500 | 34.32 | 0.475 | 1.30 | 0.113 | 1.11 | 0.103 |
| School or university | 16.71 | 0.373 | 8.71 | 0.282 | 4.53 | 0.208 | 3.75 | 0.186 |
| Insert or answer adverts in newspaper | 35.98 | 0.480 | 23.78 | 0.426 | 4.69 | 0.211 | 4.15 | 0.195 |
| Professional informal contact | 41.30 | 0.492 | 52.41 | 0.499 | 6.79 | 0.251 | 6.83 | 0.247 |
| Informal contact (Family or friends) | 51.82 | 0.500 | 52.70 | 0.499 | 3.52 | 0.184 | 24.67 | 0.425 |
| Direct application | 40.26 | 0.499 | 27.99 | 0.449 | 4.36 | 0.204 | 17.47 | 0.373 |
| Public competition | 15.83 | 0.365 | 15.20 | 0.359 | 10.08 | 0.301 | 24.83 | 0.426 |
| Start own business or join family business | 40.28 | 0.490 | 18.90 | 0.391 | 2.80 | 0.165 | 11.39 | 0.312 |
| Total | 37.13 | 0.484 | 28.37 | 0.451 | 5.63 | 0.227 | 100.00 | |

Source: ISFOL-PLUS 2011

While the descriptive analysis suggests a negative relationship between migration and overeducation, a positive relationship between the use of the informal channel and overeducation and a negative

⁴The regression introduces many control variables (for example occupational characteristics) that reduce the sample to about 11,000 employees.

⁵In Italy, the main strategies to get a job is through informal contacts and public competition. In the Plus survey the informal channel involves the 30% of the employees with a level of education higher than the compulsory school, but it makes a distinction between people that find job through family and friends referrals (about 25%) and workers that find job via professional ties (about 7%).

relationship between the use of the informal channel and internal migration, the existence of a “causal” effect of the informal channel on migration and overeducation can only be assessed in a regression framework controlling for other factors affecting overeducation and migration, taking into account of possible “selection biases” and of the possible endogeneity of migration decisions. In particular, we estimate the following equations:

$$Pover_i = \alpha_1 + \beta_1 Migr_i + \gamma_1 Inf_i + \delta' X_i + u_i \quad (1)$$

$$Pwork_i = \alpha_2 + \zeta' Y_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

$$Pmigr_i = \alpha_3 + \gamma_3 Inf_i + \theta' Z_i + \psi_i \quad (3)$$

where $Pover_i$ is the probability of being overeducated for individual i , $Migr$ is a dummy variable equal to one for people who have migrated to find a job, Inf is a dummy variable equal to one for people entering the labour market through the use of the informal channel, and X , Y and Z are vectors of individual and job related characteristics assumed to affect respectively the probability of being overeducated, of working and of migrating. In particular we control for gender, the age (4 classes), the Provinces, the type of city (metropolitan/not metropolitan), the educational level (secondary school graduation or university), type of secondary (Liceo or technical), the years of schools lost (failed), the past training course, own particular skills and competencies, the type of contract, the level of qualification, the business sector, the type and size of firms, the recruitment channels, marital status and the number of component of the family.

As stated in Section 2.3, our main hypotheses are that the use of the informal channel increases overeducation and reduces migration, while migration reduces overeducation: $\beta_1 < 0$; $\gamma_1 > 0$ and $\gamma_3 < 0$

The estimation of the three equations above should cope with two methodological issues concerning sample selection and the possible endogeneity of migration choices. As far as the first issue is concerned, overeducation can be observed only if the individual actually works and there could be some unexplained factors that affect both the probability of being overeducated and the probability of self-selecting into to work leading to biased estimates. For this reason we estimate equations (1) and (2) with the Heckman probit model using as instrument in the employment equation the number of members in the household (as in Devillanova, 2013). Secondly, there could be some unobserved factors affecting both the choice to migrate and the probability of being overeducated again leading to biased estimates. Croce and Ghignoni (2011), using as instrument long-term unemployment at origin, find no evidence of the endogeneity of migration. However, Devillanova (2013) criticizes the instrument proposed by Croce and Ghignoni and uses as an

instrument the housing arrangement. Following Devillanova we use the same instrument but we do not find evidence of endogeneity of migration so that equation (3) is estimated independently from the other equations using a probit model.

4. Empirical results

Tables 2 and 3 report the results of the estimations. In table 2 the overeducation equation does not include occupational variables that are instead introduced in Table 3. In each table column (1) reports the estimates of the probit regression, column (2) of the two step Heckman selection model, column (3) reports the estimates of the selection equation and column (4) the estimates of the probability to migrate. Consistently with Devillanova (2013), we find that, while in the estimates that do not include occupational variables migration significantly reduces overeducation, the variable loses significance when controlling for occupational variables. Again, in line with Devillanova (2013) and Croce and Ghignoni (2011), we find that commuting time is inversely related to overeducation in all regressions. However, differently from Devillanova, we do not find evidence of endogeneity of migration using the instruments that he suggests (the housing arrangement). On the other hand, we find a significant lambda coefficient in the Heckman procedure confirming the concern that the probability of being overeducated might be significantly correlated with the probability of being employed. Since this result holds across all specifications, our comments refer to the estimates of the two steps Heckman procedure.

The main concern of our paper is to assess the impact of the informal channel on overeducation. Consistently with our expectations, regression results both including and excluding occupational variables show that workers entering the labour market through the informal channel (family and friends referrals) have a higher probability of being overeducated and a lower probability to migrate. Regression results also show that overeducation is lower for university graduates with respect to people with only secondary education (university also increases the probability to be employed and the probability to migrate), while it is higher for people who have failed in their studies. Other interesting robust effects are the negative impact of having attended a training course on the probability of being overeducated (having attended a training course also increases the probability of being employed and the probability to migrate) and the higher probability of being overeducated in urban areas and, as expected, for foreigners. Finally, less expected is the evidence that overeducation is higher for singles and for people with sons while it is lower for women with sons.

Table 2 - Regression results of overeducation equation without occupational variables

| VARIABLES | Probit Over education (1) | Heck probit Over education (2) | Selection equation Employed (3) | Probit Migration (4) |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Migrant | -0.157** (0.0611) | -0.133** (0.0522) | | |
| Commuting time | -0.00491*** (0.000845) | -0.00428*** (0.000720) | | 0.00455*** (0.000981) |
| Foreigner | 0.918*** (0.143) | 0.762*** (0.132) | 0.0519 (0.0901) | -0.0269 (0.222) |
| Gender (woman=1) | 0.00797 (0.0359) | -0.0722** (0.0323) | -0.177*** (0.0215) | -0.181*** (0.0574) |
| Sons | 0.249*** (0.0607) | 0.202*** (0.0545) | -0.117*** (0.0428) | -0.0753 (0.106) |
| Woman*sons | -0.264*** (0.0545) | -0.193*** (0.0496) | 0.0659* (0.0349) | -0.0122 (0.0825) |
| Type secondary (Liceo) | 0.144*** (0.0325) | -0.0106 (0.0341) | -0.307*** (0.0187) | 0.0887* (0.0474) |
| University | -0.567*** (0.0335) | -0.319*** (0.0469) | 0.381*** (0.0196) | 0.205*** (0.0492) |
| Failed | 0.225*** (0.0364) | 0.185*** (0.0334) | 0.00120 (0.0235) | -0.0898 (0.0613) |
| Metropolitan City | 0.202*** (0.0744) | 0.181*** (0.0657) | 0.0441 (0.0449) | -0.160 (0.111) |
| North West | 0.215 (0.362) | 0.460 (0.312) | 0.649*** (0.186) | -0.349 (0.599) |
| North East | 0.692* (0.401) | 0.773** (0.346) | 0.398* (0.220) | 0.463 (0.594) |
| Centre | 0.643* (0.379) | 0.681** (0.326) | 4.899 (46.57) | 0.452 (0.575) |
| Single | 0.199*** (0.0509) | 0.146*** (0.0456) | -0.138*** (0.0356) | -0.0566 (0.0858) |
| Divorced | -0.00282 (0.0770) | 0.0252 (0.0689) | 0.0837 (0.0544) | -0.0452 (0.128) |
| Widower | 0.0156 (0.125) | -0.158 (0.110) | -0.389*** (0.0695) | 0.0664 (0.161) |
| Age 30-39 | -0.0774** (0.0391) | 0.140*** (0.0431) | 0.451*** (0.0267) | -0.0638 (0.0640) |
| Age 40-49 | -0.203*** (0.0547) | 0.155** (0.0658) | 0.770*** (0.0402) | -0.0342 (0.0834) |
| Age over 49 | -0.475*** (0.0470) | -0.225*** (0.0562) | 0.394*** (0.0340) | -0.0925 (0.0740) |
| Skills (languages and pc) | -0.302*** (0.0811) | -0.0507 (0.0776) | 0.420*** (0.0456) | 0.227 (0.158) |
| Training course | -0.375*** (0.0291) | -0.119*** (0.0419) | 0.499*** (0.0189) | 0.232*** (0.0420) |
| Informal channel (Family and friends) | 0.417*** (0.0302) | 0.342*** (0.0322) | | -0.318*** (0.0573) |
| N. of component= 2 | | | -0.246*** (0.0356) | -0.284*** (0.0848) |
| N. of component= 3 | | | -0.0579* (0.0338) | -0.176 (0.112) |
| N. of component> 3 | | | -0.0487 (0.0339) | -0.195* (0.114) |
| Housing arrangement: Rent | | | | 0.440*** (0.0608) |
| Housing arrangement: Young Adult Living | | | | -0.292*** (0.108) |
| Provincial fixed effect | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Constant | -0.265 (0.347) | -1.335*** (0.318) | -1.031*** (0.173) | -1.647*** (0.551) |
| Athrho | | 0.883*** (0.157) | | |
| Observations | 11,283 | 26,796 | 26,796 | 11,066 |

| VARIABLES | Probit Over education (1) | Heck probit Over education (2) | Selection equation Employed (3) | Probit Migration (4) |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Smith-Blundell test of exogeneity of migration: 1.020038 Chi-sqr(1) P-value = .3125 | | | | |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Looking at occupational variables (Table 3), we find, as expected, that overeducation is lower for people with higher qualifications, it is higher in private firms and in firms with temporary contracts. There are also significant differences across sectors with overeducation being higher in agriculture, industry and the commercial sector and lower in construction (base category Services). Migration is lower in the industrial sector and is higher in medium and large firms with respect to small firms, while there is no significant difference between private and public employment.

Due to the lack of significance of migration on overeducation in the equation including occupational variables, we tried to assess which variable was responsible of the results and we found that migration loses significance when the dummy for employment in private firms is introduced in the regression. Since overeducation is much more likely to happen in private firms (45%) than in public ones (19%), we decided to estimate the relationship between migration and overeducation focussing only on the private sector.

Table 3 - Regression results of overeducation equation with occupational variables

| VARIABLES | Probit Over education (1) | Heck probit Over education (2) | Selection equation Employed (3) | Probit Migration (4) |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Migrant | -0.0954 (0.0661) | -0.0838 (0.0575) | | |
| Commuting time | -0.00354*** (0.000871) | -0.00319*** (0.000754) | | 0.00431*** (0.00101) |
| Foreigner | 0.624*** (0.143) | 0.524*** (0.130) | 0.00357 (0.0911) | 0.0855 (0.224) |
| Woman | 0.0694* (0.0385) | -0.0102 (0.0356) | -0.171*** (0.0217) | -0.178*** (0.0604) |
| Sons | 0.241*** (0.0646) | 0.198*** (0.0587) | -0.129*** (0.0430) | -0.0622 (0.108) |
| Woman*sons | -0.224*** (0.0578) | -0.164*** (0.0531) | 0.0699** (0.0351) | -0.0157 (0.0848) |
| Type secondary (Liceo) | 0.218*** (0.0344) | 0.0676* (0.0367) | -0.305*** (0.0188) | 0.0973** (0.0484) |
| University | -0.278*** (0.0375) | -0.0929** (0.0414) | 0.384*** (0.0197) | 0.155*** (0.0527) |
| Failed | 0.180*** (0.0385) | 0.152*** (0.0352) | 0.00249 (0.0237) | -0.0816 (0.0629) |
| Metropolitan City | 0.217*** (0.0764) | 0.200*** (0.0687) | 0.0473 (0.0452) | -0.0819 (0.115) |
| North West | 0.108 (0.360) | 0.367 (0.315) | 0.683*** (0.186) | -0.386 (0.596) |
| North East | 0.542 (0.410) | 0.645* (0.360) | 0.421* (0.220) | 0.499 (0.595) |
| Centre | 0.349 | 0.441 | 4.782 | 0.511 |

| VARIABLES | Probit Over education (1) | Heck probit Over education (2) | Selection equation Employed (3) | Probit Migration (4) |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | (0.382) | (0.334) | (17.17) | (0.575) |
| Single | 0.146*** (0.0532) | 0.105** (0.0480) | -0.141*** (0.0359) | -0.0151 (0.0863) |
| Divorced | 0.0108 (0.0833) | 0.0280 (0.0752) | 0.0805 (0.0548) | -0.0136 (0.127) |
| Widower | -0.00308 (0.131) | -0.169 (0.118) | -0.393*** (0.0700) | 0.104 (0.161) |
| Age 30-39 | 0.0151 (0.0409) | 0.206*** (0.0430) | 0.463*** (0.0269) | -0.0471 (0.0657) |
| Age 40-49 | -0.0149 (0.0584) | 0.291*** (0.0640) | 0.780*** (0.0404) | -0.0688 (0.0865) |
| Age over 49 | -0.115** (0.0518) | 0.0682 (0.0524) | 0.414*** (0.0340) | -0.142* (0.0784) |
| Skills (languages and pc) | -0.122 (0.0868) | 0.0806 (0.0808) | 0.423*** (0.0458) | 0.173 (0.159) |
| Training course | -0.261*** (0.0309) | -0.0396 (0.0394) | 0.504*** (0.0189) | 0.205*** (0.0436) |
| Informal channel (Family and friends) | 0.270*** (0.0322) | 0.231*** (0.0291) | | -0.206*** (0.0601) |
| High level qualification (<i>Base cat. low qualification</i>) | -1.122*** (0.0561) | -0.960*** (0.0641) | | 0.0540 (0.0911) |
| Median level qualification | -0.580*** (0.0468) | -0.489*** (0.0469) | | -0.000871 (0.0844) |
| Agriculture (base cat. Services) | 0.488*** (0.109) | 0.410*** (0.0954) | | -0.295 (0.199) |
| Industry sector | 0.160*** (0.0472) | 0.142*** (0.0408) | | -0.223*** (0.0865) |
| Construction sector | -0.203*** (0.0772) | -0.169** (0.0667) | | -0.145 (0.136) |
| Commercial sector | 0.600*** (0.0387) | 0.505*** (0.0415) | | -0.0110 (0.0704) |
| Fixed term contract | -0.233*** (0.0316) | -0.205*** (0.0276) | | 0.0117 (0.0511) |
| Private firms | 0.351*** (0.0461) | 0.310*** (0.0411) | | -0.0311 (0.0646) |
| Medium firms (15-100) | 0.00619 (0.0409) | 0.00928 (0.0348) | | 0.267*** (0.0694) |
| Large firms (over 100) | 0.00948 (0.0426) | 0.0101 (0.0365) | | 0.271*** (0.0706) |
| N. of component= 2 (Base cat. 1 comp.) | | | -0.239*** (0.0363) | -0.255*** (0.0862) |
| N. of component= 3 | | | -0.0411 (0.0345) | -0.144 (0.114) |
| N. of component> 3 | | | -0.0297 (0.0345) | -0.183 (0.117) |
| Housing arrangement: Rent | | | | 0.425*** (0.0618) |
| Housing arrangement: Young Adult Living | | | | -0.275** (0.111) |
| Provincial fixed effect | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Constant | -0.207 (0.352) | -1.240*** (0.326) | -1.108*** (0.172) | -1.786*** (0.562) |
| Athrho | | | 0.781*** (0.134) | |
| Observations | 11,115 | 26,628 | 26,628 | 10,904 |

Smith-Blundell test of exogeneity of migration: 3.28059 Chi-sqr(1) P-value = .0701

Robust standard errors in parentheses

| VARIABLES | Probit Over education (1) | Heck probit Over education (2) | Selection equation Employed (3) | Probit Migration (4) |
|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4 reports the results for all equations (overeducation, employment and migration) focussing only on employment in private firms. The results show that migration reduces overeducation also when controlling for occupational variables, although the variable is significant only at 10%. Again, it is interesting to observe that the informal channel increases overeducation and reduces migration also when the sample does not include public employment. Finally, the inverse relationship between commuting time and overeducation holds also when restricting the sample to the private sector.

Table 4 - Regression results of overeducation equation with occupational variables in private firms

| VARIABLES | Probit Over education (1) | Heck probit Over education (2) | Selection equation Employed (3) | Probit Migration (4) |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Migrant | -0.147* (0.0841) | -0.122* (0.0637) | | |
| Commuting time | -0.00377*** (0.00104) | -0.00311*** (0.000789) | | 0.00550*** (0.00142) |
| Foreigner | 0.689*** (0.154) | 0.640*** (0.127) | 0.204** (0.0928) | 0.174 (0.237) |
| Woman | 0.0654 (0.0424) | -0.0619* (0.0364) | -0.213*** (0.0227) | -0.251*** (0.0751) |
| Sons | 0.142* (0.0770) | 0.166*** (0.0623) | 0.0271 (0.0493) | -0.275 (0.174) |
| Woman*sons | -0.119* (0.0707) | -0.186*** (0.0573) | -0.181*** (0.0413) | -0.0772 (0.126) |
| Type secondary (Liceo) | 0.276*** (0.0409) | -0.00996 (0.0464) | -0.388*** (0.0210) | 0.131* (0.0675) |
| University | -0.312*** (0.0449) | -0.117*** (0.0443) | 0.225*** (0.0222) | 0.307*** (0.0708) |
| Failed | 0.175*** (0.0447) | 0.138*** (0.0375) | 0.0140 (0.0257) | -0.0742 (0.0847) |
| Metropolitan City | 0.121 (0.0879) | 0.126* (0.0712) | 0.0587 (0.0491) | -0.103 (0.147) |
| North West | 0.185 (0.406) | 0.550* (0.319) | 0.807*** (0.209) | -1.014 (0.704) |
| North East | 0.586 (0.465) | 0.674* (0.365) | 0.543** (0.243) | -0.794 (0.729) |
| Centre | 0.389 (0.422) | 0.561* (0.333) | 4.722 (6.677) | -0.189 (0.605) |
| single | 0.105* (0.0614) | 0.0647 (0.0504) | -0.0996** (0.0407) | -0.0634 (0.122) |
| Divorced | -0.0244 (0.108) | 0.0358 (0.0870) | 0.129** (0.0658) | -0.0449 (0.219) |
| Widower | -0.00640 (0.187) | -0.247* (0.147) | -0.330*** (0.0905) | -0.419 (0.327) |
| Age 30-39 | 0.0482 (0.0461) | 0.263*** (0.0416) | 0.423*** (0.0289) | -0.0688 (0.0831) |
| Age 40-49 | 0.0195 (0.0697) | 0.296*** (0.0629) | 0.553*** (0.0448) | -0.143 (0.118) |
| Age over 49 | -0.0745 (0.0636) | -0.146*** (0.0518) | -0.148*** (0.0411) | -0.176 (0.114) |
| Skills (languages and pc) | -0.228** | 0.0104 | 0.262*** | 0.253 |

| VARIABLES | Probit Over education (1) | Heck probit Over education (2) | Selection equation Employed (3) | Probit Migration (4) |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Training course | (0.111) -0.254*** (0.0378) | (0.0928) -0.0327 (0.0402) | (0.0532) 0.309*** (0.0222) | (0.233) 0.235*** (0.0622) |
| Informal channel (Family and friends) | 0.242*** (0.0340) | 0.180*** (0.0286) | | -0.210*** (0.0652) |
| High level qualification (<i>Base cat. low qual</i>) | -1.070*** (0.0639) | -0.794*** (0.0755) | | -0.0878 (0.114) |
| Median level qualification | -0.540*** (0.0517) | -0.390*** (0.0500) | | -0.0341 (0.101) |
| Agriculture (<i>Base cat. Services</i>) | 0.521*** (0.117) | 0.374*** (0.0928) | | -0.607** (0.295) |
| Industry sector | 0.167*** (0.0501) | 0.132*** (0.0384) | | -0.228** (0.0986) |
| Construction sector | -0.246*** (0.0806) | -0.164*** (0.0631) | | -0.133 (0.153) |
| Commercial sector | 0.583*** (0.0412) | 0.425*** (0.0479) | | 0.0421 (0.0776) |
| Fixed term contract | -0.259*** (0.0358) | -0.199*** (0.0300) | | 0.0154 (0.0642) |
| Medium firms (15-100) | 0.0259 (0.0411) | 0.0203 (0.0304) | | 0.243*** (0.0713) |
| Large firms (over 100) | 0.0268 (0.0432) | 0.0179 (0.0322) | | 0.246*** (0.0736) |
| N. of component= 2 | | | -0.170*** (0.0399) | -0.369*** (0.125) |
| N. of component= 3 | | | -0.0169 (0.0374) | -0.00718 (0.182) |
| N. of component> 3 | | | -0.00590 (0.0375) | 0.0389 (0.184) |
| Housing arrangement: Rent | | | | 0.365*** (0.0839) |
| Housing arrangement: Young Adult Living | | | | -0.619*** (0.169) |
| Provincial fixed effect | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Constant | 0.167 (0.395) | -1.140*** (0.328) | -1.022*** (0.197) | -0.871 (0.599) |
| athrho | | | 1.106*** (0.194) | |
| Observations | 7,220 | 22,796 | 22,796 | 6,553 |
| Smith-Blundell test of exogeneity of migration: 3.421617 Chi-sqr(1) P-value = .0643 | | | | |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Since Italy is a country with large differences in income per capita and unemployment rates across geographical areas, we wanted to test whether it is especially migration towards the richer parts of the territory (North-West and North-East) that contributes to reduce overeducation. Table 5 reports the results of the overeducation equation (using the two step Heckman procedure) distinguishing between four different geographical areas: North-West, North-East, Centre and South.

Table 5 - Regression results of overeducation equation with occupational variables between different geographical areas

| VARIABLES | All sample | | Only Private firm | | All sample | | Only Private firm | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Heck probit | Selection equation | Heck probit | Selection equation | Heck probit | Selection equation | Heck probit | Selection equation |
| Migration vs North West | -0.341** (0.138) | | -0.425*** (0.150) | | | | | |
| Migration vs North East | 0.120 (0.132) | | -0.0208 (0.138) | | | | | |
| Migration vs Centre | 0.139 (0.119) | | 0.124 (0.139) | | | | | |
| Migration vs South | -0.160* (0.0897) | | -0.115 (0.102) | | | | | |
| Migration inter North West | | | | | -0.409** (0.196) | | -0.672*** (0.228) | |
| Migrat to North West from outside | | | | | -0.266 (0.192) | | -0.161 (0.206) | |
| Migration inter South | | | | | -0.180* (0.102) | | -0.109 (0.114) | |
| Mig. to South from outside | | | | | -0.104 (0.174) | | -0.142 (0.215) | |
| Commuting time | -0.00324*** (0.00075) | | -0.003*** (0.00079) | | -0.003*** (0.00075) | | -0.003*** (0.00079) | |
| Foreigner | 0.531*** (0.131) | 0.00375 (0.0911) | 0.590*** (0.129) | 0.151 (0.0943) | 0.530*** (0.131) | 0.00371 (0.0911) | 0.595*** (0.130) | 0.151 (0.0943) |
| Woman | -0.0104 (0.0357) | -0.171*** (0.0217) | -0.0682* (0.0364) | -0.215*** (0.0228) | -0.0110 (0.0356) | -0.171*** (0.0217) | -0.0684* (0.0365) | -0.215*** (0.0228) |
| Sons | 0.198*** (0.0587) | -0.130*** (0.0430) | 0.163*** (0.0625) | 0.0287 (0.0495) | 0.198*** (0.0586) | -0.130*** (0.0430) | 0.162*** (0.0626) | 0.0287 (0.0495) |
| Woman*sons | -0.165*** (0.0531) | 0.0699** (0.0351) | -0.185*** (0.0575) | -0.180*** (0.0414) | -0.165*** (0.0531) | 0.0699** (0.0351) | -0.18*** (0.0576) | -0.179*** (0.0414) |
| Type secondary (Liceo) | 0.0679* (0.0368) | -0.305*** (0.0188) | -0.0106 (0.0461) | -0.387*** (0.0210) | 0.0682* (0.0367) | -0.305*** (0.0188) | -0.00907 (0.0461) | -0.387*** (0.0210) |
| University | -0.0907** (0.0414) | 0.384*** (0.0197) | -0.113** (0.0441) | 0.226*** (0.0222) | -0.0900** (0.0413) | 0.384*** (0.0197) | -0.113** (0.0442) | 0.226*** (0.0222) |
| Failed | 0.154*** (0.0352) | 0.00258 (0.0237) | 0.136*** (0.0374) | 0.0158 (0.0257) | 0.153*** (0.0352) | 0.00257 (0.0237) | 0.136*** (0.0375) | 0.0158 (0.0257) |
| Metropolitan City | 0.203*** (0.0687) | 0.0474 (0.0452) | 0.124* (0.0712) | 0.0618 (0.0492) | 0.202*** (0.0687) | 0.0474 (0.0452) | 0.121* (0.0713) | 0.0614 (0.0492) |
| Single | 0.104** (0.0480) | -0.14*** (0.0359) | 0.0594 (0.0506) | -0.0995** (0.0409) | 0.103** (0.0480) | -0.141*** (0.0359) | 0.0596 (0.0506) | -0.0994** (0.0408) |
| Divorced | 0.0293 (0.0750) | 0.0803 (0.0547) | 0.0288 (0.0877) | 0.118* (0.0662) | 0.0296 (0.0750) | 0.0804 (0.0547) | 0.0277 (0.0879) | 0.119* (0.0662) |
| Widower | -0.170 (0.118) | -0.393*** (0.0700) | -0.232 (0.148) | -0.340*** (0.0916) | -0.170 (0.118) | -0.393*** (0.0700) | -0.233 (0.148) | -0.339*** (0.0916) |
| Age 30-39 | 0.206*** (0.0432) | 0.463*** (0.0269) | 0.262*** (0.0417) | 0.424*** (0.0290) | 0.206*** (0.0431) | 0.463*** (0.0269) | 0.262*** (0.0417) | 0.425*** (0.0290) |
| Age 40-49 | 0.290*** (0.0642) | 0.780*** (0.0404) | 0.297*** (0.0629) | 0.552*** (0.0449) | 0.290*** (0.0641) | 0.780*** (0.0404) | 0.297*** (0.0630) | 0.552*** (0.0449) |
| Age over 49 | 0.0694 (0.0525) | 0.414*** (0.0340) | -0.147*** (0.0520) | -0.150*** (0.0412) | 0.0687 (0.0524) | 0.414*** (0.0340) | -0.147*** (0.0521) | -0.150*** (0.0412) |
| Skills (languages and pc) | 0.0811 (0.0809) | 0.423*** (0.0458) | 0.0161 (0.0933) | 0.273*** (0.0536) | 0.0805 (0.0808) | 0.423*** (0.0458) | 0.0128 (0.0934) | 0.273*** (0.0536) |
| Training course | -0.0415 (0.0395) | 0.504*** (0.0189) | -0.0317 (0.0402) | 0.310*** (0.0222) | -0.0391 (0.0394) | 0.504*** (0.0189) | -0.0307 (0.0402) | 0.310*** (0.0222) |
| Informal channel (Family and friends) | 0.230*** (0.0291) | | 0.178*** (0.0285) | | 0.230*** (0.0291) | | 0.178*** (0.0285) | |
| High level qualification (Base cat. low qual) | -0.961*** (0.0644) | | -0.798*** (0.0750) | | -0.960*** (0.0641) | | -0.79*** (0.0747) | |
| Median level qualification | -0.491*** (0.0471) | | -0.395*** (0.0501) | | -0.490*** (0.0469) | | -0.39*** (0.0500) | |
| Agriculture(Base cat. | 0.411*** | | 0.374*** | | 0.409*** | | 0.375*** | |

| VARIABLES | All sample | | Only Private firm | | All sample | | Only Private firm | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Heck probit | Selection equation | Heck probit | Selection equation | Heck probit | Selection equation | Heck probit | Selection equation |
| <i>Services)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Industry sector | (0.0956) 0.141*** (0.0408) | | (0.0926) 0.130*** (0.0384) | | (0.0954) 0.141*** (0.0408) | | (0.0926) 0.130*** (0.0385) | |
| Construction sector | -0.171** (0.0667) | | -0.173*** (0.0635) | | -0.170** (0.0667) | | -0.17*** (0.0635) | |
| Commercial sector | 0.505*** (0.0416) | | 0.425*** (0.0473) | | 0.505*** (0.0415) | | 0.426*** (0.0473) | |
| Fixed term contract | -0.205*** (0.0276) | | -0.194*** (0.0298) | | -0.205*** (0.0276) | | -0.19*** (0.0298) | |
| Private firm | 0.311*** (0.0411) | | | | 0.310*** (0.0411) | | | |
| Medium firms (15-100) | 0.00994 (0.0348) | | 0.0215 (0.0305) | | 0.0106 (0.0348) | | 0.0216 (0.0305) | |
| Large firms (over 100) | 0.0104 (0.0365) | | 0.0183 (0.0324) | | 0.0109 (0.0365) | | 0.0174 (0.0324) | |
| North West | | 0.682*** (0.186) | | 0.807*** (0.209) | | 0.682*** (0.186) | | 0.807*** (0.209) |
| North East | | 0.422* (0.220) | | 0.505** (0.243) | | 0.421* (0.220) | | 0.505** (0.243) |
| Centre | | 4.781 (10.38) | | 4.701 (19.26) | | 4.769 | | 4.725 (19.41) |
| N. of component= 2 | | -0.240*** (0.0363) | | -0.169*** (0.0401) | | -0.239*** (0.0363) | | -0.168*** (0.0401) |
| N. of component= 3 | | -0.0411 (0.0345) | | -0.0168 (0.0376) | | -0.0408 (0.0345) | | -0.0166 (0.0376) |
| N. of component> 3 | | -0.0294 (0.0345) | | -0.00546 (0.0377) | | -0.0292 (0.0345) | | -0.00536 (0.0377) |
| Provincial fixed effect | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Constant | -1.232*** (0.328) | -1.107*** (0.173) | -1.14*** (0.328) | -1.033*** (0.197) | -1.238*** (0.324) | -1.108*** (0.172) | -1.133*** (0.328) | -1.033*** (0.197) |
| Athrho | 0.783*** (0.134) | | 1.106*** (0.190) | | 0.784*** (0.134) | | 1.102*** (0.189) | |
| Observations | 26,628 | 26,628 | 22,733 | 22,733 | 26,628 | 26,628 | 22,733 | 22,733 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses | | | | | | | | |
| *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 | | | | | | | | |

The table 5 reports the results for the whole sample (column 1) and for the sample including only people employed in the private sector (column 2) distinguishing for the area of destination of migrants. The results show that, when considering both the private and public sectors, not only migration towards the North West but also migration towards the South reduce overeducation, while there is no significant relationship between migration and overeducation in the other geographical areas. When focussing only on private firms, migration reduces overeducation only when it is directed towards the North-Western part of the territory. Finally, in columns (3) and (4) of table 5 we investigate whether inter-area migration (from the North-West to the North-West and from the South to the South) and intra-area migration (migration from other areas of the territory to the North-West or the South) have a differentiated impact on overeducation. The results show that only inter-area migration contributes to reduce overeducation and this holds both in the North-West and in the South. Again, in the South the results are not significant when we focus only on the private sector.

Overall our results partly confirm those found by Iammarino and Marinelli (2012), signalling differences in the impact of migration on overeducation in different areas of the Italian territory. However, while they find that only migration towards the North reduces overeducation, we find that this occurs also in the South in the sample including both private and public employment. The different results might depend on the different sample and on the different measure of migration used. First their sample includes only graduates, secondly their migrants are those individuals whose region of study is different from the region of current employment and residence (excluding graduates who live the region of study to go back to their home region, that are, however imperfectly identified). On the other hand, our sample includes both graduates and people with a secondary degree and our migrants are individuals that have migrated to find an occupation in the current job. As a consequence our significant results for migration within the South on overeducation might depend on the fact that our sample, differently from that of Iammarino and Marinelli, includes individuals with a secondary degree migrating for job reasons (most likely from smaller to larger towns) and individuals attending university outside their province of residence but migrating only after finding a job.

Overall, the results of our regression suggest that migration reduces overeducation in the North-Western part of the territory, what could be expected considering that this is the part of Italy with a more diffused presence of large firms employing people with higher levels of education. However, less expected is the result that only migration within the North-Western area reduces overeducation while this is not the case for migration from the South. This unexpected result is partly consistent with the observation of Devillanova (2013) who makes an attempt to establish a bridge between the literature on internal and international mobility and overeducation. It appears that in Italy migration from the South to the North resembles to international migration responding more to the need of simply finding a job rather than to the need of finding the “right” job, i.e. the job corresponding to their competencies.

Going back to the main question of our paper, i.e. the impact of the informal recruitment channel on migration and overeducation, the results robustly show how this channel significantly increases the employer-employees mismatch by increasing overeducation both directly and indirectly by reducing migration. But which recruitment channels perform better than the informal one? Table 6 investigates the impact of recruitment channels different from the informal one (the base category) on migration and overeducation. Looking at the migration equation, we find that people entering the labour market through public recruitment agencies, schools and universities, reading from newspapers, professional contacts, self-nominations and public competitions all have a higher probability to migrate with respect to people entering the labour market via the family and friends

recruitment channel. Moreover, all these channels (with the exception of public recruitment agencies) reduce overeducation with respect to the informal one. On the other side, the impact of temporary work agencies and private recruitment agencies does not differ from that of the informal channel. These results show the lack of an efficient public and private recruitment system in Italy based on specialised agencies providing information on workers and job characteristics and allowing a better matching between employers and employees. Such a system should be implemented, as suggested also by the European Commission, in order to reduce the use of the informal channel and to increase the reward of the investment in human capital.

Table 6 - Regression results of the impact of recruitment channels different from the informal one (the base category) on migration and overeducation

| VARIABLES | Probit Over education (1) | Heck probit Over education (2) | Selection equation Employed (3) | Probit Migration (4) |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Migrant | -0.126 (0.0853) | -0.105* (0.0633) | | |
| Commuting time | -0.00365*** (0.00105) | -0.00299*** (0.000785) | | 0.00529*** (0.00144) |
| Foreigner | 0.681*** (0.156) | 0.624*** (0.127) | 0.205** (0.0928) | 0.168 (0.237) |
| Woman | 0.0614 (0.0427) | -0.0685* (0.0361) | -0.213*** (0.0227) | -0.269*** (0.0758) |
| Sons | 0.150* (0.0772) | 0.169*** (0.0619) | 0.0301 (0.0494) | -0.265 (0.174) |
| Woman*sons | -0.114 (0.0710) | -0.183*** (0.0567) | -0.181*** (0.0413) | -0.0775 (0.127) |
| Type secondary (Liceo) | 0.276*** (0.0410) | -0.0213 (0.0470) | -0.388*** (0.0210) | 0.139** (0.0681) |
| University | -0.297*** (0.0450) | -0.0972** (0.0443) | 0.225*** (0.0222) | 0.310*** (0.0709) |
| Failed | 0.175*** (0.0447) | 0.136*** (0.0369) | 0.0135 (0.0256) | -0.0820 (0.0848) |
| Metropolitan City | 0.130 (0.0885) | 0.131* (0.0706) | 0.0593 (0.0490) | -0.139 (0.147) |
| North West | 0.251 (0.400) | 0.602* (0.310) | 0.809*** (0.208) | -0.957 (0.697) |
| North East | 0.630 (0.456) | 0.705** (0.353) | 0.540** (0.242) | -0.791 (0.728) |
| Centre | 0.460 (0.416) | 0.609* (0.324) | 4.899 | -0.150 (0.600) |
| Single | 0.117* (0.0617) | 0.0705 (0.0501) | -0.0980** (0.0407) | -0.0572 (0.122) |
| Divorced | -0.0255 (0.109) | 0.0368 (0.0866) | 0.129** (0.0658) | -0.0544 (0.219) |
| Widower | -0.0411 (0.185) | -0.274* (0.143) | -0.330*** (0.0904) | -0.418 (0.327) |
| Age 30-39 | 0.0289 (0.0465) | 0.255*** (0.0417) | 0.422*** (0.0289) | -0.0495 (0.0840) |
| Age 40-49 | 0.00865 (0.0702) | 0.297*** (0.0628) | 0.551*** (0.0448) | -0.115 (0.119) |
| Age over 49 | -0.0745 (0.0649) | -0.146*** (0.0520) | -0.150*** (0.0411) | -0.161 (0.117) |
| Skills (languages and pc) | -0.208* | 0.0324 | 0.262*** | 0.257 |

| VARIABLES | Probit Over education (1) | Heck probit Over education (2) | Selection equation Employed (3) | Probit Migration (4) |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Training course | (0.111) -0.237*** | (0.0908) -0.0137 | (0.0532) 0.309*** | (0.233) 0.238*** |
| <i>Entry Channels (family and friend)</i> | (0.0382) | (0.0396) | (0.0222) | (0.0624) |
| Public recruitment agencies | -0.0546 (0.0974) | -0.0328 (0.0695) | | 0.297* (0.160) |
| Temporary work agencies | -0.0153 (0.0879) | -0.0169 (0.0633) | | 0.136 (0.157) |
| Private recruitment agencies | -0.108 (0.123) | -0.0794 (0.0907) | | -0.233 (0.239) |
| Schools and Universities | -0.861*** (0.0994) | -0.641*** (0.0829) | | 0.283** (0.133) |
| Insert or answer adverts in newspaper | -0.268*** (0.0819) | -0.204*** (0.0610) | | 0.523*** (0.125) |
| Professional informal contact | -0.209*** (0.0649) | -0.153*** (0.0495) | | 0.261** (0.112) |
| Direct application | -0.212*** (0.0425) | -0.153*** (0.0339) | | 0.205** (0.0798) |
| Public competitions | -0.486*** (0.0864) | -0.358*** (0.0682) | | 0.406*** (0.123) |
| Start own business or join family business | -0.283*** (0.0676) | -0.209*** (0.0524) | | -0.136 (0.144) |
| High level qualification (<i>Base cat. low qual.</i>) | -1.051*** (0.0643) | -0.765*** (0.0757) | | -0.0844 (0.116) |
| Median level qualification | -0.527*** (0.0517) | -0.371*** (0.0497) | | -0.0463 (0.102) |
| Agriculture (Base cat. Services) | 0.513*** (0.117) | 0.359*** (0.0916) | | -0.528* (0.297) |
| Industry sector | 0.155*** (0.0504) | 0.122*** (0.0376) | | -0.204** (0.0991) |
| Construction sector | -0.247*** (0.0808) | -0.159** (0.0626) | | -0.110 (0.153) |
| Commercial sector | 0.564*** (0.0416) | 0.402*** (0.0478) | | 0.0655 (0.0791) |
| Fixed term contract | -0.245*** (0.0376) | -0.185*** (0.0309) | | -0.0530 (0.0686) |
| Medium firms (15-100) | 0.0113 (0.0420) | 0.00924 (0.0303) | | 0.216*** (0.0728) |
| Large firms (over 100) | 0.0175 (0.0443) | 0.0115 (0.0323) | | 0.212*** (0.0746) |
| N. of component= 2 | | | -0.168*** (0.0397) | -0.347*** (0.126) |
| N. of component= 3 | | | -0.0174 (0.0372) | 0.0110 (0.180) |
| N. of component> 3 | | | -0.00761 (0.0373) | 0.0513 (0.182) |
| Housing arrangement: Rent | | | | 0.385*** (0.0841) |
| Housing arrangement: Young Adult Living | | | | -0.631*** (0.166) |
| Provincial fixed effect | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Constant | 0.303 (0.390) | -1.066*** (0.321) | -1.023*** (0.196) | -1.097* (0.591) |
| Observations | 7,220 | 22,796 | 22,796 | 6,553 |
| Smith-Blundell test of exogeneity of migration: 2.707659 Chi-sqr(1) P-value = .0999 | | | | |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 | | | | |

5. Conclusions

In this paper we have tested the hypothesis that in Italy the use of the informal recruitment channel (family and friends referrals) increases overeducation both directly and indirectly by reducing migration. We have found robust results for the direct positive effect of the informal channel on overeducation both when including all firms and when focussing on employment in the private sector. This result confirms the finding of Meliciani and Radicchia (2011) and suggests that, while, in principle, social ties can be an effective mechanism to overcome information asymmetries thus allowing for a better matching between employers and employees, in the Italian case they do not perform this virtuous role. This is in line with the model of Bentolila et al. (2004) where social contacts induce some workers to undertake careers in industries, professions, or firms where their comparative productive advantage is not fully exploited.

A second important result of this paper is that individuals entering the labour market through the informal channel are less likely to migrate to find a job. This is not surprising considering that social ties tend to be geographically concentrated. However, the negative impact of social ties on migration can be a second source of mismatch to the extent that migration reduces overeducation. Previous studies investigating the relationship between migration and overeducation in Italy have found ambiguous results. In fact while Croce and Ghignoni (2011) find that migration reduces overeducation, Devillanova (2013) argues that the result is not robust to the inclusion of occupational variables in the overeducation equation and to controlling for the endogeneity of the migration choice. Finally, Iammarino and Marinelli (2012) show that among graduates only migration directed towards the Northern part of Italy reduces overeducation. The third aim of this paper has been to shed further light on the relationship between migration and overeducation by distinguishing between total employment and employment in the private sector and by focussing on different areas of the Italian territory separating inter-area and intra-area migration. Our empirical results show that, when focussing only on the private sector, only migration within the North-West reduces overeducation while when we include both the public and the private sector also migration within the South has a negative impact on overeducation. Surprisingly we do not find evidence of a negative impact of migration from the South to the North on overeducation. This might signal the fact that migrants from the South move in order to find any occupation rather than to find the job corresponding to the competencies acquired during their study.

To the extent that spatial flexibility helps creating a better matching between employers and employees, the use of the informal recruitment channel by reducing migration may also contribute indirectly to increase overeducation. The existence of such an effect has important consequences on the design of effective policies devoted to reduce skill imbalances, suggesting that this outcome may be achieved not only by improving vocational education and training systems but also by better

organising employment services with the purpose of enhancing spatial flexibility. In Italy, only few workers find a job through public and private employment agencies and our econometric estimates show that these channels do not perform better than the informal channel in favouring job-education matches and in enhancing spatial flexibility. On the contrary, individuals entering the labour market through schools, professional ties, reading of newspapers, self-nominations and public competitions find jobs more in line with their levels of education and have a higher mobility with respect to individuals using the informal channel. An effective reform of employment services should, therefore, make these services at least as effective as more costly job search methods in order to avoid that workers remain “trapped” into occupations where their competences are not exploited. The results of our paper show that the reform of Italian employment services is crucial not only for reducing unemployment but also for enhancing human capital investment, bringing better competencies into the labour market and increasing job satisfaction and labour productivity.

References

- Addison, J.T., Portugal, P. (2002), 'Job Search Methods and Outcomes', *Oxford Economic Papers*, 54, 505-533.
- Antoninis, M. (2006), 'The wage effects from the use of personal contacts as hiring channels', *Journal of Economic Behaviour & Organization*, 59(1), 133-146.
- Battu, H. and Büchel, F (2003). The Theory of Differential Overqualification: Does it Work?, *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 50(1): 1-16.
- Bentolila, S., Michelacci, C., Suarez, J. (2004), Social Contacts and Occupational Choice. CEPR Discussion Paper n. 4308.
- Blau, D.M., Robins, P.K. (1990), 'Job search outcomes for employed and unemployed', *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, 637-55.
- Büchel, F., & van Ham, M. (2003) Overeducation, Regional Labour Markets and Spatial Flexibility, *Journal of Urban Economics*, 53(3), 482-493.
- Corcoran, M., Datcher, L., Duncan, G. (1980), 'Information and Influence Networks in Labour Market', in Duncan and J. Morgan (eds.), *Five Thousand American Families: Patterns of Economic Progress*, Vol. 7, 1-37.
- Croce, G. and Ghignoni, E. (2011) Overeducation and spatial flexibility in Italian local labour markets, MPRA working paper no. 29670, October 2011.
- Datcher, L. (1983), 'The Impact of Informal Networks on Quit Behaviour', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 65(3), 491-495.
- Delattre, E, Sabatier, M. (2007), 'Social Capital and Wages: An Econometric Evaluation of Social Networking's Effects', *Labour*, 21(2), 209–236.
- Devillanova, C. (2013), Over-education and spatial flexibility: New evidence from Italian survey data. *Papers in Regional Science*, 92: 445–464. doi: 10.1111/j.1435-5957.2012.00434.x.
- Di Pietro, G. and Urwin, P. (2006) Education and Skills Mismatch in the Italian Graduate Labour Market", *Applied Economics*, 38, 1, 79-93.
- Franzini M., Raitano F. (2011). Few and Underutilized? Overeducation of Italian Graduates, in Mandrone E. (editor), *L'intermediazione pubblica, privata ed informale*, ISFOL, Roma.
- Giammatteo, M. (2009) 'L'indagine campionaria Isfol-Plus: contenuti metodologici e implementazione', *Studi Isfol* 2009/3
- Hartog, J. (2000), 'Over-education and earnings: where are we, where should we go?', *Economics of Education Review*, 19, 131-147.
- Heckman (1979). 'Sample selection bias as a specification error'. *Econometrica*, 47, 153–61.
- Hensen, M. M., De Vries, M. R., & Cörvers F. (2009) The Role of Geographic Mobility in Reducing Education-job Mismatches in the Netherlands, *Papers in Regional Science*, 88, 3, 667- 682.
- Holzer, H. (1988), 'Search method use by unemployed youth', *Journal of Labor Economics* 1988, 6, 1 – 20.

- Holzer, H. (1997), 'Hiring procedures in the firm: their economic determinants and outcomes', in M. Kleiner, Block, R., Roomkin, M., Salsburg, S. (eds.), *Human Resources and the Performance of the Firm*, Industrial Relations Research Association, Madison.
- Iammarino, S & Marinelli, E. (2012) Education-job (mis)matching and interregional migration: Italian university graduates transition to work. Working Paper. Birkbeck College, University of London
- Jauhiainen, S. (2011) Overeducation in the Finnish regional labour markets, *Papers in Regional Science*, 90(3), 578-588.
- Korenman, S., Turner, S. (1994), 'On employment contacts and minority-white wage differences', *Industrial Relations*, 35, 106– 122.
- Kugler, A.D. (2003), 'Employee referrals and efficiency wages', *Labour Economics*, 10(5), 531-556.
- Loury, L.D. (2006), 'Some contacts are more equal than others: informal networks, job tenure, and wages', *Journal of Labor Economics*, 24(2), 299-318.
- Mandrone, E., Radicchia, D. (2006), 'Plus, Participation Labour Unemployment Survey. Indagine campionaria nazionale sulle caratteristiche e le aspettative degli individui sul lavoro', I Libri del FSE; Rubettino.
- Mandrone, E., Radicchia, D (2012) 'Indagine Plus : il mondo del lavoro tra forma e sostanza : terza annualità / ISFOL - 475 p. I libri del Fondo sociale europeo ; 167, Rubettino.
- Marmaros, D., Sacerdote, B. (2002), 'Peer and social networks in job search', *European Economic Review*, 46, 870-79.
- Montgomery, J.D. (1991), 'Social Networks and Labor Market Outcomes: Towards an Economic Analysis', *American Economic Review*, 81, 1408-1418.
- Mortensen, D.T., Vishwanath, T. (1994), 'Personal Contacts and Earnings—It is who you know', *Labour Economics*, 1, 187-201.
- Mosca, M., Pastore, F. (2008), 'Wage effects of recruitment methods: the case of the Italian social service sector', IZA Working Paper n. 3422.
- Pellizzari, M. (2004), 'Do friends and relatives really help getting a good job?', CEPR Discussion Paper, London.
- Pistaferri, L. (1999), 'Informal networks in the Italian labor market', *Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia*, 58, 355-375.
- Ramos, R. and Sanromà, E. (2011) Overeducation and Local Labour Markets in Spain, IZA DP No. 6028, October 2011.
- Rosenbaum, J., DeLuca, S., Miller, S., Roy, K. (1999), 'Pathways into work: Short- and long-term effects of personal and institutional ties', *Sociology of Education*, 72, 179-96.
- Simon, C.J., Warner, J.T. (1992), 'Matchmaker, Matchmaker: The Effect of Old Boy Networks on Job Match Quality, Earning and Tenure', *Journal of Labor Economics*, 10(3), 306-330.
- Sylos Labini, M. (2004), 'Social networks and wages: it is all about connections'. LEM Working Paper n. 10, S. Anna School of Advanced Studies, Pisa, Italy.

Appendix

| <i>Employees with a level of education higher than the compulsory school</i> | | | | Informal channel | | Formal channel | | Migration | | No migration | | Overeducation | | No overeducation | |
|--|-------|--------|-----------|------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|
| Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Informal channel | 13097 | 0.236 | 0.425 | | | | | 0.284 | 0.451 | 0.374 | 0.484 | 0.332 | 0.471 | 0.180 | 0.384 |
| Overeducation | 13097 | 0.369 | 0.483 | 0.519 | 0.500 | 0.323 | 0.468 | 0.152 | 0.359 | 0.241 | 0.428 | | | | |
| Spatial flexibility | 13097 | 0.055 | 0.227 | 0.035 | 0.184 | 0.061 | 0.239 | | | | | 0.042 | 0.201 | 0.062 | 0.241 |
| Commuting time | 11318 | 19.965 | 19.510 | 18.598 | 18.116 | 20.395 | 19.908 | 24.775 | 22.662 | 19.692 | 19.280 | 17.351 | 16.153 | 21.406 | 20.995 |
| Foreigner | 28669 | 0.012 | 0.109 | 0.023 | 0.150 | 0.010 | 0.099 | 0.018 | 0.132 | 0.013 | 0.112 | 0.025 | 0.156 | 0.006 | 0.077 |
| Woman | 28669 | 0.499 | 0.500 | 0.445 | 0.497 | 0.463 | 0.499 | 0.384 | 0.486 | 0.463 | 0.499 | 0.393 | 0.488 | 0.497 | 0.500 |
| Sons | 28669 | 0.489 | 0.500 | 0.459 | 0.498 | 0.571 | 0.495 | 0.589 | 0.492 | 0.542 | 0.498 | 0.492 | 0.500 | 0.575 | 0.494 |
| Woman*sons | 28669 | 0.266 | 0.442 | 0.237 | 0.425 | 0.290 | 0.454 | 0.238 | 0.426 | 0.280 | 0.449 | 0.217 | 0.412 | 0.313 | 0.464 |
| Type secondary (Liceo) | 28564 | 0.318 | 0.466 | 0.217 | 0.412 | 0.310 | 0.463 | 0.349 | 0.477 | 0.285 | 0.451 | 0.255 | 0.436 | 0.308 | 0.462 |
| University | 28669 | 0.250 | 0.433 | 0.148 | 0.356 | 0.313 | 0.464 | 0.383 | 0.486 | 0.268 | 0.443 | 0.135 | 0.342 | 0.355 | 0.479 |
| Failed | 28669 | 0.163 | 0.370 | 0.197 | 0.398 | 0.163 | 0.369 | 0.162 | 0.368 | 0.172 | 0.377 | 0.219 | 0.414 | 0.143 | 0.350 |
| Metropolitan City | 28669 | 0.091 | 0.287 | 0.081 | 0.272 | 0.098 | 0.297 | 0.099 | 0.298 | 0.093 | 0.291 | 0.091 | 0.288 | 0.095 | 0.293 |
| North West | 28669 | 0.270 | 0.444 | 0.289 | 0.453 | 0.293 | 0.455 | 0.259 | 0.438 | 0.294 | 0.456 | 0.285 | 0.451 | 0.296 | 0.457 |
| North East | 28669 | 0.202 | 0.402 | 0.216 | 0.412 | 0.224 | 0.417 | 0.210 | 0.407 | 0.223 | 0.416 | 0.231 | 0.421 | 0.217 | 0.412 |
| Centre | 28669 | 0.203 | 0.402 | 0.220 | 0.414 | 0.207 | 0.406 | 0.202 | 0.402 | 0.211 | 0.408 | 0.226 | 0.418 | 0.201 | 0.401 |
| South | 28669 | 0.326 | 0.469 | 0.275 | 0.446 | 0.275 | 0.447 | 0.329 | 0.470 | 0.272 | 0.445 | 0.259 | 0.438 | 0.285 | 0.451 |
| Single | 28669 | 0.445 | 0.497 | 0.467 | 0.499 | 0.355 | 0.479 | 0.330 | 0.470 | 0.385 | 0.487 | 0.449 | 0.497 | 0.343 | 0.475 |
| Divorced | 28669 | 0.036 | 0.186 | 0.034 | 0.182 | 0.044 | 0.205 | 0.040 | 0.195 | 0.042 | 0.201 | 0.042 | 0.200 | 0.042 | 0.200 |
| Widower | 28669 | 0.014 | 0.119 | 0.009 | 0.094 | 0.013 | 0.115 | 0.011 | 0.102 | 0.012 | 0.110 | 0.010 | 0.100 | 0.014 | 0.116 |
| Age 18-29 | 28669 | 0.259 | 0.438 | 0.232 | 0.422 | 0.137 | 0.344 | 0.115 | 0.319 | 0.162 | 0.369 | 0.212 | 0.409 | 0.130 | 0.336 |
| Age 30-39 | 28669 | 0.284 | 0.451 | 0.336 | 0.472 | 0.304 | 0.460 | 0.333 | 0.471 | 0.310 | 0.462 | 0.350 | 0.477 | 0.289 | 0.453 |
| Age 40-49 | 28669 | 0.236 | 0.425 | 0.276 | 0.447 | 0.308 | 0.462 | 0.297 | 0.457 | 0.301 | 0.459 | 0.268 | 0.443 | 0.319 | 0.466 |
| Age over 49 | 28669 | 0.221 | 0.415 | 0.156 | 0.363 | 0.251 | 0.434 | 0.255 | 0.436 | 0.227 | 0.419 | 0.171 | 0.376 | 0.263 | 0.440 |
| Skills (languages and pc) | 28669 | 0.959 | 0.198 | 0.956 | 0.205 | 0.964 | 0.186 | 0.972 | 0.164 | 0.962 | 0.192 | 0.946 | 0.227 | 0.972 | 0.165 |
| Training course | 28669 | 0.277 | 0.448 | 0.232 | 0.422 | 0.350 | 0.477 | 0.441 | 0.497 | 0.315 | 0.465 | 0.209 | 0.406 | 0.388 | 0.487 |
| High level qualification | 12958 | 0.304 | 0.460 | 0.173 | 0.378 | 0.344 | 0.475 | 0.387 | 0.487 | 0.299 | 0.458 | 0.159 | 0.366 | 0.388 | 0.487 |

| <i>Employees with a level of education higher than the compulsory school</i> | | | | Informal channel | | Formal channel | | Migration | | No migration | | Overeducation | | No overeducation | |
|--|-------|-------|-----------|------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|
| Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Median level qualification | 12958 | 0.543 | 0.498 | 0.589 | 0.492 | 0.529 | 0.499 | 0.508 | 0.500 | 0.545 | 0.498 | 0.560 | 0.496 | 0.533 | 0.499 |
| Low level qualification | 12958 | 0.153 | 0.360 | 0.238 | 0.426 | 0.127 | 0.332 | 0.105 | 0.306 | 0.156 | 0.363 | 0.281 | 0.449 | 0.078 | 0.269 |
| Agriculture | 13097 | 0.025 | 0.157 | 0.032 | 0.176 | 0.023 | 0.151 | 0.013 | 0.112 | 0.026 | 0.159 | 0.042 | 0.200 | 0.016 | 0.124 |
| Industry sector | 13097 | 0.134 | 0.340 | 0.179 | 0.383 | 0.120 | 0.325 | 0.081 | 0.272 | 0.137 | 0.344 | 0.184 | 0.387 | 0.105 | 0.306 |
| Construction sector | 13097 | 0.049 | 0.216 | 0.066 | 0.247 | 0.044 | 0.205 | 0.030 | 0.172 | 0.050 | 0.218 | 0.042 | 0.201 | 0.053 | 0.224 |
| Commercial sector | 13097 | 0.146 | 0.354 | 0.207 | 0.405 | 0.128 | 0.334 | 0.078 | 0.268 | 0.150 | 0.357 | 0.239 | 0.427 | 0.092 | 0.289 |
| Services sector | 13097 | 0.646 | 0.478 | 0.517 | 0.500 | 0.685 | 0.464 | 0.799 | 0.401 | 0.637 | 0.481 | 0.493 | 0.500 | 0.735 | 0.442 |
| Fixed term contract | 13097 | 0.640 | 0.480 | 0.616 | 0.486 | 0.648 | 0.478 | 0.747 | 0.435 | 0.634 | 0.482 | 0.584 | 0.493 | 0.673 | 0.469 |
| Small firms (less 15) | 13097 | 0.388 | 0.487 | 0.546 | 0.498 | 0.339 | 0.473 | 0.198 | 0.399 | 0.399 | 0.490 | 0.466 | 0.499 | 0.341 | 0.474 |
| Medium firms (15-100) | 13097 | 0.153 | 0.360 | 0.218 | 0.413 | 0.133 | 0.339 | 0.131 | 0.338 | 0.154 | 0.361 | 0.195 | 0.396 | 0.128 | 0.335 |
| Large firms (over 100) | 13097 | 0.460 | 0.498 | 0.236 | 0.425 | 0.529 | 0.499 | 0.670 | 0.470 | 0.447 | 0.497 | 0.339 | 0.473 | 0.530 | 0.499 |

Source: ISFOL-PLUS 2011