

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

THE LABOR MARKET RETURNS TO A FOR-PROFIT COLLEGE EDUCATION

Stephanie Riegg Cellini  
Latika Chaudhary

Working Paper 18343  
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w18343>

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH  
1050 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
August 2012

We thank Burt Barnow, Dylan Conger, Hector Cordero-Guzman, Joseph Cordes, Janet Currie, Jesse Cunha, Erin Dunlop, Sue Dynarski, William Evans, Claudia Goldin, Jonathan Guryan, Wes Hartmann, Caroline Hoxby, Larry Katz, Donald Parsons, Roberto Pedace, Cecilia Rouse, Kenneth Troske, and seminar participants at Harvard University, George Washington University, Naval Postgraduate School, U.S. Treasury, U.S. Government Accountability Office, the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, AEFA, APPAM, SEA, and the NBER Education Program Meeting for helpful comments. Faith Fried, Phil Gross, Megan Hatch, and Aisling Scott provided excellent research assistance. We are grateful for financial support from the Ford Foundation (Grant Number 1095-0464). The views expressed in this paper are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Ford Foundation. A previous version of this paper was titled, “The Labor Market Returns to Private Two-Year College Education.” The views expressed in this paper are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Ford Foundation or the National Bureau of Economic Research. A previous version of this paper was titled, “The Labor Market Returns to Private Two-Year College Education.”

At least one co-author has disclosed a financial relationship of potential relevance for this research. Further information is available online at <http://www.nber.org/papers/w18343.ack>

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

© 2012 by Stephanie Riegg Cellini and Latika Chaudhary. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

The Labor Market Returns to a For-Profit College Education  
Stephanie Riegg Cellini and Latika Chaudhary  
NBER Working Paper No. 18343  
August 2012, Revised April 2014  
JEL No. I2,I20,I21,I23

**ABSTRACT**

A lengthy literature estimating the returns to education has largely ignored the for-profit sector. In this paper, we estimate the earnings gains to for-profit college attendance using restricted-access data from the 1997 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY97). Using an individual fixed effects estimation strategy that allows us to control for time-invariant unobservable characteristics of students, we find that students who enroll in associate's degree programs in for-profit colleges experience earnings gains of about 10 percent relative to high school graduates with no college degree, conditional on employment. Since associate's degree students attend for an average of 2.6 years, this translates to a 4 percent return per year of education in a for-profit college, slightly lower than estimates of returns for other sectors found in the literature.

Stephanie Riegg Cellini  
Trachtenberg School of Public Policy  
and Public Administration  
George Washington University  
805 21st Street NW, #601M  
Washington, DC 20052  
and NBER  
scellini@gwu.edu

Latika Chaudhary  
Department of Economics  
Scripps College  
1030 Columbia Avenue, #4072  
Claremont, CA 91711  
latika.chaudhary@scrippscollege.edu

# 1 Introduction

After several decades of moderate growth and relatively little controversy in for-profit college education, the 2000s ushered in a new era in higher education. The low cost of providing online education, the availability of federal student aid, and the growing number of students seeking skills beyond the high school level, combined to produce enormous growth in the for-profit sector. Since 2000, enrollment in for-profit colleges has more than tripled, climbing to 2.5 million students in 2010 (NCES 2012, Tables 219 and 222).

With this growth has come increased attention from policymakers, the media, the education community, and students themselves. In the past few years, reports of unscrupulous recruiting practices, fraud in federal financial aid programs, low graduation rates, and high student loan default rates (e.g., GAO 2010; Lewin 2010; Goodman 2010, U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions 2012) have led to new policy proposals and an intense debate over the costs and benefits of for-profit higher education. In 2011 the Obama administration proposed controversial regulations restricting federal student aid eligibility in the for-profit sector (Federal Register 2010, Guryan and Thompson 2010). The so-called “gainful employment” regulation has since been struck down in the courts, but the Obama administration has plans to pursue similar regulation during its second term (Field 2013).

Central to the debate over any further regulation and the future of the for-profit industry is the question of the quality of a for-profit education. Those arguing in favor of additional regulation believe that for-profit colleges leave students with insurmountable debt and few skills, while proponents argue that these institutions provide valuable job training for underserved students. Both sides rely heavily on anecdotal evidence and simple comparisons of for-profit students with students in other sectors. Without a better understanding of the causal effects of a for-profit education on earnings, it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the merits of various policy proposals and the sector as a whole.

This study provides an assessment of college quality in the for-profit sector, by estimating the labor market returns, or earnings gains, to associate's degree programs in for-profit colleges. We focus on associate's degree programs due to data restrictions, but also because of the importance of the for-profit sector in sub-baccalaureate education. For-profit colleges account for a disproportionate share of associate's degree enrollment and degree receipt. For-profits enroll 11 percent of all postsecondary students, yet they confer 21 percent of all associate's degrees, or 194,000 each year (NCES 2012, Table 219).<sup>1</sup>

A long literature on the returns to education has focused on estimating the earnings gains generated by a year of high school or four-year college. Several studies have also assessed the returns to associate's degrees in public community colleges, but for-profit sub-baccalaureate education has received much less attention in the literature.<sup>2</sup> Our study fills this gap in the literature, attempting to mitigate a crucial endogeneity problem that plagues studies of earnings gains: both observable and unobservable factors may jointly influence a student's decision to attend a for-profit institution and her subsequent earnings. For example, more motivated students may be more likely to pursue a degree at a for-profit college but motivation can also independently influence subsequent labor market success. Such endogeneity issues can bias cross-sectional OLS estimates of the impact of for-profit colleges on employment and earnings.

To address this problem we draw on 14 years of data contained in the restricted-access 1997 panel of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY97) to implement an individual fixed effects approach. Unlike bachelor's degree candidates, student pursuing associate's degrees often work before, during, and after they attend college, allowing us to compare an individual student's earnings after attendance to her earnings before. We compare the

---

<sup>1</sup>Although bachelor's degree and graduate programs are among the fastest growing in the for-profit sector (Deming, Goldin, and Katz 2012), for-profits still account for just 7 percent of bachelor's degrees and 9 percent of graduate degrees conferred (NCES 2012, Table 219). In contrast, for-profits confer 30 percent of all diplomas and certificates. We cannot examine the returns to diplomas and certificates given data constraints.

<sup>2</sup>We review the literature in detail in Section 2.

before-after earnings gains of for-profit associate’s degree students to a falsified before-after for high school graduates without college degrees, generating a difference-in-difference estimate of the returns to for-profit colleges.

The individual fixed effects control for all time-invariant student characteristics that may bias cross-sectional estimates of returns, but time-varying unobservables and dynamic selection issues may still remain. To address such concerns, we include an extensive set of controls including an individual-specific county of residence trend, an indicator for the years in which individuals are enrolled in college, and an indicator to control for pre-education dips in earnings among for-profit students. We conduct many robustness checks to test the sensitivity of our estimates to the inclusion of various controls, different measures of earnings, alternate samples, and heterogeneous effects.

We find that students enrolled in associate’s degree programs in for-profit colleges experience a 10 percent increase in weekly earnings, conditional on employment, in our baseline fixed effects specification. Dividing by 2.6 to account for the average length of enrollment yields a 4 percent return per year of education—a result that is incredibly robust to various assumptions and specifications. Most of the increase comes from hourly wages rather than more hours worked per week. For-profit students are also slightly more likely to be employed full-time than our control group of high school graduates, but we find no difference in the likelihood of any employment. Unconditional estimates including observations with zero earnings (thereby conflating employment and earnings effects) suggest higher earnings gains of around 22 percent, or 8 percent per year. We also find suggestive evidence that students completing associate’s degrees in for-profits earn about 20 percent more than their counterparts who dropout.

Overall, our results suggest that students enrolling in associate’s degree programs in for-profit colleges earn positive returns on the order of 4 (conditional on employment) to 8 (unconditional) percent per year. These estimates are slightly higher than other estimates

of for-profit returns (Turner 2012), but fall below estimates of the returns to public community colleges (Jepsen, Troske, and Coomes forthcoming, Jacobson, LaLonde, and Sullivan 2005) and traditional four-year colleges (Oreopolous and Petronijevic 2013) found in the literature. They also fall below the returns needed to offset the private and social costs of for-profit associate's degree attendance (Cellini 2012), suggesting that for-profits may not be worthwhile for the average student.

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 reviews the literature on the returns to education and Section 3 provides background on for-profit colleges. Section 4 details our estimation strategy. Section 5 describes the data, Section 6 presents results, and Section 7 concludes.

## 2 Related Literature

Over the past half-century, a large literature has developed to measure the returns to schooling. Reviews of the literature by Card (1999) and Ashenfelter, Harmon, and Oosterbeek (1999) report that one additional year of education results in earnings gains in the range of 6 to 9 percent. More recent and better-identified analyses reveal higher returns for college attendance, averaging 10 to 15 percent per year (Card 2001, Goldin and Katz 2008, Oreopolous and Petronijevic 2013). The vast majority of the research in this area has focused on high school and four-year colleges: few studies identify the returns to two-year colleges (Ashenfelter et al. 1999, Oreopolous and Petronijevic 2013).

Of the handful of studies examining returns to associate's degrees and two-year colleges, most focus exclusively on public community colleges. Reviewing the literature on community college returns, Kane and Rouse (1999) find that a year of community college attendance generates returns between 5 and 8 percent, just marginally below the average return to a four-year college attendance. Students who complete associate's degrees earn 15 to 27 percent more than observationally similar individuals with no postsecondary education.

Central to the literature on returns is a debate over the accuracy of various methods to identify the causal effect of education on earnings. Students who pursue additional education are likely to differ on both observable and unobservable dimensions from those who do not. If these differences are correlated with subsequent earnings, cross-sectional estimates of the returns to schooling will be biased. While a number of studies of high school and four-year college returns have attempted to address this endogeneity problem using natural experiments and sibling comparisons, few studies in the community college literature have implemented similar identification strategies. Many studies estimate cross-sectional models comparing students attending community college to those who do not, generally controlling for ability with proxies, such as IQ scores (for example, Marcotte, Bailey, Borkoski, and Kienzl 2005, Kane and Rouse 1995, Leigh and Gill 1997, Grubb 1993 and 1995, Monk-Turner 1994, and Heineman and Sussna 1977).

Recent studies on the returns to community college education have implemented stronger identification strategies. Jacobson, LaLonde, and Sullivan (2005) and Jepsen, Troske, and Coomes (forthcoming) use an individual- or person-specific fixed effects approach comparing the wages of students before and after they attend a public community college, thereby controlling for time-invariant individual characteristics that may bias cross-sectional estimates. Among displaced workers in Washington State, Jacobson et al. (2005) find returns of 9 percent per year of education for men and 13 percent for women, with much higher returns to quantitative and technically-oriented vocational coursework than less-quantitative coursework in the humanities, social sciences, and basic skills. Among all community college students in Kentucky, Jepsen et al. (forthcoming) find higher returns—56 percent for an associate’s degree for women and 24 percent for men completing degrees.

We know of very few studies that attempt to assess the returns to for-profit postsecondary education. Most rely on cross-sectional variation in earnings, comparing students who attend for-profit institutions with students who attend other types of postsecondary

institutions to estimate the differential returns to the for-profit sector. In a working paper, Chung (2008) instruments for college choice using tuition and concentration of community colleges. Along with Grubb (1993),<sup>3</sup> Chung finds limited evidence of positive effects of for-profit training, particularly for women and certificate programs, but generally shows no significant differences in returns to the for-profit students relative to students in other sectors. Deming, Goldin and Katz (2012) and Lang and Weinstein (2013)<sup>4</sup> draw on the Beginning Postsecondary Student (BPS) data along with OLS and propensity score methods. Deming, Goldin, and Katz (2012) estimate the differential return to for-profits compared to other postsecondary institutions finding that for-profit students (in all types of degree programs) earn about 8 percent less than observationally similar students in other sectors, but differences are smaller and not significant when conditioning on employment. In contrast, Lang and Weinstein (2013) find that annual income is at least 20 percent higher for students beginning associate's degrees in for-profits relative to other sectors. They attribute this finding to the fact that more students in public and not-for-profit institutions go on to obtain bachelor's degrees, so students with only an associate's degree in the public and non-profit sector are negatively selected.

In the only other working paper (that we know of) to use panel data, Turner (2012) implements the same identification strategy using tax data. Although he is unable to identify students' degree program in his data, he finds that for-profit college students in two-year institutions earn about a 2 percent return, conditional on employment. Public and non-profit students fare better, gaining about 6 percent.

In our study we estimate the impact of for-profit college education on earnings using an individual fixed effects approach, and we use this approach to study the return to for-profit associate's programs specifically. By comparing the before and after wages for the

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that a related paper (Grubb, 1993b), using the same data and methods to estimate returns to community colleges was found to be severely flawed by Kane and Rouse (1995b).

<sup>4</sup>Lang and Weinstein (2013) is an update of their 2012 working paper using BPS transcript data, rather than BPS survey data. We report results from the 2013 version.



same individual, our fixed effects approach mitigates some of the most critical endogeneity problems that plague cross-sectional studies of the for-profit sector.<sup>5</sup>

### 3 Background

Our paper estimates the returns for students enrolled in associate's degree programs in for-profit institutions. Associate's degree programs typically require two years of full-time coursework and result in the attainment of an Associate of Arts (AA) or Associate of Science (AS) degree.<sup>6</sup> Students may obtain their degree in any number of majors, including traditional liberal arts and science majors like history, psychology, or computer science, as well as more vocational fields such as medical assisting, paralegal studies, or homeland security.

For-profit institutions that award associate's degrees are classified as two-year or four-year institutions by the U.S. Department of Education, based on the highest degree that they offer. For example, many of the large for-profit chains such as University of Phoenix or DeVry University offer both associate's and bachelor's degree programs, designating them as four-year institutions. Two-year colleges offer associate's degrees as their highest degrees, such as the Heald College chain along with many smaller local colleges. Interestingly, of the roughly 144,000 students obtaining associate's degrees from for-profits, 40 percent of students receive them from institutions that also offer bachelor's degrees (NCES 2010). We include students pursuing associate's degrees in both sets of institutions in our analysis.<sup>7</sup>

As noted above, for-profits account for 21 percent of the associate's degrees conferred, while the vast majority of associate's degrees are conferred by public community colleges (76 percent). In contrast to the market for bachelor's degrees where not-for-profits dominate the

---

<sup>5</sup>This approach has also been used in the broader labor economics literature. For example, Ashenfelter (1978) and Ashenfelter and Card (1985) use individual fixed effects to assess the impact of job training programs on earnings. Angrist and Newey (1991) and Freeman (1984) examine the impact of union status on earnings. See Angrist and Kreuger (1999) for an overview of the fixed effects strategy in labor economics.

<sup>6</sup>We cannot differentiate between these degrees in our data.

<sup>7</sup>We find no differences between the returns to associate's degrees in two- versus four-year for-profit institutions, see Table 5.

private sector, not-for-profit institutions confer just 6 percent of associate's degree (NCES 2010). In this analysis, we drop students pursuing associate's degrees in public and non-profit institutions and focus exclusively on generating the absolute return to enrollment in a for-profit institution relative to students who graduate from high school, but do not receive any college degree.<sup>8</sup>

Research on for-profit colleges is scarce, primarily due to a lack of data. Most studies of these colleges examine only federal aid-eligible for-profits that participate in the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and most are descriptive in nature (Apling 1993; Bailey, Badway, and Gumport 2001; Chung 2012; Deming, Goldin, and Katz 2012; Rosenbaum, Deil-Amen, and Person 2006; Turner 2006).<sup>9</sup> Administrative licensing data has added to our knowledge of these institutions in recent years and allowed for causal studies of institutional behavior (Cellini 2009, 2010) and a more accurate count of institutions (Cellini and Goldin 2012), but in spite of these advances surprisingly little is known about for-profit colleges and their students.

What we have learned from these studies and data sources is that there are approximately 7,500 for-profit institutions in the United States, at any level i.e., two-year, four-year, or less-than-two-year (Cellini and Goldin 2012), about 3,000 of which are eligible for federal student aid programs (NCES 2010). Average enrollment is just 350 students (Cellini 2009), a figure that pales in comparison to public community colleges that average 6,600 students each nationwide (NCES 2010).

Research on the sub-baccalaureate market has emphasized the similarities and differ-

---

<sup>8</sup>A previous version of this paper emphasized estimates of the differential return to for-profits relative to public community colleges. Since we found we had little power to detect differences between the sectors, in this paper, we focus more specifically on the absolute returns to for-profits relative to high school graduates with no college degree. However, we include an estimate of the differential effect of public sector institutions as a robustness check in Table 5.

<sup>9</sup>The IPEDS undercounts the number of for-profit two-year and less-than-two-year colleges in the U.S. For many years the survey relied on snowball sampling and did not require their participation. In recent years, greater efforts have been made to track down institutions receiving federal financial aid, but many colleges that do not participate in federal aid programs remain unaccounted for in the data (see Cellini and Goldin 2012).

ences between for-profits and community colleges. Cellini (2009) shows that for-profits and community colleges compete for students: when funding for community colleges increases, for-profit colleges exit the market. Similarly, Chung (2012) finds that community college tuition positively impacts the probability of attending a for-profit college. Both sectors also offer a wide range of overlapping degree programs (Cellini 2009), but community colleges tend to offer more academic and liberal arts programs and for-profits often specialize in vocational fields in which skills are easy to verify and physical plant requirements are modest (Turner 2006). Both offer a large number of part-time, evening, and online programs to meet the needs of working students (Rosenbaum, Person, Del-Amien 2005), but some notable differences in student characteristics remain.

Deming, Goldin, and Katz (2012) report that, relative to community colleges, for-profit institutions (including aid-eligible two-year and four-year institutions) enroll a higher proportion of women (65 vs. 57 percent), blacks (22 vs. 14 percent), GED recipients (17 vs. 10 percent), and single parents (29 vs. 12 percent). Income differences are also substantial: the average income of a for-profit student is roughly \$15,000-20,000 less than a community college student. The most important difference between for-profit and public two-year colleges is undoubtedly their price: required tuition and fees for public community colleges average just \$2,650 for in-state students, while for-profit two-year colleges charge more than five times as much, averaging \$14,000 in 2011-12 (NCES 2012, Table 381).<sup>10</sup>

Of course, students at for-profit institutions receive a disproportionate share of federal student aid to pay for their education. For-profit students account for 24 percent of all federal Pell grant aid, 26 percent of student loan disbursements, and 36 percent of Post 9-11 GI Bill benefits, while enrolling just 11 percent of all students (Deming, Goldin and Katz 2012). In two-year for-profit colleges, a full 90 percent of students receive some kind of aid. Of those who receive aid, for-profit two-year college students average \$4,350 in federal

---

<sup>10</sup>The average for for-profits include only federal aid eligible institutions. For-profits that are not aid eligible charge about 78 percent less (Cellini and Goldin 2012).

grants and \$7,750 in federal loans (NCES 2012). Student loan default rates are remarkably high in the for-profit sector: two-year cohort default rates are 12.5 percent, while the 10-year cumulative rate (based on number of loans rather than students) is 35 percent (U.S. Department of Education 2011).

In light of the financial burden placed on both students and taxpayer, we should expect that the earnings gains from attendance would be positive for the average student. Whether the gain is enough to offset the high cost of attendance is an issue we explore in our conclusions below.

## 4 Empirical Methods

Many studies of the returns to education estimate cross-sectional regression models following Mincer (1974). The main concern with such estimates is the potential endogeneity of attendance because individuals more likely to earn higher earnings may also be more likely to attend college, resulting in biased estimates of the returns to education.

To address this endogeneity problem, our research design exploits the panel structure of the NLSY97 data. Unlike high school and traditional four-year college students, associate's degree students (and particularly those in for-profit colleges) often work before, during, and after attendance. We can therefore include individual-level fixed effects to the Mincer model, exploiting the variation in earnings for the same individual before and after she attends a for-profit college. This strategy effectively controls for time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity at the student level, though other types of selection may remain (we return to this point below).

Our treatment group is the sample of for-profit college students who report working towards or receiving an associate's degree in our period of study (1997 to 2010). Our main estimates therefore reflect the return to for-profit attendance, rather than degree completion.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>We do not focus on completion because it is endogenous—many factors may jointly influence whether

We construct a control group that includes high school graduates who never report working toward an associate’s degree in the time period we observe to better identify the absolute returns to for-profit attendance beyond high school. We construct a falsified post-education variable for this “high school only” group.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, our estimates of returns to for-profit colleges can be thought of as difference-in-difference estimates: the first difference is between high school graduates with no college degree and for-profit students, and the second difference is the pre- versus post-education (or falsified post-education) earnings for each individual.

We estimate log weekly earnings and other employment outcomes,  $y_{ict}$ , for individual  $i$  in county  $c$  and year  $t$  as a function of for-profit college attendance and individual characteristics as follows:

$$y_{ict} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(Post_{it}) + \beta_2(Post_{it} * ForProfit_i) + \gamma X_{it} + \delta_{ct} + \tau_t + \eta_i + \varepsilon_{ict}$$

The variable  $Post_{it}$  identifies the post-education time period for each student. It switches from 0 to 1 the year after an individual reports receiving an associate’s degree (for degree completers) and the year after an individual last reports working towards an associate’s degree (for dropouts). It then remains 1 in all subsequent years. For the high school only group the falsified  $Post_{it}$  is based on age, as described in the next section. We interact this variable with  $ForProfit_i$ , an indicator for whether the individual reported attending a for-profit college. The result is that the variable of interest  $Post_{it} * ForProfit_i$  equals 1 for for-profit college students in each year after attendance or degree completion and 0 otherwise.

To control for time-varying factors that may jointly influence for-profit college attendance and earnings, we include a variety of controls in  $X_{it}$ . Specifically, we add age fixed effects, interactions of the age fixed effects with both race and gender, an indicator for the years in

---

an individual completes their associate’s degree from a for-profit college and subsequent earnings. However, we estimate the return to degree completion as a robustness check in Table 5.

<sup>12</sup>We refer to this group as both the “high school only” and “high school graduates” group throughout.

which individuals are enrolled in college, and an indicator for the two years before college for the for-profit students. We discuss the reasons for each of these controls below. We also include a time trend for each individual's county of residence,  $\delta_{ct}$ , to proxy for changes in local labor market conditions and for-profit college supply. We include year fixed effects,  $\tau_t$ , to capture changes in the macro-economic climate influencing all individuals in the same manner.

Most importantly, we add indicators for each individual,  $\eta_i$ . These individual fixed effects control for time-invariant unobservable characteristics that are correlated both with earnings and the decision to attend a for-profit institution. In the case of for-profit associate's degree students, a student's innate ability and motivation are the primary omitted variables we should be concerned about. To the extent that these do not change over time, our fixed effects will provide adequate controls for these potentially confounding omitted variables. The key identifying assumption of the fixed effects approach is that conditional on observables, nothing else that affects earnings changes contemporaneously with college attendance. However, this assumption can breakdown and bias estimates of the returns to a for-profit education in two primary ways.

First, our sample consists of young workers that may exhibit changing labor force attachment over the age-range we observe. We deal with this issue in several ways. Our county-year trends and the controls interacting age fixed effects with race and sex help mitigate this bias, allowing for flexible trends in earnings for different groups. Our indicator for the years in college accounts for the opportunity cost of attendance, since students likely need to cut back on hours or give up working completely while in college. We also restrict our analysis to person-year observations over age 18 to avoid capturing earnings from informal jobs such as babysitting. Finally, as a robustness check, we limit the sample to individuals with valid earnings data in the pre-period, as is common in the job-training literature.

Second, we worry about biases associated with the dynamic selection of individuals into

college. In particular, estimates of returns may be biased upwards if individuals experience a decline in earnings in the years immediately preceding enrollment. This issue, sometimes referred to as “Ashenfelter’s dip,” is well-known in the job training literature, as individuals with negative earnings shocks are more likely to enroll in training than individuals in untreated control groups.<sup>13</sup> This type of dip would cause our estimate of the returns to for-profits to overstate the true gain. To address such concerns, we include an indicator variable for the two years before attendance for the for-profit students.

## 5 Data

To implement our analysis, we draw on the restricted-access 1997 panel of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY97), a major nationally-representative longitudinal survey that tracks a cohort of students through secondary school, college, and beyond. The NLSY97 is based on a panel of 8,984 youths who were 12 to 18 years old when they were first surveyed in 1997.<sup>14</sup> The youths are interviewed each year and we use data available through 2010. We thus have a group of individuals ranging from age 25 to 31 by 2010.<sup>15</sup>

The NLSY97 has both advantages and disadvantages relative to other datasets. On the down side, it is a young and relatively small cohort of individuals. Less than 1 percent of the individuals are in their 30s by 2010 and we have a small sample of individuals to draw from who enroll in associate’s degree programs in for-profit colleges. Many for-profit colleges offer certificates and diplomas, but these are not well documented in the education module of the NLSY97 so we are unable to estimate the returns to non-degree programs in for-profit colleges.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>See Ashenfelter (1978), Ashenfelter and Card (1985), and Heckman and Hotz (1989) for more discussion.

<sup>14</sup>According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics website, individuals surveyed in the NLSY97 were 12 to 16 years of age as of December 31, 1996. We report the age in the survey year. For example, a majority of the individuals (94%) are documented as 12 to 16 in the 1997 survey year, 6% are 17 years old and 12 individuals are 18 years old.

<sup>15</sup>The 2010 data are the latest available.

<sup>16</sup>The NLSY97 collects information on certificates as part of the job-training module, but we do not believe these can be matched to IPEDS college codes.

On the up side, the NLSY97 is a panel with rich information on the education and earnings trajectory of individuals. Most importantly, it surveys individuals annually for 14 years, allowing us to implement an individual fixed effects estimation that gets closer than OLS and propensity score estimates to identifying the causal effect of education on earnings, as described above. But it has several other advantages as well. It contains detailed data on weekly wages and hours for multiple jobs each year, allowing us a more accurate estimate of earning gains than many other surveys. The restricted access data also contains county of residence in each year and allows us to merge the NLSY97 with the IPEDS to accurately identify an individual's college. Overall, we believe the panel structure and detailed information on education and earnings outweigh the disadvantages of the NLSY97 for this type of analysis.

Our main sample is restricted to individuals who report working towards or receiving an associate's degree at a for-profit college (the treatment group) and a control group of individuals who have graduated from high school but never report working towards or receiving an associate's degree. We drop individuals who received a bachelor's degree or have completed 16 or more years of education from both groups, since we observe very few post-education years for these individuals. However, we leave in students who at some point may report working towards (but not obtaining) a bachelor's degree, as a sizable proportion of students at for-profit colleges who on occasion state they are working towards a bachelor's degree also report pursuing or obtaining an associate's degree.<sup>17</sup> Since students who drop out of traditional bachelor's degree programs in not-for-profit or public institutions might be positively selected vis-à-vis for-profit students, we perform robustness checks dropping these students from the high school only group. Our final sample includes 388 for-profit students and 2,303 individuals in the high school only control group.

We focus on associate's degree students in the for-profit sector for several reasons. First,

---

<sup>17</sup>About 40 percent of for-profit associate's degree students also report working toward a bachelor's degree at some point in time. We believe that many of these students aspire to a bachelor's degree, but end up getting an associate's degree and then leave college.



as noted above, for-profits offer a disproportionate share of associate’s degrees, so focusing on these students allows us a large enough sample size to identify absolute returns. Second, the individual fixed effects approach requires earnings before and after attendance, and most students in associate’s degree programs work before attending college, but this is not typically the case with “traditional” bachelor’s degree students. We observe earnings for 72 percent of our for-profit associate’s students in the pre-education period and 77 percent in the post-education period.

The two key variables in our analysis are indicators for post-education and whether an individual attended a for-profit college. To construct a consistent measure of post-education, we code  $Post_{it}$  as 1 only when we are certain that individuals are out of college. In the case of associate’s degree graduates,  $Post_{it}$  switches to 1 the year after they report receiving their degree and remains 1 for all subsequent years.<sup>18</sup> For dropouts (i.e., attendees who do not complete a degree in the time period we observe), we use self-reported information on whether they are “working towards an associate’s degree” to code post-education. 76 percent of dropouts at for-profit colleges report working towards their associate’s degree for a few years and never report working towards an associate’s degree again. For this group, we switch  $Post_{it}$  to 1 the year following the last time they report working towards an associate’s degree.

We also observe individuals who work towards an associate’s degree for a few years, then drop out (i.e., do not report working towards an associate’s degree) and report working towards an associate’s degree again after a few years before dropping out again. For these “double dropouts”, we switch  $Post_{it}$  to 1 the year following the last observed enrollment and all the years before are treated as 0.<sup>19</sup> Finally, we have 47 individuals attending for-

---

<sup>18</sup>The NLSY97 has many variables to identify degree completion. We use the most inclusive set of variables (highest degree received, highest degree received ever, and type of degree received since date of last interview) to identify degree completion. Our results are robust to using only a subset of these variables to identify degree completion. We also create an indicator variable for years in college based on self-reported information. 10% of associate’s degree for-profit graduates do not ever report working towards an associate’s degree. For this group, we assume they were in college for two years before receiving their degree.

<sup>19</sup>Among dropouts, 17% of individuals attending for-profits dropout twice (dropout for a few years, then

profit colleges who are still working towards their associate’s degree in 2010. We leave these individuals in the sample but they do not contribute to identification.

To identify students attending a for-profit institution we use the sector of the college as listed in the IPEDS. We separately identify two-year and four-year for-profits as a robustness check. Since colleges are listed every year, for degree completers, we use the IPEDS college code in the year that they graduate to identify them as for-profit students. For dropouts, we use the college listed in the last observed year of enrollment.<sup>20</sup>

For the high school only group, we create a falsified  $Post_{it}$  that turns on at age 23, which is the average age of students in the NLSY97 the first year after their last observed enrollment in an associate’s degree program (for dropouts) and the first year after they complete an associate’s degree (for graduates).<sup>21</sup> We also create a falsified in-school variable assuming the high school only group are in college for two years before their post-education period begins.

Following the returns literature (e.g., Angrist and Krueger 1991), our main dependent variable is the natural log of weekly earnings—the product of the individual’s hourly wage and average hours worked per week. In the NLSY97, individuals report their wages and hours for up to eleven jobs in a year, but the number of people reporting wages for more than five jobs is less than one percent. Hence, we focus on average weekly earnings across the first five jobs.<sup>22</sup> There are a few clear outliers in the average wage and hours worked per week variables that we use to calculate weekly earnings. We drop person-year observations

---

report working towards an associate’s degree and dropout again) and 2% dropout three times.

<sup>20</sup>The NLSY97 lists up to five colleges per year per student, but the vast majority (85%) of students list only one in the year of graduation or of last observed enrollment. As long as at least one college is for-profit in the year of graduation or the year of last observed enrollment, we code the student as for-profit. We drop students who also report attending institutions in the public sector in the same year as a robustness check in Table 5. Finally, for a few individuals, the IPEDS code is missing in the year of graduation or the year of last observed enrollment. We use the IPEDS code from the previous year to code for-profit in these instances.

<sup>21</sup>The comparable average age of post-education for the sample of for-profit students is 23.7 and our results are robust to using this age for the high school only group. However, we prefer to use the average age of all associate’s degree students (23) due to concerns about endogeneity.

<sup>22</sup>The results are robust to alternate definitions of weekly earnings based on the first job alone and all reported jobs. We show the latter result in Table 5.

where the average hourly wage across the first five jobs is less than \$1 or greater than \$100, and where the hours worked per week is greater than 160 hours.<sup>23</sup> Because we use the log of weekly earnings, observations reporting zero earnings are treated as missing and dropped from the main analysis: our estimates therefore reflect returns conditional on employment.

As noted above, we also limit our analysis to person-year observations where individuals are 18 years or older to avoid capturing wages in informal early jobs.<sup>24</sup> Since the NLSY97 is a young cohort, we observe earnings for 3.4 years on average in the post-education period (3.6 years for for-profit students and 3.4 years for high school graduates). Our estimates of returns are thus estimates of the short run returns to for-profit colleges and may underestimate returns if earnings are more responsive in the long run.

In addition to weekly earnings, we examine other labor market outcomes. We decompose weekly earnings and estimate the effects on log hourly wages and log hours worked per week across the first five jobs. We also estimate the effects of for-profit attendance on full-time employment and any employment, this time including observations with missing earnings data. Our measure of full-time employment equals one if an individual reports working 35 or more hours per week, and our indicator for any employment equals one if an individual reports non-zero weekly earnings. Finally, we report unconditional estimates of returns, using weekly earnings in dollars as the dependent variable and including observations with zero earnings. These estimates combine both the earnings gains and employment effects of for-profit attendance.

As noted above, in addition to individual fixed effects, we include age fixed effects, calendar year fixed effects, a dummy for when individuals are in school and flexible controls for observable characteristics by interacting age fixed effects with dummies for both race and sex. We also interact the 1997 county of residence from the geo-coded portion of the NLSY97

---

<sup>23</sup>The results are robust to keeping these outliers in the analysis. The \$1 average wage cut-off is below the 1 percentile of the wage distribution (\$2.08) and \$100 is above the 99 percentile of the wage distribution (\$62.5). Since there are 168 total hours in a week, reports of individuals working more than 160 hours are also clear outliers.

<sup>24</sup>Our results are robust to including individuals 16 and over.

(restricted access) with time trends to control for changing local labor market conditions. We believe the 1997 county of residence, the first year of the survey, is the most exogenous measure of location. As a robustness check, we also interact the county of residence in the year before an individual begins college.

Table 1 reports the summary statistics for the main variables used in our analysis. We present the means separately for the for-profit sample and for high school only group. Our for-profit sample consists of 388 individuals of which 43 percent received an associate's degree by 2010. On average, for-profit students are more likely to be female (57%) and non-white (63%), as found in previous research (Deming et. al 2012).<sup>25</sup> The average weekly earnings during the entire time period are slightly lower for the for-profit sample compared to our high school sample (\$371 versus \$384), but this is probably related to the larger proportion of males in the latter group. Although full time employment rates are similar for both groups, individuals from for-profits are more likely to be employed over the 1997-2010 period at 78 percent compared to 69 percent for high school graduates.

To visually examine the time patterns of earnings, we graph the raw mean of log weekly earnings for each group five years before and after post-education in Figure 1. Year 0 is the first post-education year and on average, students enter college 2.6 years earlier, where the dashed line appears. Note that for-profit students appear to have only a very slight advantage over high school graduates in the post-education period. More noticeable is the dip in earnings for for-profit students prior to enrollment that does not appear to occur for the high school group. As noted above, we include controls for the two years prior to enrollment to control for this difference. We next turn to the results to see if these visual post-education gains stand up to regression analysis.

---

<sup>25</sup>We constructed the race variable incorporating information on both race and ethnicity from the NLSY97.

## 6 Results

### 6.1 Main Results

Table 2 presents our first set of findings on log weekly earnings. Specifications (1) and (2) are cross-sectional OLS models common in the literature, while specifications (3) through (5) are our preferred estimates, exploiting within-individual variation by including individual fixed effects.

The first row of Table 2 finds small and statistically insignificant effects of post-education ( $Post_{it}$ ) in every specification. This result is expected because  $Post_{it}$  is falsified for the high school only group, so they should see no jump in earnings at age 23 in the absence of further education. More importantly, in the second row of Table 2 we find a significant effect of for-profit college attendance on weekly earnings across all specifications. Cross-sectional OLS estimates in specification (1) suggest a significant return to for-profit attendance of 13.6 percent over high school graduates.<sup>26</sup> As we add more controls (specification 2) and the individual fixed effects (specifications 3-5), the coefficients on  $Post_{it} * ForProfit_i$  decrease slightly in magnitude but not statistical significance. Our preferred fully-loaded individual fixed effects specification (5), which includes both the county of residence trends and the pre-education indicator finds a statistically significant 10.3 percent return to for-profit college attendance relative to high school graduates with no college degree.

Since the for-profit associate's degree students in our sample attend college for an average of 2.6 years, dividing our estimated returns by this figure yields a measure of returns to a single year of education that can be more easily compared to previous studies. Based on this calculation, for-profit associate's degree programs yield a 4 percent increase in earnings per year of education. This estimate is slightly higher than that found by Turner (2012) for for-profit two-year college attendance (2 percent per year),<sup>27</sup> and lower than the returns

---

<sup>26</sup>We report our findings as percentages, but they are actually log points. To convert log points to percentages use  $(e^{\log \text{ points}} - 1)$ . But note that this transformation has virtually no impact on the interpretation for log points below 0.30 (as we report here) so, for simplicity, we describe them as percentages throughout.

<sup>27</sup>The difference might be explained by the fact that Turner's sample includes students pursuing certificates

to a year of public community college attendance reported by Jacobson et al. (2005) (9-13 percent per year). Our estimates remain even slightly below the 5-8 percent range found for public community college students in cross-sectional studies in the 1980s and 1990s as reported by Kane and Rouse (1999).

To explore the dynamic pattern of earnings gains in more detail, we implement a type of event-study analysis. We add interactions of *ForProfit* with each pre- and post-education year within a three-year window and plot the coefficients and confidence intervals in Figure 2.<sup>28</sup> As expected, our results are significant only in the post period (0 is the first post-education year) and there is a slight growth in earnings over time after attendance. In the fourth year post-education, earnings gains grow to 15 percent, or about a 5.8 percent return per year.

In Table 3, we explore the effect of for-profit enrollment on employment and other labor market outcomes using our preferred fully-loaded individual fixed effects specification (specification (5) in Table 2). For comparison, we show the results on log weekly earnings in specification (1). The results in specifications (2) and (3) suggest that the positive returns to for-profit enrollment are driven mostly by higher hourly wages (6.8 percent higher than high school graduates) rather than higher hours worked per week (3.6 percent higher than high school graduates but statistically insignificant). Specifications (4) and (5) are linear probability models for employment, now including observations with zero earnings. We find that attending a for-profit college increases the probability of full-time employment relative to high school graduates by 5.3 percentage points, but this effect is only marginally significant at the 10 percent level. In specification (5), we find no significant effect of for-profit colleges on any employment, perhaps reflecting that individuals attending for-profit institutions are likely to work both before, during, and after their college enrollment.

---

and diplomas as well as associate's degrees in two-year institutions.

<sup>28</sup>This regression includes age FE, year FE, age FE\*race, age FE\*male, individual FE, county of residence trends, and an indicator for the two years before for-profit students enroll in college. Instead of an indicator for when students are in college, we include the main effects for each pre- and post-education year within the three-year window and their interactions with for-profit.

Finally, in specification (6), we analyze unconditional weekly earnings by moving away from the log specification and including the zeros in weekly earnings. The coefficient on *Post\*ForProfit* suggests for-profit students earn \$62 over high school graduates, an increase of 21 percent over the average weekly earnings of for-profit students.<sup>29</sup> Dividing by 2.6, the unconditional return to a year of education in a for-profit college is about 8 percent. Since the unconditional returns conflate employment outcomes and earnings gains, it is perhaps unsurprising that we find larger returns to unconditional earnings than conditional returns since for-profit colleges increase the probability of full time employment, as shown in column (4).

## 6.2 Robustness Checks

In our main specifications in Table 3 we dropped person-year observations where average hourly wages across the first five jobs were less than \$1 or greater than \$100. While it is possible that individuals in the NLSY97 did earn these average wages, these cut-offs are below the 1<sup>st</sup> percentile and above the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile of the average hourly wage distribution for this sample. So, in specification (1), we drop person-year observations where the average hourly wage is below the 1<sup>st</sup> percentile (\$2.08) and above the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile (\$62.5) of the distribution. The results are only slightly higher to those reported in Table 2 (specification 5) indicating a return of 11.1 percent to for-profit colleges.<sup>30</sup>

Specification (2) uses earnings from all reported jobs (up to eleven each year), rather than the first five. The results are remarkably close to our baseline, at 10.4 percent. We find similar results when we rely only on the first reported job for our measure of earnings (not reported).

As noted above, our baseline estimates include several controls to address potential biases created by the changing labor force attachment of young workers. We add one additional

---

<sup>29</sup>Average weekly earnings for the for-profit students are \$288 including the zeros compared to those reported in Table 1 that exclude the zeros.

<sup>30</sup>Our estimates are also robust to including the outliers.

robustness check here. Specification (3) uses the presence of valid earnings data in the pre-education period as a selection criterion. We restrict the sample to individuals who were employed in each of the three consecutive years prior to enrolling in college. Despite losing 1,223 individuals, our estimates remain very similar to the full sample, suggesting that for-profit students earn 10.4 percent over high school graduates.

A small proportion of our for-profit sample consists of individuals who dropout and re-enroll multiple times. In our baseline specification, our definition of post-education switches to 1 after the last observed dropout for these individuals, but this may be too restrictive if these individuals enroll for just a few weeks after the first or second dropout before deciding to quit again. In specification (4) we use an alternate definition of post-education for “double dropouts” that switches to 1 when we first observe them drop out. For associate’s degree holders and individuals who only dropout once, *Post* is defined as before. The coefficient is marginally bigger using this alternate definition of post-education suggesting for-profits earn 12 percent over high school graduates.

Finally, specification (5) uses the county of residence in the year before individuals enroll in college to construct the county of residence trend, rather than the county in 1997 as in our baseline specification. Unlike the 1997 county of residence, which is typically a parental decision, county of residence immediately prior to enrollment may be endogenous to the schooling decision. On the other hand, it may better capture changes in local labor markets relevant to young adults. The estimated returns to for-profits are robust to this alternate county of residence trend at 9.7 percent.

### **6.3 Heterogeneous Effects and Alternate Samples**

In Table 5, we test for heterogeneous effects and estimate the returns to for-profit college attendance using several different samples. As noted in the background section, individuals can pursue an associate’s degree in either a two-year or four-year for-profit institution. In our sample, 53 percent of individuals attend or receive their associate’s degree from a four-



year for-profit institution. We find no evidence of a differential return to four-year for-profit colleges in specification (1). The coefficient on the four-year interaction is small in magnitude and statistically insignificant. We conduct a similar exercise to test for a differential effect by gender (not reported). We find no significant difference in the earnings gains for men and women, perhaps because we do not have enough power to detect differences in our small sample.

In all of our prior estimates, we combine individuals who complete associate's degrees with those who do not because degree completion is endogenous. However, the returns to attendance are likely higher for completers than for dropouts. We therefore test for differential effects by degree completion in specification (2) in Table 5. We find a large, positive and significant effect of completing an associate's degree in a for-profit college on subsequent earnings on the order of 20 percent over dropouts. Given the potential endogeneity of completion in our model we hesitate to overemphasize the finding, but future research into for-profit college quality should carefully explore the margin of completion versus attendance at for-profit colleges.<sup>31</sup>

In specifications (3) through (5), we create alternate samples by dropping three types of individuals. We first drop 46 students who report attending both for-profit and public institutions in the year of degree completion or the year of last observed enrollment (for dropouts), in specification (3). When we drop these students, we find that the return to for-profit college attendance is marginally lower at 7.5 percent. It could be that higher ability students transfer to public institutions either to finish their associate's degree or to begin a bachelor's degree program.<sup>32</sup>

In specification (4), we drop the 42 "double dropouts", individuals who drop out of for-profit colleges and re-enroll. The results are somewhat higher than our baseline returns, at

---

<sup>31</sup>A few studies address these endogeneity problems. For example, Jepsen et. al (forthcoming) use unique data on whether a student aspires to complete a degree in their first year, their first year courses and field of study to capture differences in intent between degree completers versus dropouts.

<sup>32</sup>Note, however, that these students never finish a bachelor's degree due to our sample restriction.

about 13.5 percent, as we might expect since double dropouts are undoubtedly negatively selected. In specification (5), we drop 452 individuals who report ever working towards a bachelor's degree in our high school only group. In contrast to the double dropouts, these individuals are likely positively selected, or at least have higher aspirations than others in the high school only group, as they are attending public and not-for-profit institutions with the (unrealized) goal of obtaining a bachelor's degree.<sup>33</sup> In this specification we find that for-profit students earn 12.2 percentage points over high school graduates.

Finally, in specification (6) we test for a differential return between for-profit students and public community college students by adding to our sample 1,832 individuals who pursued or obtained an associate's degree in the public sector. In this specification, the variable *Post* refers to the post-education (or falsified post) period for all groups. *Post \* AnyCollege* captures the differential gains to any type of college attendance (public or for-profit) over the high school only group. And, *Post \* AnyCollege \* ForProfit* captures the further differential effect of post-education for the for-profit students. Interestingly, we find no differential return to attending a for-profit college relative to a public community college. The point estimate on *Post \* AnyCollege \* ForProfit* is positive but small and statistically insignificant. Our results imply lower returns to community colleges than found in other studies (Jacobson et al. 2005, Jepsen et al. forthcoming), perhaps because we exclude students who go on to obtain a bachelor's degree in our analysis. If community college students are more likely to transfer and complete bachelor's degrees than for-profit students, these estimates may understate the differences between the sectors.

---

<sup>33</sup>Note, again, that these students never finish a bachelor's degree and they must be working before and after attending to contribute to identification. So even though they may be positively selected on aspirations, they may not be positively selected on other dimensions.

## 7 Concluding Remarks

This study takes a step toward assessing the quality of for-profit postsecondary education, estimating the before-after earnings gains of students pursuing associate's degrees in for-profit institutions. Using an individual fixed effects approach and data from the restricted-access NLSY97, we find that students who enroll in for-profit institutions experience earnings gains of about 10 percent over individuals who complete high school without any college degree, conditional on employment. Given that the average length of associate's degree program attendance is 2.6 years, this amounts to a 4 percent return per year of education. Unconditional estimates raise our estimates of returns to 8 percent per year due to a slight increase in the likelihood of full-time employment among for-profit students.

Our estimates are robust to a wide array of specification checks. In extensions, we find no differential returns between four-year and two-year for-profit colleges and no difference in the returns for men and women. We also find that students who complete degrees in for-profits earn 20 percent more than dropouts, but we cannot fully control for the endogeneity of completion in our model.

Overall, it is noteworthy that the returns to for-profit attendance appear positive and significant in all specifications and they are somewhat higher than the only other panel estimates of returns to for-profit colleges that we know of (Turner 2012). We further find no difference in the returns between public community college students and for-profit students. However, our estimates for both groups fall below similar estimates of the returns to public community college associate's degree programs (Jacobson et al., 2005; Jepsen et al., forthcoming) and well below the average returns to bachelor's degree attendance in the literature (Oreopolous and Petronijevic 2013).

Given these findings, from a student's perspective, it would seem that a lower-cost community college would likely be a better choice than a for-profit associate's degree program. It may be the case that students are unaware of the options available at local community

colleges (Cellini 2009) and we cannot rule out that aggressive recruiters in the private sector might mislead students into believing that the earnings gains will be higher than in the public sector (GAO 2010). On the other hand, students may simply value other attributes of for-profit colleges. For example, some programs may be offered in the private sector that are not offered in the public sector, and public institutions may be capacity constrained, making for-profit institutions the only viable option.

The most important question then becomes whether for-profit students' earnings gains are sufficient to offset both the private and social costs of education in this sector. Recent work assessing the costs of a for-profit associate's degree to students and taxpayers finds that a return of 8.5 percent per year is needed to offset the private costs to students of attending. Adding in the cost to taxpayers raises the needed return to 9.8 percent (Cellini 2012). All of our conditional estimates fall well below both thresholds, suggesting that for the average student, the returns appear to be too low to justify the private cost and much too low to justify the additional cost to taxpayers. However, our unconditional estimates and those for degree completers come quite close to the benchmark for private costs, suggesting that some above-average students who complete degrees and find employment may find a for-profit college education worthwhile. This study is just a first step toward understanding the quality of education in the for-profit sector. More studies using alternative data sources and methods are needed to definitively assess student outcomes in for-profit postsecondary institutions.

## References

1. Angrist, Joshua D. and Alan Kreuger (1991). "Does Compulsory School Attendance Affect Schooling and Earnings?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 106(4): 979-1014.
2. Angrist, Joshua D. and Alan B. Kreuger (1999). "Empirical Strategies in Labor Economics" Chapter 23 of the *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Vol. 3A, eds. Orley Ashen-

- felter and David Card. North-Holland: Amsterdam.
3. Angrist, Joshua D. and Whitney K. Newey (1991). "Over-Identification Tests in Earnings Functions with Fixed Effects." *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 9(3): 317-323.
  4. Ashenfelter, Orley (1978). "Estimating the Effect of Training Programs on Earnings." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 60(1): 47-57.
  5. Ashenfelter, Orley and David Card (1985). "Using the Longitudinal Structure of Earnings to Estimate the Effect of Training Programs." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 67(4): 648-660.
  6. Ashenfelter, Orley, Colm Harmon, and Hessel Oosterbeek (1999). "A Review of Estimates of the Schooling/Earnings Relationship, With Tests for Publication Bias." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper #7457. Cambridge, MA.
  7. Apling, Richard N. (1993). "Proprietary Schools and Their Students." *Journal of Higher Education*. 64(4): 379-416.
  8. Ashenfelter, Orley, Colm Harmon, and Hessel Oosterbeek (1999). "A Review of Estimates of the Schooling/Earnings Relationship, with Tests for Publication Bias" *Labour Economics*, 6(4): 453-470.
  9. Bailey, Thomas, Norena Badway, and Patricia J. Gumport (2001). "For-Profit Higher Education and Community Colleges." National Center for Postsecondary Improvement, Stanford, CA.
  10. Card, David (1999). "The Causal Effect of Education on Earnings." Chapter 30 of the *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Vol. 3A, eds. Orley Ashenfelter and David Card. North-Holland: Amsterdam.

11. Card, David (2001). "Estimating the Return to Schooling: Progress on Some Persistent Econometric Problems." *Econometrica*, 69(5): 1127-1160.
12. Cellini, Stephanie Riegg (2009). "Crowded Colleges and College Crowd-Out: The Impact of Public Subsidies on the Two-Year College Market." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 1(2): 1-30.
13. Cellini, Stephanie Riegg (2010). "Financial Aid and For-Profit Colleges: Does Aid Encourage Entry?" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 29(3): 526-552.
14. Cellini, Stephanie Riegg (2012). "For-Profit Higher Education: An Assessment of Costs and Benefits." *National Tax Journal*, 65(1), 153-180.
15. Cellini, Stephanie Riegg and Claudia Goldin (2012). "Does Federal Student Aid Raise Tuition? New Evidence on For-Profit Colleges." NBER Working Paper #17827, Cambridge, MA.
16. Chung, Anna S. (2008). "Effects of For-Profit Training on Earnings." Manuscript, University of Michigan.
17. Chung, Anna S. (2012). "Choice of For-Profit College." *Economics of Education Review*, 31(6), 1084-1101.
18. Deming, David J., Claudia Goldin, and Lawrence F. Katz (2012). "The For-Profit Postsecondary School Sector: Nimble Critters or Agile Predators?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(1): 139-164.
19. Federal Register (July 26, 2010). "Program Integrity: Gainful Employment." Retrieved September 6, 2010 from <<http://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2010/07/26/2010-17845/program-integrity-gainful-employment#p-67>>.

20. Field, Kelly (2013, April 15). "Education Department to Renew Efforts at Gainful Employment and State Authorization Rules" *Chronicle of Higher Education*.  
<<http://chronicle.com/article/Education-Dept-to-Renew/138547/>>
21. Finaid.org (2010). "Student Loans," retrieved September 20, 2010 from  
<<http://www.finaid.org/loans/>>.
22. Freeman, Richard B. (1984). "Longitudinal Analyses of the Effects of Trade Unions," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 2: 1-26.
23. (GAO) United States Government Accountability Office (2010). For profit colleges: Undercover testing finds colleges encouraged fraud and engaged in deceptive and questionable marketing practices. Washington, D.C. Retrieved August 5, 2010 from  
<<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-948T>>.
24. Goldin, Claudia and Lawrence F. Katz (2008). *The Race Between Education and Technology*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
25. Goodman, P.S. (2010, March 13). In hard times, lured into trade schools and debt. *New York Times*. Retrieved August 6, 2010, from  
<<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/14/business/14schools.html>>.
26. Griliches, Zvi and Jerry A. Hausman (1986). "Errors in Variables in Panel Data," *Journal of Econometrics*, 31(1): 93-118.
27. Grubb, W. Norton (1993). "The Long-Run Effects of Proprietary Schools on Wages and Earnings: Implications for Federal Policy." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(1): 17-33.
28. Grubb, W. Norton (1993b). "The Varied Economic Returns to Postsecondary Education: New Evidence from the Class of 1972." *Journal of Human Resources*, 28(3): 365-382.


29. Grubb, W. Norton (1995). “Postsecondary Education and the Sub-Baccalaureate Labor Market: Corrections and Extensions.” *Economics of Education Review*. 14(3): 285–299.
30. Guryan, Jonathan and Matthew Thompson, 2010. “Comment on the Proposed Rule regarding Gainful Employment Described in the NPRM released by the Department of Education on July 26, 2010.” Document ID: ED-2010-OPE-0012-13610.1. Department of Education, Washington, DC. [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov).
31. Heckman, James J. and V. Joseph Hotz (1989). “Choosing Among Alternative Non-experimental Methods for Estimating the Impact of Social Programs: The Case of Manpower Training.” *The Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(408): 862-874.
32. Heineman, Harry N. and Edward Sussna. (1977). “The Economic Benefits of a Community College.” *Industrial Relations*. 16(3): 345–354
33. Jacobson, Louis, Robert LaLonde and Daniel G. Sullivan (2005). “Estimating the Returns to Community College Schooling for Displaced Workers.” *Journal of Econometrics*. 125: 271-304.
34. Jepsen, Christopher, Kenneth Troske, and Paul Coomes (forthcoming). “The Labor Market Returns to Community College Degrees, Diplomas, and Certificates,” *Journal of Labor Economics*.
35. Kane, Thomas J. and Cecilia Elena Rouse (1995). “The Labor Market Returns to Two- and Four-Year College.” *American Economic Review*. 85(3): 600-614.
36. Kane, Thomas J., and Cecilia E. Rouse (1995b). “Comment on W. Norton Grubb: “The Varied Economic Returns to Postsecondary Education: New Evidence from the Class of 1972.” *Journal of Human Resources*, 30 (1), 205–221.



37. Kane, Thomas J. and Cecilia Elena Rouse (1999). "The Community College: Educating Students at the Margin between College and Work." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 13(1): 63-84.
38. Leigh, Duane E. and Andrew M. Gill (1997). "Labor Market Returns to Community Colleges." *Journal of Human Resources*. 32(2): 334-353.
39. Lewin, Tamar. (2010, August 3). "For-Profit Colleges Mislead Students, Report Finds." *New York Times*, A13. Retrieved August 4, 2010 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/04/education/04education.html?hp>.
40. Marcotte, Dave E., Thomas Bailey, Carey Borkoski, and Greg S. Kienzl (2005). "The Returns of a Community College Education: Evidence from the National Education Longitudinal Survey." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 27(2), 157-175.
41. Mincer, Jacob (1974). *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*. New York: Columbia University Press for the National Bureau of Economic Research. Monk-Turner, Elizabeth (1994). "Economic Returns to Community and Four-Year College Education." *Journal of Socio-Economics*. 23(4): 441-447.
42. (NCES) National Center for Education Statistics (2010). Digest of Education Statistics. Retrieved from: [www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10](http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10).
43. (NCES) National Center for Education Statistics (2012). Digest of Education Statistics. Retrieved from: [www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12](http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12).
44. Oreopolous, Philip and Uros Petronijevic (2013). "Making College Worth It: A Review of Research on the Returns to Higher Education." NBER Working Paper #19053, Cambridge, MA.
45. Rosenbaum, James E., Regina Deil-Amen, and Ann E. Person (2006). *After Admission: from College Access to College Success*. Russell Sage Foundation: New York.


46. Turner, Nicholas (2012). "Do Students Profit from For-Profit Education? Estimating the Returns to Postsecondary Education with Tax Data." Manuscript, U.S. Treasury.
47. Turner, Sarah E. (2006). "For-Profit Colleges in the Context of the Market for Higher Education," Chapter 3 of Breneman, David W., Brian Pusser, and Sarah E. Turner, eds. *Earnings from Learning: The Rise of For-Profit Universities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
48. U.S. Department of Education (2010). Federal Student Aid, Direct Stafford Loans. Retrieved September 20, 2010 from:  
<<http://studentaid.ed.gov/PORTALSWebApp/students/english/studentloans.jsp>>.
49. U.S. Department of Education, 2011. "Institutional Default Rates." Office of Federal Student Aid, Washington, DC,  
<http://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/instrates.html>.
50. U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. (2012, July 30) "For Profit Education: The Failure to Safeguard the Federal Investment and Ensure Student Success." S. Print 112-37. 112th Congress, Second Session.

Figure 1: Unadjusted Log Weekly Earnings Over Time



Dashed vertical line at -2.6 denotes average year of college entry for for-profit students.

Figure 2: Dynamic Returns to For-Profit Attendance



Coefficient estimates from a single regression that interacts Post\*For-Profit with each year pre- and post-education.

**Table 1: Summary Statistics, NLSY 1997**

Variable	For-Profit Students		HS Graduates	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
Weekly Earnings (\$)	\$371.23	\$276.68	\$384.43	\$278.30
Hourly Wage	\$10.94	\$7.16	\$11.14	\$7.48
Hours Worked per Week	33.8	10.0	34.7	10.5
Full Time Employment	43.8%	49.6%	43.2%	49.5%
Any Employment	77.9%	41.5%	69.2%	46.2%
Age	22.7	3.1	22.8	3.1
Male	42.9%	49.5%	58.3%	49.3%
White (non-Hispanic)	37.3%	48.4%	46.1%	49.8%
Black (non-Hispanic)	36.5%	48.1%	29.1%	45.4%
Asian	0.7%	8.4%	0.9%	9.4%
Hispanic	10.8%	31.1%	11.5%	31.9%
Other	14.7%	35.4%	12.4%	33.0%
Person-Year Obs	3,964	3,964	23,534	23,534
Number of Individuals		388		2,303

Note: Statistics are person-year averages from 1997 to 2010 for individuals age 18 and older. Weekly Earnings, Average Hourly Wage and Hours Worked per Week are conditional on employment (i.e., zeros not included).

**Table 2: Returns to For-Profit Attendance, Log Weekly Earnings**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Post-Education	0.026 [0.035]	0.021 [0.035]	-0.010 [0.033]	-0.011 [0.033]	-0.012 [0.033]
Post-Educ*For-Profit	0.136*** [0.036]	0.132*** [0.036]	0.110*** [0.035]	0.104*** [0.036]	0.103*** [0.037]
Demographics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
County of Residence	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Individual FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ashenfelter's Dip	No	No	No	No	Yes
Observations	19,364	19,364	19,364	19,364	19,364
Individuals			2,627	2,627	2,627

Robust standard errors clustered at the individual level in brackets. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1  
 Note: Post-education is an indicator variable that turns on at age 23 for the high school group (falsified post), the year after graduation for the for-profit degree completers and the year after the last observed enrollment for the for-profit dropouts. For-Profit is an indicator variable for individuals who attended an associate's degree program or received an associate's degree from a for-profit college. Demographics include age fixed effects, year fixed effects, age fixed effects\*race, age fixed effects\*male, and an indicator for the years when individuals are in college. County of residence is an individual's county of residence in 1997, the first year of the survey. Ashenfelter's dip is an indicator variable for the two-years before for-profit students begin college.

**Table 3: Effects of For-Profit College Attendance on Labor Market Outcomes**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Log Wkly Earn	Log Hrly Wages	Log Hrs/Week	FT Employ	Any Employ	Wkly Earn (\$)
Post-Education	-0.012 [0.033]	0.012 [0.025]	-0.022 [0.022]	-0.021 [0.028]	0.001 [0.023]	-20.056 [13.584]
Post-Educ*For-Profit	0.103*** [0.037]	0.068** [0.027]	0.036 [0.026]	0.053* [0.028]	0.016 [0.022]	61.800*** [16.147]
Observations	19,364	19,364	19,364	27,498	27,498	27,498
Individuals	2,627	2,627	2,627	2,691	2,691	2,691

Robust standard errors clustered at the individual level in brackets. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1  
Notes: All regressions include age fixed effects, year fixed effects, age fixed effects\*race, age fixed effects\*male, an indicator for the years when individuals are in college, a county of residence trend, and an indicator for the two years before for-profit students begin college. Specifications (4) and (5) are linear probability models that include individuals with zero earnings. In specification (6) the dependent variable is the unconditional weekly earnings (in dollars), including individuals with zero earnings. See Table 2 and the text for descriptions of the Post-Education and Post-Education\*For-Profit variables.

Table 4: Robustness Checks, Log Weekly Earnings

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Post-Education	-0.024 [0.033]	-0.012 [0.033]	-0.040 [0.046]	0.016 [0.036]	-0.004 [0.033]
Post-Educ*For-Profit	0.111*** [0.036]	0.104*** [0.037]	0.104** [0.049]	0.121*** [0.036]	0.097*** [0.037]
Notes	Dropping wages below 1 percentile and above 99 percentile	Including weekly earnings across all reported jobs, rather than 5 jobs	Restricting to individuals employed in the 3 consecutive years before enrollment	Redefining <i>Post</i> to switch to 1 after first dropout, rather than last dropout	Using county of residence in the year before enrollment in county trend, rather than 1997
Observations	19,240	19,364	12,567	19,364	19,364
Individuals	2,624	2,627	1,404	2,627	2,627

Robust standard errors clustered at the individual level in brackets. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

Notes: All regressions include age fixed effects, year fixed effects, age fixed effects\*race, age fixed effects\*male, an indicator for the years when individuals are in college, a county of residence trend, and an indicator for the two years before for-profit students begin college. See Table 2 and the text for descriptions of the Post-Education and Post-Education\*For-Profit variables. Please refer to the text and notes below each specification for specific changes.

Table 5: Heterogeneous Effects and Alternate Samples, Log Weekly Earnings

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Post-Education	-0.012 [0.033]	0.013 [0.034]	-0.02 [0.036]	0.009 [0.036]	-0.028 [0.034]	-0.018 [0.018]
Post-Educ*For-Profit	0.097** [0.049]	0.019 [0.040]	0.075** [0.038]	0.135*** [0.038]	0.122*** [0.038]	
Post-Educ*For-Profit*4-yr FP	0.012 [0.063]					
Post-Educ*For-Profit*AA Degree		0.198*** [0.045]				
Post-Educ*Any College						0.088*** [0.020]
Post-Educ*Any College*For-Profit						0.026 [0.035]
Notes	Interaction: 4-yr For-Profit	Interaction: AA Degree Completion	Dropping individuals who also report attending a public college	Dropping double dropouts	Dropping individuals who report working towards a BA in HS group	Adding Public College AA attendees
Observations	19,364	19,364	19,022	19,005	16,300	33,502
Individuals	2,627	2,627	2,581	2,585	2,175	4,459

Robust standard errors clustered at the individual level in brackets. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

Notes: All regressions include age fixed effects, year fixed effects, age fixed effects\*race, age fixed effects\*male, an indicator for the years when individuals are in college, a county of residence trend, and an indicator for the two years before for-profit students begin college. See Table 2 and the text for descriptions of the Post-Education and Post-Education\*For-Profit variables. For-Profit\*4-yr is an indicator for for-profit students who attended or completed an associate's degree program in a four-year for-profit college. AA degree is an indicator for individuals who complete an associate's degree in a for-profit college. Any college is an indicator for individuals who attended or completed an associate's degree program in either a for-profit or public college.