

Caliendo, Marco; Cobb-Clark, Deborah A.; Seitz, Helke; Uhlendorff, Arne

Working Paper

Locus of control and investment in training

SOEPPapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research, No. 890

Provided in Cooperation with:

German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin)

Suggested Citation: Caliendo, Marco; Cobb-Clark, Deborah A.; Seitz, Helke; Uhlendorff, Arne (2016) : Locus of control and investment in training, SOEPPapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research, No. 890, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW), Berlin

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/149805>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

SOEPpapers
on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research

SOEP – The German Socio-Economic Panel study at DIW Berlin

890-2016

Locus of Control and Investment in Training

Marco Caliendo, Deborah A. Cobb-Clark, Helke Seitz, Arne Uhlendorff

SOEPPapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research at DIW Berlin

This series presents research findings based either directly on data from the German Socio-Economic Panel study (SOEP) or using SOEP data as part of an internationally comparable data set (e.g. CNEF, ECHP, LIS, LWS, CHER/PACO). SOEP is a truly multidisciplinary household panel study covering a wide range of social and behavioral sciences: economics, sociology, psychology, survey methodology, econometrics and applied statistics, educational science, political science, public health, behavioral genetics, demography, geography, and sport science.

The decision to publish a submission in SOEPPapers is made by a board of editors chosen by the DIW Berlin to represent the wide range of disciplines covered by SOEP. There is no external referee process and papers are either accepted or rejected without revision. Papers appear in this series as works in progress and may also appear elsewhere. They often represent preliminary studies and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be requested from the author directly.

Any opinions expressed in this series are those of the author(s) and not those of DIW Berlin. Research disseminated by DIW Berlin may include views on public policy issues, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The SOEPPapers are available at
<http://www.diw.de/soeppapers>

Editors:

Jan **Goebel** (Spatial Economics)
Martin **Kroh** (Political Science, Survey Methodology)
Carsten **Schröder** (Public Economics)
Jürgen **Schupp** (Sociology)

Conchita **D'Ambrosio** (Public Economics, DIW Research Fellow)
Denis **Gerstorff** (Psychology, DIW Research Director)
Elke **Holst** (Gender Studies, DIW Research Director)
Frauke **Kreuter** (Survey Methodology, DIW Research Fellow)
Frieder R. **Lang** (Psychology, DIW Research Fellow)
Jörg-Peter **Schräpler** (Survey Methodology, DIW Research Fellow)
Thomas **Siedler** (Empirical Economics, DIW Research Fellow)
C. Katharina **Spieß** (Education and Family Economics)
Gert G. **Wagner** (Social Sciences)

ISSN: 1864-6689 (online)

German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP)
DIW Berlin
Mohrenstrasse 58
10117 Berlin, Germany

Contact: soeppapers@diw.de



Locus of Control and Investment in Training

Marco Caliendo*

University of Potsdam, IZA, DIW, IAB

Deborah A. Cobb-Clark†

University of Sydney, IZA, ARC Life Course Centre

Helke Seitz‡

University of Potsdam

Arne Uhlendorff§

CREST, CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay, IAB, IZA, DIW

Working Paper

December 9, 2016

Abstract

This paper extends standard models of work-related training by explicitly incorporating workers' locus of control into the investment decision. Our model both differentiates between general and specific training and accounts for the role of workers and firms in training decisions. Workers with an internal locus of control are predicted to engage in more general training than are their external co-workers because their subjective expected investment returns are higher. In contrast, we expect little relationship between specific training and locus of control because training returns largely accrue to firms rather than workers. We then empirically test the predictions of our model using data from the German Socioeconomic Panel (SOEP). We find that, consistent with our model, locus of control is related to participation in general but not specific training. Moreover, we provide evidence that locus of control influences participation in general training through its effect on workers' expectations about future wage increases. Specifically, general training is associated with a much larger increase in the expected likelihood of receiving a future pay raise for those with an internal rather than external locus of control, while we do not find any relationship in the case of specific training. Actual post-training wages for those who receive general or specific training do not depend on locus of control.

Keywords: Human Capital Investment, On-the-job Training, Locus of Control, Wage Expectations

JEL codes: J24, C23, D84

*e-mail: caliendo@uni-potsdam.de. Corresponding address: University of Potsdam, Chair of Empirical Economics, August-Bebel-Str. 89, 14482 Potsdam, Germany. Tel: +49 331 977 3225. Fax: +49 331 977 3210.

†e-mail: deborah.cobb-clark@sydney.edu.au

‡e-mail: hseitz@uni-potsdam.de

§e-mail: arne.uhlendorff@ensae.fr

The authors thank participants in seminars at Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research (MIASER), Berlin Network of Labor Market Research (BeNA), University of Sydney, University of New South Wales, University of Potsdam, Freie Universität Berlin as well as the Copenhagen Business School and the 2016 meetings of ESPE and EALE for valuable comments and Melisa Bubonya for excellent research assistance. Caliendo is grateful to the Melbourne Institute for financial support during his research visit from April to August 2015 during which part of this research has been conducted. Cobb-Clark is grateful for financial support from the Australian Research Council (DP110103456).

1 Introduction

Globalization and technological change are rapidly transforming the workplace, generating demand for new skills while rendering other skills obsolete. Equipping workers with the ability to thrive in this changing environment has become a strategic imperative. National governments are working hard to facilitate continuous, lifelong investment in worker training in order to ensure that workers' skills remain up-to-date, firms continue to be competitive, and living standards are maintained (see European Commission, 2010). Training systems are also being touted as mechanisms for achieving social goals including reduced inequality, active citizenship, and social cohesion. The International Labour Organisation, for example, has an explicit goal of promoting social inclusion through expanded access to education and training for those who are disadvantaged (International Labour Organization, 2008, p. vi).

Work-related training, however, often compounds, rather than mitigates, existing skill differentials – potentially increasing social and economic inequality. In particular, workers with higher ability (as measured by aptitude scores), more formal education, and higher occupational status receive more work-related training than do their less-skilled co-workers.¹ This disparity is puzzling since less educated workers, in fact, receive relatively high returns from training (see Blundell *et al.*, 1999; Bassanini *et al.*, 2007) and firms appear to be equally willing to train them (Leuven and Oosterbeek, 1999; Maximiano, 2012). Developing a deeper understanding of what leads some workers to under-invest in training is fundamental to ensuring that work-related training systems have the potential to deliver social as well as economic benefits.

The aim of this paper is to advance the literature by adopting a behavioral perspective on the training investment decision. Specifically, we draw inspiration from Becker (1962) in developing a stylized model of the decision by firms and workers to invest in work-related education and training. Firms are assumed to have perfect information about the productivity of training and its degree of generality, while workers are instead assumed to have subjective beliefs about the returns to training. These beliefs depend on their locus of control. We then use this simplified two-period model to derive testable predictions about the influence that the degree of training generality has on the role of locus of control in the training investment decision.

¹For reviews of the work-related education and training literature see Asplund (2005); Bishop (1996); Blundell *et al.* (1999); Bassanini *et al.* (2007); Leuven (2005); Wolter and Ryan (2011); Haelermans and Borghans (2012); Frazis and Loewenstein (2006).

Locus of control is a psychological concept that is best described as a “generalized attitude, belief or expectancy regarding the nature of the causal relationship between one’s own behavior and its consequences” (Rotter, 1966). Those with internal control tend to believe that much of what happens in life is influenced by their own behavior, whereas those with external control are more likely to believe that life’s outcomes are driven by external forces, e.g. luck, chance, fate or others. Given these psychological underpinnings, it is quite natural to link locus of control to human capital investments through the returns that individuals expect. Consequently, we allow locus of control to affect training participation through the influence it has on workers’ subjective expectations about the relationship between training and future wage growth. Our specific interest in locus of control is motivated by the growing literature demonstrating its importance in many other human capital investment decisions including health (Cobb-Clark *et al.*, 2014), educational attainment (Coleman and Deleire, 2003; Jaik and Wolter, 2016), job search (Caliendo *et al.*, 2015b; McGee, 2015), internal migration (Caliendo *et al.*, 2015a), self-employment (Hansemark, 2003; Caliendo *et al.*, 2016), self-reported willingness to train (Fourage *et al.*, 2013) and job training (Offerhaus, 2013).

Our model predicts that internal workers will engage in more general training than their external co-workers because their subjective investment returns are higher. We expect little relationship between specific training and locus of control, however, because the returns to specific training largely accrue to firms rather than workers. We empirically test these predictions using data from the German Socioeconomic Panel (SOEP). Consistent with our model, we find that locus of control is related to participation in general but not specific training. Moreover, we find evidence that locus of control influences participation in general training through its effect on workers’ expectations about future wage growth. Specifically, general training is associated with an increase in the expected likelihood of receiving a future pay raise that is much larger for those with an internal rather than external locus of control. However, we find no evidence that the wage returns to general training actually depend on locus of control when we analyze realized post-training wages. This suggests that workers are forming different subjective expectations – which depend on their locus of control – about the same underlying post-general-training wage distribution. Interestingly, locus of control is unrelated to realized wages and wage expectations in the case of specific training.

We make a substantial advance on the literature by formally incorporating locus of control into an economic model of work-related education and training, carefully accounting

for the nature of training itself as well as for the role of firms and workers in the training decision. This allows us to analyze the channel through which locus of control operates and generate empirical predictions that can then be tested. We take a broad perspective on work-related education and training, considering both training that is offered by employers during work hours (i.e. on-the-job) and education taking place in external institutions outside work hours (off-the-job). This broad-brush approach demands that we consider the perspectives of both firms and workers in the training decision which adds complexity to our theoretical framework. At the same time, it also adds richness to the empirical analysis allowing us to assess the robustness of our results to alternative notions of general versus specific training.

Our research identifies a fundamental distinction - as yet unrecognized in the literature - in the role of locus of control in general versus specific training. Becker (1962) was the first to highlight the role of skill transferability in the allocation of training costs, arguing that, in competitive markets, firms are unwilling to pay for training that is completely transferable (general), while workers are unwilling to pay for training that is completely nontransferable (specific). Subsequent research demonstrates that this sharp bifurcation is blurred in the face of labor market rigidities, non-competitive market structures, and training that is both general and specific (see Acemoglu and Pischke, 1999a; Asplund, 2005; Frazis and Loewenstein, 2006, for reviews). Nonetheless, the conceptual link between skill transferability and the distribution of net training returns across workers and firms remains fundamental to understanding the incentives for training to occur. It is this conceptual link that is also at the heart of our finding that workers' perceptions of control will have a more profound effect on training investments if training is relatively transferable (general) than if it is not (specific). In short, workers' differential responsiveness to investment returns matters more if they can capture those returns than if they cannot. Crucially, this result does not depend on our simplifying assumption that markets are perfectly competitive. Instead, it is easily generalized to a variety of non-competitive environments in which greater skill transferability increases workers' ability to benefit from the training they receive (see Section 2.3).

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Our model of training is developed in Section 2, while the data are described in Section 3. In Section 4, we provide empirical evidence for the testable implications of our theoretical model. Our conclusions and suggestions for future research can be found in Section 5.

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Modeling the Training Investment Decision

We begin with a conceptual framework in which both workers and firms participate in the decision to invest in work-related training. Workers have an incentive to participate in training if that investment yields positive future returns. Although the returns to training can be conceptualized as positive effects on labor market outcomes in general, e.g. wages, performance, promotions, occupational status, etc., we focus specifically on wage returns in our model. Firms' decisions to invest in worker training rest on whether or not the investment yields positive effects for the firm in terms of productivity, measured in value added per worker.

We make a number of simplifying assumptions. Firms and workers are assumed to be risk-neutral, to face no liquidity constraints, and to maximize expected discounted profit and income streams, respectively. Both the labor market and product market are perfectly competitive and output prices are normalized to 1. In the first period ($t = 0$), the wage of worker i , w_{i0} , corresponds to his or her marginal revenue product (mP_L) which is the same in all firms. An investment in training T_i is a joint decision of worker i and firm f and takes place if the net present value of the training investment is non-negative for both the worker and the firm and if it is positive for at least one of them.

Let K capture the increase in productivity associated with training. The degree of generality of the training is given by γ which takes a value between 0 and 1. When $\gamma = 0$, training increases the productivity of worker i only at the current firm f . Following Becker (1962) we refer to this as “perfectly specific” training. If training is “perfectly general”, $\gamma = 1$ and the human capital embodied in the training is fully transferable to other firms, that is the productivity of trained workers increases by K in all firms. We account for firms' asymmetric information with respect to production process and industry conditions, by assuming that the firm has perfect information about the training's productivity returns (K) and degree of generality (γ). In contrast, workers form expectations about their own returns to training which is given by the product of these two parameters (see Section 2.2).

The cost of training C is constant across workers.² Training costs are known to both workers and firms in period $t = 0$. The worker and the firm share training costs C in

²We consider the scenario in which training costs include a stochastic component that is related to workers' characteristics, in particular their locus of control, in Section 2.3

proportion to γ . In particular, the firm offers to pay $(1 - \gamma)C$ while the worker is left to pay γC .

In period $t = 0$, the worker and the firm decide whether or not to invest in training which has a given degree of generality γ . Worker productivity in period $t = 1$ is given by $mP_L + KT_i$ in firm f and by $mP_L + K\gamma T_i$ in every other firm. Worker i stays at the current firm f in period $t = 1$ if his or her wage is equal to or greater than the potential wage offer at outside firms. Because the labor market is assumed to be perfectly competitive, there are no labor market frictions (e.g. imperfect information, job changing costs, etc.) and workers can change employers without cost. In period $t = 1$, the worker will receive a wage offer of $mP_L + K\gamma T_i$ which corresponds to his or her marginal revenue product at outside firms. The current firm f will pay this competitive market wage. This implies that the returns to the training investment are $K\gamma T_i$ for the worker and $K(1 - \gamma)T_i$ for the firm. Thus, as in Becker (1962), the worker is the full residual claimant when training is perfectly general, receiving all of the returns to training and also paying all of the costs. If training is perfectly specific, on the other hand, the firm pays all costs and receives all returns.

2.2 The Role of Locus of Control in the Investment Decision

We have assumed that the firm knows both the relationship between the investment in training and the resulting increase in productivity, K , and the degree to which the training can be utilized by outside firms, γ . These seem to us to be reasonable assumptions given that firms are in a position to know much more than workers about both their own production technology and the aggregate economic conditions in the wider industry. Together, these assumptions imply that the firm has perfect information about the worker's productivity in period $t = 1$, $K\gamma T_i$, if he or she undertakes training in period $t = 0$.

In contrast, workers must form expectations about their potential wage increase as a result of training. We adopt a behavioral perspective on expectation formation by allowing workers' subjective beliefs about the return to training, $(K\gamma)^*$, to depend on their locus of control.³ The concept of locus of control emerged out of social learning theory more than 50 years ago. In his seminal work, Rotter (1954) proposed a theory of learning in which reinforcing (i.e. rewarding or punishing) a behavior leads expectations of future reinforcement to be stronger when individuals believe reinforcement is causally related to their own

³Due to the multiplicative form of the returns to training, the predictions of our theoretical model are the same if we instead allow only K or only γ to depend on locus of control. With the data at hand, we cannot separately identify workers' expectations regarding K and γ making these models empirically equivalent.

behavior than when they do not. Because the history of reinforcement varies, Rotter argued that individuals will differ in the extent to which they generally attribute what happens to them to their own actions (Rotter, 1954). Individuals with an external locus of control do not perceive a strong link between their own behavior and future outcomes. Consequently, we argue that they are unlikely to believe that any training investments undertaken today will affect their productivity – and hence wages – tomorrow. Those with an internal locus of control, in contrast, see a direct causal link between their own choices (e.g. investment in training) and future outcomes (wages). Thus, although the true impact of training on future productivity and wages is assumed to be constant, more internal workers expect a higher wage return to their training investments.

We capture this dichotomy in our model by adopting the following multiplicative specification for the relationship between locus of control and subjective beliefs about investment returns:

$$(K\gamma)^* = K\gamma * f(loc) \tag{1}$$

where loc denotes locus of control; $f(loc)$ is both positive and increasing in internal locus of control; $\frac{(\partial K\gamma)^*}{\partial loc} > 0$.

An investment in training is made whenever that training is expected to be profitable for the firm and/or the worker. That is, the expected net present value of the training investment must be larger than or equal to 0 for the firm and the worker. The value function of the firm depends on the true increase in firm-specific productivity, while the value function of the worker depends on his or her subjective beliefs about the returns to the training. In what follows, we investigate three different scenarios: perfectly general training ($\gamma = 1$), perfectly specific training ($\gamma = 0$), and the intermediate case in which the training is partially, but not completely, transferable to outside firms ($0 < \gamma < 1$).

Perfectly-specific Training: When training is perfectly specific ($\gamma = 0$), it is not transferable to outside firms and only the current firm benefits from the future increase in worker productivity. Therefore, as in Becker (1962), the firm will pay the full cost C of training the worker. The firm invests in training if the expected net present value of training to the firm is positive, i.e. if the discounted productivity gain in period $t = 1$ exceeds the training

costs incurred in the first period $t = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{mP_L + K}{1 + \rho} - \frac{mP_L}{1 + \rho} &> C \\ K &> (1 + \rho)C \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Given this, our model results in the prediction that investments in perfectly specific training will be independent of workers' locus of control. The decision to invest in perfectly specific training is driven solely by firms that have perfect information about the costs and benefits of worker training. Consequently, workers' subjective beliefs about the net returns to training are not relevant for training outcomes. Moreover, because workers do not share in the benefit of training, the impact of training on workers' expected future wage increases also do not depend on workers' locus of control.

Perfectly-general Training: When training is perfectly general ($\gamma = 1$), workers receive the full value of the productivity increase associated with training in the form of higher wages. Therefore, firms will be unwilling to share the costs of general training and workers will have to pay all training costs C . In this case, the investment decision effectively lies in the hands of workers. Specifically, participation in training will depend on whether workers expect their post-training productivity (and hence wage) to increase in present value by more than the cost of training. This, in turn, depends on workers' locus of control. Specifically, workers invest in general training whenever:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{mP_L + (\gamma K)^*}{1 + \rho} &> \frac{mP_L}{1 + \rho} + C \\ (\gamma K)^* &> (1 + \rho)C \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Because workers with an internal locus of control believe that the returns to training are higher, i.e. $\frac{\partial K \gamma}{\partial loc} > 0$, they are willing to incur higher training costs C for general training than are their coworkers with a more external locus of control. Thus, our model predicts that the probability of investing in general training is increasing in internal locus of control. Moreover, we expect a positive relationship between workers' internal locus of control and their expectations about future post-training wage increases. At the same time, because locus of control is unrelated to productivity, workers' actual post-training wages are predicted to be independent of their locus of control.

Training that is Both General and Specific: In reality, training is unlikely to be either perfectly-specific or perfectly-general. Usually, training includes some components which may be specific to the current employer as well as components which increase productivity both inside and outside the current firm. Lazear (2009) in fact argues that firm-specific training does not even exist. Instead, he believes that all skills are general and it is only the skill mix and the weights attached to particular skills that are specific to each employer. In his framework, firms pay at least partly for general training, the willingness of a worker to pay for training is relatively low in firms with a very specific skill composition.

When training is partially, but not completely, transferable to other firms ($0 < \gamma < 1$), workers and firms will share the costs and benefits of training. We have assumed that training costs are shared in proportion to the training's degree of generality. That is, the firm is willing to pay $(1 - \gamma)C$ for the investment in workers' training, while workers have to decide whether or not to invest at cost γC . This later decision will be a function of workers' expected wage increase $(K\gamma)^*$ if they chose training, which, in turn, depends on their locus of control.

Investments in training that is neither perfectly-specific nor perfectly-general effectively result from a joint decision making process between workers and firms. Training will occur when at least one party gains, and neither party is worse off. This implies, that the following inequalities must hold for workers and firms respectively if training is to occur:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{mP_L + (\gamma K)^*}{1 + \rho} &> \frac{mP_L}{1 + \rho} + \gamma C \\
(\gamma K)^* &> (1 + \rho)\gamma C \\
\frac{(\gamma K)^*}{\gamma} &> (1 + \rho)C
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{mP_L + (1 - \gamma)K}{1 + \rho} &> \frac{mP_L}{1 + \rho} + (1 - \gamma)\gamma C \\
K &> (1 + \rho)C
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

As in the case of perfectly-general training, our model predicts that when training is at least partially transferable to outside firms, workers with an internal locus of control have a higher expected net present value from training and, consequently, are more likely to participate in training. Expectations about future wage growth depend positively on

internal locus of control, while actual post-training wage increases are predicted to be independent of workers' locus of control.

It is important to note that these predictions are not dependent on the specific sharing rule that we have assumed. In reality, firms and workers might be willing to pay more than $\gamma(1 - C)$ and γC , respectively, in order to realize an investment in training. Hashimoto (1981), for example, presents a model in which firms and workers share the costs and benefits of specific training as a form of long-term commitment device to prevent costly job separations. In this case, we also expect there to be a positive relationship between internal locus of control and participating in training, because the expected returns from training increase the more internal workers are, making it more likely that the benefits of training outweigh the costs (see equation 4).

It is also the case, that these predictions do not depend on workers being risk neutral. Risk aversion would result in workers choosing not to invest in some training – despite it delivering positive expected benefits. This under-investment in risky training is expected to be more extensive the more general training is, because workers' exposure to the costs and benefits of training increase the greater the degree of training generality. Expected wage gains are discounted because expected utility is lower as a result of the uncertainty (Stevens, 1999). Nonetheless, we still expect internal workers to be more likely to invest in general training than their external co-workers because they are more responsive to the potential benefits of training when they exist.

Finally, it is interesting to consider the implications of our model for training investments when the true productivity payoff to training (K) differs from workers' subjective beliefs about those payoffs (K^*). Specifically, workers may believe the returns to training are below the costs (i.e. equation 4 does not hold), despite the true returns exceeding these costs (i.e. equation 5 does hold). As workers presumably cannot be compelled to undertake training that they feel disadvantages them, the investment in training will not take place. Similarly, if workers believe the benefits of training exceed the costs when this is in fact not the case, firms will be unwilling to invest in the training and training will not take place. Our model thus implies that there may be under-investment in training if workers have incorrect beliefs about the returns to training. Moreover, the degree of under-investment is more severe the more general training is because workers' beliefs weigh more heavily in the training decision. In contrast, workers' misperceptions do not result in inefficient training taking place. Workers' beliefs thus constitute a form of asymmetric information

which results in less investment than is optimal. Chang and Wang (1996) reach similar conclusions when modeling the asymmetry in information between the current and outside employers regarding the productivity of training.⁴

2.3 Model Extensions

Labor Market Frictions and Market Structure: Becker's key insight regarding the role of skill transferability in driving the allocation of training costs fundamentally relies on markets being perfectly competitive (Becker, 1962). Imperfect competition breaks the strict correspondence between wages and productivity; allowing firms to earn rents by paying wages that are lower than worker productivity. If the productivity-wage gap increases with the level of skills, a situation which Acemoglu and Pischke (1999a,b) refer to as a compressed wage structure, firms may find it profitable to pay for training even if it is general. Thus, in theory, a firm may pay for general training in a wide range of circumstances including if: i) it has monopsony or monopoly power (e.g. Stevens, 1994b; Acemoglu and Pischke, 1999a); ii) matching and search frictions exist (e.g. Acemoglu, 1997; Acemoglu and Pischke, 1999b; Stevens, 1994a); iii) information is asymmetric (e.g. Katz and Ziderman, 1990; Acemoglu and Pischke, 1998); iv) general and specific training are complementary (e.g. Stevens, 1994b; Franz and Soskice, 1995; Acemoglu and Pischke, 1999a,b; Kessler and Lülfsmann, 2006); or v) worker productivity depends on coworker skill levels (Booth and Zoega, 2000).⁵ In line with these model extensions, there exist a number of empirical studies providing evidence that employers pay at least partly for general training (Leuven and Oosterbeek, 1999; Booth and Bryan, 2007, see for example).

Labor market frictions and market imperfections drive a wedge between worker productivity and wages, implying that wages will be less than marginal revenue product. The key insights of our theoretical model remain unchanged in the face of noncompetitive markets, however, so long as wages continue to depend positively on worker productivity. In this case, human capital investments that raise productivity will also result in higher wages – although potentially to a lesser degree than when markets are perfectly competitive. Workers with a more internal locus of control will continue to have higher expected returns to their training investments than will their co-workers who are more external, leading them to be more willing to participate in training. Similarly, we expect the differential between internal

⁴See Bassanini and Ok (2005) who review a number of training and capital market imperfections and co-ordination failures that also may give rise to under investment in training.

⁵See Gersbach and Schmutzler (2012) for references on information asymmetries and complementarities.

and external workers to be apparent when we consider future wage expectations (consistent with our key model assumption), but not when we examine realized wage outcomes.

Training Costs, Productivity, and Locus of Control: Our model assumes that training costs (C) are constant. In reality, however, there are many reasons to believe that training costs might differ across workers in ways that may be related to their locus of control. Suppose training costs are given by the following: $C_i = c + \epsilon_i$ where ϵ_i captures some element of the training cost that is relevant only to workers' training decisions. Well-known barriers to financing human capital investments, for example, may lead some workers to be credit constrained, resulting in suboptimal levels of training (Acemoglu and Pischke, 1999a). Credit constraints are likely to be less binding, and hence the cost of financing training lower, for those with an internal locus of control because these individuals tend to have higher earnings (e.g. Anger and Heineck, 2010; Semykina and Linz, 2007; Osborne Groves, 2005) as well as more savings and greater wealth (Cobb-Clark *et al.*, 2016). If training costs are negatively related to locus of control, then it remains the case that we would expect workers with an internal locus of control to be more likely to invest in general training, but no more likely than their external co-workers to invest in specific training. Conditional on investing in training, expected and realized wage gains will be unrelated to locus of control because the increase in worker productivity is unrelated to locus of control.

We have also assumed that workers' locus of control affects their expectations about the returns to training rather than the returns themselves. However, there is evidence that internal workers have higher job turnover (Ahn, 2015). This shortens the period over which firms are able to re-coop their training costs and reduces the discounted present value of training investments for internal workers. At the same time, having an internal locus of control may be a form of "ability" which results in the productivity gains being larger for internal workers undertaking training. This implies that the relationship between training productivity and locus of control is theoretically ambiguous.

Nonetheless, we can investigate the plausibility of these alternative explanations by considering the way that training participation, future wage expectations, and realized wages depend on locus of control. Specifically, if the firm's returns to training are lower when training internal workers, perhaps because of increased job turnover, then we would expect those workers with an internal locus of control to be less likely to engage in training. On the other hand, if having an internal locus of control conveys a productivity advantage to work-

ers, we would expect a positive relationship between the incidence of training and internal locus of control. Higher subjective returns and higher actual returns are observationally equivalent with respect to training rates. However, we expect to see a link between locus of control and subjective returns reflected in expectations regarding future wage growth, while a link between locus of control and actual returns would be reflected in realized wage outcomes conditional on training.

3 Data

3.1 Estimation Sample

The data come from the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), which is an annual representative household panel survey. The SOEP collects household- and individual-level information on topics such as demographic events, education, labor market behavior, earnings and economic preferences (e.g. risk, time, and social preferences). The first wave of the survey took place in 1984 with a sample size of approximately 6,000 households and 12,000 individuals. Over the subsequent 30 years, the SOEP sampling frame has been extended to the former German Democratic Republic and top-up samples of high-income and guest-worker households. The SOEP sample in 2013 comprised approximately 12,000 households and 22,000 individuals.

The SOEP data are perfectly suited for our purposes because in 2000, 2004 and 2008 detailed questions about training activities were included in the survey. Pre-determined measures of individuals' locus of control are also available. Moreover, in each subsequent year (2001, 2005 and 2009), the data contain information about individuals' subjective expectations regarding the likelihood of a future wage increase. Information about expected future wage growth conditional on training participation is helpful in assessing whether the link between locus of control and training participation operates through expected returns or productivity differentials. Figure 1 provides an overview of the data structure.

[INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

We restrict our sample to the working-aged population between the ages of 25 and 60, pooling all three cross-sections. As we are interested in work-related training and not in training during phases of unemployment, we restrict our analysis to individuals who were employed at the time of training. We also exclude individuals who are self-employed at

the time of interview. Finally, the sample is reduced by item non-response in the locus of control and other explanatory variables, leaving us with a sample of 10,972 person-year observations from 6,703 distinct individuals.

3.2 Training Measures

In 2000, 2004 and 2008, respondents under the age of 65 were asked about their engagement in further education over the three-year period prior to the interview. In particular, self-reports about the number of professionally-oriented courses undertaken along with detailed information (e.g. course duration, starting date, costs, etc.) about the three most recent courses are available. We define individuals to be training participants if they undertook at least one course within the 12 months prior to the respective SOEP interview.

Our theoretical framework highlights the importance of distinguishing between general training that is transferrable to other firms and training that is firm-specific. We do this using responses to the following question: *“To what extent could you use the newly acquired skills if you got a new job in a different company?”*. This allows us to construct a measure of general versus specific training that parallels the notion of skill transferability inherent in Becker (1962). Specifically, we categorize response categories *“For the most part”* and *“Completely”* as general training and response categories *“Not at all”* and *“Only to a limited extent”* as specific training. In 2004 and 2008, we have this information for up to three different courses, while in 2000 the skill-transferability question did not target a specific course. Consequently, we assume that in 2000 responses to this question pertain to the most recent training course undertaken. Using this definition, we identify 1,730 reports of general-only training, 961 reports of specific-only training, and 131 reports that both types of training occurred within the proceeding 12 months. Each of these training events corresponds to a person-year observation in our data. For 8,150 person-year observations, neither general nor specific training is reported.⁶

Information about the nature of general versus specific training is reported in Table 1. The results in Panel A highlight the high degree of skill transferability embedded in the training that workers are undertaking. Fully, 42 percent of general training courses were rated by respondents as being completely transferable to jobs in different companies, while 58 percent were seen as being mostly transferable. In 73 percent of cases, respondents

⁶Descriptive statistics for our dependent and independent variables are reported by training status in Appendix Table A.1.

undertaking specific training believe that this training would have at least some limited transferability beyond their current employer. Only 27 percent view their newly-acquired skills as applicable only to their current firm and not at all useful in other companies.⁷ At the same time, specific training is more likely to be convened by the employer, to be shorter, and to take place during work hours (see Panel B). Consistent with the previous literature (e.g. Booth and Bryan, 2007), we also find that the vast majority of employers do provide financial support for general training. At the same time, workers undertaking general training are significantly less likely to receive any financial assistance and pay significantly more for their training than do their coworkers undertaking specific training.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

3.3 Locus of Control

Locus of control is measured in 1999 and 2005 using a series of self-reported items from the Rotter (1966) scale. Item responses in 1999 are reported on a four-point Likert scale ranging from *Totally agree* (1) to *Totally disagree* (4), while in 2005 a seven-point Likert scale ranging from *Totally disagree* (1) to *Totally agree* (7) is used. We begin by harmonizing our 1999 and 2005 locus of control measures by both recoding and stretching the 1999 response scale so that the response scales correspond in both years.⁸ A description of each item and its corresponding mean can be found in Table 2 for both 1999 and 2005.

Following the literature (Piatek and Pinger, 2016; Cobb-Clark *et al.*, 2014), our measure of locus of control is constructed using a two-step process. First, factor analysis is used to identify two underlying latent variables (factors) interpretable as internal and external locus of control, respectively. This process isolates six items that load onto external locus of control and two items that load onto internal locus of control (see Figure A.1/A and A.1/B). Second, we reverse the coding of the response scale for the six external items so that higher values denote higher levels of disagreement. We then use all eight items to conduct a factor analysis, separately by year, in which a single latent factor is extracted. This process allows us to identify separate loadings (weights) for each item which are then applied in constructing a continuous index that is increasing in internal locus of control. To facilitate the interpretation of our results, we use a standardized index (mean = 0; standard

⁷We consider the robustness of our results to alternative definitions of general training as well as to the exclusion of the year 2000 in Section 4.4.

⁸Specifically, the original 1999 response scale is recoded as follows: 1 to 7; 2 to 5; 3 to 3; and 4 to 1.

deviation = 1) in our estimation models.⁹ The distribution of our continuous, standardized locus of control measure is shown in Figure A.1/C for the year 1999 and in Figure A.1/D for the year 2005.

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

In order to minimize concerns about reverse causality, we rely on the most recent, pre-determined measure of locus of control in all of our analyses. That is, 1999 measures of locus of control are used when analyzing the training outcomes reported in 2000 and 2004, while the 2005 locus of control measure is utilized in analyzing 2008 training outcomes.

3.4 Wage Expectations, Realized Wages and Control Variables

In the survey waves immediately following the training module, i.e. in 2001, 2005, and 2009, the SOEP collected data on respondents' expectations regarding their future wage growth. Specifically, respondents were asked: *“How likely is it that you personally receive a pay raise above the rate negotiated by the union or staff in general in the next two years?”*. Responses are recorded in deciles, i.e. 0, 10, 20, ..., 100%. Those individuals who participated in general training in the previous wave have on average a higher expected probability of wage growth (22.3 percent) compared to their coworkers engaged in specific training (15.1 percent) or not participating in training at all (14.6 percent, see Table A.1). Moreover, those undertaking general training are more likely to expect at least some wage growth in the future. In Section 4.3, we analyze the relationship between training and subjective wage expectations for those respondents with an internal versus external locus of control in order to assess the potential for locus of control to influence training decisions through expectations about the returns to training. We also analyze the way that locus of control and training participation are related to realized gross wages in $t + 1$ in Section 4.3. General training participants (17.15€) earn on average more per hour than participants in specific training (16.21€) and non-participants (13.71€) (see Table A.1).

Our analysis also includes an extensive set of controls for: i) socio-economic characteristics (age, gender, marital status, number of children, disability, educational attainment, household income and both employment and unemployment experience); ii) personality traits (i.e. the Big Five); iii) regional conditions (regional indicators, local unemployment

⁹We consider the sensitivity of our results to an alternative locus of control index which weights all items equally (see Section 4.4).

rates, regional GDP, etc.); iv) job-specific characteristics (e.g. occupation, tenure, contract type, trade union/association membership, etc.); and v) firm-specific characteristics (firm size and industry). Most of our control variables are measured at the same time as training participation (2000, 2004, 2008). However, data on trade union/association membership and Big Five personality information is not collected in these years, requiring it to be imputed. Specifically, Big Five personality traits are imputed from 2005, while trade union/association membership data is imputed from 2001, 2003, and 2007.¹⁰

Many of these controls have been previously identified in the literature as important correlates of the decision to engage in training. The probability of receiving training increases with workers' educational level (Leuven and Oosterbeek, 1999; Oosterbeek, 1996, 1998; Bassanini *et al.*, 2007; Lynch, 1992; Lynch and Black, 1998; Arulampalam and Booth, 1997), for example, while older workers are less likely to participate in training compared to their younger coworkers (Maximiano, 2012; Oosterbeek, 1996, 1998). The evidence for a gender differential in the uptake of training is more mixed. Lynch (1992) finds that women are less likely to participate in training, while Maximiano (2012) and Oosterbeek (1996) find no gender difference and Lynch and Black (1998) find that women are more likely to participate in training. Unsurprisingly, training is also related to both job and firm characteristics. Maximiano (2012) and Oosterbeek (1996) find that workers with a permanent contract are more likely to receive training. Leuven and Oosterbeek (1999) instead find no significant differences of the type of working contract on training incidence, though contract type is associated with training intensity. Finally, workers in smaller companies have a lower probability of receiving training (see Maximiano, 2012; Lynch and Black, 1998; Oosterbeek, 1996).

Appendix Table A.1 presents descriptive statistics – by training status – for all of the conditioning variables in our empirical analysis. Standard t-tests indicate that individuals engaging in either specific or general training are significantly different in many respects relative to their co-workers who do not participate in either form of training. In particular, training recipients are on average more educated, are less likely to be a blue collar worker, and have fewer years of unemployment experience.

¹⁰Details about the construction of these variables are available from the authors upon request.

4 Results

4.1 Estimation Strategy

Our objective is to estimate the relationship between workers' locus of control and their participation in general or specific training. Our theoretical model predicts that workers with an internal locus of control will engage in general training more frequently than their external co-workers because their expected subjective investment returns are higher. In contrast, we expect little relationship between specific training and locus of control because training returns largely accrue to firms rather than workers.

In what follows, we conduct three separate empirical analyses. We first estimate the relationship between training participation and locus of control (see Section 4.2). We then examine whether the evidence suggests that locus of control affects the training decision by influencing the wage returns that workers expect. Finally, we assess whether realized wages after training differ with respect to the locus of control (see Section 4.3). In Section 4.4, we report the results of a number of robustness tests.

We specify the probability of participating in training (T_{it}^j) as a logit model:

$$P(T^j)_{it} = \frac{\exp(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 LoC_{i0} + \mathbf{X}_{it}' \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2)}{1 + \exp(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 LoC_{i0} + \mathbf{X}_{it}' \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2)} \quad (6)$$

where i indexes individuals, t indexes time, and $j = (A, G, S)$ indexes training type (i.e. any, general, and specific training respectively). Each model pools observations from the waves 2000, 2004, and 2008 and controls for internal locus of control (LoC) as well as a vector (\mathbf{X}_{it}) of detailed measures of i) socio-economic characteristics; ii) personality traits; iii) regional conditions; iv) job-specific characteristics; and v) firm-specific characteristics (firm size and industry) (see Section 3.4). Recall that our measure of locus of control is predetermined at the time training occurs, minimizing concerns about reverse causality, while we account for a detailed set of controls in order to reduce the potential for unobserved heterogeneity to confound our estimates. The parameter of interest is α_1 which captures the impact of locus of control on the probability of participating in different types of training.

In addition, we model expected wage growth (EWG_{it+1}) and observed hourly wages (W_{it+1}) in $t + 1$ as functions of training status, i.e. general training (T_{it}^G) or specific training (T_{it}^S) versus the base case of no training, and the interaction of training status

with locus of control. Our estimating equations are given by the following linear regressions:

$$\begin{aligned}
 EWG_{it+1} &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 LoC_{i0} + \beta_2 T_{it}^G + \beta_3 T_{it}^S \\
 &\quad + \beta_4 LoC_{i0} \cdot T_{it}^G + \beta_5 LoC_{i0} \cdot T_{it}^S + \mathbf{X}_{it}' \boldsymbol{\beta}_6 + \epsilon_{it}
 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \ln W_{it+1} &= \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 LoC_{i0} + \gamma_2 T_{it}^G + \gamma_3 T_{it}^S \\
 &\quad + \gamma_4 LoC_{i0} \cdot T_{it}^G + \gamma_5 LoC_{i0} \cdot T_{it}^S + \mathbf{X}_{it}' \boldsymbol{\gamma}_6 + e_{it}
 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We control for the same set of observed characteristics \mathbf{X}_{it} as in equation (6). Here β_4 and β_5 reflect the relationship between the locus of control and expected returns to different types of training, while γ_4 and γ_5 capture potential differences in hourly wages depending on the locus of control after general and specific training; e_{it} and $\epsilon_{it} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ are i.i.d error terms.

4.2 Participation in Training

We begin by using a binomial logit model to estimate the relationship between internal locus of control and participation in training. The results, i.e. marginal effects and standard errors, are reported in Table 3 for three alternative training outcomes: i) any training irrespective of type (Panel A); ii) general training (Panel B); and iii) specific training (Panel C). In each case, we estimate a series of models increasing in controls. Column (1) reports the unconditional effect of locus of control on training participation while column (5) reports the effect of locus of control on training conditioning on our full set of controls (see Section 4.1).¹¹ Given the construction of our locus of control measure, the results can be interpreted as the percentage point (pp) change in training incidence associated with a one standard deviation change in internal locus of control.

[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Workers with an internal locus of control are more likely to engage in work-related education and training. Our unconditional estimate implies that each standard deviation increase in internal locus of control is associated with a 4.2 pp increase in the chances that a worker undertakes some form of training. Although the estimated marginal effect of locus of control on the incidence of training falls as we increasingly control for detailed individual-, regional-, job-, and firm-level characteristics, it remains statistically significant

¹¹Full estimation results are available in Appendix Table A.2.

and economically meaningful. Specifically, in our full specification, we find that a one standard deviation increase in locus of control increases the probability of training taking place by 1.3 pp, which corresponds to an effect of almost 5.1 percent. This is consistent with previous evidence that having an internal locus of control is associated with both an increased willingness to engage in training (Fourage *et al.*, 2013) and higher rates of training (Offerhaus, 2013).

Differentiating by training type, however, highlights the fact that much of this result is driven by the strong relationship between locus of control and general training. Unconditionally, workers are estimated to be 3.9 pp more likely to engage in general training for every standard deviation increase in their internal locus of control. In our preferred specification, each standard deviation increase in locus of control is associated with an increased likelihood of engaging in general training of 1.6 pp. This corresponds to an effect size of 9.5 percent. This is nearly double that associated with training overall and is comparable to the effect of having an university degree (0.013) or a one standard deviation increase in extraversion (0.013) (see Table 3 in column (2)). In contrast, the link between locus of control and specific training is both economically unimportant and statistically insignificant once socio-demographic characteristics are controlled. Failing to distinguish between alternative types of training masks this crucial differentiation.

Taken together, these findings are consistent with the predictions of our theoretical model. A greater degree of internal control results in individuals being more likely to invest in training when it is transferable to other firms and having similar levels of investment when it is not.

4.3 Wage Expectations and Realized Wages

We turn now to investigating whether there is evidence that locus of control affects training decisions by influencing workers' subjective beliefs about training returns. Unfortunately, we do not have direct information about the a priori wage returns that workers would expect in the event they were and were not to undertake training. Instead we have data on workers' expectations regarding future wage growth post-training which we argue is an indirect measure of the returns that workers expect from training. Consequently, we estimate a series of models of expected future wage growth conditional on locus of control, participation in general or specific training and other control variables. The results are summarized in Table 4, while complete results are presented in Appendix Table A.3.

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

Workers who participated in general training in the previous wave have significantly higher expected future wage growth, whereas there is no relationship between specific training and wage expectations. These findings are not particularly surprising in light of Becker's (1962) argument that trainees largely capture the returns to general training, while the returns to specific training are captured predominately by firms. Future wage expectations are also related to the extent to which workers believe that what happens in life is under their control. The estimated effect of locus of control varies widely with model specification, however. In our preferred (full) specification, an internal locus of control is associated with a small, marginally significant (at the 10% level) decrease in expected future wage growth everything else equal.

We are particularly interested in the relationship between locus of control and expectations about future wage growth conditional on workers' previous training decisions. This effect is captured in the estimated interaction between locus of control and both general and specific training. Specifically, we find that there is a significant positive interaction between an internal locus of control and general training. That is, amongst those receiving general training, expected wage growth increases significantly with internal locus of control. In contrast, the subjective wage expectations of workers receiving specific training are independent of their locus of control. These results continue to hold in models with detailed controls for year and regional controls (column 2), socio-demographic characteristics (column 3), job and firm-characteristics (column 4) and Big Five Personality (column 5).

The relationship between locus of control, training participation, and wage expectations is shown graphically in Figure 2. Specifically, we plot predicted expectations regarding future wage growth (y-axis) at different quantiles of the locus of control distribution (x-axis), for general (blue, cross), specific (green, circle) and non-training participants (red, triangle). The crosses, circles and triangles in the middle of the vertical bars indicate the predicted means, while the horizontal lines indicate 95 percent confidence intervals. The more internal general training participants are, the higher is their wage growth expectation on average, ranging from a probability of about 13 percent in the lowest quintile to more than 23 percent in the highest. In contrast, those undertaking specific training have constant wage growth expectations throughout the locus of control distribution, while the expected likelihood of experiencing wage growth falls slightly as training non-participants become more internal.

[INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE]

These results strongly suggest that locus of control is linked to training decisions through workers' expectations regarding the likely returns. In particular, there is a strong positive relationship between locus of control and expected wage increases for those workers who are most likely to capture the returns from training (i.e. those participating in general training) and either no or a negative relationship for those who are not (i.e. those participating in specific training or no training respectively).

[INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]

Finally, we analyze the association of locus of control and training participation with realized wages in $t + 1$. Estimation results are summarized in Table 5; complete results are available in Table A.4. We assume that the decision to participate in training takes place in period t (which can be either in 2000, 2004 or 2008) and we estimate the relationship between training status in t and wages realized in period $t + 1$. We lose approximately 738 employed individuals from our sample due to missing wage or working hours information in $t + 1$. Column (1), Table 5 shows the unconditional effect of locus of control and training participation on hourly gross wage in $t + 1$.

We find that being internal is significantly positively related to wages. Moreover, participation in either general or specific training is associated with significantly higher wages, though the effect of general participation is slightly larger. There is an insignificant interaction between training (general or specific) and locus of control in determining realized wages which is robust as we increasingly add controls. In short, the post-training wages of training participants do not depend on their locus of control, suggesting that the return to training participation is independent of locus of control. This is inconsistent with the idea that workers with an internal locus of control engage in more training because they are more productive in training, i.e. because they receive larger productivity gains as a result.

4.4 Robustness Analysis

We conduct a number of robustness checks in order to assess the sensitivity of our conclusions to sample choice, model specification, and the parameterization of our key variables of interest. The results for our model of training participation are reported in Panel (A) of Table 6, while results for our model of wage expectations are reported in Panel (B) and

the results for the realized wage in $t + 1$ in Panel (C). To facilitate comparisons, Column (1) reproduces the training results (logit marginal effects), wage expectations results (OLS coefficients) and realized wage results (OLS coefficients) from our preferred specifications (column (5)) in Tables 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

Sample Choice: Unlike the case in 2004 and 2008, the SOEP skill-transferability question in 2000 cannot be linked to a specific training course, requiring us to assume that individuals' responses refer to the latest course undertaken (see Section 3.2). In Column (2), we report results from a restricted estimation sample in which we drop the data from year 2000. In addition, a small number of respondents ($n = 131$) participate in both general and specific training within a 12 month period. Column (3) reports the results we obtain when these individuals are excluded from the sample. In both cases, we find that our results are substantively the same indicating that our conclusions are robust to these two sampling choices.

Definition of General and Specific Training: We also consider the robustness of our results to the distinction we make between general versus specific training. Specifically, we narrow the definition of general training to include only training in which skills are “*Completely*” transferable to another company. All other categories of training are considered to be specific training. We find a somewhat weaker, though still statistically significant, relationship between locus of control and general training, while there continues to be no significant relationship between locus of control and specific training (see Column (4)). Thus, the conclusion that locus of control is related to general, but not specific, training continues to hold under this alternative definition. Moreover, the association between specific training and future wage expectations becomes larger and statistically significant which is unsurprising given that “specific training” now also encompasses training that is “to a large extent” transferable to other firms. In order to sharpen the distinction between general and specific training, we also considered an alternative definition which captures the extremes of the skill-transferability scale. That is, training is general only when it is “completely” transferable and specific only when it is “not at all transferable”. All other training events are dropped from the sample. These results are reported in Column (5). All of our results are virtually unchanged with the exception that the positive interaction between locus of control and specific training in influencing future wage expectations becomes

much larger, though it remains statistically insignificant.

Definition of Locus of Control: Our locus of control index is constructed using the weights that result from a factor analysis conducted separately by each year. Our results are unchanged if we instead construct an alternative index in which all locus of control items are weighted equally (see Column (6)).

Risk Attitudes: We additionally investigate whether our results are stable when controlling for individually reported risk attitudes. As briefly discussed in section 2.2, risk aversion might lead to an underinvestment in general training. If individual risk aversion is unobserved and correlated with locus of control, this might bias our results. In the SOEP we observe individual risk attitudes in the years 2004 and 2008. Column (7) presents estimation results including only the observations from these years and controlling for risk aversion. Our results are virtually the same as the results in column (2), which are based on the same years of observation without controlling for risk attitudes.

Potentially Endogenous Variables: Finally, we consider the sensitivity of our results to our choice of model specification. Specifically, Column (8) presents estimation results from a model which excludes potentially endogenous variables such as education, occupation type (blue, white collar), extent of occupational autonomy, ISCO-occupation and NACE-sector classification. The inclusion of these variables likely moderates the effect of locus of control. As expected, their exclusion strengthens the effect of locus of control on general training and sharpens the distinction between general and specific training in influencing future wage expectations.

Model Choice: To account for the large number of individuals reporting that they have no expectation of receiving a future wage increase, we also estimate a Tobit model of wage expectations and find very similar results (see Column (9)).

5 Conclusions

Nations face enormous challenges in ensuring that the economic prosperity delivered by globalization and rapid technological change is enjoyed by all members of society. The risk is that many disadvantaged, under-educated and less-skilled individuals will struggle to remain

competitive and may, as a result, fall even further behind. The European Commission has recently called for the integration of work and education “into a single lifelong learning process, open to innovation and open to all” (European Commission, 2010, p. 5). Whether this successfully allows marginalized groups to remain economically active and engaged in meaningful employment depends largely on their willingness to take-up work-related training opportunities.

This paper adopts a behavioral perspective on the tendency for some workers to underinvest in their own training. Specifically, we extend standard models of work-related training investments to allow individuals’ subjective beliefs about the investment returns to training to be influenced by their sense of control over what happens in life. A greater degree of internal control is predicted to make individuals more likely to invest in training when it is transferable to outside firms, but no more likely to invest in training when it is not. We then provide empirical evidence that, consistent with our theoretical model, having an internal locus of control is associated with higher participation in general but not specific training. Moreover, we argue that our results are consistent with locus of control affecting training investments through its influence on workers’ expected investment returns, rather than through training costs or post-training productivity. Specifically, general training is associated with greater expectations of future wage growth for those with an internal rather than external locus of control, even though actual post-general-training wages – and presumably productivity – do not depend on locus of control. There is also no evidence of any link between locus of control and wage expectations or post-training wages in the case of specific training.

Crucially, it is the link between skill transferability and the allocation of training returns across firms and workers which leads workers’ perceptions of control to have a more profound effect on their decisions regarding general rather than specific training. We formally demonstrate this using a stylized, two-period investment model with competitive markets and risk-neutral agents. However, this key result is also easily generalized to a variety of non-competitive market structures and to risk-averse workers so long as increased skill transferability ultimately enhances workers’ ability to capture the benefits of the training they receive. When this is true, we expect workers with an internal locus of control to respond to these incentives by investing in training. In contrast, those with an external locus of control are expected to be much less responsive to investment returns even when they exist.

These insights about workers' differential responsiveness to general versus specific training also extend beyond their perceptions of control. Many things – for example, cognitive biases, risk-aversion, impatience, etc. – can lead subjective expected investment returns to deviate from objective returns; vary across individuals; and matter for important economic decisions. In these circumstances, we would expect the disparity in workers' responses to objective investment returns to be larger when those returns accrue to them than when they do not.

The relationship between workers' investment decisions and their locus of control suggests that those with a more external sense of control are likely to require more intensive assistance in meeting their training goals. Moreover, as work-related training decisions appear to be linked to beliefs about training returns, there is also the potential for objective information regarding the returns to training to be useful in motivating external workers. Similar information interventions are being explored as a means of increasing disadvantaged students' propensity to attend college (Peter and Zambre, 2016) and influencing students' choice of college major (Wiswall and Zafar, 2015).

Future research will no doubt be useful in extending these results along several dimensions. There is a particular need for research that models the role of cognitive biases, risk and time preferences, and personality traits in work-related training investments. Training decisions are particularly interesting because – unlike other types of human capital decisions – they are not unilateral; training investments result from a joint decision making process between workers and firms. This implies that disparity in workers' and firms' expectations regarding training returns is potentially an important explanation for the apparent under-investment in training that we observe. Developing models that have more realistic behavioral foundations is likely to have large payoffs in explaining why some individuals under-invest in training. In particular, it would be useful to analyze the joint decision process of workers and firms in more detail to shed light on the investment and bargaining strategy of firms facing workers with diverse subjective expectations about the returns to training.

References

- ACEMOGLU, D. (1997). Training and innovation in an imperfect labour market. *The Review of Economic Studies*, **64** (3), 445–464.
- and PISCHKE, J.-S. (1998). Why do firms train? Theory and evidence. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **113** (1), 79–119.
- and — (1999a). Beyond Becker: Training in imperfect labour markets. *The Economic Journal*, **109** (453), 112–142.
- and — (1999b). The structure of wages and investment in general training. *The Journal of Political Economy*, **17** (3), 539–572.
- AHN, T. (2015). Locus of control and job turnover. *Economic Inquiry*, **53** (2), 1350–1365.
- ANGER, S. and HEINECK, G. (2010). The returns to cognitive abilities and personality traits in Germany. *Labour Economics*, **13**, 535–546.
- ARULAMPALAM, W. and BOOTH, A. (1997). Who gets over the training hurdle? A study of the training experiences of young men and women in Britain. *Journal of Population Economics*, **10** (2), 197–217.
- ASPLUND, R. (2005). The provision and effects of company training: A brief review of the literature. *Nordic Journal of Political Economy*, **31** (1), 47–73.
- BASSANINI, A., BOOTH, A., BRUNELLO, G., PAOLA, M. D. and LEUVEN, E. (2007). Workplace training in Europe. In G. Brunello, P. Garibaldi and E. Wasmer (eds.), *Education and Training in Europe*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 143–323.
- and OK, W. (2005). *How do firms’ and individuals’ incentives to invest in human capital vary across groups?* Proceedings of the joint EC-OECD seminar on “Human capital and labour market performance: Evidence and policy challenges”.
- BECKER, G. S. (1962). Investment in human capital: A theoretical analysis. *The Journal of Political Economy*, **70** (5), 9–49.
- BISHOP, J. H. (1996). *What we know about employer-provided training: A review of literature*. CAHRS Working Paper 96-09, Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies, Ithaca, NY.
- BLUNDELL, R., DEARDEN, L., MEGHIR, C. and SIANESI, B. (1999). Human capital investment: The returns from education and training to the individual, the firm and the economy. *Fiscal Studies*, **20** (1), 1–23.
- BOOTH, A. and BRYAN, M. L. (2007). Who pays for general training in private sector Britain? *Research in Labour Economics*, **26**, 85–123.
- and ZOEGA, G. (2000). *Why do firms invest in general training? ‘Good’ firms and ‘bad’ firms as a source of monopsony power*. Discussion Paper 2536, CEPR, London.
- CALIENDO, M., COBB-CLARK, D., HENNECKE, J. and UHLENDORFF, A. (2015a). *Locus of control and labor market migration*. Discussion Paper 9600, IZA, Bonn.
- , — and UHLENDORFF, A. (2015b). Locus of control and job search strategies. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, **97** (1), 88–103.
- , KÜNN, S. and WEIßENBERGER, M. (2016). Personality traits and the evaluation of start-up subsidies. *European Economic Review*, **86**, 87–108.
- CHANG, C. and WANG, Y. (1996). Human capital investment under asymmetric information: The pigovian conjecture revisited. *Journal of Labor Economics*, **14** (3), 505–519.

- COBB-CLARK, D. A., KASSENBOEHMER, S. C. and SCHURER, S. (2014). Healthy habits: The connection between diet, exercise, and locus of control. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, **98**, 1–28.
- , — and SINNING, M. (2016). Locus of control and savings. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, **73**, 113–130.
- COLEMAN, M. and DELEIRE, T. (2003). An economic model of locus of control and the human capital investment decision. *Journal of Human Resources*, **38** (3), 701–721.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2010). *New Skills for New Jobs: Action Now*. Report, European Commission.
- FOURAGE, D., SCHILS, T. and DE GRIP, A. (2013). Why do low-educated workers invest less in further training? *Applied Economics*, **45** (18), 2587–2601.
- FRANZ, W. and SOSKICE, D. (1995). The German apprenticeship system. In F. Buttler, W. Franz, R. Schettkat and D. Soskice (eds.), *Institutional Frameworks and Labor Market Performance: Comparative Views on the U.S. and German Economies*, London: Routledge, pp. 46–81.
- FRAZIS, H. and LOEWENSTEIN, M. A. (2006). On-the-job-training. *Foundations and Trends in Microeconomics*, **2** (5), 363–440.
- GERSBACH, H. and SCHMUTZLER, A. (2012). Product markets and industry-specific training. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, **43** (3), 475–491.
- HAELERMANS, C. and BORGHANS, L. (2012). Wage effects of on-the-job training: A meta-analysis. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, **50** (3), 502–528.
- HANSEMARK, O. C. (2003). Need for achievement, locus of control and the prediction of business start-ups: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, **24** (3), 301–319.
- HASHIMOTO, M. (1981). Firm-specific human capital as a shared investment. *The American Economic Review*, **71** (3), 475–482.
- INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION (2008). *Conclusions on skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development*. Report for the International Labor Conference, ILO, Geneva.
- JAIK, K. and WOLTER, S. C. (2016). *Lost in transition: The influence of locus of control on delaying educational decisions*. Discussion Paper 10191, IZA, Bonn.
- KATZ, E. and ZIDERMAN, A. (1990). Investment in general training: The role of information and labour mobility. *The Economic Journal*, **100** (403), 1147–1158.
- KESSLER, A. S. and LÜLFESMANN, C. (2006). The theory of human capital revisited: On the interaction of general and specific investments. *The Economic Journal*, **116** (514), 903–923.
- LAZEAR, E. P. (2009). Firm specific human capital: A skill weights approach. *Journal of Political Economy*, **117** (5), 914–940.
- LEUVEN, E. (2005). The economics of private sector training: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, **19** (1), 91–111.
- and OOSTERBEEK, H. (1999). The demand and supply of work-related training: Evidence from four countries. *Research in Labor Economics*, **18**, 303–330.
- LYNCH, L. M. (1992). Private-sector training and the earnings of young workers. *The American Economic Review*, **82** (1), 299–312.

- and BLACK, S. E. (1998). Beyond the incidence of employer-provided training. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, **52** (1), 64–81.
- MAXIMIANO, S. (2012). *Two to tango: The determinants of workers and firms willingness to participate in job-related training*. Mimeo, Purdue University.
- MCGEE, A. D. (2015). How the perception of control influences unemployed job search. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, **68** (1), 184–211.
- OFFERHAUS, J. (2013). *The type to train? Impacts of personality characteristics on further training participation*. SOEPpapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research 531, DIW SOEP, Berlin.
- OOSTERBEEK, H. (1996). A decomposition of training probabilities. *Applied Economics*, **28** (7), 799–805.
- (1998). Unravelling supply and demand factors in work-related training. *Oxford Economic Papers*, **50** (2), 266–283.
- OSBORNE GROVES, M. (2005). How important is your personality? Labor market returns to personality for women in the US and UK. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, **26** (6), 827–841.
- PETER, F. H. and ZAMBRE, V. (2016). *Intended college enrollment and educational inequality: Do students lack information?* Discussion Paper 1589, DIW, Berlin.
- PIATEK, R. and PINGER, P. (2016). Maintaining (locus of) control? Data combination for the identification and inference of factor structure models. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, **31** (3), 734–755.
- ROTTER, J. B. (1954). *Social Learning and Clinical Psychology*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, **80** (1), 1–28.
- SEMYKINA, A. and LINZ, S. J. (2007). Gender differences in personality and earnings: Evidence from Russia. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, **28** (3), 387–410.
- STEVENS, M. (1994a). An investment model for the supply of training by employers. *The Economic Journal*, **104** (424), 556–570.
- (1994b). A theoretical model of on-the-job training with imperfect competition. *Oxford Economic Papers*, **46** (4), 437–562.
- (1999). Human capital theory and UK vocational training policy. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, **15** (1), 16–32.
- WISWALL, M. and ZAFAR, B. (2015). Determinants of college major choice: Identification using an information experiment. *The Review of Economic Studies*, **82** (2), 791–824.
- WOLTER, S. C. and RYAN, P. (2011). Apprenticeship. In E. A. Hanushek, S. Machin and L. Woessmann (eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, vol. 3, Elsevier, pp. 521–576.

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Descriptives Course Characteristics

	(1)	(2)
	General Training	Specific Training
A. All courses		
Observations	1,730	961
To what extent could you use the newly acquired skills if you got a new job in a different company? ^a		
Not At All	0.00	0.27
Limited	0.00	0.73
To A Large Extent	0.58	0.00
Completely	0.42	0.00
B. Most recent course undertaken		
Total course duration (weeks) ^b	4.08	1.47 ***
Hours of Instruction every week	16.46	16.06
Correspondence course	0.04	0.04
Introduction to a new job	0.02	0.03
Qualification for professional advancement	0.13	0.07 ***
Adjustment to new demands in current job	0.74	0.77
Other	0.10	0.13 ***
Did the course take place during working hours		
During Working Time	0.66	0.76 ***
Some Of Both	0.12	0.11
Outside working time	0.21	0.13 ***
Did you receive a participation certificate?	0.80	0.63 ***
Who held the course:		
Employer	0.44	0.61 ***
Private Institute	0.19	0.10 ***
Did you receive financial support from your employer		
Yes, From The Employer	0.74	0.77
Yes, From another Source	0.08	0.06
Dummy for no own Costs	0.83	0.89 ***
Own costs	526.59	133.78 ***
Looking back, was this further education worth it for your professionally?		
Very Much	0.44	0.19 ***
A Little	0.39	0.56 ***
Not At All	0.07	0.16 ***
Do Not Know Yet	0.10	0.09

Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29 , own calculations.

Notes: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Panel A refers to all courses of the estimation sample, whereas Panel B refers only to the most recent course participated in. Number of observations of the presented survey question vary slightly due to item non-response.

^a In case individuals participated in more than one course within one cross-section, we took the information available of the most recent course.

^b Own calculation, based on information of the length (days, weeks, months) or each course.

Table 2: Locus of Control Items 1999 and 2005

Variable	Wave	
	1999 ^a	2005 ^b
Number of observations	6,954	4,018
Components of locus of control (Mean, 1999 Scale: 1-4, 2005 Scale: 1-7)		
I1: How my life goes depends on me (I)	3.30	5.55
I2: Compared to other people, I have not achieved what I deserve (E)	2.08	3.10
I3: What a person achieves in life is above all a question of fate or luck (E)	2.19	3.39
I5: I frequently have the experience that other people have a controlling influence over my life (E)	1.99	3.04
I6: One has to work hard in order to succeed (I)	3.46	6.03
I7: If I run up against difficulties in life, I often doubt my abilities (E)	2.02	3.28
I8: The opportunities that I have in life are determined by the social conditions (E)	2.67	4.47
I10: I have little control over the things that happen in my life (E)	1.77	2.52

Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29 , own calculations.

Notes:

In both years, item 4 “If a person is socially or politically active, he/she can have an effect on social conditions” and 9 “Inborn abilities are more important than any efforts one can make” are not included in the prediction of the latent factor.

Items marked with (I)/(E) refer to internal/external items. External items are reversed prior to factor analysis in order to indicate an internal locus of control for high values.

^a In 1999 the LoC was surveyed on a 4-point likert scale from 1 for “Totally Disagree” to 4 for “Totally Agree”. The scale was reversed in the data preparation in order to indicate agreement for high values as it is also the case in the other wave of 2005. For the later harmonization, the scale was stretched to the length of a 7-point likert scale.

^b In 2005 the LoC was surveyed on a 7-point likert scale from 1 for “Disagree Completely” to 7 for “Agree completely”.

Table 3: Logit Estimation Results: Participation in Training (Marginal Effects)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
A. Training					
Locus of Control (std.)	0.042*** (0.004)	0.041*** (0.004)	0.024*** (0.004)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.013*** (0.004)
B. General Training					
Locus of Control (std.)	0.039*** (0.004)	0.038*** (0.004)	0.027*** (0.004)	0.02*** (0.004)	0.016*** (0.004)
C. Specific Training					
Locus of Control (std.)	0.007** (0.003)	0.007** (0.003)	0.0003 (0.003)	-.002 (0.003)	-.001 (0.003)
Control Variables					
Locus of Control	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
year, regional		✓	✓	✓	✓
socio-demographics			✓	✓	✓
job, firm				✓	✓
Big Five Personality					✓
Observations	10,972	10,972	10,972	10,972	10,972

Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29 , own calculations.

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Standard errors are clustered on person-level.

The full estimation results can be found in Table A.2 in the Appendix.

Table 4: OLS Estimation Results: Wage Expectations

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
Locus of Control (std.)	0.823*** (0.287)	0.831*** (0.289)	-.013 (0.273)	-.229 (0.269)	-.459* (0.279)
General Training	6.807*** (0.734)	6.966*** (0.73)	4.139*** (0.703)	3.445*** (0.687)	3.220*** (0.683)
Specific Training	0.292 (0.848)	0.764 (0.837)	-.794 (0.817)	0.003 (0.803)	-.108 (0.8)
General Training * Locus of Control (std.)	3.071*** (0.834)	2.795*** (0.817)	2.896*** (0.771)	2.793*** (0.741)	2.705*** (0.74)
Specific Training * Locus of Control (std.)	0.502 (0.882)	0.366 (0.871)	0.257 (0.843)	0.506 (0.833)	0.431 (0.829)
Control Variables					
Locus of Control, Training	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
year, regional		✓	✓	✓	✓
socio-demographics			✓	✓	✓
job, firm				✓	✓
Big Five Personality					✓
Observations	10,972	10,972	10,972	10,972	10,972
R^2	0.018	0.038	0.128	0.173	0.179

Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29 , own calculations.

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Standard errors are clustered on person-level. The full estimation results can be found in Table A.3 in the Appendix.

Table 5: OLS Estimation Results: Gross Log Hourly Wage (t+1)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
Locus of Control (std.)	0.057*** (0.006)	0.057*** (0.006)	0.024*** (0.005)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.015*** (0.004)
General Training	0.195*** (0.013)	0.195*** (0.013)	0.113*** (0.011)	0.044*** (0.009)	0.045*** (0.009)
Specific Training	0.178*** (0.014)	0.189*** (0.014)	0.094*** (0.012)	0.03*** (0.01)	0.03*** (0.01)
General Training * Locus of Control (std.)	0.022 (0.014)	0.01 (0.014)	-0.006 (0.012)	-0.003 (0.01)	-0.002 (0.01)
Specific Training * Locus of Control (std.)	-0.009 (0.016)	-0.018 (0.015)	-0.004 (0.012)	-0.013 (0.011)	-0.014 (0.011)
Control Variables					
Locus of Control, Training	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
year, regional		✓	✓	✓	✓
socio-demographics			✓	✓	✓
job, firm				✓	✓
Big Five Personality					✓
Observations	10,234	10,234	10,234	10,234	10,234
R^2	0.057	0.135	0.414	0.54	0.54

Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29 , own calculations.

Notes: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Standard Errors are clustered on person-level.

The full estimation results can be found in Table A.4 in the Appendix.

Table 6: Robustness Analysis for Training Participation and Wage Expectations

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
A. Logit Estimation Results: Participation in Training (Marginal Effects)									
General and Specific Training									
Locus of Control (std.)	0.013*** (0.004)	0.015*** (0.005)	0.013*** (0.005)	0.013*** (0.004)	0.012*** (0.003)	0.011** (0.004)	0.015*** (0.005)	0.024*** (0.005)	
Observations	10,972	7,436	10,841	10,972	9,085	10,972	7,423	10,972	
General Training									
Locus of Control (std.)	0.016*** (0.004)	0.017*** (0.005)	0.016*** (0.004)	0.011*** (0.003)	0.013*** (0.003)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.017*** (0.005)	0.025*** (0.004)	
Observations	10,972	7,436	10,841	10,972	9,085	10,972	7,423	10,972	
Specific Training									
Locus of Control (std.)	-0.001 (0.003)	-0.0004 (0.004)	-0.002 (0.003)	0.002 (0.004)	0.0002 (0.002)	-0.002 (0.003)	-0.0003 (0.004)	0.002 (0.003)	
Observations	10,972	7,387	10,841	10,972	9,002	10,972	7,423	10,972	
B. OLS Estimation Results: Wage Expectations									
Locus of Control (LoC) (std.)	-0.459* (0.279)	-0.783** (0.326)	-0.418 (0.298)	-0.452 (0.279)	-0.409 (0.282)	-0.453 (0.278)	-0.799** (0.326)	-0.125 (0.284)	-1.740*** (0.613)
General Training	3.220*** (0.683)	1.887** (0.773)	2.925*** (0.725)	2.768*** (1.046)	2.554** (1.090)	3.275*** (0.686)	1.854** (0.774)	4.604*** (0.698)	5.312*** (1.300)
Specific Training	-1.108 (0.8)	-0.342 (0.886)	-0.164 (0.828)	1.823*** (0.662)	-0.762 (1.497)	-1.107 (0.802)	-0.337 (0.888)	-0.122 (0.811)	-1.440 (1.727)
General Training * LoC (std.)	2.705*** (0.74)	2.531*** (0.794)	2.634*** (0.817)	3.514*** (1.178)	3.429*** (1.223)	2.515*** (0.726)	2.517*** (0.794)	2.775*** (0.777)	4.835*** (1.384)
Specific Training * LoC (std.)	0.431 (0.829)	-0.166 (0.886)	0.223 (0.916)	1.390** (0.657)	2.147 (0.849)	0.53 (1.395)	-0.135 (0.888)	0.21 (0.832)	1.295 (1.898)
Observations	10,972	7,436	10,841	10,972	9,085	10,972	7,423	10,972	10,972
C. OLS Estimation Results: Gross Log Hourly Wage (t+1)									
Locus of Control (LoC) (std.)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.016*** (0.005)	0.016*** (0.005)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.013*** (0.005)	0.014*** (0.004)	0.016*** (0.005)	0.032*** (0.005)	
General Training	0.045*** (0.009)	0.042*** (0.011)	0.05*** (0.01)	0.043*** (0.015)	0.039*** (0.015)	0.045*** (0.009)	0.042*** (0.011)	0.133*** (0.011)	
Specific Training	0.03*** (0.01)	0.024** (0.012)	0.039*** (0.011)	0.044*** (0.009)	0.038** (0.018)	0.03*** (0.01)	0.024* (0.012)	0.084*** (0.012)	
General Training * LoC (std.)	-0.002 (0.01)	-0.005 (0.012)	-0.003 (0.012)	-0.003 (0.017)	-0.004 (0.018)	-0.003 (0.01)	-0.005 (0.012)	-0.0007 (0.012)	
Specific Training * LoC (std.)	-0.014 (0.011)	-0.012 (0.013)	-0.013 (0.012)	-0.008 (0.009)	0.0008 (0.019)	-0.014 (0.011)	-0.011 (0.013)	-0.026** (0.012)	
Observations	10,234	6,925	10,107	10,234	8,436	10,234	6,916	10,234	
Control Variables									
Locus of Control, Training	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
year, regional	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
socio-demographics	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓*	✓
job, firm	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓*	✓
Big Five Personality	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29 , own calculations.

Notes: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Standard Errors are clustered on person-level.

Sensitivity tests are presented in the different columns, we tested the following specifications:

(1): Main results, from column (5) in Tables 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

(2): Excluding year 2000

(3): Excluding individuals participating in general and specific training within one cross-section

(4): Changing definition of general training (general=completely; specific=for the most part, only to a limited extend, not at all)

(5): Changing definition of general training (general=completely; specific=not at all)


(6): Locus of Control index is average of items (all items equally weighted)

(7): Including general risk attitudes (only available in 2004 and 2008)

(8): Excluding potentially endogenous variables (education, blue/white collar worker, occupational autonomy, manager, ISCO, NACE)
remaining Job + Firm control variables are: firm size, type of contract, member trade union/ association

(9): Tobit Model


Figure 1: Description of the Data Structure



Source: Own illustration.

Notes: The figure gives an overview of the variables used from which data waves in the present analysis. We use the data waves from the years 2000, 2004 and 2008 in our analysis, as they contain information about the characteristics of training participated in. The variable measuring the participation in *training* refers to the three years prior to the interview date. However, we defined individuals as training participants if they report participation in training within the 12 months prior to the date of interview. Information about locus of control and wage expectations were not observed in our three data waves and therefore had to be imputed from other years. Information about *locus of control* are available in the years 1999 and 2005. Locus of control observed in the year 1999 was imputed in the data waves of the years 2000 and 2004, and we use the locus of control measured in 2005 in our last data wave. *Wage expectations* referring to the next following years are observed one year after each data wave and had to be backward imputed.

Figure 2: Predicted Wage Expectations by Locus of Control



Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29, own illustration.

Notes: The figure shows different locus of control quantiles plotted against the predicted wage expectations for non-training participants (red, triangle), and only general training participants (blue, cross). The triangles / crosses in the middle of the vertical bars show the predicted mean expectations for the respective training outcome. The horizontal ending points of the vertical bars denote the lower and upper end of the 95% confidence interval.

A Supplementary Tables and Figures

Table A.1: Summary Statistics of Explanatory Variables

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	No Training	General Training	Specific Training
Number of Observations ^a	8,150	1,730	961
Locus of Control ^{b,c}	4.40	4.59 ***	4.46 **
Wage Expectations ^{d,c}	14.60	22.34 ***	15.05
Share with Expectation of 0%	0.58	0.48	0.61
Realized Gross Wage (per hour) in t+1 (in €) ^{c,e}	13.71	17.15 ***	16.21 ***
Socio-Economic Variables			
Age ^c	42.92	41.74 ***	43.24
Female	0.48	0.45 *	0.44 **
Married	0.74	0.71 ***	0.74
Number of Children ^c	0.69	0.70	0.64
Disabled	0.06	0.05 *	0.06
German Nationality	0.90	0.97 ***	0.96 ***
Owner of House/Dwelling	0.53	0.58 ***	0.58 ***
No School Degree	0.02	0.00 ***	0.00 ***
Lower/Intermediate School Degree	0.76	0.56 ***	0.63 ***
Highschool Degree	0.22	0.44 ***	0.36 ***
No Vocational Training	0.27	0.27	0.23 **
Apprenticeship	0.47	0.38 ***	0.38 ***
Vocational School	0.26	0.35 ***	0.38 ***
University Degree	0.19	0.38 ***	0.36 ***
Work Experience (FT + PT) (in years) ^c	18.69	16.93 ***	18.94
Unemployment Experience (in years) ^c	0.65	0.41 ***	0.35 ***
Real Net HH income last month of 2 years ago (in 1000 €) ^c	2.76	3.03 ***	3.02 ***
Regional Information			
East Germany	0.26	0.28 *	0.33 ***
South Germany	0.28	0.25 ***	0.21 ***
North Germany	0.11	0.11	0.11
City States	0.05	0.06 ***	0.06 *
Unemployment Rate ^c	9.73	9.78	10.36 ***
GDP ^c	26.69	27.29 ***	26.24 *
Job-Specific Characteristics			
White-collar Worker	0.53	0.75 ***	0.65 ***
Blue-collar Worker	0.42	0.13 ***	0.16 ***
Member Tradeunion	0.19	0.20	0.27 ***
Member Tradeassociation	0.05	0.12 ***	0.11 ***
High Occupational Autonomy	0.19	0.44 ***	0.36 ***
Manager	0.14	0.32 ***	0.22 ***
Tenure (in years) ^c	11.09	11.32	13.96 ***
Contract - Permanent	0.34	0.40 ***	0.40 ***
Contract - Temporary	0.60	0.56 ***	0.56 **
Contract - Other	0.06	0.04 ***	0.05 *
Managers (ISCO88)	0.05	0.09 ***	0.06
Professionals (ISCO88)	0.12	0.28 ***	0.25 ***
Technicians and associate professionals (ISCO88)	0.21	0.32 ***	0.31 ***
Clerical support workers (ISCO88)	0.12	0.09 ***	0.13
Service and sales workers (ISCO88)	0.11	0.08 ***	0.09 ***
Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers (ISCO88)	0.01	0.01	0.01
Craft and related trades workers (ISCO88)	0.17	0.10 ***	0.10 ***
Plant and machine operators, and assemblers (ISCO88)	0.10	0.03 ***	0.04 ***
Firm-Specific Characteristics			

Small Firmsize	0.57	0.46 ***	0.36 ***
Medium Firmsize	0.22	0.24 **	0.26 ***
Large Firmsize	0.21	0.30 ***	0.38 ***
NACE - Manufacturing	0.13	0.13	0.10 **
NACE - Agriculture	0.01	0.01 *	0.02 *
NACE - Mining, Quarrying, Energy, Water	0.01	0.02 ***	0.02 ***
NACE - Chemicals/Pulp/Paper	0.07	0.04 ***	0.04 ***
NACE - Construction	0.07	0.04 ***	0.03 ***
NACE - Iron/Steel	0.06	0.03 ***	0.03 ***
NACE - Textile/Apparel	0.01	0.00 ***	0.00 ***
NACE - Wholesale/Retail	0.14	0.08 ***	0.07 ***
NACE - Transportation/Communication	0.05	0.04 **	0.05
NACE - Public Service	0.26	0.42 ***	0.45 ***
NACE - Financials/Private Services	0.12	0.13	0.13
Personality Characteristics			
Big Five Factor Openness ^c	4.35	4.62 ***	4.49 ***
Big Five Factor Conscientiousness ^c	6.01	5.98	5.88 ***
Big Five Factor Extraversion ^c	4.77	4.95 ***	4.82
Big Five Factor Agreeableness ^c	5.36	5.35	5.26 ***
Big Five Factor Neuroticism ^c	3.88	3.69 ***	3.81 *

Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), waves 1999-2011, version 29, doi:10.5684/soep.v29,

own calculations. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Notes: Table shows mean values of explanatory variables by training status. Result of mean comparison tests are indicated by asterisks. The test compared non-training participants to specific and general training participants.

The summary statistics in columns (2) and (3) refer to those people who exclusively participate in general or specific training.

^a The number of non-training, general and specific training participants does not add up to the estimation sample size as 131 people participate in general and specific training which are excluded from the descriptives.

^b The locus of control index in the descriptives table is the average sum over all internal and reversed external items.

^c Denotes continuous variable.

^d Wage expectations refer to the perceived likeliness of receiving a pay raise above the rate negotiated by the union of staff in general in the next two years.

^e The number of observations for non-training participants are 7,548, for general 1,640 and for specific 919.

Table A.2: Logit Estimation Results: Participation in Training, General Training, Specific Training

	(1) Training	(2) General Training	(3) Specific Training
Locus of Control (std.)	0.013*** (0.004)	0.016*** (0.004)	-.001 (0.003)
Age	-.001 (0.001)	-.001 (0.001)	0.00002 (0.0008)
Female	-.026** (0.011)	-.014 (0.009)	-.013* (0.007)
Married	0.0007 (0.011)	-.003 (0.009)	-.0004 (0.008)
Number of Children	-.001 (0.005)	0.0004 (0.005)	0.0009 (0.004)
Disabled	-.028 (0.019)	-.013 (0.016)	-.027* (0.014)
German Nationality	0.069*** (0.021)	0.06*** (0.02)	0.023 (0.016)
Owner of House/Dwelling	0.013 (0.009)	0.012 (0.008)	0.0004 (0.007)
School Degree (Ref.: Low/Intermed. School)			
No Degree	-.113 (0.077)	-.104 (0.095)	-.048 (0.05)
Highschool Degree	0.015 (0.013)	0.02* (0.011)	-.007 (0.008)
Vocational Education (Ref.: Non)			
Apprenticeship	0.065*** (0.013)	0.04*** (0.011)	0.031*** (0.009)
Vocational School	0.088*** (0.013)	0.051*** (0.011)	0.039*** (0.009)
University or College Degree	0.042*** (0.014)	0.013 (0.012)	0.031*** (0.009)
Work Experience (FT + PT)	-.002 (0.001)	-.002 (0.001)	-.0008 (0.0008)
Unemployment Experience	-.006 (0.005)	-.001 (0.004)	-.005 (0.003)
Real Net HH income last month of 2 years ago (in 1000 €)	-.008** (0.003)	-.005 (0.003)	-.002 (0.002)
East Germany	0.035 (0.021)	0.025 (0.018)	0.016 (0.015)
South Germany	-.020 (0.014)	-.013 (0.012)	-.010 (0.01)
North Germany	-.013 (0.015)	-.005 (0.013)	-.004 (0.01)
City States	-.003 (0.021)	0.002 (0.018)	-.007 (0.014)
Unemployment Rate	-.0005 (0.002)	-.001 (0.002)	0.0003 (0.002)
GDP	0.0009 (0.0009)	0.001* (0.0008)	-.0002 (0.0007)
Dummy for year 2000	-.014 (0.017)	-.020 (0.015)	-.008 (0.012)
Dummy for year 2004	-.014 (0.017)	-.015 (0.015)	0.002 (0.013)
White-collar Worker	-.065*** (0.023)	0.006 (0.019)	-.051*** (0.014)
Blue-collar Worker	-.217*** (0.027)	-.126*** (0.024)	-.097*** (0.018)

Member Trade Union	0.031*** (0.011)	0.014 (0.01)	0.016** (0.007)
Member Trade Association	0.039** (0.015)	0.034*** (0.013)	0.009 (0.01)
High Occupational Autonomy	0.059*** (0.021)	0.065*** (0.019)	-.004 (0.015)
Manager	-.003 (0.023)	-.009 (0.02)	0.00006 (0.016)
Tenure	0.0009 (0.0006)	-.0002 (0.0005)	0.001*** (0.0004)
Contract - Permanent	0.02 (0.016)	0.006 (0.013)	0.017 (0.011)
Contract - Other	-.048** (0.021)	-.028 (0.019)	-.008 (0.014)
Managers (ISCO88)	0.181*** (0.031)	0.133*** (0.029)	0.08*** (0.025)
Professionals (ISCO88)	0.178*** (0.029)	0.124*** (0.028)	0.096*** (0.022)
Technicians and associate professionals (ISCO88)	0.189*** (0.027)	0.13*** (0.026)	0.093*** (0.021)
Clerical support workers (ISCO88)	0.136*** (0.028)	0.078*** (0.027)	0.09*** (0.022)
Service and sales workers (ISCO88)	0.148*** (0.028)	0.099*** (0.027)	0.077*** (0.023)
Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers (ISCO88)	0.218*** (0.068)	0.174*** (0.066)	0.078 (0.049)
Craft and related trades workers (ISCO88)	0.199*** (0.029)	0.152*** (0.027)	0.084*** (0.022)
Plant and machine operators, and assemblers (ISCO88)	0.107*** (0.034)	0.067** (0.032)	0.052** (0.025)
Firm size small	-.074*** (0.01)	-.025*** (0.009)	-.058*** (0.007)
Firm size medium	-.024** (0.012)	-.008 (0.01)	-.021*** (0.008)
Manufacturing (NACE)	0.019 (0.021)	0.035* (0.018)	-.018 (0.015)
Agriculture (NACE)	0.051 (0.052)	-.032 (0.046)	0.063* (0.036)
Mining, Quarring, Energy, Water (NACE)	0.077** (0.034)	0.06* (0.031)	0.025 (0.023)
Chemicals/Pulp/Paper (NACE)	-.035 (0.027)	-.022 (0.024)	-.026 (0.019)
Construction (NACE)	-.051* (0.027)	-.018 (0.024)	-.051** (0.022)
Iron/Steel (NACE)	-.030 (0.027)	-.003 (0.024)	-.030 (0.02)
Textile/Apparel (NACE)	-.179** (0.075)	-.091 (0.063)	-.155* (0.086)
Wholesale/Retail (NACE)	-.075*** (0.022)	-.046** (0.02)	-.045*** (0.016)
Transportation/Communication (NACE)	-.007 (0.026)	0.008 (0.024)	-.017 (0.018)
Public Service (NACE)	0.029 (0.018)	0.03* (0.017)	-.0008 (0.013)
Financials/Private Services (NACE)	0.017 (0.02)	0.013 (0.019)	-.004 (0.015)
Big Five Factor Openness	0.01** (0.005)	0.009** (0.004)	0.0003 (0.003)
Big Five Factor Conscientiousness	-.006 (0.006)	0.003 (0.006)	-.011*** (0.004)

Big Five Factor Extraversion	0.014*** (0.005)	0.013*** (0.004)	0.002 (0.003)
Big Five Factor Agreeableness	-0.007 (0.006)	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.005 (0.004)
Big Five Factor Neuroticism	-0.004 (0.004)	-0.005 (0.004)	-0.001 (0.003)
Obs.	10,972	10,972	10,972

Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29 , own calculations.

Notes: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Standard Errors are clustered on person-level.

Table A.3: OLS Estimation Results: Wage Expectations, controlling for General and Specific Training

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Locus of Control (std.)	0.823*** (0.287)	0.831*** (0.289)	-0.013 (0.273)	-0.229 (0.269)	-0.459* (0.279)
General Training	6.807*** (0.734)	6.966*** (0.73)	4.139*** (0.703)	3.445*** (0.687)	3.220*** (0.683)
Specific Training	0.292 (0.848)	0.764 (0.837)	-0.794 (0.817)	0.003 (0.803)	-0.108 (0.8)
General Training * Locus of Control (std.)	3.071*** (0.834)	2.795*** (0.817)	2.896*** (0.771)	2.793*** (0.741)	2.705*** (0.74)
Specific Training * Locus of Control (std.)	0.502 (0.882)	0.366 (0.871)	0.257 (0.843)	0.506 (0.833)	0.431 (0.829)
East Germany		1.653 (1.242)	2.017* (1.196)	0.891 (1.178)	1.233 (1.175)
South Germany		-1.969** (0.868)	-1.994** (0.81)	-2.137*** (0.774)	-2.325*** (0.771)
North Germany		-2.583*** (0.962)	-3.093*** (0.92)	-3.274*** (0.874)	-3.275*** (0.869)
City States		1.909 (1.396)	1.127 (1.324)	1.314 (1.289)	1.250 (1.281)
Unemployment Rate		-0.824*** (0.134)	-0.822*** (0.127)	-0.787*** (0.125)	-0.828*** (0.125)
GDP		0.111* (0.058)	0.074 (0.054)	-0.023 (0.053)	-0.019 (0.052)
Dummy for year 2000		5.520*** (0.675)	4.394*** (0.653)	2.003** (1.006)	2.237** (1.005)
Dummy for year 2004		2.628*** (0.671)	1.862*** (0.645)	-0.387 (0.999)	-0.178 (0.999)
Age			-0.519*** (0.059)	-0.508*** (0.058)	-0.484*** (0.058)
Female			-6.344*** (0.543)	-6.276*** (0.625)	-5.971*** (0.642)
Married			-2.102*** (0.664)	-1.781*** (0.645)	-1.583** (0.641)
Number of Children			-0.231 (0.314)	-0.438 (0.302)	-0.381 (0.3)
Disabled			-2.032** (0.952)	-1.392 (0.921)	-1.191 (0.914)
German Nationality			2.647*** (0.925)	1.691* (0.883)	1.853** (0.883)
Owner of House/Dwelling			0.387 (0.533)	0.457 (0.517)	0.48 (0.513)
School Degree (Ref.: Low/Intermed. School)					
No Degree			-2.842* (1.512)	-2.015 (1.575)	-1.374 (1.568)
Highschool Degree			5.336*** (0.849)	2.842*** (0.847)	2.914*** (0.846)
Vocational Education (Ref.: Non)					
Apprenticeship			1.863** (0.726)	0.891 (0.719)	0.747 (0.712)
Vocational School			-0.196 (0.745)	0.176 (0.75)	-0.049 (0.745)
University or College Degree			2.656*** (0.866)	0.383 (0.905)	0.272 (0.899)
Work Experience (FT + PT)			-0.094* (0.054)	-0.007 (0.055)	-0.014 (0.055)
Unemployment Experience			-0.136 (0.168)	-0.314* (0.174)	-0.293* (0.174)

Real Net HH income last month of 2 years ago (in 1000 €)	1.004*** (0.228)	0.743*** (0.224)	0.668*** (0.223)
White-collar Worker		6.358*** (1.384)	6.625*** (1.383)
Blue-collar Worker		4.484*** (1.545)	5.007*** (1.541)
Member Trade Union		-.946 (0.623)	-1.110* (0.621)
Member Trade Association		-1.023 (1.025)	-1.298 (1.020)
High Occupational Autonomy		2.426* (1.401)	2.381* (1.401)
Manager		5.155*** (1.534)	4.894*** (1.533)
Tenure		-.191*** (0.03)	-.184*** (0.03)
Contract - Permanent		-1.929** (0.915)	-1.923** (0.915)
Contract - Other		-.895 (0.985)	-.842 (0.98)
Managers (ISCO88)		5.884*** (1.647)	5.550*** (1.639)
Professionals (ISCO88)		2.513* (1.382)	2.542* (1.375)
Technicians and associate professionals (ISCO88)		2.745** (1.072)	2.758*** (1.067)
Clerical support workers (ISCO88)		2.862** (1.173)	2.895** (1.165)
Service and sales workers (ISCO88)		0.983 (1.064)	0.936 (1.059)
Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers (ISCO88)		-.288 (2.575)	-.230 (2.555)
Craft and related trades workers (ISCO88)		-1.010 (1.013)	-1.139 (1.010)
Plant and machine operators, and assemblers (ISCO88)		-2.006* (1.079)	-2.049* (1.072)
Firm size small		-.925 (0.664)	-.814 (0.662)
Firm size medium		-.790 (0.717)	-.709 (0.714)
Manufacturing (NACE)		3.092*** (1.149)	3.361*** (1.144)
Agriculture (NACE)		-.680 (2.098)	-.070 (2.068)
Mining, Quarring, Energy, Water (NACE)		1.168 (1.981)	1.008 (1.974)
Chemicals/Pulp/Paper (NACE)		3.424*** (1.326)	3.581*** (1.317)
Construction (NACE)		1.833 (1.322)	1.747 (1.322)
Iron/Steel (NACE)		0.808 (1.357)	1.060 (1.350)
Textile/Apparel (NACE)		2.458 (2.191)	2.962 (2.214)
Wholesale/Retail (NACE)		0.743 (1.126)	0.992 (1.120)
Transportation/Communication (NACE)		-.703 (1.435)	-.620 (1.435)
Public Service (NACE)		-2.811*** (1.011)	-2.607*** (1.003)

Financials/Private Services (NACE)					3.267*** (1.177)	3.387*** (1.169)
Big Five Factor Openness						0.805*** (0.257)
Big Five Factor Conscientiousness						-.086 (0.377)
Big Five Factor Extraversion						0.958*** (0.267)
Big Five Factor Agreeableness						-1.349*** (0.311)
Big Five Factor Neuroticism						-.869*** (0.251)
Const.	14.653*** (0.291)	17.358*** (2.204)	40.066*** (2.876)	40.382*** (3.476)	41.866*** (4.425)	
Obs.	10972	10972	10972	10972	10972	10972
R^2	0.018	0.038	0.128	0.173	0.179	

Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29 , own calculations.

Notes: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Standard Errors are clustered on person-level.

Table A.4: OLS Estimation Results: Gross Log Hourly Wage Income (t+1)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Locus of Control (std.)	0.057*** (0.006)	0.057*** (0.006)	0.024*** (0.005)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.015*** (0.004)
General Training	0.195*** (0.013)	0.195*** (0.013)	0.113*** (0.011)	0.044*** (0.009)	0.045*** (0.009)
Specific Training	0.178*** (0.014)	0.189*** (0.014)	0.094*** (0.012)	0.03*** (0.01)	0.03*** (0.01)
General Training * Locus of Control (std.)	0.022 (0.014)	0.01 (0.014)	-0.006 (0.012)	-0.003 (0.01)	-0.002 (0.01)
Specific Training * Locus of Control (std.)	-0.009 (0.016)	-0.018 (0.015)	-0.004 (0.012)	-0.013 (0.011)	-0.014 (0.011)
East Germany		-0.176*** (0.027)	-0.201*** (0.022)	-0.173*** (0.019)	-0.173*** (0.019)
South Germany		-0.012 (0.016)	-0.014 (0.013)	-0.001 (0.012)	-0.003 (0.012)
North Germany		0.021 (0.02)	0.009 (0.015)	0.007 (0.013)	0.007 (0.013)
City States		0.06** (0.027)	0.095*** (0.022)	0.072*** (0.018)	0.072*** (0.018)
Unemployment Rate		-0.003 (0.003)	-0.005** (0.002)	-0.005** (0.002)	-0.005** (0.002)
GDP		0.008*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.0009)	0.003*** (0.0008)	0.003*** (0.0008)
Dummy for year 2000		0.045*** (0.012)	0.079*** (0.01)	0.086*** (0.018)	0.085*** (0.018)
Dummy for year 2004		0.073*** (0.013)	0.094*** (0.01)	0.102*** (0.018)	0.101*** (0.018)
Age			-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)
Female			-0.199*** (0.009)	-0.154*** (0.009)	-0.150*** (0.01)
Married			-0.042*** (0.011)	-0.012 (0.01)	-0.011 (0.01)
Number of Children			0.032*** (0.005)	0.027*** (0.005)	0.028*** (0.005)
Disabled			0.004 (0.02)	-0.022 (0.018)	-0.021 (0.018)
German Nationality			0.012 (0.015)	-0.006 (0.013)	-0.007 (0.013)
Owner of House/Dwelling			0.011 (0.009)	0.0004 (0.008)	-0.0004 (0.008)
School Degree (Ref.: Low/Intermed. School)					
No Degree			-0.118** (0.049)	-0.077* (0.043)	-0.076* (0.043)
Highschool Degree			0.179*** (0.014)	0.078*** (0.012)	0.077*** (0.012)
Vocational Education (Ref.: Non)					
Apprenticeship			0.03** (0.013)	0.029** (0.011)	0.029*** (0.011)
Vocational School			0.055*** (0.014)	0.021* (0.012)	0.021* (0.012)
University or College Degree			0.223*** (0.015)	0.088*** (0.014)	0.089*** (0.014)
Work Experience (FT + PT)			0.013*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)
Unemployment Experience			-0.043*** (0.004)	-0.018*** (0.004)	-0.018*** (0.004)
White-collar Worker				0.032	0.032


	(0.022)	(0.022)
Blue-collar Worker	-.035 (0.023)	-.035 (0.023)
Member Trade Union	0.038*** (0.008)	0.038*** (0.008)
Member Trade Association	0.006 (0.015)	0.005 (0.015)
High Occupational Autonomy	0.078*** (0.021)	0.078*** (0.021)
Manager	0.103*** (0.023)	0.102*** (0.023)
Tenure	0.005*** (0.0005)	0.005*** (0.0005)
Contract - Permanent	0.022 (0.018)	0.021 (0.018)
Contract - Other	-.168*** (0.022)	-.168*** (0.022)
Managers (ISCO88)	0.262*** (0.024)	0.263*** (0.025)
Professionals (ISCO88)	0.276*** (0.022)	0.276*** (0.022)
Technicians and associate professionals (ISCO88)	0.235*** (0.019)	0.236*** (0.019)
Clerical support workers (ISCO88)	0.164*** (0.02)	0.165*** (0.02)
Service and sales workers (ISCO88)	-.001 (0.02)	-.0004 (0.02)
Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers (ISCO88)	0.067 (0.074)	0.071 (0.074)
Craft and related trades workers (ISCO88)	0.146*** (0.018)	0.145*** (0.018)
Plant and machine operators, and assemblers (ISCO88)	0.099*** (0.019)	0.099*** (0.019)
Firm size small	-.153*** (0.009)	-.153*** (0.009)
Firm size medium	-.037*** (0.009)	-.037*** (0.009)
Manufacturing (NACE)	0.075*** (0.018)	0.075*** (0.018)
Agriculture (NACE)	-.139*** (0.051)	-.142*** (0.051)
Mining, Quarring, Energy, Water (NACE)	0.111*** (0.03)	0.111*** (0.03)
Chemicals/Pulp/Paper (NACE)	0.093*** (0.021)	0.092*** (0.021)
Construction (NACE)	0.027 (0.02)	0.026 (0.02)
Iron/Steel (NACE)	0.085*** (0.021)	0.085*** (0.021)
Textile/Apparel (NACE)	-.051 (0.039)	-.048 (0.04)
Wholesale/Retail (NACE)	-.062*** (0.019)	-.062*** (0.019)
Transportation/Communication (NACE)	-.015 (0.023)	-.015 (0.023)
Public Service (NACE)	0.041** (0.017)	0.041** (0.017)
Financials/Private Services (NACE)	0.021 (0.019)	0.022 (0.019)
Big Five Factor Openness		0.0009

					(0.004)
Big Five Factor Conscientiousness					0.003 (0.006)
Big Five Factor Extraversion					-.007 (0.004)
Big Five Factor Agreeableness					-.007 (0.005)
Big Five Factor Neuroticism					-.004 (0.004)
Const.	2.513*** (0.007)	2.324*** (0.043)	2.232*** (0.051)	2.195*** (0.057)	2.262*** (0.07)
Obs.	10234	10234	10234	10234	10234
R^2	0.057	0.135	0.414	0.54	0.54

Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29 , own calculations.

Notes: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Standard Errors are clustered on person-level.

Figure A.1: Locus of Control: Factor Analysis and Distribution



Source: Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1999 - 2008, version 29, SOEP, 2013, doi: 10.5684/soep.v29, own illustration.
 Notes: Figure 2 A. (B.) shows the loading plot of a factor analysis of the locus of control items of the year 1999 (2005). We identify items 1 and 6 as loading on Factor 2 (interpretable as internal factor) and items 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 as loading on Factor 1 (interpretable as external factor). Item 4 and 9 are not loading on any of the two factors and were therefore neglected in the analysis.
 Figure 2 C. and 2 D. show the distribution of the continuous standardized locus of control index for the years 1999 and 2005, which is calculated by firstly reversing all external items and secondly by extracting a single factor by running a factor analysis for each year. Hence, higher scores reflect higher internality and lower scores reflect higher externality. The original item scale of the year 1999 was reversed (in order of higher scores reflecting higher internality) and was recoded in order to match the locus of control scale of the year 2005. The recoding is as follows: 2 to 3, 3 to 5 and 4 to 7.