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THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF
SCHOOLING AND LEARNING

"The fate of empires depends on the education of youth"
--Aristotle

Concern about slackening productivity growth and deteriorating competitiveness has resulted in a new public focus on the quality and rigor of the elementary and secondary education received by the nation's front line workers. The National Assessment of Educational Progress, for example, reports that 93 percent of 17 year olds do not have "the capacity to apply mathematical operations in a variety of problem settings." (1988 p. 42)

Higher order thinking and problem solving skills are believed to be in particularly short supply so much attention has been given to mathematics and science education because it is thought that these subjects are particularly relevant to their development.

The debate has been enlivened by the availability of comparative data on mathematics and science achievement of representative samples of secondary school students for many industrialized nations. American high school students lag far behind their counterparts overseas. In the 1960s, the low ranking of American high school students in such comparisons was attributed to the fact that the test was administered to a larger proportion of American than European and Japanese youth. This excuse is no longer valid. Figures 1 to 4 plot the scores in Algebra, Biology, Chemistry and Physics against the proportion of the 18-year old population in the types of courses to which the international test was administered (Postlethwaite and Wiley, 1992). In the Second International Math Study, the universe from which the American sample was drawn consisted of high school seniors taking a college preparatory math course. This group which represents only 13 percent of American 17 year olds, is roughly comparable to the 12 percent of Japanese youth who were in the sample frame and is considerably smaller than the 19 percent of youth in the Canadian province of Ontario and the 50 percent of Hungarians who were taking college preparatory mathematics. In Algebra, the mean score for this very select
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group of American students was about equal to the mean score of the much larger group of Hungarians and substantially below the Canadian achievement level (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement 1988).

The findings of the Second International Science Study are even more dismal. Take the comparisons with English-speaking Canada, for example. The 18% of English-speaking Canadian youth taking physics knew almost as much as the 1% of American 17-18 year olds who were taking their second year of physics (most of whom were in "Advanced Placement"). The 25% of Canadian 18-year olds taking chemistry knew just as much chemistry as the very select 2% of Americans high school seniors taking their second chemistry course (Postlethwaite and Wiley, 1992).

(Figure 1-4 about here)

The poor performance of American students is sometimes blamed on the nation's "diversity". It is true that secondary schools do a particularly poor job educating African-Americans, Hispanics and children from low income backgrounds generally. But the affluent non-minority parents who believe that their children are doing acceptably by international standards are sadly misinformed. In Stevenson, Lee and Stigler’s (1986) study of 5th grade math achievement, the best of the 20 classrooms sampled in Minneapolis was outstripped by every single classroom studied in Sendai, Japan and by 19 of the 20 classrooms studied in Taipei, Taiwan. The nation's top high school students rank far behind much less elite samples of students in other countries. Substantially larger shares of 17-18 year old Belgians, Finns, Hungarians, Scots, Swedes and Canadians are studying advanced algebra, pre-calculus and calculus and their achievement levels are significantly higher than American high school seniors in such classes. The gap between American high school seniors in middle class suburbs and their counterparts in many European nations is larger than the two to three grade level equivalent gap between whites and blacks in the US (NAEP 1988; IAEEA, 1988). The learning deficit is pervasive.

Does the large gap between the mathematical and scientific competence of American youth and the youth of other nations have major consequences for a nation's standard of living? In the view of many, it does:
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If only to keep and improve on the slim competitive edge we still retain in world markets, we [Americans] must dedicate ourselves to the reform of our educational system...Learning is the indispensable investment required for success in the "information age" we are entering. (National Commission on Excellence in Education, p. 7).

Behind their call for higher standards and more class time devoted to core academic subjects--mathematics, science, social science and language arts--is an assumption that most jobs require significant competency in these fields. There is, however, some controversy about these claims. Morris Shamos, an emeritus professor of physics at New York University, argues, for example, that "widespread scientific literacy is not essential to...prepare people for an increasingly technological society" (Education Week, Nov. 23 1988. p. 28). Other commentators have questioned the relevance of algebra and geometry to the great majority of jobs that do not require technical training. It has been argued, for example, that since the great majority of employers do not currently use the new management techniques that are supposed to require a high skill work force, preparing young people for working in high performance work systems will make them unfitted for the boring and repetitive jobs that predominate in the labor market. This report examines whether evidence from labor markets supports the claims that schooling and academic achievement improve worker productivity and that the productivity benefits of quality schooling are increasing?

Americans are justly proud of the high participation in postsecondary education, but most college freshmen and sophomores are studying material that Europeans study in secondary school and drop out rates are extremely high due in part to the poor preparation received in high school. Participation in postsecondary education is expanding rapidly in other industrialized nations. For males, the ratio of higher education graduates to the population 24 years old is 33 percent for Japan, 25 percent for the United States, 20.6 percent for Canada, and 14-16 percent for England, France and Germany (NCES 1990, Indicator 2.8). What are the economic benefits of this high rate of participation in higher education?

The first two sections of the paper review the voluminous literature on the labor market impacts of well signalled educational achievements--obtaining a bachelors degree,
ones major in college, the quality of one's college or high school, pursuing a vocational program in high school, etc. Since information these gross characteristics of a youth's educational background is available to all prospective employers, competitive labor markets will insure that wage differentials between groups with different amounts and types of education will pretty closely correspond to the productivity differentials between these groups. Section 1 examines the wage effects of (a) years of schooling, (b) the quality of elementary and secondary education, (c) a college degree and (d) different college majors. Section 2 examines the literature on the impact of high school vocational education.

The remainder of the paper examines the effect of direct measures of skill and knowledge on wages and productivity. These dimensions of educational achievement, however, are not easily signalled to employers, so there is no assurance that competition will force employers to pay those who studied the hardest and learned the most a higher wage that reflects their higher productivity. Schools and programs which do a particularly good job of preparing students may be recognized by the labor market but then again they may not be. Consequently, a study of the effect of school quality and academic achievement on worker productivity is not a simple matter. A study of wage rate effects will not suffice; relationships between skill and knowledge and worker productivity must be examined as well.

The third section of the paper examines the effect of generalized academic competence on the wage rates of adults. In section four I examine which of the various competencies developed in secondary school has the largest impact on wage rates and earnings of young workers. The findings from this analysis appear on the surface to support Shamos and contradict the recommendations of many educational reformers. For young men in the United States, competence in mathematical reasoning, science and language arts does not increase wage rates or earnings in the first 8 years after graduating from high school. The competencies that pay off for young men are speed in doing simple computations (something that calculators do better than people) and technical competence (knowledge of mechanical principles, electronics, automobiles and shop tools), a skill which has been ignored by most educational reformers. For young women in the United States, the findings are that verbal and mathematical reasoning competence lower unemployment
and increase earnings but only mathematical reasoning competence and computational speed increase female wage rates. Competence in science has no effect on earnings or wage rates and verbal ability has no effects on wage rates. While these results provide little support for the Excellence Commission's recommendations, they suggest an immediate explanation for the poor performance of American students in science and higher level mathematics—the absence of significant rewards for the competencies.

The reports recommending educational reform, however, make claims about the productivity effects not the wage rate effects of science, mathematics and language arts competency. Are these effects necessarily the same? The fifth section of the paper addresses this question and concludes that, when the specific competencies of students are not signaled to the labor market by a credential (as is the case for math and science achievement in US high schools), there is very little reason to expect the wage rate effects of specific competencies which are highly correlated with each other to be the same as their productivity effects.

The sixth and seventh section of the paper, therefore, tackle the productivity effects question more directly by analyzing data sets in which worker competencies have been correlated with their relative job performance in specific jobs. These analyses provide support for recommendations for better preparation in math and science, but they also reinforce the findings from the analysis of wage rates, earnings and unemployment regarding the important role of technical competence in blue collar, craft and technician jobs.

The eighth section of the paper examines the association for the period following World War 2 between rates of gain on tests assessing the general intellectual achievement of the population and aggregate rates of productivity growth for the nation. The association is quite strong and survives the introduction into the model of controls for the setback to economic growth resulting from World War 2.

The ninth section of the paper briefly reviews growth accounting studies of the impact of schooling and learning on productivity growth and concludes that improvements in the academic achievement of the average worker can have substantial effects on a nation's productivity growth rate. The final section of the paper reviews the major findings and conclusions of the paper.
I. THE IMPACT OF SCHOOLING ON EARNINGS

There have been hundreds of studies of the private return to years of schooling. The growth accounting literature (Jorgenson 1984) and most of the rate of return literature (Becker 1975; Hansen 1963; Hines 1970; Hanoch 1967, Hause 1975) uses estimates of schooling's impact on wages and output that are not controlled for ability and social background. Corrected estimates of private returns to schooling can be obtained by including measures of ability in the model (Griliches and Mason 1972; Taubman and Wales 1975) or by using sibling data to match people on ability and socioeconomic factors (Behrman et al. 1977; Olneck 1977). Corrected estimates of rates of return must also take into account downward biases introduced by errors in measuring schooling (Bishop 1974; Griliches 1979) and the probability that those who choose to continue schooling face higher rates of return than those who do not (Willis and Rosen 1979). When models correcting for omitted variables and selection effects are estimated, impacts of years of schooling are typically smaller than in simpler models but the effects are still quite strong. One particularly ingenious study examined the payoff to the additional years of schooling that are caused by state compulsory attendance laws. Angrist and Krueger (1990) found that in 1960 that compulsory attendance laws kept in school about one third of the students who would have dropped out of school at age 16. They also found that the payoff to the additional years of schooling that resulted was 7 percent, roughly the same as the coefficient on schooling in a simple cross section regression.

The economic theory of occupational choice predicts that the selection of occupations and fields of study will be influenced by economic returns. Numerous empirical studies also have demonstrated that decisions to enter college (Bishop 1977a, 1977b, 1992; Tannen 1978; Blakemore and Low 1983) and selections of college major (Freeman 1971; Polachek 1978; Fiarito and Dauffenbach 1982; Blakemore and Low, 1984) are influenced by market signals.

Studies also typically find that vocational training at two-year colleges and technical institutes has positive effects on earnings and that the effects of training are generally more positive for blacks and women than for white males (Freeman 1974). None of the studies of college major or vocational training completely control for tastes, ability, and family
background, however. One of the most comprehensive studies of the impact of sub-baccalaureate education is a recent study of people who graduated from high school graduates in 1972 (Norton Grubb 1990). When credentials were obtained—particularly associate degrees in vocational specialties—, the payoff was substantial. When, however, credits were obtained but no program completed, wages and earnings seldom increased. Contrary to Freemans findings private vocational technical schools failed to increase wages and earnings.

**College Quality:** The returns to the quality of postsecondary education have been examined by a number of studies. These studies have found that college quality has significant effects on earnings (Alwin, Hauser and Sewell 1973, Wise 1975, Wachtel 1976, Symonette 1981). Analyzing 1967 CPS data, Reed and Miller (1970) found that when colleges are ranked by the average ability of entering students, the graduates of top ranked institutions earned 48 percent more than the graduates of the lowest ranked institutions holding college major and years of schooling constant but not student ability. Analyzing NBER-Thorndike data on World War II Air Force veterans and controlling on ability prior to entering college, Terence Wales (1973) found that those graduating from a college in the top quintile of the Gourman ratings earned 10 percent more than those in the other four quintiles. Solomon's (1975) study of the same data set examined compared the effects of different dimensions of quality (cost per student, faculty salaries, prestige, or selectivity) and found that the ability of entering students and faculty salaries were the two best predictors of future earnings. Impacts were quite large. The elasticities of earnings with respect to the quality indicators were .5 for faculty salaries and .7 with respect to SAT test scores of entering freshman. The most recent cohort of college graduates to be studied are students who graduated from high school in 1972. Fourteen years after graduating from high school, the elasticity of earnings with respect to SAT test score of entering freshman was roughly .29 (James, Alsalam, Conaty and To 1989). Clearly, improvements in the quality of ones college education have significant economic payoffs.

1.2 Does the Quality of Elementary and Secondary Schools Make A Difference?

Studies of the impact of schools and teachers on educational outcomes have used
standardized test scores indicating acquisition of basic skills (reading and mathematics) as their criterion. This research can be divided into two strands: the first addresses the question "Do schools make a difference?", while the second addresses the more difficult question: "What is it about schools that makes a difference?" The first question has been addressed by modelling student achievement as a function of the characteristics of the student and his/her parents and a set of dummy variables indicating the students' teacher or school. Hanushek concludes:

The findings of these studies (Hanushek 1971, 1986b; Murnane 1975; Armor et al. 1976; Murnane and Phillips 1981) are unequivocal: Teachers and schools differ dramatically in their effectiveness. (Hanushek 1986a, p.1159)

Input-Output Studies

Finding out what makes some schools more effective than others has proved much more difficult. Input-output studies attempt to answer this question by regressing measures of output--academic test scores--on an array of "school resource" variables. Many of the "school-resource" variables, such as pupil-teacher ratios, physical equipment, and staff training, that have been hypothesized to influence learning turn out to have only weak associations with measured learning outcomes when individual characteristics of students are controlled (Coleman et al. 1966; Averch et al. 1972; Hanushek and Kain 1972; Mosteller and Moynihan 1972). Coleman's conclusion that school inputs of this type do not affect learning generated quite a controversy. Numerous commentaries and additional research have disputed these conclusions (Bowles and Levin 1968a, 1968b; Cain and Watts 1968; Smith 1972; Bowles 1968), but recent reviews of the input-output research conclude that these educational inputs do not have a consistent positive impact on student performance (Hanushek 1986, 1989). The teacher characteristics that most consistently have a positive effect on learning are tests measuring teacher knowledge and ability (Hanushek 1971; Strauss and Sawyer 1986, Ferguson 1991). The results are somewhat more equivocal for teacher experience--in Hanushek's 1989 survey 28 percent of the coefficients were significantly positive and 7 percent were significantly negative. For per pupil expenditure, 20 percent of the coefficients were significantly positive and 4.6 percent were significantly negative.
When, however, the dependent variable is an individual's wage rate (adjusted for local variations in the cost of living), measures of per pupil expenditures typically have significant positive effects (Akin and Garfinkel 1977; Ribich and Murphy 1975; Link and Ratledge 1975; Rizzuto and Wachtel 1980; Tremblay 1986). The best of these studies is a recent one by David Card and Alan Krueger 1992). They report:

Using earnings data from the 1980 Census, we find that men who were educated in states with higher quality schools have a higher return to additional years of schooling. Rates of return are also higher for individuals from states with better educated teachers....A decrease in the pupil /teacher ratio by five students is associated with a 0.4 percentage point increase in the rate of return to schooling (p. 1,3).

These findings suggest the possibility that in the United States increased school expenditures do indeed increase a student's future labor market productivity but not by raising the scores on the tests of mathematical and verbal skills used in input-output studies. If, for example, poorly endowed school districts respond to their situation by focusing instruction on basic skills, adopting styles of teaching which inhibit the development of problem solving ability (but improve scores on basic skills tests), and scaling back offerings in the more costly scientific, vocational and technical subjects, one would expect school expenditures to have much larger effects on wages than on tests of basic skills.

In order for input-output studies to yield unbiased estimates of the effects of school resource variables on learning it is essential that school inputs are both exogenous and uncorrelated with unmeasured determinants of school quality. This is rather strong assumption. The philosophy behind compensatory education programs implies that one should react to failure by trying harder--ie. spending more. Examples of this are easy to find: special education, mastery learning, Title I and programs which offer additional state aid to districts with large numbers of students performing below grade level. If school failure indeed leads to increases in funding, the endogeneity biases the estimated effects of school resource variables toward zero.

Troubled schools often find that they cannot recruit and retain teachers without paying a salary premium and that class sizes become small because of truancy and pupil transfers. These phenomena tend to generate a negative correlation between unobserved
school quality, on the one hand, and teacher salaries and teacher-pupil ratios on the other. This biases the estimates of the effects of school inputs in the negative direction.

1.3 The Social Payoff to College Attendance

The Vietnam War, the baby boom and the founding of more than a thousand public colleges caused the college graduate labor force to explode during the 1970s. The share of 25-29 year old males with a bachelors degree rose from 13.5 percent in 1957 to 27.5 percent in 1976. The result was a surplus which substantially lowered the economic return to college. This caused enrollment rates to decline and by 1987 the share of 25-29 year old males with a BA had fallen to 22.3 percent. The surplus quickly disappeared and by the end of the decade a shortage had developed.

The wage premium for attaining a college degree rose dramatically during the 1980s and is now at all time highs. The evidence on this issue is overwhelming. In May/June CPS data, real hourly wage rates of workers with 16 years of schooling and 1 to 10 years of experience rose 14.7 (12.2) percent for males (females) between 1980 and 1988 while real wage rates of workers with 12 years of schooling and similar levels of experience fell 16 (5.4) percent for males (females) (Kosters 1989). Kosters concludes that "The college wage premium was more than twice as large for men and more than 50 percent higher for women in 1988 than in 1980 (p. 2)". In the National Center for Education Statistics' (1991) Recent College Graduate surveys, real average annual salaries (one year after graduation) rose 31 percent from $15,000 (in 1987 dollars) for the class of 1975 to $20,300 for the class of 1986. Blackburn, Bloom and Freeman (1989) report that between 1979 and 1987 the real full time earnings of 25 to 34 year old white male college graduates rose 9.2 percent while the earnings of their high school graduate counterparts fell 9.4 percent. The mean earnings of year-round full-time workers aged 25 to 34 with exactly 16 years of schooling rose 19.5 (8.9) percent for females (males) between 1980 and 1989, while the mean earnings of comparable high school graduates fell 0.8 percent for women and fell 8.9 percent for men (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1982, 1991; price index was CPI-U-X1).

Katz and Murphy's (1990) study of March CPS data found that between 1980 and
1987 real weekly earnings of college graduates with 1 to 5 years of work experience rose 10.6 (12.9) percent for females (males) while the real earnings of high school graduates with similar levels of experience fell 3.2 and 15 percent respectively. They conclude that "changes in education differentials ...reflect changes in 'skill prices' rather than changes in group composition. We find that rapid secular growth in the relative demand for 'more skilled' workers is a key component of any consistent explanation..." of these changes in wage structure.

Further evidence on the issue comes from Freeman's (1991) study of trends in the incidence of unemployment by education group. While unemployment rates for college graduates were unchanged at very low levels (1.5 percent for 25-64 year olds) in both 1980 and 1988, they rose from 4.7 to 5.4 percent for high school graduates and from 7.4 to 9.2 percent for those who had not completed high school. He concludes that "Rising educational pay differentials thus understate the growing mismatch between demand and supply for labour skills in the United States. (p. 361)"

Not all analysts, however, take the view that the nation is currently experiencing a shortage of college graduates. Ronald Kutscher, Associate Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, argues that there existed "an oversupply of college graduates during the 1980's (Kutscher 1991)." He sights as evidence for this view recent increases in the number of people with 16+ years of schooling who are coded by the Current Population Survey as having jobs which are not "traditional" for holders of a bachelors degree. He reports that between 1983 and 1988 workers claiming to have completed 16 years of schooling increased by 41,000 in secretarial and typist jobs, by 59,000 in factory operative jobs, and by 6,000 in bartender, waiter and waitress jobs. But what about the opposite kind of mismatch: workers who have substantially fewer years of schooling than are required by the job. This kind of mismatch also increased between 1983 and 1988. The number of workers claiming to have fewer than 16 years of schooling increased by 23,000 among physicians, by 18,800 among lawyers and judges, by 14,500 among college teachers, by 125,000 among other teachers and by 99,000 among mathematical and computer scientists (U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 1990). Don't these statistics imply a growing shortage of qualified college graduate workers?
But one should not give much credence to any of these estimates of mismatches between schooling and occupation. The reporting and coding of occupation is quite unreliable. Those coded as a professional, a technician or manager by a Census interviewer have a 15 to 21 percent chance of being coded in a lower level occupation by a second interviewer a few months later (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1972). Ten percent of those who report completing 16+ years of schooling also claim not to have received a bachelors degree. Errors in measuring education are also quite common and the incidence of such errors appears to have risen during the 1980s.\(^1\) Many of the discrepancies between an individual's schooling and occupation found in CPS data are caused by reporting and coding errors. How else can one explain the 9.6 percent of college teachers and the 5.4 to 6.5 percent of lawyers, physicians and secondary school teachers who claim not to have completed 16 years of schooling (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 1990, Table F-3). The unreliability of individual measures of occupation and education means that counts of mismatches between schooling and occupation derived from micro data have almost no validity at all. The fact that the BLS keeps track of only one kind of mismatch makes matters worse. True mismatches between education and occupation are a lot less common than these statistics suggest.

This is not to deny that mismatches occur. College graduates are incredibly diverse and seek work in very distinct labor markets. College graduates who major in subjects which have little value in the labor market, who get C's and D's in undemanding courses, who are not geographically mobile, who have a substance abuse problem or who make a poor impression in interviews, will sometimes have to accept jobs which do not appear to "require" a college degree. These graduates are included in the averages and despite the drag they represent on the mean, the average college graduate is doing very well and compared to those who did not go to college she is doing extremely well. Most of those graduating in engineering, computer science, natural science, and business during the 1980s had a variety of well paying alternatives and the job opportunities of humanities, education and social science majors had substantially improved by the end of the decade. Real starting salaries rose 36 percent for humanities majors, 14 percent for education majors, and 31 percent for social science majors between 1976 and 1987 (National Center for Education
1.4 Is the Payoff to College Likely to Decline in the Future?

The 1991-92 recession caused many companies to cut back their hiring of college graduates. Is this setback the beginning of a crash in the market demand for college graduates or is it a temporary effect of the recession? In my view the recession is the cause of the problem. The recession has made things even more difficult for workers without a college degree. Real hourly compensation of production and non-supervisory workers fell 0.3 percent between the first quarter of 1990 and the last quarter of 1991 while the real hourly compensation rose 0.5 percent for managers and 0.8 percent for professional and technical workers (Bureau of Labor Statistics, March 1992).

The second way to examine whether the wage premium for college is likely to crash in the 1990s is to compare projections of the supply and demand for college graduates. Let us begin by examining projections of supply. Such an examination leads to the conclusion that the number of college graduates in the work force is fated to grow more slowly in the 1990s than in the 1980s. The latest Projections of Education Statistics (NCES, Nov. 1991) forecasts that 1,080,000 BAs will be awarded annually during the 1990s. This projection assumes that recent increases in college attendance rates will soon result in substantial increases in the proportion of 25-29 year olds with a college degree. Nevertheless, this forecast implies that during the 1990s there will be a slowdown of .71 percentage points per year in the growth rate of the ratio of workers with a college degree to those with a high school degree or less. This slowdown has four causes: the baby bust, the rising number of college educated workers reaching retirement age during the 1990s, rising tuition levels, and falling achievement levels and high non-completion rates in American high schools (Bishop 1992).

If relative demand for college educated workers continues to grow at the rates that prevailed in the 1960s, 70s and 80s, the inevitable outcome is a further escalation of the already extremely high wage premiums for college education. Will the upskilling trends of the last three decades continue during the 1990s? The BLS predicts a slowdown. Bishop and Carter (1991, Bishop 1992a) argue, to the contrary, that past upskilling trends will
continue. They argue that the method of forecasting occupational demand is biased and tends to underproject the growth of occupations in which college graduates predominate. An examination of the track record of recent BLS projections appears to support Bishop and Carter's claims.

**BLS Projections for the 1980s:** In August 1981, the BLS projected that professional, technical and managerial (PT&M) jobs, which were 24.9 percent of the nation's jobs in 1978, would account for 28 percent of employment growth between 1978 and 1990. Operatives, laborers, farm laborers and service workers (OL&S) which were 37 percent of employment in 1978, were projected to account for 35.4 percent of employment growth during the period. Columns 4 and 6 of Table 1 tell us what actually happened. Data from the Current Population Survey indicates that professional, technical and managerial jobs accounted for 53.6 percent of 1978-90 job growth and operative, laborer and service jobs accounted for only 8.7 percent of the growth.

For the 1982 to 1995 period, BLS projected that PT&M employment would account for 30.7 percent of employment growth and that OL&S would account for 30.8 percent of growth. Here again they appear to be far off the mark. For the 1982 to 1991 period PT&M accounted for 48.7 percent of job growth, and OL&S accounted for 17.7 percent. (see row 5 of Table 1).³

**BLS Projections for 2000:** The flawed methodology that failed to predict the strong growth of high skill occupations during the 1980s has not been changed. It is, therefore, reasonable to hypothesize that the BLS's latest projections understate upskilling trends of the 1990s. One can see this unfolding in Table 1. The actual growth shares calculated for 1986 through 1991 may be compared to BLS's forecasted growth shares for 1986 to 2000 (see row 7). BLS projects that managerial, professional and technical jobs will account for 37.9 percent of job growth between 1986 and 2000. So far, however, the three high skill occupations have accounted for 64.1 percent of job growth between 1986 and 1991. In 1987, BLS projected that operative, laborer, farm laborer and service jobs would account for 27.8 percent of job growth between 1986 and 2000. So far, these low skill jobs have accounted for only 19.7 percent of job growth between 1986 and 1991.

Still another way to evaluate BLS projections is to compare their predictions to
forecasts based on a regression analysis of changes in occupational employment shares during the 1972 to 1991 period. Changes in occupational employment shares were assumed to follow a linear path. The variables that were found to have significant effects on occupational shares during the 1972 to 1991 period were: a simple trend, the unemployment rate, the merchandise trade surplus as a proportion of GNP, and the ratio of personal computers used in business to total employment. The personal computer variable captures the accelerated introduction of computer technology during the 1980s as well as the direct effects of microcomputers.

The results of these projections taken from Bishop (1992a) are summarized in rows 10 to 12 of Table 1 and columns 5 and 6 of Table 2. The preferred model which contains all four variables predicts that growth of managerial, professional and technical jobs will remain strong. These occupations are projected to account for 68 percent of growth of occupational demand between 1990 and 2005. Dropping the variable representing the share of the work force with a PC on their desk lowers the projected high skill share to 57 percent and dropping both the trade deficit and PC share lowers it to 52.5 percent. BLS, by contrast, projects that the growth of managerial and professional jobs will slow and that these three occupations will account for only 40.9 percent of job growth. The regression models project declines in the employment share of craft workers, operatives and laborers and farmers and a stable share for service workers. Low skill jobs--operatives, laborers (farm and factory) and service workers--are projected to account for no more than about 10 percent of job growth to the year 2005. BLS, by contrast, projects that 27 percent of job growth will be in these low skill occupations.

**Forecasts of Future College Wage Premiums:** Bishop and Carter's forecast that upskilling trends of the 1960s, 70s and 80s will continue in the 1990s imply that the wage premiums for college will continue their rapid growth in the 1990s. If the BLS's forecast of decelerating growth of professional and managerial jobs is correct, forecasts of the path of the college wage premium are little altered, however (Bishop 1992a). The balance between supply and demand would still look a great deal more like the 1980s than the 1970s and the result would probably be further growth of college wage premiums. Either way a precipitous
decline in the payoff to college (as occurred in the 1970s) is extremely unlikely. Even a 20 percent increase in college completion rates above those now projected would not precipitate a crash of the college wage premium if upskilling trends continue. Bishop (1992a) concludes that even with a slowdown in upskilling similar to that projected by the BLS, substantial declines in college wage premiums are unlikely as long as the share of 25 to 29 year olds with college diploma which is currently 23.5 percent does not substantially exceed 35 percent by 1997.

1.5 Which College Specialties Generate the Largest Economic Payoff?

College graduates who have majored in physical science, engineering and business earn substantially more than graduates who have majored in education, humanities or social sciences other than economics. The first four columns of Table 2 present data from the College Placement Council on how field of study effected the starting salaries received by college graduates whose placement outcomes were reported to the school's placement office for 1963, for 1969-70, for 1979-80 and for 1991 (College Placement Council 1985; 1991). The differences across field are sometimes as large as the wage gains accruing to those obtaining higher level degrees. Relative to majors in humanities and social sciences other than economics, engineers received 45-70 percent higher starting salaries in 1991, computer scientists received a 38 percent premium, physical science majors received a 24 percent premium and business majors received a 10 percent premium. Studies of the earnings of adults indicate that the salaries of business majors tend to catch up with the engineers, but education and liberal arts majors remain far behind those with engineering, physical science and business degrees (see column 7 and 8).

These large differentials by college major remain even when one controls for family background and life goals expressed in high school. The fifth and sixth columns of Table 2 present estimates of the effects of college major on 1979 hourly earnings of young men and women who had graduated from high school in 1972 while controlling for family background and the student's preferences regarding life goals (e.g. the importance of being wealthy and of helping others (Daymont and Andrisani, 1984). Humanities, social science and education majors received the lowest wage rates. Male engineers obtained 34 percent
more than male humanities majors. Male business majors were paid 13 percent more. Female engineers were paid 27 percent more than female humanities majors and female business majors were paid 25 percent more. Clearly, the market values some of the skills developed in college much more highly than others.

Largely because of these large wage differentials, there has been a dramatic growth in the relative supply of graduates in engineering, computer science and business administration. For males degrees in engineering, computer science and business which accounted for 33.2 percent of all BA's in 1973 rose to 50.8 percent of all bachelors degrees in 1986. For women degrees in engineering, computer science and business grew from 3.5 percent to 26.6 percent of degrees awarded. In 1973 degrees in education, humanities and social science accounted for 50.5 percent of bachelors degrees awarded to men and 83.5 percent of the bachelors degrees awarded to women. By 1986 these percentages had dropped to 35.1 percent and 54.7 percent respectively. As a result, the ratio of degrees awarded in engineering and computer science to degrees awarded in humanities, social science or education grew 5.2 percent per year in the 1970s and 10.7 percent per year in the 1980s. The ratio of business degrees to humanities, social science, and education degrees grew 5.8 percent per year in the 1970s and 5.1 percent in the 1980s.

The very rapid growth during the last 20 years of the relative supply of college graduates trained in business and engineering fields has surprisingly not significantly diminished the wage premiums these fields command. Trends in wage premiums for business and technical degrees can be followed by comparing the first four columns of Table 2. Relative to humanities majors, wage premiums for engineering degrees grew dramatically during the 1970s and then dropped slightly by 1991, but remained significantly above the levels that had prevailed in the 1960s. Wage premiums for chemistry and mathematics majors over humanities majors rose from 17 percent in the 1960s to 36 percent in 1979-80 and then fell to 24 percent in 1991. Starting wage premiums for business majors rose from essentially zero in the 1960s to 10-11 percent during the late 1970s and 1980s. The starting wage premium for masters level training in business and engineering also appears to be substantially greater now than it was in the 1960s.

Trends in the effect of college major on salaries of college graduates who have been
working for many years can be examined by comparing columns 8 and 9 of Table 2. In 1967 male college graduates 21-70 years old who had majored in business earned 28 percent more and engineers 52 percent more than those who had majored in humanities (U.S Bureau of the Census, 1967). In 1966 college graduates (male and female) who had majored in physical science earned 93 percent more, engineers earned 114 percent more and business majors 103 percent more than humanities majors (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987).\(^5\) Masters degrees in engineering or business which had produced wage premiums over humanities BAs of only a 62-65 percent in 1966, produced wage premiums of 169 to 198 percent in 1984. Education majors earned slightly less than humanities majors.\(^6\)

Clearly, the economic payoff to business and technical education is considerably greater than the payoff to majors in the humanities and social sciences other than economics and the advantage of these fields of study has not diminished appreciably in the face of the massive increase in the number of students choosing these fields of study. There has been a substantial shift in market demand favoring graduates with business and technical degrees over graduates with liberal arts and education degrees. In addition, the most important externalities of university education--technological advances--are generated by the education of scientists and engineers so the case for stimulating young people to enter these fields is very strong.

II. DOES HIGH SCHOOL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PAYOFF ?

2.1 The Payoff during the 1970s

There have been quite a few studies of the impact of high school vocational education on labor market success of non-college bound youth. Most of the studies analyzing data collected during the 1970s used student reports of their track to define participation in vocational education (Grasso and Shea 1981, Gustman and Steinmeier 1981, Haney and Woods 1981). When, however, these student reports of track were cross checked against transcripts, it was found that some of the self-identified vocational students had only a few vocational courses on their transcript and many "general track" students had taken 3
or 4 vocational courses (Campbell, Orth and Seitz 1981; Meyer 1981). Since it is the number and types of courses taken which are influenced by school policy, studies of the impact of vocational education need to employ objective measures of participation and not self-assessments of track, which apparently measure the student's state of mind as much as they measure the courses actually taken.

The solution to this problem is to use transcripts or reports of actual courses taken to measure participation in vocational education. In his analysis of longitudinal data on approximately 3500 men and women who graduated from high school in 1972, Meyer (1982) used school reports of the number of courses taken in vocational and nonvocational fields to define a continuous variable: the share of courses that were vocational. He found that females who devoted one-third of their high school course work to clerical training earned 16 percent more during the seven years following graduation than those who took no vocational courses (see Table 3). Those who specialized in home economics or other non-clerical vocational courses did not obtain higher earnings. Males who specialized in trade and industry earned 2.8 percent more than those in the general curriculum. Males in commercial or technical programs did not earn significantly more than those who pursued a general curriculum.

Rumberger and Daymont (1982) used transcripts to define variables for the share of course work during the 10th, 11th and 12th grades that was vocational and the share that was neither academic nor vocational. Analyzing 1979/80 data on 1161 young adults in the National Longitudinal Survey (NLS) who were not attending college full time and had attended high school during the early and middle 1970s, they found that males who devoted one-third of their time to vocational studies instead of pursuing a predominantly academic curriculum spent about 12 percent more hours in employment, but experienced slightly greater unemployment and received a 3 percent lower wage. Females who similarly devoted one-third of their time to vocational studies at the expense of academic course work were paid the same wage but spent about 8 percent more time in employment and 1.6 percent less time unemployed.

2.2 The Payoff during the 1980s
Studies of vocational education that have used more recent data sets have obtained much more positive results. Kang and Bishop's (1986) study of 2485 men and women who graduated from high school in 1980 and did not attend college full-time used student reports [transcripts were not available] of courses taken in three different vocational areas--business and sales, trade and technical, and other--and five academic subjects--English, math, science, social science and foreign languages--as measures of curriculum. Males who took four courses (about 22 percent of their time during the final three years of high school) in trade and technical or other vocational subjects by cutting back on academic courses were paid a 7 to 8 percent higher wage, worked 10 to 12 percent more, and earned 21 to 35 percent more during 1981, the first calendar year following graduation. Males who took commercial courses did not have higher earnings or wage rates. Females who substituted four courses in office or distributive education for four academic courses were paid an 8 percent higher wage, worked 18 percent more, and earned 40 percent more during 1981. Females who took trade and technical courses did not receive higher wage rates and earned 6 percent more than those who pursued an academic curriculum (see Table 3). The benefits probably diminish in later years, but this is of little consequence since the incremental costs of four vocational courses can be recovered in just one or two years at this rate.

Recent studies of students who graduated in the late 1970s and early 1980s by Paul Campbell and his colleagues at the National Center for Research on Vocational Education also obtained very positive findings. Controlling for test scores and past and present enrollment in higher education, their analysis of 1983 and 1985 National Longitudinal Survey data on 6953 young men and women between the ages of 19 and 28 found that graduates of vocational programs had 16.5 percent higher earnings than those who had specialized in academic courses [comparison is made with academic rather than general track students because most general track students take one or two vocational courses]. A parallel analysis of High School and Beyond data on 6098 students who graduated in 1982 (which also controlled for test scores and college attendance) found that the vocational graduates were 14.9 percent more likely to be in the labor force in 1983/84, were one percentage point less likely to be unemployed, and were paid about 9 percent more per month than the academic graduates. The overall earnings effect was 27 percent. The differential between vocational
and general curriculum graduates [who generally took 1 to 2 vocational courses] was generally about half the size of the differential between vocational and academic graduates (Campbell et. al., 1986, 1987a, 1987b).

These very positive results contrast markedly with the very negative findings regarding CETA's classroom occupational skills training programs for youth and the Supported Work Demonstration (see the right hand side of Table 3). Only the Job Corps, a considerably more costly training program, has positive impacts that even approach these results (Maller, Kerachsky and Thornton 1982).

2.3 Why did the Payoff to High School Vocational Education Increase?

There are three reasons for viewing the more recent studies as more accurate descriptions of the current impacts of high school vocational education than the studies published prior to 1983. First, vocational education has been changing rapidly. During the 1970s, competency based instruction tied to competency profiles certifying the skills learned became common practice, career education courses preceding the selection of an occupational specialty were introduced, job search skills were added to the curriculum of most vocational programs, home economics was reoriented from a focus on home making to a focus on preparation for work, and the content of many individual programs was upgraded and updated. Consequently, the data on the younger members of the NLS Youth sample and on High School and Beyond students, who received their vocational instruction between 1978 and 1982, is much more relevant to vocational education as it is now practiced than the Class of 1972 data analyzed by Meyer, Gustman/Steinmeier and Haney/Woods.

Second, the labor market reward for the skills taught in high school appears to be experiencing secular growth. The 1980s were a period of dramatic increases in all kinds of skill premiums. Rewards for work experience and for college degrees rose substantially. Between 1979 and 1988 the real wage of male college graduates with fewer than 10 years of work experience increased by 5.5 percent while the real wage of high school graduates with fewer than 10 years of post-school work experience declined by 20 percent (Kosters 1989). High school graduates with vocational training suffered a decline in their real wage during this period but those without any vocational training suffered even bigger declines.
Third, large samples are preferable to small samples. In the four year interval between the Rumberger/Daymont analysis of NLS youth data and Campbell et al's analysis, the number of graduates for which high school transcript data was available nearly doubled. This makes the findings in Campbell et al's 1986 and 1987 papers a more reliable estimate of vocational education's effect than those provided by Rumberger/Daymont's 1982 study and the early studies of NLS data done by Gardner (1982) and others.

III. THE EFFECT OF GENERAL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ON WAGES OF ADULTS

The standard way to assess the impact of general academic achievement on the productivity of individual workers is to infer its effect by studying the relationship between general academic achievement and wage rates. Models must be estimated in which adult wage rates are predicted by a contemporaneous measure of general academic achievement while controlling for schooling and other worker characteristics such as experience. It is essential that the sample be representative of the nation and that academic achievement be measured long after the completion of schooling and as close as possible to the date of the wage rate observation. The difficulty, however, is that reliable academic achievement tests are time consuming and costly to administer. Consequently, data sets which measure both adult academic achievement and earnings for national probability samples are rare. There is only one American data set with these characteristics, the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (Bishop 1989). Unfortunately, the measure of academic achievement available in the Panel Study of Income Dynamics is a short form IQ test with 13 sentence completion questions (taken from the Lorge-Thorndike intelligence test) which has a KR-20 reliability of only .652. If not corrected for, measurement error will seriously attenuate estimated relationships between wage rates and such a short form IQ test.

Consequently, the true impact of general academic achievement (GAA) and years of schooling on wage rates must be estimated as part of a system of equations that includes a measurement model for academic achievement, years of schooling (SCH) and family background. The results of estimating such a model predicting the log of weekly earnings in 1971 PSID data on male household heads 25 to 64 years old was:
(1) \( \ln \text{WEARN} = .190 \text{GAA} + .0576 \text{SCH} + .004 \text{AGE} - .06 \text{NOWHITE} + .005 \text{FAED} - .0028 \text{FAOCC} \\
(6.26) \ (6.24) \ (2.92) \ (1.25) \ (45) \ (1.44) \\
- .0002 \text{SIBS} + .076 \text{FAFOR} - .152 \text{BORNFARM} - .009 \text{BORNORTH} + a_e \quad R^2 = .268 \\
(0.03) \ (1.74) \ (3.58) \ (25) \ N = 1774

T statistics are in parenthesis below the coefficient. Except for BORNFARM, none of the indicators of family background have a significant direct effect on weekly earnings. The addition of these variables to the model causes a small (7 percent) reduction in the coefficient on academic achievement.

If there is no correction for errors in measurement the coefficient on academic achievement (GIA) is .109 and the coefficient on schooling is .0596. This implies that correcting for measurement error increases the estimated effect of academic achievement by 74 percent and reduces the direct effect of years of schooling very slightly. The .190 coefficient on the IQ test may be interpreted as implying that a one population standard deviation change/difference in the academic achievement of an adult will result in a 20.9 percent (antilog of .19) increase in productivity. These results suggest that if the GIA of people with given levels of schooling either changes over historical time or differs across societies, these differences need to be explicitly included in any accounting of differences in labor quality across space or time.

3.1 Are Regression Estimates of The Economic Payoff to Knowledge and Skill Biased?

Will, however, improvements in performance on such tests resulting from a more rigorous, higher quality education have a similar effect on productivity? The absence of controls for the individual’s genetic endowment in the above analysis might mean that .190 is an upward biased estimate of the true causal impact of test score gains generated by higher quality education. There are a number of reasons for believing that if such bias exists, it is limited in magnitude. First, while genetic endowment has probably influenced schooling and academic achievement as an adult, it appears to have no direct effect on wages in this data set, for adding the three background variables—fathers education, fathers occupation and number of siblings—with the highest correlation with genetic endowment did not decrease the coefficient on academic achievement. It was the addition of Born on a
farm and Father foreign born which lowered the coefficient on academic achievement. Secondly, controlling for family background and genetic endowment by estimating within family models comparing brothers actually increases the effect of academic ability relative to cross section regressions of earnings on education and childhood IQ in Michael Olneck's (1977) Kalamazoo data.

The test used to characterize general academic achievement in this analysis purports to be an "aptitude" test. But, verbal and mathematical aptitude tests correlate almost as highly with broad spectrum achievement tests as alternate forms of the same test correlate with each other. Numerous studies have found that school attendance raises scores on these aptitude tests (Lorge 1945; Husen 1951; Department of Labor 1970), and that taking a rigorous college prep curriculum increases the gains on these tests between sophomore and senior years of high school (Bishop 1985; Hotchkiss 1984). In recognition of the fact that aptitude test scores are significantly influenced by educational background, the College Board describes the SAT as a measure of "developed verbal and mathematical reasoning abilities (1987, p. 3)."

Adult vs Childhood GIA Tests: The final piece of evidence on this issue comes from examining the results of estimations where adult GIA tests compete with childhood IQ tests in predicting adult labor market success. It is sometimes argued that aptitude tests like the Lorge-Thorndike test really measure a stable "ability to learn" which is not substantially effected by educational experiences after the age of 10, and that it is this "ability to learn" not the content of the courses taken in secondary and tertiary education which helps workers who score well on these tests to get better, higher paying jobs. If this were true, we would expect childhood IQ tests to predict adult labor market success just as well as GIA tests taken as a young adult. In fact, however, when the two tests are simultaneously entered into a model, it is the adult test not the childhood test which has by far the biggest effect on labor market success (Husen, 1969). Evidence for this statement can be found in Tables 3 to 5. American data from the National Longitudinal Study of Youth (NLSY) was analyzed to determine whether 1985 wages and earnings is more influenced by a test taken in 1980 (the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery) or by aptitude tests taken in the early 1970s. The results reported in Table 4 clearly imply that the later test had by far the most
significant effect, implying that the learning that occurred during the interval between test administrations had a substantial impact on subsequent labor market outcomes.

Results from Tuijnman's (1989) analysis of occupational attainment in the Malmo Longitudinal Study are reported in Table 5. Occupation was predicted by tests administered at age 10 and age 20, youth education, adult education and home background. As in the American NLSY data, the test at age 20 had significant positive effects on earnings while the childhood test often had negative effects when the adult test was included in the model. Table 6 presents a similar analysis of the effects of test scores, schooling and home background on log earnings in the Malmo data based on Tuijnman's estimated "true" correlations. The estimated effect of these test scores on earnings in the Malmo data is much smaller than the effects obtained in NLSY data. This could be reflecting the general compression of wage differentials in Sweden or a shift over time in the relative importance of the competencies assessed by these tests. But here again, the adult test has much stronger effects on earnings than the childhood test.

These findings suggest that the associations between scores on employment aptitude and IQ tests on the one hand and productivity and labor market success on the other arise because the tests measure developed abilities and knowledge that contribute to productivity. This suggests that an increase in the incidence of these developed abilities in the working population will increase national output. Left unresolved, however, is the relative importance of different types of developed abilities. It is to this issue I now turn.

IV. WHICH COMPETENCIES ARE REWARDED IN THE AMERICAN LABOR MARKET?

Which of the various subjects typically taught in secondary schools yield the largest economic return. Joseph Altonji's (1988) study of 1972 high school graduates found that (controlling for family background and years of schooling) wage rates in the first 15 years after graduating from high school were negatively related to the number of high school courses in English, social studies and fine arts; were unrelated to the number of courses in
science and commercial subjects and were positively related to courses in mathematics, foreign languages and trade and technical subjects. Science courses were associated with higher rates of wage growth, however, so there may be more substantial benefits coming when the individuals reach the age of 40. The effect of two additional full year math courses on wage rates was between .88 percent and 3.4 percent depending on specification. Two full year courses in an applied technology field raised wage rates by 2.5-2.8 percent.

Kang and Bishop (1989 Table 5) found that for 1980 high school graduates not going to college that those who had taken many academic courses earned substantially less in 1981 than those who had taken vocational courses. For young women (men), the earnings impact of a one year course was -4.8 (+2.0) percent for mathematics, -2.6 (+1.5) percent for English, -5.4 (+0.5) percent for foreign languages, -8.4 (-0.8) percent for social science and -3.2 (-3.1) percent for science.

Examining the effects of course taking on wage rates may not, however, be the best way to assess the effects of specific competencies on wages because the association between numbers of courses taken in specific subjects and competency in those subjects is not very strong. Courses vary a great deal in their rigor and rigor is much more important to learning than the number of courses taken (Bishop 1985). For this reason, an alternative and probably better approach is to measure achievement in specific subjects directly and then examine how they effect labor market success.

4.1 NLSY Data

The Youth Cohort of National Longitudinal Survey (NLS) is a good data for analyzing this issue because it contains subtest scores on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB), a three hour battery of tests used by the armed forces for selecting recruits and assigning them to occupational specialties. The primary purpose of the ASVAB is to predict the success of new recruits in training and their subsequent performance in their occupational specialty. Even though the ASVAB was developed as an "aptitude" test, the current view of testing professionals is that:

Achievement and aptitude tests are not fundamentally different....Tests at one end of the aptitude-achievement continuum can be distinguished from tests
at the other end primarily in terms of purpose. For example, a test for mechanical aptitude would be included in a battery of tests for selecting among applicants for pilot training since knowledge of mechanical principles has been found to be related to success in flying. A similar test would be given at the end of a course in mechanics as an achievement test intended to measure what was learned in the course (National Academy of Sciences Committee on Ability Testing 1982 p.27).

The ASVAB test battery is made up of 10 subtests: Mechanical Comprehension, Auto and Shop Knowledge, Electronics Knowledge, Clerical Checking (Coding Speed), Numerical Operations (a speeded test of simple arithmetic), Arithmetic Reasoning, Mathematics Knowledge (covering the high school math curriculum), General Science, Word Knowledge and Paragraph Comprehension. (See Bishop 1990 for sample questions.)

Two dimensions of mathematical achievement are measured: the speed of doing simple mathematical computations is measured by a three minute 50 problem arithmetic computation subtest which will be referred to as computational speed. Mathematical reasoning ability is measured by a composite of the mathematics knowledge and arithmetic reasoning subtests. Science achievement is indexed by the ASVAB's General Science subtest. This test focuses on science definitions and has minimal coverage of higher level scientific reasoning. Verbal achievement is measured by a composite made up of the word knowledge and paragraph comprehension subtests.

The universe of skills and knowledge sampled by the mechanical comprehension, auto and shop information and electronics subtests of the ASVAB roughly corresponds to the vocational fields of trades and industry and technical so these subtests are aggregated into a single composite which is interpreted as an indicator of competence in the "technical" arena.10

Competencies that are unique to clerical and retail sales jobs do not appear to be measured by the ASVAB. The ASVAB does contain a seven minute 84 item clerical checking subtest which was intended to predict performance in clerical jobs but validity studies of clerical jobs in the military have found that it does not add to the validity of composites based on verbal, arithmetic reasoning and mathematics knowledge subtests (Wise, McHenry, Rossmeissl and Oppler, 1987). The clerical checking subtest is included in the analysis but it should not be viewed as a valid predictor of clerical competency.
These seven test composites have all been normalized to have zero mean and unit variance.\textsuperscript{11} All of these competencies are highly correlated with years of schooling. When these composites are regressed on age, ethnicity, proportion of 1980 spent in school, region, work experience, occupation of parents and schooling, the coefficients on years of high school range between .19 for math and .28 for verbal for males and range from .12 for technical and .24 for verbal and clerical speed for females. Greater work experience significantly increased the clerical speed of women but did not have positive effects on any of the other competencies.

4.2 Results

Two measures of labor market success were studied: the log of the hourly wage rate in the current or most recent job taken form the 1983 through 1986 interviews and the log of yearly earnings for calender years 1984 and 1985 when they exceed $500.\textsuperscript{12} The sample was limited to those who were not in the military in 1979. At the time of the 1986 interview the NLS Youth ranged from 21 to 28 years of age. An extensive set of controls was included in the estimating equations.\textsuperscript{13}

The labor market consequences of the competencies that a young person develops early in life were examined by regressing log wage rates and log earnings on ASVAB subtest scores, years of schooling, and the background variables listed above. Holding academic competencies in 1980 constant, female high school dropouts with 10 years of schooling earned 10 percent less than high school graduates and college graduates earned 42 percent more. Male high school drop outs earned 21 percent less than high school graduates and college graduates earned 35 percent more. The effects of our measures of academic and technical achievement are summarized in Figures 5 and 6 (see Bishop 1991 for a more complete description of the results).

The results for young men were as follows—high level academic competencies do not have positive effects on wage rates and earnings. The mathematics reasoning, verbal and science composites all had negative effects on wage rates and earnings. Speed in arithmetic computation has substantial positive effects on labor market success of young men. This
Figure 5

Effect of Competencies on Earnings, 1984-1985
Young Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational Speed</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of NLS Youth data. The figure reports the effect of a one population standard deviation increase in Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery subtest while controlling for schooling, school attendance, age, work experience, region, SMSA residence and earnings.

Effect of Competencies on Wage Rates, 1983-1986
Young Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational Speed</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Analysis of NLS Youth data. The figure reports the effect of a one population standard deviation increase in Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery subtest while controlling for schooling, school attendance, age, work experience, region, SMSA residence and ethnicity.
competency, however, is a lower order skill that is not (and should not be) a focus of high school mathematics (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics 1980).

For young women, speed in arithmetic computation and mathematical reasoning ability both have substantial effects on wage rates and earnings. Verbal competence had somewhat more modest positive effects on wages and earnings. Science test scores had no effect on wage rates and earnings.

For young men, the ASVAB technical subtests measuring electronics knowledge and mechanical, auto and shop information had large and significant positive effects on wage rates and earnings. These subtests had essentially no effect on the labor market success of young women.

The clerical checking subtest had weak positive effects on wage rates of young women and large significant effects on their earnings. For young men, doing well on the clerical checking subtest appears to increase earnings very modestly but it has no effect on wage rates.

This pattern of results is not unique to this data set. Similar results were obtained in Willis and Rosen's (1979) analysis of the earnings of those who chose not to attend college in the NBER-Thorndike data, Kang and Bishop's (1986) analysis of High School and Beyond seniors and Bishop, Blakemore and Low's (1985) analysis of both Class of 1972 and High School and Beyond data.14

In summary, when years of schooling are held constant, achievement in science has no effect on wage rates, earnings or unemployment of young men and women. Achievement in mathematical reasoning has no effect on the wage rates and earnings of young men and only very modest effects on the wage rates of young women. Verbal competency has no effect on the wage rates on young men and women and no effect on the earnings of young men. These results suggest an immediate explanation for the poor performance of American students in science and higher level mathematics. For the 80 percent of youth who are not planning to pursue a career in medicine, science or engineering, there are no immediate labor market rewards for developing these competencies. For the great bulk of students, therefore, the incentives to devote time and energy to the often difficult task of learning these subjects are very weak.
Do these findings also imply that if a way could be found to recruit a high quality engineering and scientific elite (possibly by recruiting scientists and engineers from abroad or early identification of mathematically and scientifically talented youth), there would be little need to worry about the poor math and science preparation of most American youth. It is to this question we now turn.

V. IS THERE REASON TO EXPECT WAGE EFFECTS OF SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES TO BE THE SAME AS THEIR PRODUCTIVITY EFFECTS?

Are the productivity effects of achievement in science, mathematical reasoning and English essentially zero in the types of jobs occupied by most young workers? Speed in simple arithmetic computations has large effects on the wage rates of both sexes and technical competence has large effects on wage rates of young men. Do these competencies have comparable effects on productivity?

One approach to these questions is to ask employers directly about the nature of the tasks performed by entry level workers. When the owners of small and medium sized business in the United States were asked how frequently the employee most recently hired by their firm needed to "use knowledge gained of chemistry, physics or biology" in their job, 74 percent reported that such knowledge was never required and only 12 percent reported such knowledge was used at least once a week.15 Asked how frequently the new employee had to "use algebra, trigonometry or calculus", 68 percent reported that such skills were never required by the job and only 12 percent reported they were used at least once a week (Bishop and Griffin forthcoming).

The skills used by entry level workers at small and medium sized firms, however, are not decisive evidence regarding employer needs for three reasons. First, the low levels of scientific and mathematical competence in the work force available to small and medium sized firms may have forced them to put off technological innovations such as statistical process control that require such skills and to simplify the functions that are performed by workers who lack technical training. If better educated workers were available, entry level workers might be given greater responsibility and become more productive. Second, the
study just quoted does not tell us what is happening at large firms or in the jobs occupied by long tenure employees at small firms. The CEOs of many large technologically progressive companies such as Motorola and Xerox are insisting that their factory jobs now require workers who are much better prepared in math and science than ever before. Third, employers may not realize how the knowledge and skills developed in high school science and mathematics classes contribute to productivity in their jobs. Not knowing which employee possesses which academic skill, they would have no way of learning from experience which scientific and mathematical skills are helpful in doing a particular job. Science and mathematics are thought to teach thinking, reasoning and learning skills applicable outside the classroom and the laboratory. If these skills are indeed successfully developed by these courses, productivity might benefit even when there are no visible connections between job tasks and course content.

A second approach to estimating the effect of a trait on productivity, one favored by economists, has been to infer its effect by studying its effect on wage rates. Such an approach is not justified in this case. In the United States academic achievements in high school--particularly the fine details of achievement in a particular domain like science, mathematical reasoning or reading ability--are not well signaled to the labor market. When competencies which are highly correlated with each other are poorly signaled to the labor market, American employers have a difficult time figuring out which competencies they need and an even more difficult time finding high school graduates with the particular constellations of academic abilities they may believe they need. As a result, the relationship between their wage offers and the imperfect signals of worker competencies available to them is unlikely to reflect the true relationship between productivity and these competencies.

The Signalling Failure in the United States

In Canada, Australia, Japan, and Europe, educational systems administer achievement exams which are closely tied to the secondary school curriculum. Students generally take between 3 and 9 different examinations. These are not pass/fail minimum competency exams. On the Baccalaureate, for example, there are four different levels of
pass: *Tre's Bien, Bien, Assez Bien* and a regular pass (Noah and Eckstein 1988). Grades on these exams are requested on job applications and typically included on one's resume. Exhibit 1 reproduces a resume used by an Irish secondary school graduate applying for a clerical job. Exhibit 2 is the first page of an application filed by a 28 year old university graduate seeking a managerial job. While employers report they pay less attention to exam grades when hiring workers who have been out of school many years, it is nevertheless significant that the information remains on one's resume long after graduation from secondary school.

In Japan, clerical, service and blue collar jobs at the best firms are available only to those who are recommended by their high school. The most prestigious firms have long term arrangements with particular high schools to which they delegate the responsibility of selecting the new hire(s) for the firm. The criteria by which the high school is to make its selection is, by mutual agreement, grades and exam results. In addition, most employers administer their own battery of selection tests prior to hiring. The number of graduates that a high school is able to place in this way depends on its reputation and the company's past experience with graduates from the school. Schools know that they must be forthright in their recommendations because if they fail just once to make an honest recommendation, the relationship will be lost and their students will no longer be able to get jobs at that firm (Rosenbaum and Kariya 1989).

The hiring environment for clerical, service and blue collar jobs is very different in the US. American employers generally lack objective information on applicant accomplishments, skills, and productivity. Tests are available for measuring competencies, but EEOC guidelines resulted in a drastic reduction in their use after 1971 (Friedman and Belvin 1982). A 1987 survey of 2014 small-and medium-sized employers who were members of the National Federation of Independent Business found that aptitude test scores had been obtained in only 2.9 % of the hiring decisions studied (Bishop and Griffin, forthcoming).

Other potential sources of information on effort and achievement in American high school are transcripts and referrals from teachers who know the applicant. Both are under-used. In the NFIB survey, when someone with 12 or fewer years of schooling was hired, the new hire had been referred or recommended by vocational teachers only in 5.2 % of the
cases and referred by someone else in the high school in only 2.7%. Transcripts had been obtained prior to the selection decision for only 14.2% of the hires of people with 12 or fewer years of schooling. Transcripts are not obtained because differing grading standards in different schools and courses make them difficult to interpret, because many high schools are not responding to requests for the information and because there are generally long delays before the transcripts arrive.

The only information about school experiences requested by most American employers is years of schooling, diplomas and certificates obtained, and area of specialization. Hiring decisions are based on easily observable characteristics which are imperfect signals of the competencies the employer cannot observe directly. As a result, hiring selections and starting wage rates are often not influenced by even very gross indicators of academic achievement such as GPA, AFQT or SAT scores (Bishop 1987b). Given the limited information available to employers prior to hiring, it is not realistic to expect their decisions to reflect in a refined manner the specific combinations of academic competencies that students bring to the market.

But after a worker has been at a firm a while, the employer presumably learns more about the individual's capabilities and is able to observe performance on the job. Workers assigned to the same job often produce very different levels of output (Hunter, Schmidt and Judiesch 1988). Why, one might ask, are the most productive workers (those with just the right mix of specific competencies) not given large wage increases reflecting their higher productivity? The reason appears to be that workers and employers prefer employment contracts which offer only modest adjustments of relative wages in response to perceived differences in relative productivity. There are a number of good reasons for this preference: the unreliability of the feasible measures of individual productivity (Hashimoto and Yu, 1980), the unwillingness of workers to risk that their wage may be reduced if their supervisor decides they are not doing a good job (Stiglitz, 1974), the absence of any real danger that one's best employees will be raided because the skills of these top performers can be fully used only within the firm (Bishop, 1987a), the desire to encourage cooperation among coworkers (Lazear 1986) and union preferences for pay structures which limit the power of supervisors. In addition, compensation for better than average job performance
may be non-pecuniary -- praise from one's supervisor, more relaxed supervision, or a high rank in the firm's social hierarchy (R. Frank, 1984).

A study of how individual wage rates varied with initial job performance found that when people hired for the same or very similar jobs are compared, someone who is 20% more productive than average is typically paid only 1.6% more. After a year at a firm, better producers received only a 4% higher wage at nonunion firms with about 20 employees, and they had no wage advantage at unionized establishments with more than 100 employees or at nonunion establishments with more than 400 employees (Bishop, 1987a). Over time there is some tendency for those with high test scores to be promoted more rapidly and to be employed more continuously (Wise 1975). Since, however, worker productivity cannot be measured accurately and cannot be signaled reliably to other employers, this sorting process is slow and only partially effective. Consequently, when men and women under the age of 30 are studied, the wage rate effects of specific competencies may not correspond to their true effects on productivity and, therefore, direct evidence on productivity effects of specific competencies is required before conclusions may be drawn. We turn now to an examination of direct evidence on the effects of academic and technical competencies on the job performance. Research on the determinants of job performance in the US military is examined in section 6. Research on the determinants of job performance in the civilian sector is examined in section 7.

VI. THE IMPACT OF ACADEMIC AND GENERIC TECHNICAL COMPETENCIES ON THE JOB PERFORMANCE IN THE AMERICAN MILITARY

The theoretical arguments of the previous section will now be put to an empirical test. Direct estimates of the relative importance of different competencies are obtained by estimating models in which measures of job performance in the military are regressed on all 9 subtest scores of the ASVAB battery. These direct measures of the productivity effects of the competencies measured by the ASVAB, will then be compared to the wage and earnings effects of ASVAB subtests presented in section 4. Is technical competence an
important determinant of job performance as well as wages? Do verbal skills and scientific competencies which have no effects on wage rates, nevertheless, have significant positive effects on job performance? The wages and earnings of young men were influenced by computational speed not mathematical reasoning ability. Is this the case for job performance as well?

The ASVAB is one of the most thoroughly researched selection and classification batteries in existence, so there is a wealth of evidence on how its subtests effect job performance in a great variety of jobs. The test battery was developed by the US armed forces for use within the military, so military recruits have been the subject of almost all of this research. Eighty percent of the jobs held by enlisted personnel in the military have civilian counterparts, so the research on the validity of the ASVAB in military settings generalizes quite well to large portions of the civilian sector (US Department of Defense, 1984). The civilian occupations that are not represented in the ASVAB research are professional, manager, farmer, sales representative, and sales clerk. Since most of the soldiers studied were young and male, generalizing to other populations must be done with care. This is not a problem in this study, however, for the desired comparisons are with other young males, those in the NLS.

6.1 Studies of Training Success

Most of the validity research has involved correlating scores on ASVAB tests taken prior to induction with final grades in occupationally specific training courses (generally measured at least 4 months after induction). Since recruits are selected into the army and into the various specialties by a nonrandom process, mechanisms have been developed to correct for selection effects—what I/O psychologists call restriction of range (Thorndike 1949; Lord and Novick 1968; Dunbar and Linn 1986). These selection models assume that selection into a particular MOS is based on ASVAB subtest scores (and in some cases measures of the recruit’s occupational interests). For the military environment, this appears to be a reasonable specification of the selection process for attrition is low and selection is indeed explicitly on observable test scores. This ability to model the selection process is an advantage that validity research in the military has over research in the civilian sector.4
A reanalysis was conducted of data from two large scale studies of Marine recruits (Sims and Hiatt 1981 reprinted in Hunter, Crossen and Friedman 1985; Maier and Truss 1985). These studies were selected because they used versions of the ASVAB that were quite similar to the one administered to the NLS Youth Cohort. Correlation matrices which had been corrected (for restriction of range and selection effects) were obtained from the appendices of these studies and LISREL was employed to estimate models in which training grades were regressed on the full set of ASVAB subtests. The standardized regression coefficients from this analysis are reported in table 7.

The results were similar to the wage and earnings regressions in only one respect: technical competency as indexed by the mechanical, auto-shop and electronics subtests had major effects on success in training for occupations involving the maintenance or use of complicated equipment. In all other respects, however, the results contrast sharply with the wage rate regressions for young males. The math knowledge and arithmetic reasoning subtests have much larger effects on training success than the computational speed test. Both the science and verbal subtests have strong positive impacts on success in training. It appears that the higher level academic competencies measured by the ASVAB have much larger positive effects on success in training programs than on wage rates of young men in the civilian sector.

6.2 Reanalysis of Maier and Grafton's Data on Job Performance

In the reanalysis we reported above, training success was measured by a paper and pencil test. There is a danger that validity coefficients may be biased by common methods bias. It would be desirable to check these findings in a data set in which ASVAB subtest scores predict a hands-on measure of job performance. Maier and Grafton's (1981) study of ASVAB 6/7's ability to predict the hands-on Skill Qualification Test (SQTs) provides such a data set. Maier and Grafton described the hands-on SQTs they used in their study as follows:

SQTs are designed to assess performance of critical job tasks. They are criterion referenced in the sense that test content is based explicitly on job requirements and the meaning of the test scores is established by expert judgment prior to
administration of the test rather than on the basis of score distributions obtained from administration. The content of SQTs is a carefully selected sample from the domain of critical tasks in a specialty. Tasks are selected because they are especially critical, such as a particular weapon system, or because there is a known training deficiency. The focus on training deficiencies means that relatively few on the job can perform the tasks, and the pass rate for these tasks therefore is expected to be low. Since only critical tasks in a specialty are included in SQTs, and then only the more difficult tasks tend to be selected for testing, a reasonable inference is that performance on the SQTs should be a useful indicator of proficiency on the entire domain of critical tasks in the specialty; that is, workers who are proficient on tasks included in an SQT are also proficient on other tasks in the specialty. The list of tasks in the SQT and the measure themselves are carefully reviewed by job experts and tried out on samples of representative job incumbents prior to operational administration (pp. 4-5).

A more extensive discussion of the procedures for developing SQTs is available in a handbook (Osborn et al, 1977). A thorough discussion of their rationale is provided in Maier and Hirshfeld (1978).

Regressions were estimated using LISREL for nine major categories of Military Occupational Specialties (MOS): Skilled Technical, Skilled Electronic, General Maintenance, Mechanical Maintenance, Clerical, Missile Battery and Food Service Operators, Unskilled Electronic, Combat and Field Artillery. Except for combat and field artillery, these MOSs have close counterparts in the civilian sector. The independent variables were the 10 ASVAB 6/7 subtest scores which had counterparts in the ASVAB 8A battery used in the analysis of NLS Youth. The standardized regression coefficients from this analysis are reported in Table 8. These coefficients are an estimate of the effect of a one population standard deviation improvement in a test score on the hands-on job performance criterion measured in standard deviation units. Since the ASVAB subtests measure competencies with error and this error has not been corrected for, these results provide lower bound estimates of the effects of the true competencies on true job performance.

The effects of the four "technical" subtests--mechanical comprehension, auto information, shop information and electronics information--are presented in the first four columns of the table. As one might anticipate, these subtests had no effect on job performance in clerical jobs. However, they had very substantial effects on job performance
in all the other occupations. The impact of a one population standard deviation increase in all four of these subtests is an increase in the SQT of .415 SD in skilled technical jobs, of .475 SD in skilled electronics jobs, of .316 SD in general maintenance jobs, of .473 SD in mechanical maintenance jobs, of .450 SD for missile battery operators and food service workers, of .170 SD in unskilled electronics jobs, of .345 SD in combat occupations and .270 SD in field artillery. The technical subtests appear to have larger effects on hands-on job performance than on training grades suggesting a common methods bias in validation studies which employ training grades as the criterion. The proportionate change in productivity that results is somewhere between 25 and 40 percent of these numbers.16 If we assume the SD of true productivity averages 30 percent of the mean wage in these jobs, the impact of a simultaneous one SD increase in all four technical subtests is 11.5 percent of the wage (or about $2875 per year) averaging across the six non-clerical non-combat occupations. The present discounted value of such a learning gain is about $50,000 (using a 5 percent real rate of discount). This is consistent with the wage rate findings presented earlier. These results imply that broad technical literacy is essential for workers who use and/or maintain equipment that is similar in complexity to that employed in the military.

The attention to detail subtest (which is similar to the clerical checking subtest in ASVAB 8A) has no effect on performance in clerical jobs and small effects on performance in skilled electronic, general maintenance, combat arms and field artillery.

The results for the academic subtests, however, contrast sharply with the wage rate regressions for young males. With the sole exception of the mechanical maintenance MOS cluster, the two mathematical reasoning subtests have much larger effects on SQTs than on wage rates. The Math Knowledge subtest assessing algebra and geometry is responsible for most of this effect. A one standard deviation increase in competence in algebra and geometry raises predicted job performance by .121 SD in skilled technical jobs, .261 SD in skilled electronic jobs, .44 SD in general maintenance jobs, .206 SD in clerical jobs, .106 SD for missile battery operators and food service jobs, .139 SD in combat arms and .230 SD in artillery. The arithmetic reasoning test was significant in 7 of the MOS clusters and had large positive effects on performance in clerical (.24 SD), missile battery and food service (.11 SD), and field artillery (.186 SD) jobs. Assuming that the standard deviation of true
productivity is 30 percent of the wage, the impact of a simultaneous one SD increase in both mathematics reasoning subtests is 6.4 percent averaging across all seven non-combat occupations. The effects of the two tests of mathematical reasoning on job performance are substantial and unlike the wage rate findings much larger than the effects of computational speed. Nevertheless, they are somewhat smaller than those obtained in the models predicting training success suggesting again the possibility of methods bias.

Science knowledge which had small negative effects on wage rates, now has positive effects on hands-on measures of job performance in eight of the MOS clusters, significantly so in 4 clusters and in pooled data. A one standard deviation (SD) increase in science knowledge raises job performance by .057 SD in skilled technical jobs, .072 SD in skilled electronics jobs, .134 SD in general maintenance and construction jobs, .096 SD in mechanical maintenance jobs, .064 SD in clerical jobs, .076 SD in missile battery operator and food service jobs and .070 SD in combat arms. Word knowledge has significant effects on job performance in the skilled technical, general maintenance and clerical jobs and in combat arms. While statistically significant, the effects of these two competencies appear to be rather modest. Assuming that the standard deviation of true productivity is 30 percent of the wage, the effect of a one SD increase in test scores is 2 percent of the wage for science and 1.9 percent for word knowledge averaged across the seven non-combat occupations.

Differences in science or verbal competency of one population SD are quite large. In these subjects, one population SD is about the magnitude of the difference between young people with 14 years of schooling and those who left school after the 9th grade. Consequently, a productivity increase of about 2 percent per population SD on the test may appear to be only a modest return. This may be due to the inadequacies of the 11 minute long ASVAB subtests used to assess these competencies. General science had only 24 items and word knowledge only 35. This biases down the estimated effects of science and word knowledge on job performance. Clearly, there is a need for new research to determine whether broader and more reliable measures of verbal capacity, scientific knowledge and understanding and the ability to solve problems have more substantial effects on job performance in non-technical jobs than these ASVAB subtests.
On the other hand, however, a 2 percent increase in productivity should not be dismissed as unimportant. It is about $500 per worker per year and has a present discounted value of about $8700. (using a 5 percent real rate of interest and a 40 year working life).

6.3 Analysis of Project A Data on Core Technical Proficiency

Still more evidence on what truly determines job performance comes from Project A, a massive study (total costs of more than $100,000,000) that is developing improved methods for selecting and classifying army personnel. Wise, McHenry, Rossmeissl and Oppler (1987) have estimated ASVAB validities for 19 very diverse jobs using Core Technical Proficiency, a MOS specific job performance measures, as the criterion. These ratings are about 50 percent based on hands-on work sample tests (the hands-on SQT) and 50 percent based on paper and pencil job knowledge exams. The ratings were obtained after the recruit had been in the army for 2 to 3 years. The study was designed to select the three or four ASVAB subtests which could be used as the aptitude composite for that MOS cluster.

Table 9 reports the names of the three or four subtests which in combination did the best job of predicting Core Technical Proficiency. As before, the technical subtests are important predictors of Core Technical Proficiency in all the nonclerical occupations. For the academic subtests the results are very different from the wage rate regressions but similar to the results of the reanalysis of Maier and Grafton's validity data for hands-on work samples. Computational speed is only a weak determinant of job performance. Competence in science, language arts and mathematical reasoning has very large effects on job performance.

6.4 Analysis of Project A Data on Other Performance Measures

Most of the ASVAB validity studies have studied MOS specific measures of performance which reflect the soldier's ability to do the job not their willingness to do it on a regular basis or under adverse conditions. Do the results change when other dimensions of job performance are studied? The Project A data set again provides an opportunity to
address this issue. Besides the Core Technical Proficiency construct already analyzed, Project A offers three other performance constructs which have some applicability to civilian jobs: General Soldiering Proficiency, Effort and Leadership and Maintaining Personal Discipline. General Soldiering Proficiency assesses skills that all soldiers must have (e.g., use of basic weapons, first aid, map reading, use of a gas mask) and is measured much the same way as Core Technical Proficiency by a combination of job knowledge tests and hands-on performance tests. These two constructs are designed to measure the can do element of job performance.

The other two constructs attempt to measure the will do element of job performance. John P. Campbell (1986) described the constructs and their measurement as follows:

**Peer Leadership, Effort, and Self Development:** Reflects the degree to which the individual exerts effort over the full range of job tasks, perseveres under adverse or dangerous conditions, and demonstrates leadership and support of peers. That is, can the individual be counted on to carry out assigned tasks, even under adverse conditions, to exercise good judgement, and to be generally dependable and proficient? Five scales from the Army-wide BARS rating form (Technical Knowledge/Skill, Leadership, Effort, Self-development, and Maintaining Assigned Equipment), the expected combat performance rating, and the total number of commendations and awards received by the individual were summed for this factor.

**Maintaining Personal Discipline:** Reflects the degree to which the individual adheres to Army regulations and traditions, exercises personal self-control, demonstrates responsibility in day-to-day behavior, and does not create disciplinary problems. Scores on this factor are composed of three Army-wide Bars scales (Following regulations, Self-Control, and Integrity) and two indices from the administrative records (number of disciplinary actions and promotion rate). (p. 150)

It had been planned to obtain information on commendations, awards, promotions, and disciplinary actions from administrative records. However, the cost of this approach was extremely high so "everyone crossed their fingers and we collected eight archival performance indicators via a self report questionnaire....Field tests on a sample of 500 people showed considerable agreement between self-report and archival records"(Campbell, 1986, p 144).

These two constructs are related to each other (they correlate .59) but are clearly quite distinct from the two "can do" constructs. Correlations with Core Technical
Proficiency are only .28 for Effort and Leadership and .19 for Personal Discipline. The "can do" constructs are based on ratings made by the same person, so they share some common measurement error. Campbell, consequently, constructs residualized "can do" performance constructs by subtracting a ratings method factor from the raw score. With the ratings methods effect removed, Core Technical Proficiency (raw) has a correlation of .465 with Effort and Leadership (residual) and .225 with Personal Discipline (residual). In the view of the Project A team, soldiers must have both qualities—the technical competence to do their job and the willingness to do it under stressful circumstances.

Table 10 presents the results of using ASVAB test scores to predict General Soldiering Proficiency (raw), Effort and Leadership (both raw and residualized) and Personal Discipline (raw) (Campbell, 1986, Table 10). The correlation matrices were corrected for range restriction as described by Dunbar and Linn (1986). In this analysis the 9 ASVAB subtests have been reduced to four composites: Technical, Speed (Numerical Operations and Clerical Checking), Quantitative (Arithmetic Reasoning and Mathematics Knowledge) and Verbal/Science. For General Soldiering Proficiency, the results are quite similar to the results obtained predicting Hands-on SQTs and Core Technical Proficiency. The technical and quantitative composites have the largest effects, and the verbal/science composite has a substantial effect. Speed has almost no effect. As before, the pattern of coefficients is very different from the wage regression for young men.

The pattern is different for the "will do" performance constructs. The technical composite had large positive effects on both measures of Effort and Leadership. The quantitative composite had a modest positive effect on Maintaining Personal Discipline and the residualized Effort and Leadership. Speed had a modest positive effect on Effort and Leadership. The verbal/science composite had no effect on the residualized Effort and Leadership and a small negative effect on raw score measures of both constructs. The coefficient pattern for the raw score "will do" performance constructs looks rather similar to the male wage and earnings regressions. This is an interesting result that needs to be investigated in other data sets. It should be treated with caution, however, for four reasons: the information on commendations, awards, promotions and disciplinary actions was self reported, a ratings method effect was clearly visible in the data, other researchers have
expressed skepticism about the validity of military ratings (Vineberg and Joyner 1982, 1983), and there appears to be major differences between the civilian and military sectors in the effect of academic achievement tests on supervisory ratings (with the effects much larger in the civilian sector) (Hunter 1986).

In any case, even if one adopts the Project A position that ratings are a valid measure of the "will do" component of job performance, this in no way implies that the "can do" elements are subsidiary or unimportant. Consequently, the findings reviewed above that science, verbal and mathematical reasoning capability predict hands-on SQTs, Core Technical Proficiency and General Soldiering Proficiency in the military appear to provide some support the claim that improved math, science and language arts education will add to the productivity of the work force.

Eighty percent of the jobs held by enlisted personnel in the military have civilian counterparts so the research on the validity of the ASVAB in military settings just presented should generalize quite well to major segments of the civilian economy (US Department of Defense, 1984). Nevertheless, it would be useful to examine civilian data on the effect of academic and technical competence on job performance. It is to the analysis of civilian data we now turn.

VII. THE IMPACT OF ACADEMIC AND TECHNICAL COMPETENCE ON JOB PERFORMANCE IN THE CIVILIAN SECTOR

7.1 Ghiselli's Review of Validation Research Prior to 1973

Over the last 50 years, industrial psychologists have conducted hundreds of studies, involving many hundreds of thousands of workers, on the relationship between supervisory assessments of job performance and various predictors of performance. In 1973 Edwin Ghiselli published a compilation of the results of this research organized by type of test and occupation. Table 11 presents a summary of the raw validity coefficients (correlation coefficients uncorrected for measurement error and restriction of range) for six types of tests: mechanical comprehension tests, "intelligence" tests, arithmetic tests, spatial relations
tests, perceptual accuracy tests and psychomotor ability tests. As pointed out earlier, mechanical comprehension tests assess material that is covered in physics courses and applied technology courses such as auto mechanics and carpentry. The intelligence tests used in this research were paper and pencil tests assessing verbal and mathematical competency.

Intelligence tests were the best predictors of the performance of foreman. For craft occupations and semi-skilled industrial jobs, the mechanical comprehension tests are more valid predictors of job performance than any other test category. For protective occupations, mechanical comprehension tests and intelligence tests had equal validity. For clerical jobs, the best predictors of job performance were tests of intelligence, arithmetic and perceptual accuracy. These results are consistent with the analysis of job performance in the military data reported in Table 8.

It would appear that measures of mathematical, and generic technical competence all have substantial effects on performance in most jobs. What about paper and pencil occupational competency tests for specific occupations? How well do they correlate with job performance.

7.2 The Relationship between Occupational Competency Tests and Job Performance

Meta-analyses of the hundreds of studies of the validity of occupational competency tests have found that content valid occupational competency tests are highly valid predictors of job performance. Dunnette's (1972) meta-analysis of 262 studies of occupational competency tests found that their average correlation with supervisory ratings was .51. This correlation was higher than the correlation of any other predictor studied including cognitive ability tests (.45), psychomotor tests (.35), interviews (.16) and biographical inventories (.34). Vineberg and Joyner's (1982) meta-analysis of military studies found that grades in training school (which were based on paper and pencil tests of occupational competency) had a higher correlation (.27) with global performance ratings by immediate supervisors than any other predictor. The correlations for the other predictors were .21 for ASVAB ability composites, .14 for years of schooling, .20 for biographical inventory and .13 for interest.
Hunter's (1983b) meta-analysis found that content valid job knowledge tests had a correlation of .48 with supervisory ratings and an even higher correlation of .78 with a work sample measure of job performance, the Skill Qualification Test. Consequently, for training program graduates who are employed in the occupation for which their competency was assessed, scores on these competency exams are highly valid predictors of job performance and promotion probabilities.

7.3 Analysis of GATB Validation Studies

More recent data on what predicts job performance is available from the US Employment Service's program for revalidating the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB). This data set contains data on job performance, the 9 GATB "aptitudes" and background data on 36,614 individuals in 159 different occupations (Swarthout 1988; Bishop 1988c). Professional, managerial and high level sales occupations were not studied but the sample is quite representative of the 71,132,000 workers in the rest of the occupational distribution. It ranges from drafters and laboratory testers to hotel clerks and knitting-machine operators.

Since a major purpose of these validation studies was to examine the effects of race and ethnicity on the validity of the GATB, the firms that were selected tended to have an integrated workforce in that occupation. Firms that used aptitude tests similar to the GATB for selecting new hires for the job being studied were excluded. The employment service officials who conducted these studies report that this last requirement did not result in the exclusion of many firms. A total of 3052 employers participated.

The workers in the study were given the GATB test battery and asked to supply information on their age, education, plant experience and total experience. Plant experience was defined as years working in that occupation for the current employer. Total experience was defined as years working in the occupation for all employers. The dependent variable was an average of two ratings (generally two weeks apart) supplied by the worker's immediate supervisor. The Standard Descriptive Rating Scale obtains supervisory ratings of 5 aspects of job performance (quantity, quality, accuracy, job knowledge and job versatility) as well as an "all around" performance rating (See Appendix C). Some studies
employed rating scales specifically designed for that occupation and in one case a work sample was one of the job performance measures. None of the studies used ticket earnings from a piece rate pay system as the criterion. Studies which used course grades or tests of job knowledge as a criterion were excluded. Firms with only one employee in the job classification were excluded, as were individuals whose reported work experience was inconsistent with their age.

The mathematical achievement index (N) was an average of normalized scores on the same arithmetic reasoning test and on a numerical computations test. These two Verbal ability was assessed by a vocabulary test. Perceptual Speed was the sum of the P and Q aptitudes of the GATB divided by 36.72 to put it in a population SD metric. Psychomotor Ability was the sum of the K, F and M aptitudes of the GATB divided by 51.54 to put it in a population SD metric. The GATB does not contain tests assessing knowledge of electronics, mechanical comprehension, auto mechanics or shop knowledge.

Because wage rates, average productivity levels and the standards used to rate employees vary from plant to plant, mean differences in ratings across establishments have no real meaning. Only deviations of rated performance \( (R_{ij}^m - R_{ij}) \) from the mean for the establishment \( (R_{ij}) \) were analyzed. The variance of the job performance distribution was also standardized across establishments by dividing \( (R_{ij}^m - R_{ij}) \) by the standard deviation of rated performance, \( (SD_j(R_{ij}^m)) \), calculated for that firm (or 3 if the sample SD is less than 3).\(^{17}\) Separate models were estimated for each major occupation. They were specified as follows:

\[
\frac{R_{ij}^m - R_{ij}}{SD_j(R_{ij}^m)} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(T_{ij} - T_j) + \beta_2(S_{ij} - S_j) + \beta_3(X_{ij} - X_j) + \beta_4(D_{ij} - D_j) + v_{2j}
\]

where \( R_{ij} \) = ratings standardized to have a zero mean and SD of 1.

\( T_{ij} \) = a vector of the five GATB aptitude composites

\( S_{ij} \) is the schooling of the \( i^{th} \) individual.

\( X_{ij} \) = a vector of age and experience variables--age, age\(^2\), total occupational experience, total occupational experience\(^2\), plant experience and plant experience\(^2\).
\( \mathbf{D}_{ij} = \) a vector of dummy variables for black, Hispanic and female.

\( T_j, S_j, X_j \) and \( D_j \) are the means of test composites, schooling, experience variables and race and gender dummies for the \( j \)th job/establishment combination. Normalized ratings deviations were predicted by deviations from the job/establishment's mean for gender, race, Hispanic, age, age squared, plant experience, plant experience squared, total occupational experience, total occupational experience squared, schooling and test composites.

It should be recognized that the validity literature in general and this model in particular do not yield unbiased estimates of the true structural relationships prevailing in the full population (Brown 1978; Mueser and Maloney 1987). Validity studies based on examining which job incumbents are most productive are subject to bias for three reasons: omitted variables, the selection process that determines which new hires were retained by the firm and the selection process by which members of the population were hired for the job.

While equation 2 is a more complete specifications of the background determinants of job performance than is typically found in the validity literature, it lacks controls for important characteristics of the worker which effect worker productivity. Examples of things left out of the model are occupationally specific schooling, grades in relevant subjects in school, reputation of the school, the amount and quality of on-the-job training, performance in previous jobs, character traits like reliability and need to achieve, physical strength and a desire to work in the occupation. Exclusion of these variables from the model causes bias in the coefficients of included variables.

The second problem arises from the fact that job performance outcomes have been used to select the sample used in the analyses. Since incompetent workers were fired or induced to quit and high performing workers were probably promoted to jobs of a higher classification, the job incumbents used in this study were a restricted sample of the people originally hired for a job. The systematic nature of attrition from the job substantially reduces the variance of job performance and biases coefficients of estimated job performance models toward zero. When all variables are multivariate normal, the ratio of the coefficients estimated in the selected sample to the true coefficient estimated in an
unselected population is equal to:

\[(3) \frac{B^*}{B} = \frac{VR}{(1-R^2(1-VR))} = VR + R^{*2}(1-VR)\]

where VR is the ratio of the variance of y in the selected sample to its variance in the full population, R² is the multiple coefficient of determination of y on x in the full population and R*² is the multiple coefficient of determination of y on x in the selected population (Goldberger 1981). Estimates of VR, the ratio of incumbent job performance variance to new hire job performance variance can be derived from the NCRVE employer survey analyzed in Bishop (1987a, 1990). Data on the reported productivity in the 3rd through 13th week after being hired of two different workers was employed to calculate a variance ratio by dividing job performance variance of incumbents (pairs of workers both of whom were still at the firm at the time of the interview a year or so after being hired) by the job performance variance of a group of very recent hires (pairs of workers both of whom stayed at least 13 weeks but who may or may not have remained at the firm through the interview). The resulting estimate of VR was .486. Assuming multi-variate normality and noting that the R² of the models in table 8 averages about .16, our estimate of B / B *, the multiplier for transforming the coefficients estimated in the selected sample into estimates of population parameters, is 1.76.

The third source of problems is selection effects introduced by the selection that precedes the hiring decision. If hiring selections were based entirely on X variables included in the model, unstandardized coefficients such as B^ would be unbiased and correction formulas would be available for calculating standardized coefficients and validities. Unfortunately, however, incidental selection based on unobservables such as interview performance and recommendations is very probable (Thorndike 1949; Olson and Becker 1983; Mueser and Maloney 1987). In a selected sample like accepted job applicants, one cannot argue that these omitted unobservable variables are uncorrelated with the included variables that were used to make initial hiring decisions and, therefore, that coefficients on included variables are unbiased. When someone with 10 years of formal schooling is hired for a job that normally requires 12 years of schooling, there is probably a reason for that decision. The employer saw something positive in that job applicant (maybe the applicant
received a particularly strong recommendation from previous employers) that led to the decision to make an exception to the rule that new hires should have 12 years of schooling. The analyst is unaware of the positive recommendations, does not include them in the job performance model and, as a result, the coefficient on schooling is biased toward zero. This phenomenon also causes the estimated effects of other worker traits used to select workers for the job such as previous relevant work experience to be biased toward zero. Consequently, the results presented below should not be viewed as estimates of the structural effect of schooling and previous work experience on worker productivity.

The test score results are not similarly biased, however, because very few firms use cognitive tests to select workers and those that do were not included in the sample of firms studied specifically to avoid this source of bias.18

Results: The results of estimating equation 2 are presented in Table 12. Mathematical achievement was clearly the most important determinant of job performance for all occupational categories except operatives. The effect of mathematical achievement on the performance of operatives was highly significant but only about one-half to two-thirds of the size of the other occupations. Verbal ability had no effect on job performance in craft and operative jobs and in clerical and service jobs its impact is roughly 40 percent of the mathematical achievement's effect.

Spatial ability had significant positive effects on performance only for craft occupations. Perceptual speed had small effects on job performance, but the coefficients are nevertheless significant in all but technical occupations (where the sample is quite small). Psychomotor skills were significantly related to performance in all occupations but in the better paid and more complex jobs the magnitude of the effect was only about one-third of that of verbal and mathematical achievement together.

The effect of psychomotor skills was larger in the two least skilled occupations—operatives and service except police and fire. For operatives the impact of psychomotor skills was roughly comparable to the impacts of mathematical and verbal achievement. These results are consistent with previous studies of these and other data sets (Hunter 1983a). Models were estimated containing squared terms for academic achievement and psychomotor skills but these additions did not produce significant reductions in the residual
variance.

When test scores are controlled, years of schooling had very small and sometimes negative effects on job performance. These coefficients are biased toward zero, however, by selection effects.

The effects of occupational experience and tenure are also quite substantial for all occupations. The negative coefficients on the square terms for occupational experience and tenure imply they are subject to diminishing returns. For workers who have no previous experience in the field, the expected gain in job performance is about 12-13 percent of a standard deviation in the first year and about 8-9 percent of an SD in the fifth year. The effect of tenure on job performance stops rising and starts to decline somewhere between 16 and 24 years of tenure. Increases in occupational experience lose their positive effect on performance even later--at 37 years for operatives, at over 55 years for craft workers and high skill clerical workers and at 19-31 years for other occupations. Except for technicians, age has large curvilinear effects on job performance as well. Holding tenure and occupational experience constant, age had a significant positive effect on job performance in all except technical occupations. In these occupations, twenty year olds with no experience at all in the field were 7.2 to 10.3 percent of an SD more productive than 18 year olds with no experience in the field. Thirty year olds with no occupational experience were 4.7 to 7.4 percent more of an SD more productive than 28 year olds with no experience in the field.

The substantial effects of age and previous occupational experience on job performance are consistent with current hiring practices which give great weight to these job qualifications. These results suggest that a job applicant who has age and relevant work experience in his favor but low test scores may nevertheless be preferable to a young applicant who has high test scores but no relevant work experience. This is particularly likely to be the case if turnover rates are high for the productivity benefits of age and previous relevant work experience are large initially but diminish with time on the job.

VIII. EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AND THE GROWTH OF NATIONS
The evidence just presented suggests that verbal, mathematical and scientific competence has larger effects on a worker's productivity than on his or her wage rate. In these subjects, it appears, learning generates externalities--public benefits which do not accrue to the learner. If true, we would expect group differences in mean academic achievement to have larger effects on the average productivity of a group of cooperating workers than individual differences in academic achievement have on individual wage rates. National rates of productivity growth should, therefore, be more responsive to rates of change in average academic achievement, than cross section wage regressions would imply.

Economists have always had a difficult time explaining why some countries grow faster than others. Access to natural resources and a high savings rate are clearly important but large discrepancies between growth rates remain when these factors are controlled (Christensen, Cummings and Jorgenson 1980). The high productivity growth rates of Japan and continental Europe since 1950 have sometimes been attributed to a convergence phenomenon. According to the convergence hypothesis countries that have lower productivity at the start of a period tend to grow faster because they are adopting already proven technologies rather than having to discover and refine completely new technologies. When, however, 1950-80 growth rates are plotted against 1950 per capita output for all 72 countries for which data are available, there does not appear to be any systematic tendency for the countries with low initial productivity levels to grow more rapidly (Baumol 1986).

High mean levels of schooling appear to be one of the factors that explain why some low income countries grow rapidly and others do not (Hicks 1980, Wheeler 1980, Easterlin 1981, Marris 1982). But among the more advanced countries, rates of change of mean years of schooling are negatively correlated with gains in total factor productivity (Christensen, Cummings and Jorgenson 1980).

Are the countries where learning is progressing most rapidly also the countries where worker productivity is improving most rapidly? To address this question one needs measures of the rate at which educational outcomes are improving. The average number of years spent in school is an educational input not an outcome. It is possible to spend many years in school and learn very little.

What is required is internationally comparable data on trends in test scores. To
calculate such trends the same test (or equated tests) must have been administered decades apart to large representative samples of the population. Data of this type can be obtained from two sources: general academic ability exams administered to military recruits in countries which have universal military service and from standardization studies for the Stanford-Binet, the WISC or the WAIS IQ tests (Flynn 1987). Such data is available for 10 western countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, the United States and the United Kingdom.

The mean IQ of the young adult population substantially increased during the postwar period in both Europe and Japan. Table 13 reports the findings of the studies for which there can be no debate about the representativeness of the populations tested. In every country for which data was available (including the countries with weaker studies), there were major gains on IQ tests during the post war period. The findings for France, Netherlands, Norway and Belgium are especially strong. In these countries unchanged tests were given to all male 18 year olds entering their universal military training obligation. In just 25 years, for example, the IQ scores of French 18 year olds rose 25 points on the Ravens, a "culture reduced" test of abstract problem solving ability, and 9.4 points on a more conventional test of verbal and mathematical intelligence. In general, test score gains were smaller on math and verbal tests than on tests of abstract problem solving ability and the performance components of Wechsler IQ tests.

Let us begin by looking at how gains in test scores relate to gains in years of schooling. In figure 7 we have rates of gain on general academic ability tests per decade on the horizontal axis plotted against gains in mean years of schooling of adults (translated into a worker productivity metric) on the vertical axis. Quite clearly when one compares industrialized societies, there is no tendency for the countries with rapid increases in mean years of schooling to also have more rapid gains on tests given to adults and to students nearing the completion of their schooling. This result suggests that changes in mean years of schooling may be a very imperfect indicator of gains in real academic achievement. Since it is additional skills and knowledge, not additional years of schooling, which is presumed to cause increased worker productivity, it is the gains in skills and knowledge which must be measured and then related to productivity growth, not gains in mean years of schooling.
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Now let us return to the question we began with. Figure 8 plots yearly percentage growth in labor productivity between 1960 and 1984 against gains on general academic ability tests. Clearly there is a strong positive relationship between productivity growth and the growth of general human capital as indexed by increased scores on IQ tests. Similarly there is a strong positive relationship between manufacturing productivity growth and gains on IQ tests (see Figure 9), between real wage growth in manufacturing and IQ test gains (see Figure 10) and between growth of per capita income and IQ test gains (see Figure 11).

These comparisons probably exaggerate the causal effect of test score gains on national productivity. The countries such as Japan, Germany, Belgium, France and Netherlands that had above average rates of gain in test scores during the postwar period tended to be the countries who suffered the most during World War 2. The war destroyed much of the nations physical capital and disrupted schooling of the young. The rapid postwar growth of these nations has quite correctly been characterized as a return to their pre-war position in the industrialized world. Table 14 presents the results of cross section regressions which examine the impact of gains in general human capital while statistically controlling for the effects of World War 2. Including controls for the devastation of the war, somewhat reduces the magnitude of the relationship between test score growth and productivity growth but the effect of IQ growth on productivity growth remains highly significant and substantively important.

We have not, however, yet controlled for other determinants of productivity growth such as growth of capital per worker. Total factor productivity growth effectively provides such a control. It is defined by subtracting the effects of the growth of capital from labor productivity growth. Figure 12 plots total factor productivity growth for the period 1955 to 1973 against IQ growth. The slope of the relationship is somewhat reduced but a positive and significant relationship remains. When total factor productivity growth in manufacturing is examined, we also find a significant positive relationship with IQ growth (see Figure 13). Both of these relationships survive introduction of controls for the devastation of World War 2 (see Table 15). If one were to take the coefficient in the overall total factor productivity regression at face value, it implies that a one point gain in mean IQ raises a nation’s output by 1.5 percent. This coefficient is remarkably similar to
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the .19 coefficient obtained in the analysis of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics. In the total factor productivity model, the effect of a one population standard deviation increase in IQ (15 IQ points) is a .225 increase in the logarithm of gross domestic product. The fact that two very different modes of analysis yield similar estimates adds to the confidence that can be attached to the results. Regressions analyses of 7 to 10 observations can never be conclusive, however. When samples are so small, a different specification of the catchup phenomenon or a change in the time period analyzed might well cause the results to change. In addition, causation may also operate in the opposite direction--better living standards may directly cause higher levels of academic achievement.

Nevertheless, the results provide further support for the proposition that improvements in general academic achievement have profound effects on competitiveness and productivity growth. US productivity growth has lagged behind that of other nations in the postwar period and slower rates of improvement in human capital may be one of the reasons for this lag.

IX. IMPACT OF IMPROVEMENTS IN ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE ON AMERICAN PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH

Evidence has been presented that the effect of general intellectual achievement on wage rates and productivity is quite large. This, in turn, implies that the 1.25 grade level equivalent decline in the test scores of American secondary school graduates between 1967 and 1980 signalled a significant deterioration in the quality of young entrants into the American work force. The decline of student test scores was unprecedented for prior to 1967, student test scores had been rising steadily for more than 50 years. Bishop (1989) has recently developed an index of the quality of the US work force that incorporates the effects of improvements in academic achievement at given levels of schooling as well as increases in years of schooling. Jorgenson, Gollop and Fraumeni estimate that increases in years of schooling raised labor quality in the US by .725 percent per year between 1948 and 1973. Our estimates imply that improvements in academic achievement at given amounts of schooling contributed an additional .212 percent per year to the growth of the quality of
labor during this period. The test score decline reduced this contribution to .16 percent per year between 1973 and 1980, and .085 percent per year in the 1980s. If the test scores of high school graduates had continued to grow at the rate that prevailed between 1942 and 1967, labor quality would now be 2.9 percent higher. The social cost in terms of foregone GNP is now 86 billion dollars annually. Even with rapid improvements in the quality of elementary and secondary education, the labor quality shortfall grows to 5.5 percent in 2000 and 6.7 percent in 2010.¹⁹ If academic learning creates externalities, as argued above, the social costs of deteriorating school quality are even greater.

It would appear that the education enterprise has historically been an important source of economic growth. When the academic achievement of students completing their schooling declines substantially, the economic costs are large and last for generations. Consequently, the potential benefits of major improvements in the academic achievement of students would also appear to be substantial.

X. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The low level of academic achievement in American secondary schools has been a disaster for our youth and our economy. For the last six years, an average of 28 percent of noncollege-bound white high school graduates and 55 percent of the black graduates had no job four months after graduating from high school (Bureau of Labor Statistics 1989, 1991). Inflation adjusted wages fell 17.3 percent for young male high school graduates and 10 percent for young female graduates between 1971 and 1988 (Katz and Murphy 1990).

Export oriented capitalist growth strategies are being adopted throughout the world. These countries have billions of hard working poorly educated workers who are currently paid far less than 50 cents an hour. Manufacturing operations which make heavy use of unskilled labor have been moving abroad and will continue to do so. By the year 2010 only a few manufacturing jobs for poorly educated unskilled workers will remain in the United States and they will pay very poor wages.

The high school graduates of 1980 knew about 1.25 grade level equivalents less math, science, history and English than the graduates of 1967. This decline in the academic
achievement lowered the nation's productivity by $86 billion in 1987 and will lower it by more than $200 billion annually in the year 2010 (Bishop 1989).

The deteriorating achievement levels of those completing high school in the late 1970s did not generate a significant decline in the proportion enrolling in college the following October, but it did cause a major decrease in college completion rates. College graduation rates rose dramatically in the 1950s and 1960s but the share of high school graduates 25-29 years old who have completed 4 years of college peaked at 28 percent in 1976/7, fell to 25 percent in 1981/2, and has since crept back to 27.3 percent in 1989/90 (NCES, 1991, Indicator 2:7). Demand for highly educated workers has grown very rapidly during the last 30 years and wage premiums for professionals and managers are now at post war highs. The very high payoff to completing a college degree has stimulated only a modest increase in rates of college completion, however. For the high school class of 1980, only 18.8 percent had obtained a bachelors degree by February 1986. If the academic preparation of those completing high school does not quickly improve, college drop out rates will remain high and the future supply of highly educated workers will fall far short of the forecasted rapidly growing demand and the wage gap between educational haves and educational have nots will continue to escalate (Bishop and Carter 1991).

An important conclusion of this analysis is that mathematical and technical skills of average workers generate much greater wage and productivity benefits than verbal and scientific skills. The policy implications of these findings are that mathematics particularly algebra, geometry and statistics should receive much greater emphasis in the secondary school curriculum. Students also need to be given more exposure to computers and other technologies. There is no data on the productivity consequences of greater knowledge of history, geography and foreign languages. The economic case for greater emphasis on English and science in high school rests largely on the pipeline argument--these competencies are necessary for success in college.

Business leaders are complaining about the declining quality of entry level workers in the U.S. They and others argue correctly that the competitiveness of American companies is threatened by the poor educational background of our frontline workers. Some have responded to these complaints by saying that business should solve its own
problems by improving management and beefing up training. Public education should not, it is argued, give business needs much consideration; student and public needs should come first.

And indeed there is a grain of truth in the first response, the survival of a business is almost entirely determined by factors which schools, even excellent schools, cannot change. If schools do not improve, businesses must and will adapt to the capabilities of the workers that are available. Functionally illiterate workers are less productive so domestic companies will survive by paying lower wages. Multinational companies will survive by transferring assets and activities overseas. There is no amount of union power or government regulation that can stop this from happening. When the pie shrinks, the slices shrink as well. The losers will be American workers and all who depend on their productivity including the least fortunate among us. Yes, public and student needs must come first. It is their need for higher wages and a better standard of living which drives the need for higher standards in secondary school. Like Cassandra, employers are warning the nation that its mediocre secondary education system is a Trojan Horse which if not repaired will eventually bring the city down. The warning needs to be heeded not because employers are the daughters of a king, but because their forecast is correct and none of us can escape the city.
ENDNOTES

1. Comparisons of CPS estimates of increases in the number of college graduates in the population to estimates derived from data on bachelors degrees awarded for period prior to 1980 suggest rough consistency. During the 1980s, these two data sources diverge. The number of individuals born after 1935 claiming to have completed 16+ years of schooling increased by 9,181,000 between 1980 and 1988. During this eight year period, there were only 6,543,000 bachelors degrees awarded in the US. Immigration probably accounts for another 734,000 of this increase and individuals with 16+ years of schooling but no degree for another 1,019,000. This leaves a remaining discrepancy of 885,000 that is probably increased misreporting of years of schooling. This means that the true growth rate of college graduate workers is not the 4.18 percent per year figure calculated directly from CPS data, but rather 3.76 percent per year that results from subtracting 885,000 from 26,814,000, the 1988 CPS estimate of the number of college graduate workers, when calculating the rate of gain between 1980 and 1988. John Bishop, "Achievement, Test Scores and Relative Wages," forthcoming in Wages in the 1980s, edited by Marvin Kosters, American Enterprise Institute. This correction of the data helps explain why the college graduate labor market tightened so dramatically during the 1980s. It also results in the 1990s looking more like the 1980s and thus reduces our estimates of the magnitude of the shortage during the 1990s.

2. The no policy change projection of the increase in the stock of workers with 16 or more years of schooling was developed in the following manner. The National Center of Educational Statistics projects that an average of 1,080,000 BAs will be awarded each year during the 1990s, an 11.5 percent increase from the level that prevailed from 1980 to 1988 (Projections of Education Statistics to 2002, Table 200). Immigration of people with a college degree was about 100,000 per year in the first part of the 1980s (data provided by George Borjas) and this flow is assumed to increase to 120,000 because of the 1991 Immigration Act. Adkins reports that for every 100 individuals with a BA degree there are about 12.5 individuals reporting 16 or more years of schooling without having a BA or first professional degree. This information is from Douglas L. Adkins, (1975). Therefore, our estimate of the flow into the college graduate category is obtained by multiplying 1.18 million by 1.125. The share of the flow of new college graduates assumed to be employed was set equal to the labor force participation rate for this group, .90. The result was a projection of 14,349,000 individuals added to the stock of employed college graduates over the 12 year period. In the March 1988 CPS, there were 3,018,000 college graduates over the age of 65, 3,245,000 between 55 and 64 and 4,982,000 between 45 and 54 years of age. Their labor force participation rates were .906 for 45-54 year olds, .706 for 55-64 year olds and .222 for those 65 and over. (Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Educational Attainment of Workers: March 1988" July 1988). Based on life tables, the estimated 10 year survival rate is .9083 for the 45-54 year old college graduates and .8136 for the 55-64 year old group. (Statistical Abstract, 1990). An
estimate of the number of college graduates from the 45-64 year old group in 1988 that are still in the labor force 10 years later was obtained by multiplying the population figures by the survival rate and then by the labor force participation rate for the next older group. Exits from the labor force for the 12 year period were estimated to be 1,585,000 of the age 45-54 in 1988 group, 1,729,000 in the 55-64 in 1988 group and 670,000 (all) of those over 65 in 1988. Thus, the projected net growth in the number of college graduates over the 12 year period is 10,365,000 from a 25,929,000 level in 1988 or 2.8 percent per year. BLS's 1990 prediction of the growth of college graduate workers is substantially lower--9,105,000 (BLS, "1988-2000 Outlook for College Graduates, unpublished technical memorandum, 1990). The 1991 NCES projections of supply growth are used in column 5 and 6 of Table 4.

3. Since high skill jobs account for a larger proportion of total employment in CPS data than in the Occupational Employment Survey (OES) data used by the BLS, one needs to add 4 or 5 percentage points to the BLS projected growth shares for high skill jobs to make them comparable to our CPS estimates of occupational growth. Making this adjustment does not change the conclusion that BLS projections significantly underpredicted the growth of college level occupations in the 1980s.

4. The source of the yearly data on occupational employment is the Current Population Survey. Consequently, the dependent variable is the share of workers who describe themselves as being in a given occupation not the share of jobs that employers describe as being in a particular occupation. The advantage of CPS data is that there is no double counting of workers with more than one job. For supply/demand comparisons CPS data has the further advantage of also being the source of data on educational attainment. This means that under enumeration of undocumented workers and homeless individuals has little effect on estimates of the balance between supply and demand because these individuals are excluded from both sides of the equation. The disadvantage of CPS data is the possibility that self reports of occupation are less accurate than data collected from employers.

5. The very large differentials between college majors found in these data reflect both differences in wage rates and in hours worked per month. If gender were controlled, the differentials would be smaller.

6. Clearly teachers are paid a great deal less than most other college graduates and their disadvantage appears to have grown between 1967 and 1984. The remuneration of teachers is much greater in many other countries. In Australia, for example, 1981 starting salaries of college graduates was $18,484 for education majors, $15,193 for engineers, $14,314 for computer science, and $16,390 for economics. Regression analysis of this data indicates that controlling for age, academic honors, locality, type of university and college major, that those entering teaching are paid $1691 more than those going into government administration and $540 more than those entering a production or sales position. This information is from Paul Miller and Paul Volker
The model estimated was:

\[
\ln \text{WEARN} = a_0 + a_1 \text{GAA} + a_2 \text{SCH} + a_3 \text{AGE} + a_4 \text{NOWHITE} + a_5 \text{TRUEBG} + u_1 \\
\text{TEST} = \text{GAA} + u_2 \\
\text{YRED} = \text{SCH} + u_3 \\
\text{MEASBG} = c^* \text{TRUEBG} + u_4
\]

\text{MEASBG} is a vector of imperfectly measured characteristics of the individual's true family background: \text{TRUEBG} = \{father's education, father's occupation (Duncan index), number of siblings, father foreign born, born on a farm, born in the South\}. \text{GIA}, \text{SCH} and the elements of \text{TRUEBG} are latent variables with measurement errors (\text{u}_2, \text{u}_3 and \text{u}_4) which are uncorrelated with each other and with equation error (\text{u}_1). \text{Var(GAA)} is normalized to 1, \text{Var(GAA)/Var(TEST)} = .652 and \text{Var(SCH)/Var(YRED)} = .915. For the three dummy variables (Father foreign born, Born on a farm, and Born in the South), reliability is assumed to be .903 and \text{c}_i is assumed equal to be .95. For the other three background variables, \text{c}_i is assumed to be 1 and the reliabilities are assumed to be .702 for Father's education, .735 for Father's occupation and .927 for Number of siblings (Christopher Jencks et al., 1979, table A2.14).

8. For example, reliabilities for the College Board's afternoon Scholastic Achievement Tests are .90 for English Literature and .87 for Math I and for the morning Scholastic Aptitude Tests are .91-.92. The correlation between Math I and the Math SAT is .83 and the correlation between English Literature and the Verbal SAT is .84 (College Board 1984, 1987). In contrast, the correlation between math and verbal SATs is .66. There are good reasons for high correlations between past achievement in a subject and scores on aptitude tests designed to predict future achievement in the subject. Past achievement aids learning because the tools (e.g. reading and mathematics) and concepts taught early in the curriculum are often essential for learning the material that comes later. Furthermore, aptitude tests are validated on later achievement levels, not on rates of change of achievement. Consequently, many of the items that are included are similar to the items that appear on achievement tests.

9. Its ability to accomplish these objectives has been thoroughly researched and the battery has been periodically modified to incorporate the findings of this research. Eighty percent of the jobs held by enlisted personnel in the military have civilian counterparts so the research on the validity of the ASVAB in military settings generalizes quite well to major segments of the civilian economy (US Department of Defense, 1984). The test is highly correlated with the cognitive subtests of the General Aptitude Test Battery, a personnel selection test battery used by the US
Employment Service, the validity of which has been established by studies of over 500 occupations. A validity generalization study funded by the armed forces concluded "that ASVAB is a highly valid predictor of performance in civilian occupations" (Hunter Crossen and Friedman, 1985, p. ix). During the summer of 1980 all members of the NLS Youth sample were asked to take this test and offered a $50 honorarium as an inducement. The tests were successfully administered to 94 percent of the sample. Testing was generally conducted in groups of 5 to 10 persons. The 1980 version of the ASVAB (Form 8A) was administered by staff of the National Opinion Research Corporation according to strict guidelines conforming to standard ASVAB procedures. At the time of the testing the NLS youth were between 15 and 23 years of age.

10. These subtests have some similarities with the occupational competency examinations developed to assess high school vocational students. However, the ASVAB technical subtests assess knowledge in a much broader domain and the individual items are, consequently, more generic and less detailed. The ASVAB technical composite is interpreted as a measure of knowledge and trainability for a large family of jobs involving the operation, maintenance and repair of complicated machinery and other technically oriented jobs.

11. The alternate form reliabilities of these composites are approximately .92-.93 for Technical, .93 for Math, .93-.94 for Verbal, .80 for General Science, .72 for Numerical Operations and .77 for Clerical Checking (US Military Entrance Processing Command 1984; Palmer et al, 1988).

12. Technical and academic competencies were assumed to have linear and additive effects on labor market outcomes:

\[ Y_t = a_t A + b_t C + c_t T + e_t S + g_t Z_t + u_t \quad \text{for} \ t = 1983...1986 \]

where \( Y_t \) is a vector of labor market outcomes (wage rates and earnings) for year \( t \).

\( A \) is a vector of test scores measuring competence in mathematical reasoning, reading and vocabulary and science knowledge.

\( C \) is a measure of speed in simple arithmetic computation.

\( T \) is the technical composite measuring mechanical comprehension and electronics, auto and shop knowledge.

\( S \) is clerical checking speed.

\( Z_k \) is a vector of control variables such as age, civilian work experience, schooling, school attendance, military status, marital status, parenthood, minority status,
13. Reports of weeks spent in civilian employment were available all the way back through 1975. For each individual, these weeks worked reports were aggregated across time and an estimate of cumulated civilian work experience was derived for January 1 of each year in the longitudinal file. This variable and its square was included in every model as was age, age squared and current and past military experience. School attendance was controlled by four separate variables: a dummy for respondent is in school at the time of the interview; a dummy for respondent has been in school since the last interview; a dummy for part time attendance and the share of the calendar year that the youth reported attending school derived from the NLS's monthly time log. Years of schooling was controlled by four variables: years of schooling, a dummy for high school graduation, years of college education completed, and years of schooling completed since the ASVAB tests were taken. The individual's family situation was controlled by dummy variables for being married and for having at least one child. Minority status was controlled by a dummy variable for Hispanic and two dummy variables for race. Characteristics of the local labor market were held constant by entering the following variables: dummy variables for the four Census regions, a dummy variable for rural residence and for residence outside an SMSA and measures of the unemployment rate in the local labor market during that year.

14. Bishop, Blakemore and Low's (1985) studied the effect of math, reading and vocabulary test scores on the wage rates and earnings of high school graduates for both 1972 and 1980 in a model that contained controls for grade point average and the number of credit hours of academic and vocational courses. In both these years, none of the variables representing academic performance—the three test scores, GPA and the number of academic courses—had a significant (at the ten percent level) effect on the wage rate of the first post high school job. Only one variable (the vocabulary test for female members of the class of 1972) had a significant effect on the wage 18 months after graduation.

15. The survey was of a stratified random sample of the National Federation of Independent Business membership. Larger firms had a significantly higher probability of being selected for the study. The response rate to the mail survey was 20 percent and the number of usable responses was 2014 (Bishop and Griffin, forthcoming).
16. Studies that measure output for different workers in the same job at the same firm, using physical output as a criterion, can be manipulated to produce estimates of the standard deviation of non-transitory output variation across individuals. It averages about .14 in operative jobs, .28 in craft jobs, .34 in technician jobs, .164 in routine clerical jobs and .278 in clerical jobs with decision making responsibilities (Hunter, Schmidt & Judiesch 1988). Because there are fixed costs to employing an individual (facilities, equipment, light, heat and overhead functions such as hiring and payrolling), the coefficient of variation of marginal products of individuals is assumed to be 1.5 times the coefficient of variation of productivity. Because about 2/3rds of clerical jobs can be classified as routine, the coefficient of variation of marginal productivity for clerical jobs is 30% \[1.5 \times (0.33 \times 0.278 + 0.67 \times 0.164)\]. Averaging operative jobs in with craft and technical jobs produces a similar 30% figure for blue collar jobs. The details and rationale of these calculations are explained in Bishop 1988b and in Appendix B.

17. The formula was \(\text{SD}(R_{ij}) = (R_{ij} - R_{i})^2 / N - 1\). Occasionally employers who had only 2 or 3 employees gave them all the same rating. Consequently, a lower bound of 40 percent of the mean \(\text{SD}(R_{ij})\) was placed on the value the SD could take. Models were also estimated which did not standardize job performance variance across firms and which instead standardized the variances only across the occupation. None of the substantive findings were changed by this alternative methodology.

18. Variables which were not used to select new hires such as the GATB test scores may have a positive correlation with unobservable characteristics of the individual which are used in selection. If the unobservable has its own independent effect on job performance (ie. it is not serving solely as a proxy for test scores), test score coefficients may be positively biased. Mueser and Maloney (1987) experimented with some plausible assumptions regarding this selection process and concluded that coefficients on education were severely biased but that coefficients on test scores were not substantially changed when these incidental selection effects were taken into account.

19. The only way to prevent these forecasts from being realized is to change the relationship between GIA at age 17 and GIA as an adult. This might be accomplished by attracting massive numbers of adults back into school, by expanding educational offerings on television and/or by inducing employers to provide general education to long term employees.
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### Bureau of Labor Statistics Changes Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Published</th>
<th>Projection Period</th>
<th>Share Prof, Tech &amp; Manag.</th>
<th>Share Oper, Lab. &amp; Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1982-95</td>
<td>30.7% 48.7%*</td>
<td>27.8% 17.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1984-95</td>
<td>38.8% 55.4%*</td>
<td>28.7% 18.6%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1986-2000</td>
<td>37.9% 64.1%*</td>
<td>27.8% 19.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1988-2000</td>
<td>40.8% 95.4%*</td>
<td>24.6% 5.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1990-2005</td>
<td>40.9% ---</td>
<td>27.1% ---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Linear Regression Models of Occupational Shares

- **M1--Time, Unemp, Trade & PCShare**: 68.1% 0.3%
- **M2--Time, Unemp, & Trade**: 57.2% 10.6%
- **M3--Time & Unemp.**: 52.5% 6.1%

Source: The record of the 1960-75 and 1970-80 BLS projections of occupational shares and actual outcomes is taken from Carey (1980) and Carey and Kasunic (1982). Later projections come from Carey (1981); Silvestri, Lucasiewicz & Eckstein (1983); Silvestri and Lucasiewicz (1985, 1987, 1989, 1991) and are based on Occupational Employment Survey estimates of occupational shares in the initial year. CPS data on occupational employment from January issues of Employment and Earnings and Klein (1984) is used to estimate actual growth shares. Estimates of the level of high skill employment are higher in CPS data and this accounts for about 5 percentage points of the difference between projected and actual growth shares. For projection periods ending after 1990, an "actual" growth share (indicated by a *) is reported for the shorter period from the baseline year up to 1991. The "actual" high skill growth share for the 1988-91 period is temporarily extremely high (95.4%) because the recession has slowed the growth of low skill jobs like operative and laborer more than it has slowed the growth of professional and technical jobs.
Table 2
Wage Premiums by College Major
(Relative to Bachelors Degree in Humanities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Starting Salaries</th>
<th>Hourly Earnings of 25 Year Olds in 1979</th>
<th>Median Earnings BAs in 1966</th>
<th>Average Monthly Earnings in 1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1963-1991a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>All College Colleges</strong></td>
<td><strong>Both Sexes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors in Low Wage Major</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69-70</td>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Social Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors in High Wage Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Eng.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Eng.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Eng.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Eng.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters in Bus. Admin</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters in Engineering</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage differential between the starting salary in the designated major over that received by humanities majors. The College Placement Council "Inflation and the College Graduate" 1985 and CPC Salary Survey, Sept. 1989.

b Percentage differential implied by regressions predicting hourly wage rate of college graduates who have been out about 3 years controlling for degree and preferences using 1835 observations from Class of 1972 data. Daymont and Andrisani, "Job Preferences, College Major and the Gender Gap in Earnings," JHR, 1984, 408-428.

c Percentage differential for median yearly earnings of male BA holders with designated major (and MBAs and Masters in Engineering) relative to median earnings of humanities majors. Current Population Reports, P-20, No. 201.

d Percentage differential for mean monthly earnings of BA holders with designated major (and MBAs and Masters in Engineering) relative to earnings of humanities and liberal arts majors. Current Population Reports, P-70, No. 11, p. 13.

* CPC starting salary data is for MBAs with non-technical undergraduate degrees and less than one year of work experience before starting the program.

f CPC starting salary data is an unweighted average of chemical, electrical and mechanical engineers. Data for working adults is for all masters level engineers combined.
### Table 3
THE EFFECT OF OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING ON YEARLY EARNINGS
A Comparison of Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Vocational Education</th>
<th>CETA Classroom Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post 1983 Studies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comparison Group Methodology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kang/Bishop (1986)</td>
<td>Bassi et al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women: Business</td>
<td>Bassi et al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1674 (40%)</td>
<td>Young Women $-302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade &amp; Tech.</td>
<td>Young Men $-874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$262 (6%)</td>
<td>Dickinson et al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Young Women $117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$882 (22%)</td>
<td>Young Men $-565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men: Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-192 (-3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade &amp; Tech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1472 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2488 (36%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell et al (1986)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLS-1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$933 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSB-1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- (27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-1983 Studies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supported Work Demonstration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer (1982)</td>
<td>Fraker/Maynard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women: Business</td>
<td>Disadv. Youth $-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$410 (16%)</td>
<td>Women on Welfare $351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-72 (-2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-248 (-5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men: Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$106 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade &amp; Ind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$201 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$94 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rumberger/Daymont (1982)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Job Corps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Maller et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- (8%)</td>
<td>First Year $515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Second Year $667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- (10%)</td>
<td>Third Year $652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth Year $787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Kang/Bishop estimates are based on the quadratic model and assume the individual goes from zero to 4 vocational courses and reduces academic courses from 12 to 8, with the reduction occurring in the following subjects: math, foreign language, science, and social science. The other category of vocational courses in Kang/Bishop includes home economics and exploratory vocational courses. Campbell et al. (1986, 1987) results are a weighted average for all three patterns of participation that combine those who found training related jobs with those who did not. Meyer (1982) and Rumberger/Daymont (1982) results are calculated by multiplying the coefficient on the proportion of courses that is vocational by .33. The CETA estimates are taken from Barnow's (1981, Table 3) review of the literature and are a simple average of results for white and minority youth. The Supported Work result is from Table 5 of Fraker/Maynard (1987). The Job Corps estimate includes both civilian and military jobs and uses non-linear time trends (Maller et al. 1982 p. ix). The estimated effects are reported in current dollars. The dates reported are the year of the earnings data. Since the studies analyze data from different years, comparisons between studies may be influenced by differences in the general level of wages.
Table 4
Effect of ASVAB and Early School Tests on Wage Rates and Earnings in 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ASVAB</th>
<th>School Test</th>
<th>Controls For Educ. &amp; Background</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F Test of Equality of Coef.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Wage Rate</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>18.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.91)</td>
<td>(2.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Earnings</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>21.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.54)</td>
<td>(2.27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Wage Rate</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.03)</td>
<td>(.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Earnings</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.87)</td>
<td>(.43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of NLS Youth Data. The ASVAB test score was an average of all 9 subtests. The school test was the Z score relative to national norms on a test taken early in the youth's school career were included in the models. A full set of controls for years of schooling, school attendance, actual cumulated work experience, gender, race, Hispanic and characteristics of the local labor market. The sample was limited to youth for whom an early test score was available.
Table 6
Determinants of Earnings
Swedish Malmo Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 20</td>
<td>Age 10</td>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>Back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn 25</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(3.13)</td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn 30</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(7.60)</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn 35</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.89)</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>(8.00)</td>
<td>(4.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn 40</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.69)</td>
<td>(-.56)</td>
<td>(10.68)</td>
<td>(2.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn 43</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.65)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(9.01)</td>
<td>(2.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn 52</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td>(.60)</td>
<td>(6.69)</td>
<td>(1.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn 56</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(5.58)</td>
<td>(1.60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: For log earnings models unstandardized regressions coefficients are reported so the test score coefficients provide an estimate of the percentage change in earnings that results from a one population standard deviation change in the test score. They were fitted using Tuijnman’s estimated “true” correlations reported in Tables 9.2, 9.8 and Appendix C.
Table 7
Cognitive Determinants of Success in Marine Training Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mechanical Comprehension</th>
<th>Auto &amp; Shop Knowledge</th>
<th>Electronics</th>
<th>Clerical Speed</th>
<th>Computational Speed</th>
<th>Math Reasoning</th>
<th>Math Knowledge</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Occupations</td>
<td>.043***</td>
<td>.098***</td>
<td>.047***</td>
<td>.013***</td>
<td>.060***</td>
<td>.116***</td>
<td>.205***</td>
<td>.006***</td>
<td>.089***</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.20)</td>
<td>(12.46)</td>
<td>(5.78)</td>
<td>(2.29)</td>
<td>(8.96)</td>
<td>(14.44)</td>
<td>(25.26)</td>
<td>(11.68)</td>
<td>(10.68)</td>
<td>(5.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailor &amp; Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASVAB 6/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23061)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Occupations</td>
<td>.054***</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.102***</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.062***</td>
<td>.151***</td>
<td>.256***</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.130***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.73)</td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
<td>(4.81)</td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td>(3.44)</td>
<td>(6.41)</td>
<td>(11.91)</td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
<td>(5.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASVAB 8/9/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5841)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Occupations</td>
<td>.058***</td>
<td>.253***</td>
<td>.094***</td>
<td>.063***</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.086***</td>
<td>.135***</td>
<td>.120***</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.29)</td>
<td>(15.02)</td>
<td>(5.02)</td>
<td>(4.44)</td>
<td>(.67)</td>
<td>(4.16)</td>
<td>(7.14)</td>
<td>(6.27)</td>
<td>(.27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators, Food</td>
<td>.079***</td>
<td>.063***</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.086***</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.137***</td>
<td>.199***</td>
<td>.164***</td>
<td>.093***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1897)</td>
<td>(2.72)</td>
<td>(2.27)</td>
<td>(.57)</td>
<td>(3.66)</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td>(4.02)</td>
<td>(6.41)</td>
<td>(5.20)</td>
<td>(2.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.136***</td>
<td>.037***</td>
<td>.125***</td>
<td>.259***</td>
<td>.206***</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5231)</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td>(1.22)</td>
<td>(1.33)</td>
<td>(9.03)</td>
<td>(2.26)</td>
<td>(5.70)</td>
<td>(13.02)</td>
<td>(10.14)</td>
<td>(.47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat</td>
<td>.087***</td>
<td>.078***</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.027*</td>
<td>.056***</td>
<td>.069***</td>
<td>.143***</td>
<td>.073***</td>
<td>.061***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8191)</td>
<td>(4.98)</td>
<td>(4.68)</td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
<td>(1.95)</td>
<td>(3.62)</td>
<td>(3.40)</td>
<td>(7.71)</td>
<td>(3.88)</td>
<td>(3.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Artillery</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.237***</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.178***</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.148***</td>
<td>.138***</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1062)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(6.01)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
<td>(5.36)</td>
<td>(1.64)</td>
<td>(3.07)</td>
<td>(3.13)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Effect of competencies on job performance (SQT).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical</td>
<td>0.092***</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.132***</td>
<td>0.174***</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.215***</td>
<td>0.062**</td>
<td>0.121***</td>
<td>0.057*</td>
<td>0.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1324)</td>
<td>(3.07)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(4.28)</td>
<td>(5.09)</td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
<td>(6.77)</td>
<td>(1.96)</td>
<td>(3.76)</td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled electronic</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.246***</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.261***</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(349)</td>
<td>(1.30)</td>
<td>(1.49)</td>
<td>(3.64)</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
<td>(1.81)</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(3.67)</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (const.)</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.082**</td>
<td>0.117***</td>
<td>0.121***</td>
<td>0.043*</td>
<td>0.068***</td>
<td>0.066*</td>
<td>-0.101***</td>
<td>0.441***</td>
<td>0.134***</td>
<td>0.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance (879)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(2.34)</td>
<td>(3.25)</td>
<td>(3.05)</td>
<td>(1.76)</td>
<td>(2.19)</td>
<td>(1.80)</td>
<td>(2.73)</td>
<td>(11.70)</td>
<td>(3.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.314***</td>
<td>0.206*</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.235**</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance (131)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(2.88)</td>
<td>(1.84)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
<td>(2.43)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.087***</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.085**</td>
<td>0.118***</td>
<td>0.241***</td>
<td>0.206***</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(830)</td>
<td>(1.59)</td>
<td>(2.05)</td>
<td>(1.33)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(2.24)</td>
<td>(2.61)</td>
<td>(5.33)</td>
<td>(4.46)</td>
<td>(1.44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators and food</td>
<td>0.109*</td>
<td>0.179***</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.100**</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.114*</td>
<td>0.106**</td>
<td>0.076*</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(814)</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
<td>(4.11)</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(2.02)</td>
<td>(1.62)</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td>(1.33)</td>
<td>(2.47)</td>
<td>(2.25)</td>
<td>(1.66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled electronic</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.062*</td>
<td>0.077***</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.053*</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.058*</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2545)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
<td>(1.93)</td>
<td>(2.15)</td>
<td>(1.65)</td>
<td>(1.92)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(1.75)</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat</td>
<td>0.147***</td>
<td>0.060***</td>
<td>0.080***</td>
<td>0.058***</td>
<td>0.048***</td>
<td>0.035**</td>
<td>0.069***</td>
<td>0.070***</td>
<td>0.139***</td>
<td>0.070***</td>
<td>0.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5403)</td>
<td>(6.28)</td>
<td>(3.38)</td>
<td>(4.42)</td>
<td>(2.86)</td>
<td>(3.82)</td>
<td>(2.23)</td>
<td>(3.71)</td>
<td>(7.34)</td>
<td>(7.29)</td>
<td>(3.82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field artillery</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.134***</td>
<td>0.088***</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.186***</td>
<td>0.230***</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(534)</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>(0.56)</td>
<td>(2.21)</td>
<td>(2.33)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(3.28)</td>
<td>(3.99)</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Reanalysis of Maier and Grafton's (1981) data on the ability of ASVAB 6/7 to predict Skill Qualification Test (SQT) scores. The correlation matrix was corrected for restriction of range by Maier and Grafton.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Verbal/Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronics Repair (123)</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>Compute-Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Tech. (1329)</td>
<td>Mechanical Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Math Knowledge</td>
<td>Science Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Maintenance (716)</td>
<td>Auto-Shop Know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Maintenance (272)</td>
<td>Auto-Shop Know.</td>
<td>Math Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators/Food (1215)</td>
<td>Auto-Shop Know.</td>
<td>Arith Reasoning</td>
<td>Math Knowledge</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Auto-Shop Know.</td>
<td>Compute-Speed</td>
<td>Math Knowledge or Arith Reason.</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(289)</td>
<td>Mechanical Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical (1210)</td>
<td>Auto-Shop Know.</td>
<td>Arith Reasoning</td>
<td>Math Knowledge</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat (1429)</td>
<td>Auto-Shop Know.</td>
<td>Math Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Artillery (464)</td>
<td>Auto-Shop Know.</td>
<td>Compute-Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Summarized from Table 2 of Wise, McHenry, Rossmeissl and Oppler, 1987. Based on an analysis of the ability of ASVAB subtests to predict Core Technical Proficiency ratings after the recruit has been in the US Army for 2 or 3 years. Core Technical Proficiency ratings are about 50 percent based on hands-on work sample tests and 50 percent based on paper and pencil job knowledge exams. The subtests listed in the table are the 3 or 4 subtests which in combination maximized the $R^2$ of the model predicting Core Technical Proficiency.
Table 10

Effect of ASVAB Composite on other Dimensions of Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Soldering Proficiency</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort and Leadership (resid)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort and Leadership (raw)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Discipline</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source from John Campbell, 1986, Table 10. Standardized Coefficients from an Analysis of Project A Data on Performance in the Military.
### Table 11.

**Raw Validity Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mechanical Comprehension</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Arithmetic</th>
<th>Spatial Relations</th>
<th>Perceptual Accuracy</th>
<th>Psychomotor Abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>23'</td>
<td>28'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>21'</td>
<td>27'</td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftworkers</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>23'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>19'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Workers</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>21'</td>
<td>21'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>22'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Operators</td>
<td>22'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Occupations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td>28'</td>
<td>13'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Occupations</td>
<td>23'</td>
<td>23'</td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>21'</td>
<td>14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>23'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>29'</td>
<td>16'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ghiselli (1973) compilation of published and unpublished validity studies for job performance. The raw validity coefficients have not been corrected for restriction of range or measurement error in the performance rating. The Perceptual Accuracy category include number comparison, name comparison, cancellation and perceptual speed tests. They assess the ability to perceive detail quickly. Psychomotor tests measure the ability to perceive spatial patterns and to manipulate objects quickly and accurately. This category of tests includes tracing, tapping, doting, finger dexterity, hand dexterity and arm dexterity tests.

* Less than 100 cases.
* 100 to 499 cases.
* 500 to 999 cases.
* 1,000 to 4,999 cases.
* 5,000 to 9,999 cases.
* 10,000 or more cases.
### Table 12
Determinants of Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Technician</th>
<th>High Skill Clerical</th>
<th>Low Skill Clerical</th>
<th>Craft Workers</th>
<th>Operatives</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>.198***</td>
<td>.161***</td>
<td>.207***</td>
<td>.168***</td>
<td>.107***</td>
<td>.223***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.073**</td>
<td>.070**</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.078*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Perception</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.068***</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.075***</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual Ability</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.106***</td>
<td>.103***</td>
<td>.048***</td>
<td>.082***</td>
<td>.063*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychomotor Ability</td>
<td>.113***</td>
<td>.094***</td>
<td>.091***</td>
<td>.083***</td>
<td>.145***</td>
<td>.133***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs. of Schooling</td>
<td>.031*</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.036***</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Experience</td>
<td>.041***</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.042***</td>
<td>.040***</td>
<td>.036***</td>
<td>.082***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relevant Experience)^2</td>
<td>-.00094**</td>
<td>-.00012</td>
<td>-.0009**</td>
<td>-.00025*</td>
<td>-.0005</td>
<td>-.0021**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00046)</td>
<td>(0.00046)</td>
<td>(0.0004)</td>
<td>(0.00015)</td>
<td>(0.0003)</td>
<td>(0.0005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.085***</td>
<td>.113***</td>
<td>-.0925***</td>
<td>.0620***</td>
<td>.079***</td>
<td>.054***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.0056)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure^2</td>
<td>-.0024***</td>
<td>-.0031***</td>
<td>-.0026***</td>
<td>-.00156***</td>
<td>-.0017***</td>
<td>-.00131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0006)</td>
<td>(0.0006)</td>
<td>(0.0006)</td>
<td>(0.00018)</td>
<td>(0.0004)</td>
<td>(0.00077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.0024</td>
<td>.040***</td>
<td>.037***</td>
<td>.052***</td>
<td>.053***</td>
<td>.044**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0163)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.0078)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Age-18)^2</td>
<td>-.00012</td>
<td>-.00064***</td>
<td>-.00062***</td>
<td>-.00071***</td>
<td>-.00072***</td>
<td>-.00055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00021)</td>
<td>(0.00020)</td>
<td>(0.00013)</td>
<td>(0.00010)</td>
<td>(0.00009)</td>
<td>(0.00017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.396***</td>
<td>-.194***</td>
<td>.166**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>(0.072)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.138**</td>
<td>-.390***</td>
<td>-.146***</td>
<td>-.247***</td>
<td>-.216***</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.286***</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.109***</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.099)</td>
<td>(0.086)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Square</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Obs.</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td>2570</td>
<td>4123</td>
<td>10016</td>
<td>8167</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Analysis of GATB revalidation data in the US Employment Services Individual Data File. Deviations of job performance ratings from the mean for the job/establishment are modeled as a function of deviations of worker characteristics from the mean for the job/establishment. The test scores are in a population standard deviation metric. The metric for job performance is the within job/establishment standard deviation.
# Table 13

Increases in IQ Test Scores Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>IQ Point Gain</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1918-1943</td>
<td>Army--Wells Alpha</td>
<td>18-33</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1932-1953</td>
<td>SB--WAIS</td>
<td>16-48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1932-1971</td>
<td>SB-LM--SB-72</td>
<td>2-18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1954-1978</td>
<td>WAIS--WAIS:R</td>
<td>16-70</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1942-1987</td>
<td>ITED-Iowa Seniors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1939-1979</td>
<td>Ravens</td>
<td>8-30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>1949-1974</td>
<td>Ravens</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1949-1974</td>
<td>Verbal &amp; Math</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1951-1975</td>
<td>Wechsler</td>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1952-1982</td>
<td>Ravens</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1954-1968</td>
<td>Ravens</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1954-1968</td>
<td>Verbal &amp; Math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton, Canada</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1956-1977</td>
<td>CTMM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1958-1967</td>
<td>Ravens/Shapes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1958-1967</td>
<td>Verbal/Math</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: WAIS--WAIS:R, ITED and Army Alpha results are discussed in the text. For all other comparisons the source is Flynn 1987. SB stands for Stanford Binet, CTMM stands for California Test of Mental Maturity, ITED stands for Iowa Test of Educational Development, and Ravens stands for the Ravens Progressive Matrices test of Abstract Reasoning. All tests have been adjusted to give them a standard deviation of 15. Flynn's classification of the reliability of the estimate is given in the column headed by status. It has the following key 1 = verified, 2 = probable, 3 = tentative, and 4 = speculative. The status classifications in parenthesis were assigned by the author.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>GDP/hr 1960-84 excluding mining</th>
<th>GDP/hr 1960-85 manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP/hr Growth</td>
<td>5.2*** (4.19)</td>
<td>5.8*** (3.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP/hr Schooling</td>
<td>-0.42*** (2.08)</td>
<td>-0.94** (3.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP/hr 1938-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP/hr 1938-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1960</td>
<td>1.1 (1.72)</td>
<td>1.8* (1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates of GDP/hr levels and growth rates are from Maddison 1982, 1984 with updates derived from data in OECD National Accounts, OECD Economic Outlook and OECD Employment Outlook. The sample comprises Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, West Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, United States and United Kingdom. Mining input and hours worked were excluded. The sample for the model containing schooling growth comprises Canada, France, West Germany, Japan, Netherlands, U.S. and the U.K. Estimates of growth of output per hour in manufacturing are from Bureau of Labor Statistics (1987). The dependent variable is the logarithmic growth rate multiplied by 100. The IQ variable is average number of IQ points gained per year in that country. The effect of a population standard deviation improvement in IQ on a nations productivity may be calculated by multiplying the coefficient on the IQ variable by 15. The sample comprises Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, United States and the United Kingdom. T statistics are in parenthesis below the coefficient.

* significant at the 10 percent level on a one tail test.
** significant at the 5 percent level on a one tail test.
*** significant at the 1 percent level on a one tail test.
Table 15

Effect of IQ Gains
On
Total Factor Productivity Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQ Growth</th>
<th>Schooling Growth 1955-73</th>
<th>Growth GDP/hr 1938-50</th>
<th>Growth GDP/hr 1938-60</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Business Sector 1955-73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.27***</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.35***</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.29)</td>
<td>(.27)</td>
<td>(2.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing 1969-85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.83**</td>
<td>3.90**</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.90)</td>
<td>(2.41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.72**</td>
<td>2.5**</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.15)</td>
<td>(1.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.58)</td>
<td>(2.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimates of total factor productivity for the Private Business Sector are from Christensen, Christensen and Cummings. The countries which matched with the IQ data were Canada, France, West Germany, Japan, Netherlands, United States and the United Kingdom. Estimates of capital labor productivity for the manufacturing sector are from OECD Economic Outlook, May 1986 Table 5. The dependent variable is the logarithmic growth rate multiplied by 100. The IQ variable is average number of IQ points gained per year in that country. The effect of a population standard deviation improvement in IQ on a nations productivity may be calculated by multiplying the the coefficient on the IQ variable by 15. The countries which matched with the IQ data were Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, Norway, United States and the United Kingdom. T statistics are in parenthesis below the coefficient.

* significant at the 10 percent level on a one tail test.
** significant at the 5 percent level on a one tail test.
*** significant at the 1 percent level on a one tail test.
APPENDIX B

The ASVAB
The ASVAB is a multiple aptitude battery designed for use with students in Grades 11 and 12 and in postsecondary schools. The test was developed to yield results that are useful to both schools and the military. Schools use ASVAB test results to provide educational and career counseling for students. The military services use the results to identify students who potentially qualify for entry into the military and for assignment to military occupational training programs.

Like other multiple aptitude batteries, the ASVAB measures developed abilities and predicts what a person could accomplish with training or further education. This test is designed especially to measure potential for occupations that require formal courses of instruction or on-the-job training. In addition, it provides measures of general learning ability that are useful for predicting performance in academic areas.

The ASVAB can be used for both military and civilian career counseling. Scores from this test are valid predictors of success in training programs for enlisted military occupations. Through the use of validity generalization techniques, predictions from military validity studies can be generalized to occupations that span most of the civilian occupational spectrum. Although some enlisted occupations are military specific, more than 80% of these occupations have direct civilian occupational counterparts.

Since the ASVAB was first used in high schools in 1968, it has been the subject of extensive research and has been updated periodically. Appendix A contains a brief history of the ASVAB and the various forms that have been used.

ASVAB-14, introduced in the 1984-85 school year, contains several key features that were not included in previous forms. These key features include

- Improved usefulness in measuring vocational aptitudes: In addition to yielding academic composites that provide measures of academic potential, ASVAB-14 supplies occupational composites that provide measures of potential for successful performance in four general career areas.
- Increased reliability: Changes in the length and number of subtests have increased the test's reliability without a substantial increase in testing time.
- Nationally representative norms: ASVAB-14 is normed on a nationally representative sample of 12,000 women and men, ages 16-23, who took the test in 1980.

Subtests

The ASVAB consists of 10 subtests. Eight are power subtests that allow maximum performance with generous time limits. Two subtests are speeded.
Figure 1-1 presents the subtests, the time allowed for the administration of each subtest, the number of items per subtest, and the descriptions of the abilities or knowledge measured. The subtests are designed to measure general cognitive abilities and acquired information in specific areas. Sample questions for each subtest are provided in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Time Allowed</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>11 Minutes</td>
<td>25 Items</td>
<td>Measures knowledge of the physical and biological sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARITHMETIC REASONING</td>
<td>36 Minutes</td>
<td>50 Items</td>
<td>Measures ability to solve arithmetic word problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>11 Minutes</td>
<td>35 Items</td>
<td>Measures ability to select the correct meaning of words presented in context and to identify the best synonym for a given word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAGRAPH COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>13 Minutes</td>
<td>15 Items</td>
<td>Measures ability to obtain information from written passages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMERICAL OPERATIONS</td>
<td>3 Minutes</td>
<td>50 Items</td>
<td>Measures ability to perform arithmetic computations in a speeded context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO &amp; SHOP INFORMATION</td>
<td>11 Minutes</td>
<td>25 Items</td>
<td>Measures knowledge of automobiles, tools, and shop terminology and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHEMATICS KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>24 Minutes</td>
<td>25 Items</td>
<td>Measures knowledge of high school mathematics principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANICAL COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>19 Minutes</td>
<td>25 Items</td>
<td>Measures knowledge of mechanical and physical principles and ability to visualize how illustrated objects work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODING SPEED</td>
<td>7 Minutes</td>
<td>84 Items</td>
<td>Measures ability to use a key in assigning code numbers to words in a speeded context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONICS INFORMATION</td>
<td>9 Minutes</td>
<td>20 Items</td>
<td>Measures knowledge of electronics and electronics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Science

1. An eclipse of the sun throws the shadow of the
   1-A moon on the sun.
   1-B moon on the earth.
   1-C earth on the sun.
   1-D earth on the moon.

2. Substances which hasten chemical reaction time without themselves undergoing change are called
   2-A buffers.
   2-B colloids.
   2-C reducers.
   2-D catalysts.

## Arithmetic Reasoning

3. How many 36-passenger busses will it take to carry 144 people?
   3-A 3
   3-B 4
   3-C 5
   3-D 6

4. It costs $0.50 per square yard to waterproof canvas. What will it cost to waterproof a canvas truck cover that is 15' x 24'?
   4-A $ 6.67
   4-B $ 18.00
   4-C $ 20.00
   4-D $180.00

## Word Knowledge

5. The wind is **variable** today.
   5-A mild
   5-B steady
   5-C shifting
   5-D chilling

6. **Rudiments** most nearly means
   6-A politics
   6-B minute details
   6-C promotion opportunities
   6-D basic methods and procedures.
Paragraph Comprehension

7. Twenty-five percent of all household burglaries can be attributed to unlocked windows or doors. Crime is the result of opportunity plus desire. To prevent crime, it is each individual's responsibility to

- A: provide the desire.
- B: provide the opportunity.
- C: prevent the desire.
- D: prevent the opportunity.

8. In certain areas water is so scarce that every attempt is made to conserve it. For instance, on one oasis in the Sahara Desert the amount of tree has been carefully determined. How much water is each tree given?

- A: no water at all
- B: water on alternate days
- C: exactly the amount required
- D: water only if it is healthy

Numerical Operations

9. 3 + 9 = 10. 60 + 15 =

- 9-A 3
- 9-B 6
- 9-C 12
- 9-D 13

- 10-A 3
- 10-B 4
- 10-C 5
- 10-D 6

Coding Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bargain</td>
<td>8385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chin</td>
<td>8930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>game</td>
<td>6456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>music</td>
<td></td>
<td>1117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunshine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. game</td>
<td>6456</td>
<td>7150</td>
<td>8385</td>
<td>8930</td>
<td>9645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. knife</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>6456</td>
<td>7150</td>
<td>7489</td>
<td>8385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. bargain</td>
<td>2859</td>
<td>6227</td>
<td>7489</td>
<td>8385</td>
<td>9645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. chin</td>
<td>2859</td>
<td>4703</td>
<td>8385</td>
<td>8930</td>
<td>9645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. house</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>2859</td>
<td>6227</td>
<td>7150</td>
<td>7489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. sofa</td>
<td>7150</td>
<td>7489</td>
<td>8385</td>
<td>8930</td>
<td>9645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. owner</td>
<td>4703</td>
<td>6227</td>
<td>8456</td>
<td>7150</td>
<td>8930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 18. music | 1117| 2859| 7489| 8385| 9645 |
| 19. knife | 6227| 6456| 7150| 7489| 8385 |
| 20. sunshine| 4703| 6227| 8456| 7150| 8930 |
| 21. chin  | 1117| 2859| 4703| 7150| 7489 |
| 22. sofa  | 4703| 6227| 7150| 8456| 9645 |
| 23. bargain| 2859| 6456| 8385| 8930| 9645 |
| 24. point | 1117| 4703| 6227| 8456| 7150 |
### Auto & Shop Information

25. A car uses too much oil when which parts are worn?

- 25-A pistons
- 25-B piston rings
- 25-C main bearings
- 25-D connecting rods

26. The saw shown above is used mainly to cut

- 26-A plywood.
- 26-B odd-shaped holes in wood.
- 26-C along the grain of the wood.
- 26-D across the grain of the wood.

### Mathematics Knowledge

27. If \( x + 6 = 7 \), then \( x \) is equal to

- 27-A 0
- 27-B 1
- 27-C -1
- 27-D 7/6

28. What is the area of this square?

- 28-A 1 square foot
- 28-B 5 square feet
- 28-C 10 square feet
- 28-D 25 square feet
Mechanical Comprehension

29. Which post holds up the greater part of the load?
   29-A post A
   29-B post B
   29-C both equal
   29-D not clear

30. In this arrangement of pulleys, which pulley turns fastest?
   30-A A
   30-B B
   30-C C
   30-D D

Electronics Information

31. Which of the following has the least resistance?
   31-A wood
   31-B iron
   31-C rubber
   31-D silver

32. In the schematic vacuum tube illustrated, the cathode is element
   32-A A
   32-B B
   32-C C
   32-D D

Key To The Sample Test Items

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1 | B |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2 | D |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3 | B |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4 | C |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5 | C |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6 | D |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7 | D |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8 | C |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9 | C |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|10 | B |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|11 | A |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|12 | C |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|13 | D |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|14 | D |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|15 | B |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|16 | E |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|17 | B |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|18 | A |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|19 | C |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|20 | D |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|21 | E |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|22 | E |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|23 | C |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|24 | B |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|25 | B |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|26 | B |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|27 | B |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|28 | D |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|29 | A |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|30 | A |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|31 | D |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|32 | D |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
### Appendix E

**NAME OF WORKER (FIRM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Company Job Title:**

**How often do you see this worker in a work situation?**  
- [ ] All the time.  
- [ ] Several times a day.  
- [ ] Several times a week.  
- [ ] Seldom.

**How long have you worked with this worker?**

- [ ] Under one month.  
- [ ] One to two months.  
- [ ] Three to five months.  
- [ ] Six months or more.

**A. How much can this worker get done? (Worker's ability to make efficient use of time and to work at high speed.)**  
(If it is possible to rate only the quantity of work which a person can do on this job as adequate or inadequate, use 02 to indicate "inadequate" and 01 to indicate "adequate.")

- [ ] 1. Capable of very low work output. Can perform only at an unsatisfactory pace.
- [ ] 2. Capable of low work output. Can perform at a slow pace.
- [ ] 3. Capable of fair work output. Can perform at an acceptable pace.
- [ ] 4. Capable of high work output. Can perform at a fast pace.
- [ ] 5. Capable of very high work output. Can perform at an unusually fast pace.

**B. How good is the quality of work? (Worker's ability to do high-grade work which meets quality standards.)**

- [ ] 1. Performance is inferior and almost never meets minimum quality standards.
- [ ] 2. Performance is usually acceptable but somewhat inferior in quality.
- [ ] 3. Performance is acceptable but usually not superior in quality.
- [ ] 4. Performance is usually superior in quality.
- [ ] 5. Performance is almost always of the highest quality.

**C. How accurate is the work? (Worker's ability to avoid making mistakes.)**

- [ ] 1. Makes very many mistakes. Work needs constant checking.
- [ ] 2. Makes frequent mistakes. Work needs more checking than is desirable.
- [ ] 3. Makes mistakes occasionally. Work needs only normal checking.
- [ ] 5. Rarely makes a mistake. Work almost never needs checking.
D. How much does the worker know about the job? (Worker's understanding of the principles, equipment, materials and methods that have to do directly or indirectly with the work.)

☐ 1. Has very limited knowledge. Does not know enough to do the job adequately.
☐ 2. Has little knowledge. Knows enough to get by.
☐ 3. Has moderate amount of knowledge. Knows enough to do this work.
☐ 4. Has broad knowledge. Knows enough to do good work.
☐ 5. Has complete knowledge. Knows the job thoroughly.

E. How large a variety of job duties can the worker perform efficiently? (Worker's ability to handle several different operations)

☐ 1. Cannot perform different operations adequately.
☐ 2. Can perform a limited number of different operations efficiently.
☐ 3. Can perform several different operations with reasonable efficiency.
☐ 4. Can perform many different operations efficiently.
☐ 5. Can perform an unusually large variety of different operations efficiently.

F. Considering all the factors already rated, and only these factors, how good is this worker? (Worker's all-around ability to do the job)

☐ 1. Performance usually not acceptable.
☐ 2. Performance somewhat inferior.
☐ 3. A fairly proficient worker.
☐ 4. Performance usually superior.
☐ 5. An unusually competent worker.

Complete the following ONLY if the worker is no longer on the job.

G. What do you think is the reason this person left the job? (It is not necessary to show the official reason if you feel that there is another reason, as this form will not be shown to anybody in the company.)

☐ 1. Fired because of inability to do the job.
☐ 2. Quit, and I feel that it was because of difficulty doing the job.
☐ 3. Fired or laid off for reasons other than ability to do the job (i.e., absenteeism, reduction in force).
☐ 4. Quit, and I feel the reason for quitting was not related to ability to do the job.
☐ 5. Quit or was promoted or reassigned because the worker had learned the job well and wanted to advance.