

This work is distributed as a Discussion Paper by the  
**STANFORD INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC POLICY RESEARCH**

SIEPR Discussion Paper No. 04-14

**Evidence on the Returns to  
Secondary Vocational Education**

By  
Jonathan Meer  
Stanford University

January 2005

Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305  
(650) 725-1874

The Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research at Stanford University supports research bearing on economic and public policy issues. The SIEPR Discussion Paper Series reports on research and policy analysis conducted by researchers affiliated with the Institute. Working papers in this series reflect the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research or Stanford University.

---

# **EVIDENCE ON THE RETURNS TO SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION**

Jonathan Meer  
Stanford University

January 2005

I have benefited greatly from discussions with Colleen N. Flaherty, Stephan D. McBride, Harvey S. Rosen, Carmit Segal, Edward J. Vytlačil, and members of Stanford University's Labor Reading group. In addition, I am particularly grateful to B. Douglas Bernheim, Kevin J. Mumford, and Sriniketh S. Nagavarapu for helpful comments on this paper.

## ABSTRACT

Vocational education in high schools has frequently been stigmatized as an anachronistic, dead-end path for students. We use data from the National Education Longitudinal Survey of 1988 to examine claims that students on a vocational track would benefit from a more academically rigorous education. Clearly, selection bias confounds attempts to untangle the effects of academic tracking on income after high school. Using an econometric framework that accounts for this bias, we find evidence of comparative advantage in tracking.

Keywords: educational economics, salary wage differentials, vocational education

Jonathan Meer  
Department of Economics  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305  
[jmeer@stanford.edu](mailto:jmeer@stanford.edu)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that real wages for white collar workers rose 1.5% between 1997 and 2002, while real wages for blue collar workers increased 4.8% over the same time span. Certain fields have seen even greater gains, particularly for apprentice workers; automobile mechanics' apprentices have seen a 7.8% increase, plumbers' apprentices wages have increased 18.6%, and carpenters' apprentices wages have risen 22.7%. Yet many researchers feel that secondary vocational education is obsolete and schools should concentrate on fostering general academic skills. Jacobs and Grubb (2003) state that the "institutional transformation of education over the twentieth century has resulted in a general consensus that specific vocational preparation should not be a part of high school." Krueger and Kumar (2003) even argue that "public policies favoring vocational education over a concept-based, 'general' education may contribute to slower technology adoption and economic growth, especially during times of rapid technological change." Goodlad (1984) and Adler (1983) refer to vocational education as anachronistic and even discriminatory. On the other hand, as Neuman and Ziderman (1999) note, "[a]dvocates of vocational schooling see it, variously: as an effective means of supplying national manpower skills needs; as an appropriate educational alternative to general secondary schooling for students of weaker academic ability; as a framework for improving life-outcomes of unemployed youth and other social groups with special needs." The Department of Education (2000) points out that vocational concentrators have "generally increased the rigor of their academic coursework, particularly in mathematics, science, and social studies" in recent years, and that the purpose of this sort of tracking "has shifted toward broader preparation that develops the academic, vocational,

and technical skills of students in vocational education programs.” Therefore, it is of interest to revisit this question.

Evidence showing that vocational graduates have lower income than students who pursue other paths is meaningless without context. After all, it is just as plausible that these students earn less because of unobservable characteristics that are correlated with track choice as it is that vocational education is somehow diminishing their earnings potential. Simply because those who are currently on the academic or general track earn more than vocational students does not mean that shifting vocational students to those tracks would increase their income. Moreover, many previous studies have been hampered by focusing on vocational education as a single entity, as opposed to a varied track that covers everything from mechanical subjects to business studies. This paper divides vocational education into ‘technical’ and ‘business’ tracks and strives to create counterfactual estimates, conditional means that show what a student who chose, for example, the technical track would have earned had they actually chosen the academic track.

Section 2 examines some of the previous literature on this subject. Section 3 describes the data, which are drawn from two waves of the National Education Longitudinal Survey of 1988. Section 4 details the selection model with a multinomial logit first stage that is used to account for selection bias. Section 5 presents our results. We estimate the effect of track choice on income without accounting for selection bias. We then turn to a selection model and construct counterfactual estimates that provide evidence of comparative advantage; that is, those most suited for a particular track are already on it, and, for the most part, would not benefit from shifting. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper and provides suggestions for future research.

## 2. PREVIOUS LITERATURE

Previous work in this field has directly examined the effect of secondary vocational education, often finding little or no economic benefit. Hotchkiss (1993) examines the first job after high school and concludes that “secondary vocational training in the United States is not effective in raising one’s wage.” Neuman and Ziderman (1999), using Israeli data, find that for “workers who had attended secondary school and did not proceed to higher education, only a small earnings difference was found between the vocational and academic streams.” Gustman and Steinmeier (1980) do not find any evidence that “vocational training for male students in high school produces any special skills that are valued by firms beyond those that are produced by a general high school education.” Gustman and Steinmeier (1981) further argue that “the lack of any measurable impact of vocational training on subsequent earnings may occur either because the programs are not producing useful skills or because supply adjustments have eliminated the earnings advantage for vocational program graduates.” Using data from the National Longitudinal Study of 1972, Meyer and Wise (1982) find no effect of secondary vocational education on wages after high school. Kang and Bishop (1989), on the other hand, find that vocational courses increase wages for men. Others believe that a job-training match raises wages; if graduates of vocational programs work in the fields for which they are trained, they will receive a premium. Fredland and Little (1980) find that “those who use their vocational training receive long-term premiums. Those who took training but report not using it appear to earn no premiums, indicating that the training effects are job-specific.”

Mane (1999) compares the short and medium-run returns to vocational coursetaking for students who graduated high school in 1972, 1980, and 1992, and finds that these returns grew much higher after the 1970s. Bishop and Mane (2004) examine literature on the effects of secondary vocational education and find evidence that this return has been growing, possibly because “the skill needs of business were growing and shifting very rapidly during the 1980s and 90s,” and because this type of education has become more effective. Bishop and Mane’s comprehensive study uses the same data set as this paper and finds positive effects on income for vocational study, indicating “that those who trained for specific occupations were more successful in the labor market.” They address the problem of selection bias by including “as many personal and school characteristics as possible,” though this method may not completely address the issue.

It is difficult to have complete faith in the above results, though; Gamoran and Mare (1989) rightly note that “[s]tandard models may fail to disentangle track effects from preexisting differences among students.” Selection bias most likely plays a large role in confounding the relationship between secondary vocational training and wages. One careful attempt to correct for selection is by Hotchkiss (1993), who finds “only modest evidence of selection bias.” However, his exclusionary restrictions include variables such as perceived college ability and time spent on homework, which may be indicators of ability that do not satisfy the exogeneity criteria necessary to exclude them from the income equation.

Kulik (1998) writes that “there is an achievement gap at the start of high school between students who elect different programs.” Some argue that tracking only serves to reinforce these differences, but Slavin (1990) counters that students in different tracks

differ too much in aptitude to make any such comparisons meaningful. Alexander and Cook (1982) find that actual choice of track has little effect on academic achievement once ability is controlled, and Grasso and Shea (1979) do not find significant effects on earnings based on self-reported educational track. Gamoran and Mare (1989) note that it is likely that “students differ in their academic goals and in the environment in which they learn best.” Kulik’s conclusion is telling:

These regression comparisons are inadequate, however, and their results are misleading. It is important to note that the groups being compared differ profoundly in educational aspirations at the start of high school. Students usually follow college-prep programs because they intend to go to college; students often follow vocational programs because they do not intend to go to college. The goals of the two groups seem almost by definition to be non-overlapping.

Gamoran (1998) argues that academic courses may “nurture general cognitive abilities,” which in turn “aid performance in the workplace.” Moreover, there may be a stigma attached to vocational education. Arum and Shavit (1995) point out that “[p]otential employers, who want to cut training costs by recruiting fast-learning employees, may interpret the choice of a vocational track as evidence of a lower level of general aptitude.” On the other hand, “vocational credentials may indeed send signals to employers about applicants’ characteristics, but these signals may be positive (for example, that the applicants have a favorable disposition toward technical and/or manual work).” Self-selection into a vocational track as opposed to a general one may serve as a signal of determination and focus; the Department of Education (2000) finds that “[v]ocational concentrators were more likely than their other/general peers to obtain a degree or certificate within two years, despite the fact that the two groups enrolled at similar rates in community colleges and that vocational concentrators were more likely to be employed while in school.” Arum and Shavit argue that while vocational education may inhibit future edu-



cational and occupational plans for some students, “it also serves as a safety net for those high school graduates who are unlikely to go to college” and “vocational education teaches students marketable skills and attitudes that can help them find skilled jobs and reduce their risk of unemployment or employment as low-paid unskilled workers.”

In response to arguments that vocational tracking is discriminatory or coercive, Kulik (1998) finds evidence that “personal preference seems to be the most important determinant of curricular track” and “[t]he percentage of vocational students reporting that they were free to choose their track was similar to the percentage of preparatory students claiming that they had a choice.” Moreover, vocational programs may have the added benefit of dropout prevention; Kulik goes on to write that “[t]he evidence shows that vocational programs help keep students in high school. Without vocational programs, more at-risk students would drop out of school each year than currently do.”

While many studies attempt to account for ability, there are clear pitfalls to simply including these controls. Willis and Rosen (1979) note that “merely partitioning observed earnings into schooling and ability components does not use any of the restrictions imposed on the data” by, in our case, different track choices. Gamoran (1998) writes that unobserved differences among students as well as imperfect measures of ability will lead to biased results that overestimate the effects of academic tracking. We strive to avoid these biases.

### **3. DATA**

The data for this project are drawn from the 1992 and 2000 waves of the National Education Longitudinal Survey of 1988 (NELS:88). NELS:88 sampled eighth graders in 1988, with follow-ups in 1990, 1992, 1994 and 2000. In 1992, the sample was updated to

represent the high school class of 1992. The 1992 wave also sampled school administrators, providing data that is of great interest. We do not address income data from 1994 as a large part of the sample was still in postsecondary schooling, whereas by 2000 most sample members were eight years out of high school. Unfortunately, NELS:88 does not sample area and regional vocational schools. This is worrisome, as many of those who are targeted for or select into vocational education, and therefore who may most benefit from it, are not included in the sample. This may bias estimates of the return to vocational education downwards.

The initial sample consists of 12,144 individuals. Those with missing covariates, transcript data, and income in the 2000 wave are dropped, leaving 9,070 observations. 39 income outliers whose values seem anomalous are also dropped, as are 530 observations reporting zero income. Dropping those observations which have missing values for the exogenous selectors used in this paper would leave only 4,524 respondents. This would not be a sufficient number to divide the vocational track into technical and business components, a key contribution of this paper. The majority of these variables are administrator-reported and have high, non-overlapping non-response rates. In order to preserve the larger sample, we create dummy variables corresponding to the missing observations. There is no reason to believe that these observations with missing data are different from the others, since, except for socioeconomic status, the non-response originates with the school's administrators rather than the respondents themselves. None of these missing variables is correlated in any meaningful way with our income variable or track choice.<sup>1</sup> We also drop 1,644 students whose transcripts report not achieving the National Assess-

---

<sup>1</sup> The highest correlation, 0.057, is between being on the technical track and missing the indicator for offering Advanced Placement classes. The large majority of these correlations are under 0.03.

ment of Educational Progress's definition of general (often called "academic"), academic (often called "rigorous academic" or "college preparatory"), or vocational tracks. The requirements of the general track (twelve total Carnegie units in English, social studies, math, and science) and the vocational tracks (three total Carnegie units in a specific vocational field) are quite low, below the graduation requirements of many states. It stands to reason that those who do not achieve them are fundamentally different from the balance of the sample and, if included, may confound the estimates. Using the NAEP track definitions, we divide our sample into general, academic, technical, and business tracks. The technical track consists of those who achieve three or more Carnegie units in agricultural, technical, trade, and health-related fields, while the business track includes those with three or more Carnegie units in business and office, marketing, and occupational home economics fields. The results do not differ greatly when students concentrating on health-related vocational education are placed on the business track. Kang and Bishop (1986) provide support for a division along these lines; they find that there are differential effects to vocational coursetaking, depending on the type of classes.

We are left with 6,857 observations, of whom 4,050 are on the general track (59.1%), 1,714 are on the academic track (25.0%), 583 are on the technical track (8.5%), and 510 are on the business track (7.4%). Students who fulfill the requirements for both a vocational and either the general or academic track are listed as being on the particular vocational track. 27 respondents who fulfill the requirements for both the business and technical track are assigned to the technical track; assigning them to the business track does not alter the results. Including those who met the standards for both a vocational and the academic track in the academic track does not alter the nature of the results in any

significant way. Moving those who meet the standards for both a vocational and the general track to the general track leaves too few observations for meaningful estimation.

A description of the variables used in our estimation, along with weighted summary statistics, can be found in Table 1. Income data is reported in 1999 dollars and parental education data uses the parent with higher reported education. Tables 2a through 2d contain summary statistics broken down by track type.

#### **4. ECONOMETRIC SPECIFICATION**

In order to account for selection bias in track choice and its subsequent effects on income, we use a multinomial logit selection model that is described in Bourguignon, Fournier, and Gurgand (2001).<sup>2</sup> Their model generalizes Lee (1983)'s original extension of the Heckman (1979) selection model. The Lee model makes very strict assumptions regarding the error structure between the first and second stages. As Bourguignon, Fournier, and Gurgand explain, the main implication of these assumptions is that the “unobservable determinants of the choice of [an] alternative against any other alternative should be correlated in the same direction with the unobservable determinants of [that] outcome.” This seems antithetical to our model. As a hypothetical example, assume that the unobservables that make one more likely to choose the technical track over the academic track consist of academic ambition and are negatively correlated with the unobservables for the technical track income equation, which consist of mechanical abilities. Lee's model would assume, then, that the unobservables that drive students to choose the technical track over the general track, such as interest in learning a trade, would be nega-

---

<sup>2</sup> The paper is available at <http://www.crest.fr/pageperso/lmi/gurgand/selmlog.htm>, along with a version of the Stata ado file used for estimation.

tively correlated with those same unobservables regarding mechanical abilities. Moreover, the Lee assumption implies that these correlations are identical when the first stage is estimated using the multinomial logit model. Altogether, these assumptions do not seem accurate in our case and would render the results meaningless.

For brevity, only the framework of the Bourguignon, Fournier, and Gurgand model will be reproduced here:

$$(1) \begin{aligned} Y_i &= X\beta_i + \mu_i \\ S_j^* &= Z\delta_j + \eta_j \quad j = 1 \dots M \end{aligned}$$

where  $Y_i$  is log income for each individual, observed for category  $i$  of  $M$  alternatives (general, academic, technical or business track) if  $S_i^* > \max_{j \neq i} S_j^*$ . The individual subscript is suppressed.  $X$  contains covariates for race, gender, region, and parental education, while  $Z$  contains these variables along with socioeconomic status, whether vocational courses are offered at the school, whether the school has a formal vocational department, whether the school offers Advanced Placement classes, and indicators for the proportion of the previous year's class that attended a two- or four-year college.  $X$  does not include variables such as work experience or achieved education since these covariates may not only be endogenous, but, as Willis and Rosen (1979) point out, "it is more in the spirit of the choice framework of the model to allow these 'current' events to be captured indirectly via their correlations with included variables in order to estimate expected or anticipated results."

If the unobservables that drive track selection also affect income, then the error terms  $\mu_i$  and  $\eta_1 \dots \eta_M$  will not be independent, rendering least squares estimates of a standard income equation inconsistent. Bourguignon, Fournier, and Gurgand show that, under

the assumption that  $\mu_i$ , the error of the track  $i$  income equation, and a normal transformation of each  $\eta_j$ , represented as  $\eta_j^*$ , are linearly related (which is true, for example, under the assumption that  $\mu_i$  is normal and  $\mu_i$  and  $\eta_j^*$  are bivariate normal), it is straightforward to correct for selection bias. The expectation of  $\mu_i$  can be written as

$$(2) E[\mu_i | \eta_1 \dots \eta_M] = \sigma_i \sum_{j=1}^M r_j^* \eta_j^*$$

where  $\sigma_i$  is the standard deviation of  $\mu_i$  and  $r_j^*$  is the correlation between  $\mu_i$  and each  $\eta_j^*$ . Under this assumption, a multinomial logit first stage can be used to create selection parameters as in (3), for each  $s$  signifying track, and  $G$ ,  $A$ ,  $T$ , and  $B$  corresponding to the

$$(3) E\left[\mu_i \left| S_i^* > \max_{j \neq i} S_j^* \right.\right] = \alpha_G^i \cdot M_G^i + \alpha_A^i \cdot M_A^i + \alpha_T^i \cdot M_T^i + \alpha_B^i \cdot M_B^i$$

general, academic, technical, and business tracks, respectively. The superscripts represent the track being estimated, while the subscripts refer to the element of the correction term corresponding to that particular track. Each  $\alpha$  is composed of  $\sigma_i$  and  $r_j^*$  as in (2). The  $M$  terms are the conditional expectations of  $\eta_j^*$ , estimates of which are computed numerically. This framework is well-suited to our purposes in that it not only provides adequate selectivity correction, but can be used to form counterfactuals. Namely, this model allows us to examine what  $Y$  would have been for someone who chose, for example, the technical track if they had actually chosen the academic track. For that case, we wish to find

$$(4) E\left[Y_A \left| S_T^* > \max_{j \neq T} S_j^* \right.\right] = E\left[X\beta_A \left| S_T^* > \max_{j \neq T} S_j^* \right.\right] + E\left[\mu_A \left| S_T^* > \max_{j \neq T} S_j^* \right.\right]$$

Using the assumption of a linear relationship between the error terms in (1), this can be rewritten as

$$(5) E\left[Y_A \left| S_T^* > \max_{j \neq T} S_j^* \right.\right] = E\left[X\beta_A \left| S_T^* > \max_{j \neq T} S_j^* \right.\right] + \alpha_G^A \cdot M_G^T + \alpha_A^A \cdot M_A^T + \alpha_T^A \cdot M_T^T + \alpha_B^A \cdot M_B^T$$

The coefficients  $\alpha$  are drawn from the estimates of the hypothetically chosen track (in this case, academic), while the selection terms  $M$  are drawn from the estimates of the actually chosen track (in this case, technical). In this manner, we can compare alternative outcomes for the subgroups that choose each track. If the income from a counterfactual choice is lower than that from the actual choice, then this can be taken as evidence of comparative advantage.

## 5. ANALYSIS

### 5.1 Preliminary Issues

Most previous studies divide students into three tracks (academic, general, and vocational), but this is a source of contention. Arum and Shavit (1995) argue that, while “this simplification is an appropriate technique for examining curricular effects on levels of educational attainment, it tends to distort the analysis of occupational outcomes, since different vocational programs prepare students for distinct types of employment opportunities.” Due to a limited sample size, dividing programs more finely than ‘technical’ and ‘business’ is not feasible. This precludes us from directly examining the training-job match question; namely, the argument that vocational training is only useful when it feeds into a job with relevant skills. However, splitting vocational education into two fairly distinct types enables us to more thoroughly explore its benefits.

Another issue is the use of self-reported versus transcript-reported tracks. Gamoran (1987) notes that “student track perceptions may be exactly what is called for... Because high school students typically have some choice in the courses they select, students’ perceptions of their curricular programs are likely to govern their learning opportunities as much if not more than the school’s view.” However, Rosenbaum (1980) points

out that students “often misperceive their tracks” and that this can “be an obstacle that frustrates their plans.” The former observation is borne out by the data; a significant number of students who report themselves as being on the academic track have not, in fact, achieved the necessary credits to be considered on that track. We feel that actual achievement is most likely to have an effect on future occupations and income; therefore, we use transcript-reported track in the senior year. Bishop and Mane (2004) concur, stating that “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.” While Vanfossen *et al.* (1987) point out that “vocational-track students who reach twelfth grade constitute a more able and more select subset of those who had initially been placed on that track,” using an earlier measure not only ignores those who change tracks but requires reliance on less complete transcript data. Gamoran (1987) finds evidence that “senior track positions carry greater significance” than earlier choices, further vindicating this decision.

### 5.2 Exclusionary Restrictions

In order to identify the model, it is helpful to include exogenous variables that affect track choice but not outcome variables directly in addition to the nonlinearity inherent in this framework. To that end, we use the following variables, with associated dummies for missing observations, in the first stage of the selection model:

- Whether vocational classes are taken at the school, as reported by administrators
- Whether the school has full-time vocational teachers, as reported by administrators
- Whether the school offers Advanced Placement courses, as reported by administrators
- Whether more than a quarter of the previous year’s graduating high school class went on to a two year college, as reported by administrators
- Whether more than a quarter of the previous year’s graduating high school class went on to a four year school, as reported by administrators
- Socioeconomic quartile, a composite variable in the NELS data set comprised of information on parental income, education, occupation, and standard of living.



These variables, including the missing observation dummies, are jointly significant ( $\text{Chi}^2$  with 42 d.f. = 177.76; p-value = 0.000) in the first stage of the selection model, where track choice is on the left hand side. With the exception of the Advanced Placement indicator, each individual variable combined with its missing indicator counterpart is significant as well. Such mechanical tests of suitability are insufficient, though; a theoretical justification must be made.

Card (2000) notes that, in education, “variables from the supply side are an obvious source of identifying information for estimating demand-side parameters.” If vocational classes are taken at the school as opposed to a district or regional center, students can be expected to be more likely to follow the vocational track. After all, it is far more difficult to take specialized classes if they are only offered away from the school. Full-time vocational teachers may be an indicator of the accessibility and quality of vocational education at that school and thus an influence on the propensity to follow that track. The availability of Advanced Placement classes is likely to influence students to follow the academic track, since these courses are tailored to the college-bound. Their mere presence also serves as an indication of the overall academic atmosphere of the school, which – while exogenous to a single individual – may affect the student’s perspective on track choice. This also holds true for the indicators regarding college attendance for the class of 1991, the class previous to the one observed in this data set. If a significant proportion of older students go to college, it can be expected to enhance awareness and desirability of the college preparatory track.

These factors can plausibly be argued to be indicators of a school's quality, which may, in turn, affect income. However, none of the above variables are significant with

their missing counterpart in the naïve regression for log income; all the variables together are jointly insignificant as well (F-test with 10 and 6832 d.f. = 1.27; p-value = 0.2404). Once actual track choice (and demographic variables) are controlled, income is not affected by these indirect mechanisms.

Finally, the composite family socioeconomic status variable provides a source of information about the student's background, which is likely to influence track choice. Wealthier, better educated parents in higher-status occupations are likely to push their children onto the college preparatory track, *ceteris paribus*. One can posit that parental variables affect income in a manner other than directly through education choice. However, in the naïve regression, parental education is just jointly insignificant at the five percent level (F-test with 4 and 6842 d.f. = 2.26; p-value = 0.0599). When socioeconomic status quartile (and its missing counterpart) is included in this regression, the variables are also just jointly insignificant at the five percent level (F-test with 4 and 6838 d.f. = 2.18; p-value = 0.0682). More importantly, the individual effects are relatively small. The indicator for top SES quartile (compared to bottom SES quartile) is 8.3% with a standard error of 6.8%; by comparison, the coefficient on the gender indicator for male is 30.3% percent and that on being white is 10.8%. The second and third quartile coefficients are smaller. There is no strong evidence to suggest that parental socioeconomic status has a large effect on outcomes eight years after high school graduation.

The weighted multinomial logit first stage of the selection model is reported in Table 3.

### 5.3 Log Income

We first turn to the effects of track choice on income. A *prima facie* examination of the data shows that those on either vocational track earn substantially less than those on the academic track. From the naïve regression with no selection correction in Table 4, we see that being on the technical track is associated with a significant 11.4% lower income relative to being on the academic track, but the difference with the general track is an insignificant 1.9%. The business track is associated with 15.8% lower earnings than the academic track and 2.6% lower earnings than the general track, though this latter difference is not statistically significant. It remains to be seen, though, whether those who were on the technical and business tracks would have done better had they chosen an alternate path.

Using our multinomial logit selection model to account for these unobservable differences, we can create counterfactual scenarios to go along with the actual predicted outcomes. The results of the models are in Tables 5a through 5d, while the conditional means are reproduced in Table 6. For consistency, the conditional means for the actual outcomes are drawn from the selection model. As would be expected if the model is correctly specified, they reproduce the naïve results almost exactly. Constructing these estimates as described in Section 4, log income for those on the technical track would have been 3.7% less had they been on the academic track, 3.8% less had they been on the general track, and 10.9% less had they been on the business track. All differences are statistically significant and can be taken as evidence of comparative advantage; namely, those that are most suited to the technical track tend to gravitate towards that choice and are best off there. On the other hand, those on the business track have a log income that is

7.1% and 10.1% lower than the one they would have had on the general and academic tracks, respectively. They do, however, see a comparative gain of 11.0% over an alternative choice of the technical track. This seems to indicate that students who follow a non-technical vocational path would benefit from increased academic rigor, and perhaps suffer from developing specific white collar skills, as opposed to general cognitive skills. Nevertheless, they tend to be unsuited for the technical track, providing further evidence of the importance of different types of ability. Log income for those on the academic track would be 18.0% less had they been on the technical track and 15.9% less had they been on the business track. This is not surprising, since students who concentrate on college preparatory material are probably unsuited to more labor-intensive work or more limiting types of office work. The general track counterfactual log income for those on the academic track is 3.5% lower, a significant difference but much smaller than that for the vocational tracks, as would be expected if students on the academic track benefit from developing general skills. Consistent with the argument that students are not well served by developing specific white collar skills (as opposed to a trade), the counterfactual log income for the business track is 7.4% lower than the observed general track log income, a significant difference. Those on the general track, however, would expect a significant 9.5% higher log income if they had chosen the technical track. This may be an indication that students who are less likely to be college bound or less well-matched for jobs that require more education would benefit from more technical education. Due to error on their own part or through societal pressure and lack of opportunities, these students are avoiding from a path that may greatly benefit them.

#### 5.4 Demographic Comparative Advantage

It is of great interest to ascertain whether certain demographic groups gain relatively more from different tracks. To that end, conditional means for both actual and counterfactual outcomes are calculated in Tables 7 and 8 for a number of different groups. Men benefit far more from the technical track than women do. Women, in fact, have a higher counterfactual wage for the academic and general tracks than the actual expected wage. It should be noted, though, that there are only 94 women in the sample on the technical track. The expected technical income premium for those on the general track is significantly larger for men than for women and the expected technical income loss for those on the academic track is significantly smaller. Examining the gender coefficient in Tables 5a through 5d confirms this finding. This coefficient is not significant for the academic track, while it is quite large and significant for the general and business tracks, and in particular the technical track.

Whites tend to benefit more from the technical track than blacks as well. Blacks have a significantly higher counterfactual wage for the academic track than the actual expected wage and the general track expected wage is insignificantly different. Moreover, their premium (in absolute terms) over the business track is significantly lower than that of white students. The technical wage for white technical students is 4.0% higher than the expected academic wage, as compared to 1.3% lower for blacks. The counterfactuals for blacks on the business track indicate that these students would be far better served by focusing on the academic or general tracks. This may be due to different perceptions of the abilities of those on the technical track. Following the arguments in Arum and Shavit (1995), whites may be perceived as taking technical courses because of mechanical skills

and ambition in related fields, whereas blacks may be falsely perceived as being under-achievers shunted to a “lower” track.

Altogether, it seems that technical education is best serving those who are already committed to it, while those on the business track would be better served by focusing on more general skills. This is by no means a proposition that white males be pushed towards the technical track to the exclusion of others, merely an observation that certain demographic groups seem to benefit from different educational plans.

### 5.5 Alternative Specifications

We estimate a number of variations on our basic model in order to assess the robustness of the results. Full results from this section are available upon request.

#### 5.5.1 Public School Only

It can reasonably be argued that students in private schools differ in unobservable ways from students in public schools. Parents may be choosing a private school with regard to their child’s ability, meaning that the exclusionary restrictions discussed above are not as valid. Moreover, from a policy perspective, it may be more interesting to examine track choice solely for public school students. To that end, we estimate the model for the 5,864 respondents meeting the criteria described in section 3 who attended a public school. The results do not differ qualitatively from the main specification, providing additional support for the exclusionary restrictions. However, there are some shifts in magnitude. Actual technical track log income is now 1.4% higher than expected academic track log income for those on the technical track, though this difference is still significant; the premium over expected general track log income is increased to 5.1%, also significant. The advantage of those on the academic track over expected technical track log income is

reduced to 8.2%, from 18.0%, though this amount remains highly significant. As for the business track, the disadvantage relative to counterfactual general track log income falls to a significant 2.3%, from 7.1%, while the advantage relative to the counterfactual technical track log income rises to 19.3%, from 11.0%. The overall conclusions remain unchanged: there is strong evidence of comparative advantage in track choice.

### 5.5.2 Specific Occupations

We include indicators corresponding to occupations that can be assumed to be well-suited to vocational education in the two-stage models. While this specification is plagued by the same selection bias issues that affect track choice, this exercise can be viewed as an attempt to account for the job-training match. The occupations included in the business indicator include, among others, secretaries, business support services, and computer operators, while occupations included in the technical indicator include construction, manufacturing, and repair services. Each category forms approximately 14% of the sample. 34.4% of those on the technical track have an occupation included in the technical indicator, while 18.9% of those on the business track have an occupation included in that indicator. Both variables are positive and significant in the naïve specification. The technical occupation indicator is associated with an 11.6% (standard error: 3.4%) increase in wages, while the business occupation indicator is associated with an 11.2% (standard error: 3.7%) increase; these coefficients are statistically indistinguishable from each other. In the two-stage estimates, the technical indicator is small (3.4%, standard error: 5.6%) and has no significant effect on the wages of those who chose the academic track. However, the business indicator is positive and significant (12.5%, standard error: 4.5%). While those with a strong academic background should be expected to

perform well in business-oriented occupations, this premium is not much larger than that found in the naïve specification, controlling for track choice. For the general track, the technical indicator is positive and significant (11.3%, standard error: 4.3%), but it is not significantly greater than the insignificant business indicator (8.9%, standard error: 5.2%). Again, however, these premiums are not very different than those found in the naïve specification. As expected, the technical occupation indicator is very large and significant for those on the technical track (20.7%, standard error: 7.7%), while the business occupation indicator is not significant (11.9%, standard error: 15.3%), and again is not very different from the premium found in the naïve specification. Also, as expected, the business occupation indicator is very large and significant for those on the business track (18.3%, standard error: 6.9%), while the technical occupation indicator is not significant and, again, not very different from the naïve specification (11.2%, standard error: 7.8%). The nature of the counterfactual estimates is unaltered by the inclusion of this indicator. This result provides some confirmation for the job-training match hypothesis, in that even after controlling for a number of other factors, occupational choice provides an unusually large premium for those on the related track.

### 5.5.3 Ability Controls

In their seminal study of selection bias in education, Willis and Rosen (1979) include ability controls in the second stage of estimation. While the pitfalls of this method have been discussed above, it is still instructive to attempt it. We include indicators corresponding to the quartiles of a composite standardized test including reading and math taken by all respondents in 1988. These measures were taken in the eighth grade, before students had chosen their secondary school tracks and therefore before this choice could



have influenced their perceptions, abilities, or plans. Including these ability controls alters the counterfactual results in only two significant ways; the hypothetical technical track income for those who actually chose the business track is now higher than the true outcome, and the hypothetical academic track income for those who actually chose the general track is now slightly lower than the true outcome. Both differences are significant; the latter provides more evidence for comparative advantage, while the former provides more evidence for the importance of learning trade skills. It is important, though, to note the limitations of these measures. Mechanical ability and dexterity, which are not measured by standardized tests, may be more important to those who choose the technical track and apply their training to more manually-oriented occupations.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

We have used the National Educational Longitudinal Survey of 1988 to examine the returns to secondary vocational education in the United States. Using methods that account for self-selection in track choice, we find that those on the technical track are not likely to earn more had they chosen differently. Moreover, students on a general or non-college-preparatory track are likely to benefit from at least some technical education. The evidence points to comparative advantage in track selection: those on the technical track are best off there, and those on the academic track are best off following that path. The average student on the business track is, for the most part, better served by focusing on more general education.

This study only examines gross effects of track. With additional data, it would be possible to divide vocational education more finely than the relatively crude ‘technical’ and ‘business’ tracks examine the differential returns in that manner. This would also al-

low further research into the hypothesized training-occupation match premium, for which we found some preliminary evidence. Moreover, investigating the marginal effect of both academic and vocational credits may be of use as well. It is possible that there are incremental benefits to vocational education.

The path of income over time is of great interest as well. It may be that later in life, the vocational premium is diminished and that a life-cycle income maximizing strategy is different from the one found here. Due to the nature of our data, we are only able to examine income not long after high school graduation.

The effect of the information revolution on vocational education is worth mentioning. As formerly high-skill technology jobs become accessible to those with less education, vocational education should adapt so as to help those students who most benefit from it. As Jacobs and Grubb (2003) state, “to prepare students for high-paid, challenging employment, vocational education must take account of the ‘knowledge revolution.’” In any case, whether it serves as a “safety net” or an alternate path for those with different skills and interest, vocational education should not be stigmatized as a lesser or demeaning option.

## REFERENCES

- Adler, Mortimer. Paideia Problems and Possibilities. New York: Macmillan. 1983.
- Alexander, Karl L., and Martha A. Cook. 1982. "Curricula and Coursework: A Surprise Ending to a Familiar Story." *American Sociological Review*, October 1982. 626-640.
- Arum, Richard and Yossi Shavit. "Secondary Vocational Education and the Transition from School to Work." *Sociology of Education*, July 1995, 187-204
- Bishop, John H. and Ferran Mane. "The Impacts of Career-Technical Education on High School Labor Market Success." *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 23, No. 4. 381-402.
- Bourguignon, Francois, Martin Fournier and Marc Gurgand. "Selection Bias Corrections Based on the Multinomial Logit Model: Monte Carlo Comparisons." Draft, September 2004.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. <http://data.bls.gov/labjava/outside.jsp?survey=nc>.
- Card, David. "Estimating the Return to Schooling: Progress on Some Persistent Econometric Problems." NBER Working Paper No. 7769.
- Department of Education. "Vocational Education in the United States: Toward the Year 2000." NCES 2000-029. February 2000.
- Fredland, Roger and J. Eric Little. "Long-Term Returns to Vocational Training: Evidence from Military Sources." *Journal of Human Resources*, Winter 1980, 49-66.
- Gamoran, Adam. "The Stratification of High School Learning Opportunities." *Sociology of Education*, July 1987, 135-155.
- Gamoran, Adam. "The Impact of Academic Course Work on Labor Market Outcomes for Youth Who Do Not Attend College." *The Quality of Vocational Education*, June 1998.
- Gamoran, Adam and Robert D. Mare. "Secondary School Tracking and Educational Inequality: Compensation, Reinforcement, or Neutrality?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 94:5, March 1989, 1146-1183.
- Goodlad, John. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1984.
- Grasso, John and John Shea. "Vocational Education and Training: Impact on Youth." Berkeley: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. 1979.
- Gustman, Alan and Thomas Steinmeier. "The Relation Between Vocational Training in High School and Economic Outcomes." NBER Working Paper No. 478.

Gustman, Alan and Thomas Steinmeier. "Labor Markets and Evaluations of Vocational Training Programs in the Public High Schools" NBER Working Paper No. 648.

Heckman, James. "Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error." *Econometrica*, January 1979, 153-162.

Hotchkiss, Lawrence. "Effects of Training, Occupation, and Training-Occupation Match on Wage." *Journal of Human Resources*. Summer 1993. 482-496.

Jacobs, James and W. Norton Grubb. "The Federal Role in Vocational-Technical Education." Community College Research Center Brief, March 2003.

Kang, Suk and John Bishop. "Effects of Curriculum on Labor Market Success Immediately After High School." *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, Vol 23, No. 4. 15-29.

Kang, Suk and John Bishop. "Vocational and Academic Education in High School: Complements or Substitutes?" *Economics of Education Review*. Vol. 8, No. 2. 133-148.

Krueger, Dirk and Krishna B. Kumar. "Skill Specific Rather than General Education: A Reason for US-Europe Growth Differences." NBER Working Paper 9408.

Kulik, James. "Curricular Tracks and High School Vocational Education." *The Quality of Vocational Education*, June 1998.

Lee, Lung-Fei. "Generalized Econometric Models with Selectivity." *Econometrica*, March 1983, 507-512.

Mane, Ferran. "Trends in the Payoff to Academic and Occupation-Specific Skills: The Short and Medium Run Returns to Academic and Vocational High School Courses for Non-College-Bound Students." *Economics of Education Review*. Vol. 18, No. 4. 417-437.

Mertens, D.M., McElwain, D., Garcia, G., and M. Whitmore. "The Effects of Participating in Vocational Education: Summary of Studies Reported Since 1968." National Center for Research on Vocational Education. 1980

Mertens, D. M., and J.A. Gardner. "Vocational Education and the Younger Adult Worker." National Center for Research in Vocational Education. 1981.

Meyer, Robert and David Wise. "High School Preparation and Early Labor Force Experience." NBER Working Paper No. 32, May 1979.

Neuman, Shoshana and Adrian Ziderman. "Vocational Education in Israel: Wage Effects of the VocEd-Occupation Match." *Journal of Human Resources*, 34:2, Spring 1999, 407-420.

Rosenbaum, James. "Track Misperceptions and Frustrated College Plans: An Analysis of the Effects of Tracks and Track Misperceptions in the National Longitudinal Survey." *Sociology of Education*, April 1980, 74-88.

Vanfossen, Beth, James Jones, and Joan Spade. "Curriculum Tracking and Status Maintenance." *Sociology of Education*, April 1987, 104-122.

Willis, Robert and Sherwin Rosen. "Education and Self-Selection." *Journal of Political Economy*, October 1979, S7-S36.

Table 1  
Weighted Summary Statistics

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
General	Respondent's transcript indicates general track in 1992	0.5776	0.4940
Academic	Respondent's transcript indicates academic track in 1992	0.2513	0.4338
Technical	Respondent's transcript indicates technical track in 1992	0.1017	0.3023
Business	Respondent's transcript indicates business track in 1992	0.0693	0.2540
LnInc99	Log income in 1999	10.03	0.7315
Hispanic	Respondent is Hispanic	0.0792	0.2701
Black	Respondent is black	0.1108	0.3139
White	Respondent is white	0.7628	0.4254
Male	Respondent is male	0.5239	0.4995
Neast	Respondent lives in the northeast Census region	0.2024	0.4018
Midwest	Respondent lives in the midwest Census region	0.2706	0.4443
West	Respondent lives in the west Census region	0.1684	0.3743
ParHS	Respondent's best-educated parent had a high school degree by 1992	0.1775	0.3821
ParSomeColl	Respondent's best-educated parent attended some college by 1992	0.4148	0.4927
ParColl	Respondent's best-educated parent had a college degree by 1992	0.1860	0.3891
ParPro	Respondent's best-educated parent had a professional degree by 1992	0.1553	0.3622
VocSchl	Vocational classes were taught in the school	0.6380	0.4806
MissVocSchl	VocSchl variable is missing	0.1601	0.3667
FullTeach	Respondent's school had full-time vocational education teachers	0.7816	0.4132
MissFullTeach	FullTeach variable is missing	0.1004	0.3005
OfferAP	School offered Advanced Placement classes	0.7749	0.4176
MissOfferAP	OfferAP variable is missing	0.0291	0.1680
QtrFour	Quarter or more of 1991 graduating class went to a four-year school	0.6838	0.4650
MissQtrFour	QtrFour variable is missing	0.1196	0.3245
QtrTwo	Quarter or more of 1991 graduating class went to a two-year school	0.2650	0.4414
MissQtrTwo	QtrTwo variable is missing	0.1380	0.3449
Missing SES	Socioeconomic status is missing	0.1010	0.3013

Table 2a  
Weighted Summary Statistics: General Track

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
LnInc99	Log income in 1999	9.995	0.764
Hispanic	Respondent is Hispanic	0.0847	0.2785
Black	Respondent is black	0.1153	0.3194
White	Respondent is white	0.7491	0.4336
Male	Respondent is male	0.5159	0.4998
Neast	Respondent lives in the northeast Census region	0.1847	0.3881
Midwest	Respondent lives in the midwest Census region	0.2656	0.4417
West	Respondent lives in the west Census region	0.2078	0.4058
ParHS	Respondent's best-educated parent had a high school degree by 1992	0.1688	0.3746
ParSomeColl	Respondent's best-educated parent attended some college by 1992	0.4171	0.4931
ParColl	Respondent's best-educated parent had a college degree by 1992	0.1890	0.3915
ParPro	Respondent's best-educated parent had a professional degree by 1992	0.1663	0.3724
VocSchl	Vocational classes were taught in the school	0.6336	0.4819
MissVocSchl	VocSchl variable is missing	0.1630	0.3694
FullTeach	Respondent's school had full-time vocational education teachers	0.7795	0.4147
MissFullTeach	FullTeach variable is missing	0.0989	0.2986
OfferAP	School offered Advanced Placement classes	0.7852	0.4107
MissOfferAP	OfferAP variable is missing	0.0255	0.1576
QtrFour	Quarter or more of 1991 graduating class went to a four-year school	0.6889	0.4630
MissQtrFour	QtrFour variable is missing	0.1122	0.3156
QtrTwo	Quarter or more of 1991 graduating class went to a two-year school	0.2986	0.4577
MissQtrTwo	QtrTwo variable is missing	0.1304	0.3368
SES 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quart	Respondent's family is in 2 <sup>nd</sup> socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.2328	0.4227
SES 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quart	Respondent's family is in 3 <sup>rd</sup> socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.2395	0.4269
SES Top Quart	Respondent's family is in top socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.2243	0.4172
Missing SES	Socioeconomic status is missing	0.1116	0.3150

Table 2b  
Weighted Summary Statistics: Academic Track

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
LnInc99	Log income in 1999	10.13	0.6464
Hispanic	Respondent is Hispanic	0.0709	0.2568
Black	Respondent is black	0.0995	0.2994
White	Respondent is white	0.7853	0.4108
Male	Respondent is male	0.4694	0.4992
Neast	Respondent lives in the northeast Census region	0.2574	0.4373
Midwest	Respondent lives in the midwest Census region	0.2439	0.4296
West	Respondent lives in the west Census region	0.1227	0.3282
ParHS	Respondent's best-educated parent had a high school degree by 1992	0.1160	0.3204
ParSomeColl	Respondent's best-educated parent attended some college by 1992	0.3924	0.4884
ParColl	Respondent's best-educated parent had a college degree by 1992	0.2415	0.4281
ParPro	Respondent's best-educated parent had a professional degree by 1992	0.2089	0.4066
VocSchl	Vocational classes were taught in the school	0.6045	0.4891
MissVocSchl	VocSchl variable is missing	0.1589	0.3657
FullTeach	Respondent's school had full-time vocational education teachers	0.7397	0.4389
MissFullTeach	FullTeach variable is missing	0.1077	0.3100
OfferAP	School offered Advanced Placement classes	0.7902	0.4073
MissOfferAP	OfferAP variable is missing	0.0299	0.1704
QtrFour	Quarter or more of 1991 graduating class went to a four-year school	0.7301	0.4441
MissQtrFour	QtrFour variable is missing	0.1216	0.3269
QtrTwo	Quarter or more of 1991 graduating class went to a two-year school	0.2093	0.4070
MissQtrTwo	QtrTwo variable is missing	0.1461	0.3534
SES 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quart	Respondent's family is in 2 <sup>nd</sup> socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.2198	0.4142
SES 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quart	Respondent's family is in 3 <sup>rd</sup> socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.2745	0.4464
SES Top Quart	Respondent's family is in top socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.3105	0.4628
Missing SES	Socioeconomic status is missing	0.0718	0.2582



Table 2c  
Weighted Summary Statistics: Technical Track

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
LnInc99	Log income in 1999	10.10	0.7502
Hispanic	Respondent is Hispanic	0.0485	0.2150
Black	Respondent is black	0.1064	0.3086
White	Respondent is white	0.8079	0.3943
Male	Respondent is male	0.8444	0.3628
Neast	Respondent lives in the northeast Census region	0.2033	0.4028
Midwest	Respondent lives in the midwest Census region	0.3151	0.4650
West	Respondent lives in the west Census region	0.1029	0.3041
ParHS	Respondent's best-educated parent had a high school degree by 1992	0.3241	0.4684
ParSomeColl	Respondent's best-educated parent attended some college by 1992	0.4455	0.4974
ParColl	Respondent's best-educated parent had a college degree by 1992	0.0739	0.2619
ParPro	Respondent's best-educated parent had a professional degree by 1992	0.0264	0.1606
VocSchl	Vocational classes were taught in the school	0.6755	0.4686
MissVocSchl	VocSchl variable is missing	0.1795	0.3841
FullTeach	Respondent's school had full-time vocational education teachers	0.8619	0.3453
MissFullTeach	FullTeach variable is missing	0.1046	0.3063
OfferAP	School offered Advanced Placement classes	0.7161	0.4513
MissOfferAP	OfferAP variable is missing	0.0458	0.2093
QtrFour	Quarter or more of 1991 graduating class went to a four-year school	0.5828	0.4935
MissQtrFour	QtrFour variable is missing	0.1607	0.3675
QtrTwo	Quarter or more of 1991 graduating class went to a two-year school	0.2051	0.4041
MissQtrTwo	QtrTwo variable is missing	0.1718	0.3776
SES 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quart	Respondent's family is in 2 <sup>nd</sup> socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.2536	0.4355
SES 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quart	Respondent's family is in 3 <sup>rd</sup> socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.1558	0.3630
SES Top Quart	Respondent's family is in top socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.0514	0.2209
Missing SES	Socioeconomic status is missing	0.1139	0.3180

Table 2d  
Weighted Summary Statistics: Business Track

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
LnInc99	Log income in 1999	9.892	0.6693
Hispanic	Respondent is Hispanic	0.1087	0.3116
Black	Respondent is black	0.1211	0.3265
White	Respondent is white	0.7297	0.4445
Male	Respondent is male	0.3168	0.4657
Neast	Respondent lives in the northeast Census region	0.1497	0.3571
Midwest	Respondent lives in the midwest Census region	0.3441	0.4755
West	Respondent lives in the west Census region	0.1026	0.3038
ParHS	Respondent's best-educated parent had a high school degree by 1992	0.2579	0.4379
ParSomeColl	Respondent's best-educated parent attended some college by 1992	0.4326	0.4959
ParColl	Respondent's best-educated parent had a college degree by 1992	0.1240	0.3299
ParPro	Respondent's best-educated parent had a professional degree by 1992	0.0585	0.2349
VocSchl	Vocational classes were taught in the school	0.7403	0.4389
MissVocSchl	VocSchl variable is missing	0.1117	0.3153
FullTeach	Respondent's school had full-time vocational education teachers	0.8335	0.3729
MissFullTeach	FullTeach variable is missing	0.0798	0.2713
OfferAP	School offered Advanced Placement classes	0.7204	0.4492
MissOfferAP	OfferAP variable is missing	0.0313	0.1744
QtrFour	Quarter or more of 1991 graduating class went to a four-year school	0.6209	0.4856
MissQtrFour	QtrFour variable is missing	0.1140	0.3181
QtrTwo	Quarter or more of 1991 graduating class went to a two-year school	0.2751	0.4470
MissQtrTwo	QtrTwo variable is missing	0.1216	0.3271
SES 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quart	Respondent's family is in 2 <sup>nd</sup> socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.2576	0.4377
SES 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quart	Respondent's family is in 3 <sup>rd</sup> socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.1923	0.3945
SES Top Quart	Respondent's family is in top socioeconomic status quartile in 1992	0.1224	0.3281
Missing SES	Socioeconomic status is missing	0.0992	0.2993

Table 3  
First Stage of Selection Model: Multinomial Logit

	Academic		Technical		Business	
	Coefficient	Standard Error	Coefficient	Standard Error	Coefficient	Standard Error
SES 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	<i>1.4346</i>	<i>0.1657</i>	<i>0.5782</i>	<i>0.0756</i>	0.9154	0.1411
SES 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	<i>1.7427</i>	<i>0.2159</i>	<i>0.3965</i>	<i>0.0624</i>	0.8966	0.1624
SES Top Quartile	<i>1.9439</i>	<i>0.2823</i>	<i>0.3673</i>	<i>0.0961</i>	1.0005	0.2494
Missing SES	0.9645	0.1358	<i>0.6641</i>	<i>0.1069</i>	0.7754	0.1475
VocSchl	1.0369	0.0838	1.4490	0.1936	<i>1.7415</i>	<i>0.2649</i>
MissVocSchl	<i>0.6969</i>	<i>0.0880</i>	1.0184	0.2197	0.6662	0.1685
FullTeach	0.8495	0.0843	<i>2.6779</i>	<i>0.6340</i>	0.8752	0.1697
MissFullTeach	0.8824	0.1154	<i>2.6362</i>	<i>0.7228</i>	0.8597	0.2238
OfferAP	1.0098	0.0807	0.7962	0.0908	0.8015	0.0980
MissOfferAP	1.2543	0.2740	0.7570	0.2271	0.8921	0.3164
QtrFour	<i>1.2208</i>	<i>0.1030</i>	<i>0.7295</i>	<i>0.0809</i>	<i>0.6860</i>	<i>0.0845</i>
MissQtrFour	1.3999	0.3480	<i>2.4425</i>	<i>1.0180</i>	<i>3.1631</i>	<i>1.6214</i>
QtrTwo	<i>0.6898</i>	<i>0.0513</i>	<i>0.6113</i>	<i>0.0698</i>	0.8809	0.1056
MissQtrTwo	1.1974	0.2460	0.6888	0.2619	0.5607	0.2623
Hispanic	1.1457	0.2055	<i>0.5221</i>	<i>0.1538</i>	1.1927	0.3506
Black	0.8070	0.1382	0.7357	0.1994	0.7627	0.2236
White	0.9888	0.1431	1.4226	0.3356	0.9988	0.2564
Male	<i>0.8125</i>	<i>0.0484</i>	<i>5.8455</i>	<i>0.6614</i>	<i>0.4738</i>	<i>0.0502</i>
Neast	<i>1.2337</i>	<i>0.1019</i>	1.2092	0.1557	0.8153	0.1277
Midwest	<i>0.7671</i>	<i>0.0616</i>	1.0214	0.1194	1.1991	0.1506
West	<i>0.5240</i>	<i>0.0513</i>	<i>0.5110</i>	<i>0.0814</i>	<i>0.3779</i>	<i>0.0678</i>
ParHS	0.8056	0.1370	<i>0.6976</i>	<i>0.1182</i>	0.7469	0.1449
ParSomeColl	0.9731	0.1664	<i>0.5459</i>	<i>0.0974</i>	<i>0.5381</i>	<i>0.1095</i>
ParColl	1.0426	0.1981	<i>0.2411</i>	<i>0.0602</i>	<i>0.3570</i>	<i>0.0956</i>
ParPro	0.9416	0.1889	<i>0.1035</i>	<i>0.0356</i>	<i>0.1952</i>	<i>0.0639</i>

The left hand side variable is a categorical for the chosen track: general, academic, vocational, or business. The comparison category is general track. Relative risk ratios are reported. Estimation is weighted and bootstrapped with 1000 repetitions. Those significant at the 5% level are italicized.

Table 4  
Least Squares Estimates

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>
Academic track in 1992	<i>0.1328</i>	<i>0.0290</i>
Technical track in 1992	0.0192	0.0829
Business track in 1992	-0.0255	0.0397
Hispanic	-0.0084	0.0748
Black	-0.0125	0.1011
White	0.1097	0.0626
Male	<i>0.3051</i>	<i>0.0353</i>
Neast	0.0716	0.0387
Midwest	0.0752	0.0489
West	-0.0018	0.0420
ParHS	-0.0426	0.0553
ParSomeColl	0.0004	0.0511
ParColl	0.0347	0.0549
ParPro	0.1084	0.0603
Constant	9.707	0.0768

The left hand side variable is log income in 1999. Estimation is by weighted least squares. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Those significant at the 5% level are italicized.

Table 5a  
 Selection Model for Log Income: General Track

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error
Hispanic	0.2249	0.2289
Black	0.0047	0.2328
White	0.0995	0.2064
Male	<i>0.4320</i>	<i>0.1586</i>
Neast	0.0817	0.1145
Midwest	<i>0.1874</i>	<i>0.0792</i>
West	0.0382	0.1965
ParHS	-0.1480	0.1195
ParSomeColl	-0.0307	0.1306
ParColl	-0.0639	0.2102
ParPro	-0.1322	0.3038
$\alpha_G$	-0.9251	1.8155
$\alpha_A$	-1.2596	1.3952
$\alpha_T$	-0.9059	1.3554
$\alpha_B$	-0.1338	0.3208
Constant	<i>8.778</i>	<i>1.3175</i>

The left hand side variable is log income in 1999 for those on the general track. Estimation is weighted and bootstrapped with 1000 repetitions. Standard errors in parentheses and those significant at the 5% level are italicized.

Table 5b  
 Selection Model for Log Income: Academic Track

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error
Hispanic	-0.1603	0.1068
Black	-0.0636	0.1035
White	-0.0236	0.0732
Male	0.0743	0.0747
Neast	-0.0099	0.0577
Midwest	-0.0393	0.0596
West	-0.0913	0.0979
ParHS	-0.0675	0.1021
ParSomeColl	-0.0414	0.1088
ParColl	0.0268	0.1335
ParPro	0.1529	0.1467
$\alpha_G$	0.2891	0.9271
$\alpha_A$	0.2032	0.2836
$\alpha_T$	-0.1039	0.7364
$\alpha_B$	0.6403	0.6324
Constant	<i>10.181</i>	<i>0.493</i>

The left hand side variable is log income in 1999 for those on the academic track. Estimation is weighted and bootstrapped with 1000 repetitions. Standard errors in parentheses and those significant at the 5% level are italicized.

Table 5c  
 Selection Model for Log Income: Technical Track

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error
Hispanic	0.1266	0.2168
Black	-0.3441	0.3799
White	0.1212	0.1608
Male	<i>0.8541</i>	<i>0.3778</i>
Neast	-0.0295	0.1152
Midwest	-0.0358	0.1522
West	0.2937	0.1753
ParHS	0.2033	0.1598
ParSomeColl	0.0068	0.1635
ParColl	0.1235	0.2651
ParPro	0.4332	0.3407
$\alpha_G$	0.8024	1.6124
$\alpha_A$	-1.3565	1.1817
$\alpha_T$	-0.1259	0.4332
$\alpha_B$	-0.6188	1.4991
Constant	<i>9.376</i>	<i>0.701</i>

The left hand side variable is log income in 1999 for those on the vocational track. Estimation is weighted and bootstrapped with 1000 repetitions. Standard errors in parentheses and those significant at the 5% level are italicized.

Table 5d  
 Selection Model for Log Income: Business Track

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error
Hispanic	0.0371	0.1170
Black	0.1180	0.1255
White	0.1301	0.1010
Male	<i>0.2417</i>	<i>0.0871</i>
Neast	0.1011	0.0660
Midwest	<i>0.1959</i>	<i>0.0592</i>
West	0.0925	0.0947
ParHS	-0.0258	0.0922
ParSomeColl	0.0742	0.0953
ParColl	0.0826	0.1247
ParPro	0.1351	0.1484
$\alpha_G$	0.7050	0.5921
$\alpha_A$	0.3964	0.9462
$\alpha_T$	0.2548	0.9646
$\alpha_B$	0.8396	0.8045
Constant	<i>9.564</i>	<i>0.3341</i>

The left hand side variable is log income in 1999 for those on the business track. Estimation is weighted and bootstrapped with 1000 repetitions. Standard errors in parentheses and those significant at the 5% level are italicized.



Table 6  
Conditional Mean Comparison

	<b>Conditional Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
General Track	9.985	0.1962
Academic Track given General Track was chosen	10.14	0.1409
Technical Track given General Track was chosen	10.93	0.4756
Business Track given General Track was chosen	9.245	0.2648
Academic Track	10.13	0.1275
General Track given Academic Track was chosen	9.775	0.201
Technical Track given Academic Track was chosen	8.302	0.530
Business Track given Academic Track was chosen	8.520	0.323
Technical Track	10.11	0.3681
Academic Track given Technical Track was chosen	9.730	0.1312
General Track given Technical Track was chosen	9.723	0.1503
Business Track given Technical Track was chosen	9.007	0.4625
Business Track	9.862	0.2457
Academic Track given Business Track was chosen	10.86	0.2455
General Track given Business Track was chosen	10.57	0.3590
Technical Track given Business Track was chosen	8.778	0.3469

Table 7  
Conditional Mean Comparison: Gender

		<b>Conditional Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
General Track	Male	10.14	0.1202
	Female	9.839	0.1295
Technical Track given General Track was chosen	Male	11.34	0.2557
	Female	10.55	0.2733
Academic Track given General Track was chosen	Male	9.492	0.1190
	Female	10.07	0.1227
Business Track given General Track was chosen	Male	9.492	0.1190
	Female	9.014	0.1103
Academic Track	Male	10.22	0.0870
	Female	10.05	0.1029
General Track given Academic Track was chosen	Male	9.954	0.1136
	Female	9.622	0.1155
Technical Track given Academic Track was chosen	Male	8.681	0.4114
	Female	7.978	0.3844
Business Track given Academic Track was chosen	Male	8.733	0.2724
	Female	8.338	0.2417

Table 7 (continued)  
Conditional Mean Comparison: Gender

		<b>Conditional Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Technical Track	Male	10.24	0.1948
	Female	9.393	0.1929
Academic Track given Technical Track was chosen	Male	9.772	0.0923
	Female	9.511	0.0743
General Track given Technical Track was chosen	Male	9.755	0.1306
	Female	9.559	0.1390
Business Track given Technical Track was chosen	Male	9.169	0.2818
	Female	8.163	0.2522
Business Track	Male	10.215	0.1235
	Female	9.735	0.1243
Academic Track given Business Track was chosen	Male	11.16	0.1672
	Female	10.75	0.1662
General Track given Business Track was chosen	Male	11.03	0.2107
	Female	10.40	0.2310
Technical Track given Business Track was chosen	Male	9.182	0.2600
	Female	8.632	0.2435

Table 8  
Conditional Mean Comparison: Race

		<b>Conditional Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
General Track	Black	9.916	0.1967
	White	10.03	0.1854
Technical Track given General Track was chosen	Black	10.37	0.4353
	White	10.99	0.4517
Academic Track given General Track was chosen	Black	10.11	0.1188
	White	10.17	0.1256
Business Track given General Track was chosen	Black	9.102	0.2655
	White	9.256	0.2550
Academic Track	Black	10.08	0.1092
	White	10.15	0.1157
General Track given Academic Track was chosen	Black	9.692	0.1884
	White	9.811	0.1916
Technical Track given Academic Track was chosen	Black	7.640	0.4529
	White	8.389	0.4880
Business Track given Academic Track was chosen	Black	8.285	0.3079
	White	8.570	0.2946

Table 8 (continued)  
 Conditional Mean Comparison: Race

		<b>Conditional Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Technical Track	Black	9.592	0.3522
	White	10.16	0.3306
Academic Track given Technical Track was chosen	Black	9.714	0.1190
	White	9.751	0.1154
General Track given Technical Track was chosen	Black	9.658	0.1444
	White	9.739	0.1449
Business Track given Technical Track was chosen	Black	8.794	0.5092
	White	9.055	0.4388
Business Track	Black	9.759	0.2522
	White	9.872	0.2386
Academic Track given Business Track was chosen	Black	10.90	0.2461
	White	10.88	0.2363
General Track given Business Track was chosen	Black	10.59	0.3773
	White	10.60	0.3509
Technical Track given Business Track was chosen	Black	8.301	0.2858
	White	8.846	0.2867