Table 3. Estimated Training Effects for the NSW Male Participants Using Comparison Groups From PSID and CPS

(4)

Unadjusted

1,608

(1.571)

2.220

(1.768)

2,321

NSW treatment earnings less comparison group earnings,

conditional on the estimated propensity score

(6)

Observations^c

1,255

389

247

Matchina on the score

(7)

Unadiusted

1,691

(2.209)

1,455

(2,303)

2,120

(8)

Adjusted^d

1.473

1.480

1,549

(809)

(808)

Stratifying on the score

(5)

Adjusted

1.494

(1.581)

2.235

(1,793)

1.870

000.40	(899)							
000 40	(000)	(1,104)	(1,383)	(1,994)	(2,002)		(2,335)	(826)
CPS-1 ^g	-8,498	972	1,117	1,713	1,774	4,117	1,582	1,616
	(712)	(550)	(747)	(1,115)	(1,152)		(1,069)	(751)
CPS-2g	-3,822	790	505	1,543	1,622	1,493	1,788	1,563
	(670)	(658)	(847)	(1,461)	(1,346)		(1,205)	(753)
CPS-3 ^g	-635	1,326	556	1,252	2,219	514	587	662
	(657)	(798)	(951)	(1,617)	(2,082)		(1,496)	(776)

Propensity scores are estimated using the logistic model, with specifications as follows: e PSID-1: Prob (T_i = 1) = F(age, age², education, education², married, no degree, black, Hispanic, RE74, RE75, RE74², RE75², u74*black).

Quadratic

in scoreb

(3)

294

496

647

(1.389)

(1,193)

NSW earnings less

comparison group earnings

(2)

Adjusted^a

1.672

(638)

731

(886)

683

825

(1,028)

(1)

Unadjusted

-15,205

1.794

(1,154)

(959)

1.069

-3.647

(633)

NSW

PSID-1e

PSID-2f

PSID-3f

^f PSID-2 and PSID-3: Prob $(T_i = 1) = F(age, age^2, education, education^2, no degree, married, black, Hispanic, RE74, RE74, RE75, RE75², u74, u75).$

⁹ CPS-1, CPS-2, and CPS-3: Prob $(T_i = 1) = F(\text{age, age}^2, \text{education}^2, \text{no degree, married, black, Hispanic, RE74, RE75, u74, u75, education}^* RE74, age³).$