

This PDF is a selection from an out-of-print volume from the National Bureau of Economic Research

Volume Title: Education, Income, and Human Behavior

Volume Author/Editor: F. Thomas Juster, ed.

Volume Publisher: NBER

Volume ISBN: 0-07-010068-3

Volume URL: <http://www.nber.org/books/just75-1>

Publication Date: 1975

Chapter Title: Appendix C: Summary of Full Regression Equations of Log Earnings on Measured Ability and Background Variables

Chapter Author: John C. Hause

Chapter URL: <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c3707>

Chapter pages in book: (p. 411 - 418)

Appendix C: Summary of Full Regression Equations of Log Earnings on Measured Ability and Background Variables

by John C. Hause

Regressions, for a single year, of the log of earnings on some ability measures and a more or less standard set of background variables are summarized in Table C-1 for the different samples and different schooling levels. The educational levels are not directly comparable for the different samples, and the coding should be checked in the main text. The scaling of the different ability tests makes direct comparison between samples meaningless, and the tests themselves would not be perfectly correlated. However, since earnings are expressed in logarithms, multiplying the ability coefficients by the standard deviation of the ability measure indicates the proportion (approximately) by which earnings are altered by this size of change in measured ability. This information is included in a number of tables in the main text.

The scaling and criteria used to produce dummy variables for high and low socioeconomic status differ greatly between samples and make comparison of coefficient magnitudes in the four samples meaningless.

TABLE C-1
Coefficients*
from full
regressions of
the logarithm of
earnings on an
ability measure
and background
variables

<i>Education level</i>	<i>Sample size N</i>	<i>Ability† test</i>	<i>LNWK (log of weeks worked)</i>	<i>SCH (social class high)</i>
<i>Rogers (dependent variable: log of 1960 earnings)</i>				
<i>E₁</i>	60	.024 (.35)		-.262 (.278)
<i>E₂</i>	117	.70 (.32)		.050 (.210)
<i>E₃</i>	51	.36 (.78)		.062 (.262)
<i>E₄</i>	68	.92 (.63)		-.106 (.174)
<i>E₅</i>	47	1.32 (.90)		.180 (.221)
<i>Project Talent (dependent variable: log of 1966 earnings)</i>				
<i>E'₁</i>	183	.02 (.16)	.489 (2.36)	.038 (.49)
<i>E'₂</i>	3853	.06 (3.24)	.488 (9.51)	.067 (4.00)
<i>E'₃</i>	1914	.00 (.03)	.514 (9.25)	.059 (2.44)

<i>SCL</i> (social class low)	<i>RC</i> (religion Catholic)	<i>RJ</i> (religion Jewish)	<i>NM</i> (not married)	<i>S</i> (southern U.S.)	<i>PHLTH</i> (serious illness since mid-teens)	<i>PS</i> (private school)	<i>R</i> ²	
-.351 (.202)	.202 (.099)		-.473 (.180)			-.057 (.298)	.240	
-.233 (.107)	.067 (.081)	.679 (.275)	-.045 (.132)			.072 (.134)	.165	
.144 (.174)	.040 (.153)	.696 (.376)	-.744 (.390)			.556 (.238)	.296	
-.119 (.182)	.114 (.139)	.170 (.270)	-.843 (.251)			.338 (.162)	.212	
.020 (.222)	.566 (.210)	.636 (.245)	-.695 (.386)			.063 (.245)	.319	
						<i>PARS</i>	<i>PRVS</i>	
-.083 (1.20)	.042 (.67)	.203 (.88)	-.166 (2.53)	-.236 (2.74)		.023 (.11)	.026 (.09)	.136
-.046 (2.84)	.041 (2.57)	.050 (.91)	-.298 (21.3)	-.068 (3.57)		-.030 (.99)	.224 (3.59)	.149
.012 (.38)	.068 (2.45)	.093 (1.66)	-.320 (14.5)	-.095 (3.11)		-.017 (.42)	.001 (.02)	.156

TABLE C-1
(continued)

Education level	Sample size <i>N</i>	Ability† test	LNWK (log of weeks worked)	SCH (social class high)
<i>Project Talent: (dependent variable: log of 1966 earnings) (continued)</i>				
E_4	793	-.03 (.56)	.702 (12.0)	.062 (1.49)
E_5	2534	.06 (2.24)	.719 (34.3)	.038 (1.57)
<i>NBER-Thorndike (dependent variable: log of 1969 earnings)</i>				
E_1^+	489	.0267 (.0102)		-.059 (.092)
E_2^+	535	.021 (.011)		-.039 (.069)
E_3^+	900	.026 (.007)		.003 (.039)
E_4^+	211	.072 (.014)		-.011 (.086)
E_5^+	128	.044 (.024)		-.237 (.126)
E_6^+	53	.030 (.034)		-.356 (.148)

<i>SCL</i> (social class low)	<i>RC</i> (religion Catholic)	<i>RJ</i> (religion Jewish)	<i>NM</i> (not married)	<i>S</i> (southern U.S.)	<i>PHLTH</i> (serious illness since mid-teens)	<i>PS</i> (private school)	<i>R</i> ²	
						<i>PARS</i>	<i>PRVS</i>	
.010 (.15)	.066 (1.38)	.132 (1.64)	-.330 (8.06)	-.082 (1.58)		-.052 (.76)	.165 (1.73)	.263
-.006 (.172)	.055 (1.92)	.027 (.67)	-.105 (4.98)	.038 (1.28)		-.069 (1.71)	-.031 (.62)	.376
-.034 (.040)	-.039 (.035)	.564 (.101)	-.180 (.077)	-.024 (.049)				.077
-.118 (.038)	.003 (.042)	.291 (.096)	-.058 (.081)	-.022 (.048)				.050
-.082 (.027)	.002 (.029)	.372 (.062)	-.167 (.059)	-.084 (.032)				.086
-.217 (.060)	.182 (.073)	.274 (.102)	-.176 (.128)	-.060 (.086)				.233
-.233 (.112)	.037 (.112)	.122 (.1578)	.118 (.208)	-.065 (.106)				.084
-.207 (.123)	.122 (.126)	.040 (.225)	-.420 (.230)	.129 (.159)				.216

TABLE C-1
(concluded)

Education level	Sample size <i>N</i>	Ability† test	LNWK (log of weeks worked)	SCH (social class high)
<i>Husén Swedish sample</i> (dependent variable: log of 1968 earnings)				
E_1^1	18	.392 (.607)		
E_2^2	235	.050 (.800)		-.138 (.161)
E_3^3	59	.219 (.379)		-.291 (.208)
E_4^4	66	.427 (.386)		.049 (.136)
E_5^5	51	.586 (.409)		.255 (.106)
E_6^6	21	.393 (.457)		-.018 (.157)

* Standard errors are in parentheses except for Project Talent, where the regression program gives t-values.

† Different ability tests are used for each major sample cohort. These are Rogers, IQ test scores; Project Talent, C004 (quantitative composite); NBER-Thorndike (a general-ability factor from Air Force test battery); and Husén, TST38 (total test score, 1938).

SOURCE: Author's computations are from data in the indicated samples.

<i>SCL</i> (social class low)	<i>RC</i> (religion Catholic)	<i>RJ</i> (religion Jewish)	<i>NM</i> (not married)	<i>S</i> (southern U.S.)	<i>PHLTH</i> (serious illness since mid-teens)	<i>PS</i> (private school)	<i>R</i> ²
-.105 (.195)			-.112 (.241)		-.061 (.349)		.098
-.049 (.042)			-.163 (.072)		-.025 (.062)		.030
-.072 (.129)			-.121 (.394)		-.116 (.237)		.042
-.111 (.141)			-.277 (.157)		-.238 (.166)		.117
-.086 (.137)			-.071 (.161)		-.098 (.176)		.199
-.066 (.328)					-.049 (.239)		.056

