## Tables and figures for the paper "Why Are Extraverted Young Men Less Likely to Receive Higher Education? Evidence from Hungary" by Zsombor Cseres-Gergely and Gábor Kézdi

Table 1. Representativeness of the BLSCD sample. Budapest residents in the BLSCD and Budapest residents of the Hungarian Labor Force Survey (HLFS), 2002.

	BLSCD	HLFS
Labor market status		
Not working non-student	0.17	0.21
Working non-student	0.28	0.34
Enrolled in higher education	0.54	0.45
All	1.00	1.00
Former education		
General secondary (or higher)	0.57	0.51
Specialized secondary	0.27	0.25
Vocational	0.07	0.08
Primary or less (0-8grades)	0.09	0.16
All	1.00	1.00
Gender		
Female	0.50	0.50
Male	0.50	0.50
All	1.00	1.00
Observations	294	334

## Table 2. Summary statistics

	Female	Male	All
Not employed, non-student	0.12	0.16	0.14
Employed non-student	0.28	0.29	0.28
Enrolled in higher education	0.60	0.55	0.58
IQ	-0.01	0.16	0.07
Extraversion	-0.02	0.01	-0.01
IQ age 5	0.04	0.05	0.04
Agreeableness	0.07	-0.07	0.00
Conscienciousness	0.00	0.00	0.00
Neuroticism	-0.17	0.19	0.00
Openness	-0.07	0.08	0.00
GPA (grades 1 through 8, standardized)	0.11	-0.12	0.00
GPA (grades 9 through 12, standardized)	0.18	-0.19	0.00
Mother's education (years, standardized)	0.04	-0.04	0.00
Behavior problems (assessed by parent, standardized)	-0.18	0.19	0.00
Behavior problems (assessed by teacher, standardized)	-0.07	0.07	0.00
Number of observations	162	150	312

Note: Estimation sample: educational attainment at least 11 grades (vocational school)

	Female	Male	All
In higher education	60	55	58
Not in higher education	40	45	42
of which			
employed	28	29	28
not employed	12	16	14
All	100	100	100
Observations	162	150	312

Table 3. Student status and labor market activity at age 22 (per cent).

Note: Estimation sample: educational attainment at least 11 grades (vocational school)

Table 4. IQ and extraversion by student status and labor market activity at age 22.

-		IQ		E	Extraversion			
	Female	Male	All	Femal	Male	All		
				e				
In higher education	0.26	0.42	0.34	0.08	-0.23	-0.07		
Not in higher education	-0.43	-0.16	-0.30	-0.17	0.30	0.07		
of which								
employed	-0.35	-0.20	-0.28	-0.11	0.32	0.10		
not employed	-0.61	-0.10	-0.33	-0.30	0.28	0.02		
All	-0.01	0.16	0.07	-0.02	0.01	-0.01		

Notes: IQ is measured by standardized Raven IQ, age 22. Extraversion is measured by standardized Big5 scores, age 22. Estimation sample: educational attainment at least 11 grades (vocational school)

Table 5. The probability of higher education a	s a function of cognitive of	capacity and extraversion.
Average partial effects from probit models.		

	Simple probit			]	IV probi	t
	Female Male All		Femal	Male	All	
				e		
IQ	0.25	0.17	0.22	0.69	0.46	0.56
[standard error]	$[0.04]^{**}$	$[0.04]^{**}$	$[0.03]^{**}$	$[0.20]^{**}$	$[0.20]^{*}$	$[0.14]^{**}$
Extraversion	0.05	-0.13	-0.04	0.03	-0.12	-0.04
[standard error]	[0.04]	$[0.04]^{**}$	[0.03]	[0.06]	$[0.06]^*$	[0.04]

Notes: IQ is measured by standardized Raven IQ, age 22. Extraversion is measured by standardized Big5 scores, age 22. Estimation sample: educational attainment at least 11 grades (vocational school). <sup>+</sup> significant at 10%; <sup>\*\*</sup> significant at 5%; <sup>\*\*</sup> significant at 1%

	Pr(not er	nployed)	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
-0.12	-0.12	-0.06	-0.16
[0.03]**	[0.04]**	[0.03]	[0.05]**
-0.05	-0.05	0.00	-0.05
[0.03]	[0.03]	[0.03]	[0.04]
-0.05	-0.03	-0.06*	-0.02
[0.03]	[0.03]	[0.03]	[0.04]
0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04
[0.03]	[0.03]	[0.03]	[0.04]
	Pr(emp	oloyed)	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
-0.18	-0.18	-0.08	-0.16
[0.05]**	[0.05]**	[0.05]	[0.05]**
-0.14	-0.14	-0.04	-0.13
[0.07]**	[0.05]**	[0.05]	[0.04]**
-0.02	-0.01	-0.06	-0.02
[0.04]	[0.05]	[0.04]	[0.04]
0.10	0.15	0.09	0.10
[0.04]*	[0.05]**	[0.04]*	[0.04]*
	Pr(higher	education)	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
0.30	0.30	0.14	0.27
[0.06]**	[0.06]**	[0.07]*	[0.06]**
0.20	0.19	0.04	0.18
[0.05]**	[0.05]**	[0.05]	[0.05]**
0.07	0.04	0.13	0.06
[0.04]	[0.04]	[0.05]**	[0.04]
-0.14	-0.20	-0.13	-0.14
[0.05]**	[0.05]**	[0.05]**	[0.05]**
	$(1) \\ -0.12 \\ [0.03]^{**} \\ -0.05 \\ [0.03] \\ -0.05 \\ [0.03] \\ 0.04 \\ [0.03] \\ 0.04 \\ [0.03] \\ (1) \\ -0.18 \\ [0.05]^{**} \\ -0.14 \\ [0.07]^{**} \\ -0.02 \\ [0.04] \\ 0.10 \\ [0.04]^{*} \\ (1) \\ 0.30 \\ [0.06]^{**} \\ 0.20 \\ [0.05]^{**} \\ 0.07 \\ [0.04] \\ -0.14 \\ [0.05]^{**} \\ $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

Table 6: Estimated average partial effects from the multinomial probit models

\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

u
(3) (4)
8 0.19 0.13
12 -0.13 -0.12
0 0.24 0.21
8 0.01 0.03
$\beta - \gamma$
(3) (4)
0.24 0.73
81 0.31 0.76
0 0.14 -0.06
91 -0.46 -0.50

Table 7: Point estimates of the structural parameters of interest

## Appendix

	Female	Male	All	Female	Male	All
IQ	0.770	0.508	0.635	1.783	1.179	1.451
	[0.152]*	[0.132]*	[0.097]*			
	*	*	*	[0.521]**	[0.513]*	[0.358]**
Extraversion	0.159	-0.376	-0.103	0.094	-0.309	-0.091
		[0.120]*				
	[0.117]	*	[0.080]	[0.121]	[0.129]*	[0.080]
Male			-0.235			-0.39
			[0.152]			[0.166]*
Constant	0.288	0.070	0.273	0.318	-0.039	0.294
	[0.107]*		[0.105]*			
	*	[0.111]	*	[0.110]**	[0.137]	[0.106]**
					First stage	
				(dep. var.: c	ognitive capaci	ty at age 22)
IQ age 5				0.259	0.225	0.242
				[0.072]**	[0.069]**	[0.050]**
Extraversion				0.063	-0.091	-0.013
				[0.065]	[0.071]	[0.048]
Male						0.174
						[0.091]
Constant				-0.024	0.151	-0.025
				[0.060]	[0.068]	[0.063]
Log-likelihood	-92.44	-89.02	-187.70	-277.45	-273.16	-558.87
Pseudo-R2	0.15	0.14	0.12			
Observations	162	150	312	162	150	312

 Table A1: Detailed results of the probit models predicting higher education

\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

			$\pi_{10}$				$\pi_{21}$	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
IQ X female	0.15	0.18	0.19	0.13	0.95 [0.21]*	0.95 [0.22]*	0.43	0.86 [0.22]*
	[0.22]	[0.23]	[0.25]	[0.23]	*	*	[0.26]	*
IQ X male	-0.10	-0.12	-0.13	-0.12	0.70	0.69	0.18	0.64
	FO 001	[0.20]*	FO 221	50 011	[0.19]*	[0.00]	FO 011	[0.20]*
	[0.20]	*	[0.22]	[0.21]	*	[0.22]	[0.21]	^ 0.15
Extraversion X female	0.19	0.1	0.24	0.21	0.15	0.1	0.38	0.15
Extraversion V male	[0.22]	[0.25]	[0.23]	[0.23]	[0.17]	[0.20]	[0.20]	[0.17]
Extraversion X male	0.05	[0 21]*	0.01	0.05	-0.30 [0 18]*	-0.73	-0.45	-0.47
	[0.21]	*	[0.21]	[0.21]	*	[0.25]	[0.19]*	[0.18]*
Agreeableness X female		0.00				0.28		
-		[0.23]				[0.18]		
Agreeableness X male		0.06				0.28		
		[0.20]				[0.18]		
Conscienciousness X female		0.18				0.05		
		[0.25]				[0.19]		
Conscienciousness X male		0.39				-0.19		
		[0.23]				[0.19]		
Neuroticism X female		0.06 [0.10]				-0.05		
Neuroticism V male		[0.19]				[0.10]		
Neuroticisiii X inale		-0.03				-0.08		
Openness X female		013				0.13		
openness in remain		[0.21]				[0.18]		
Openness X male		-0.58				0.69		
•						[0.23]*		
		[0.25]*				*		
GPA 1 through 8			0.08				0.88	
			[0 19]				[0.17]* *	
GPA 9 through 12			$\begin{bmatrix} 0.18 \end{bmatrix}$				0.57	
OTA 7 unough 12			0.20				[0.17]*	
			[0.18]				*	
Mother's education			0.22				0.41	
			50.1.63				[0.14]*	
			[0.16]	0.02			*	0.10
Behavior problems (parent)				-0.03				-0.18
Pahaviar problems (tapahar)				[0.14]				$\begin{bmatrix} 0.12 \end{bmatrix}$
Benavior problems (teacher)				-0.07				-0.24
Male	-0.27	-0.36	-0.19	-0.27	-0.20	-0.11	0.45	-0.09
	[0.28]	[0.24]	[0.31]	[0.29]	[0.23]	[0.32]	[0.26]	[0.23]
Constant	0.69	-0.64	0.80	0.71	0.67	-0.78	0.60	0.62
	[0.21]*	[0.16]*		-	[0.15]*	[0.23]*	[0.19]*	[0.16]*
	*	*	[0.24]	[0.22]	*	*	*	*
Log-likelihood	-264.4	-251.5	-208.8	-258.8				
Observations	312	312	312	312				

Table A2: Detailed results of the multinomial probit models

\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%