POSSIBLE BIASES DUE TO RESTRICTIONS
OF THE SAMPLES

All of the data used in this study are restricted to active, working participants in the labor force. This undoubtedly introduces certain biases. Most obviously, since most unemployed people belong in the working class, our estimates of the class distribution will somewhat underestimate the size of the working class.

This restriction of the sample may also tend to bias some of the results for returns to education. Under most circumstances, the rate of unemployment is especially high among less educated people. The exclusion of the unemployed from the analysis will thus tend to bias the returns to education downward (if the unemployed had been included, the expected income of poorly educated individuals would be less, and thus the returns to education greater). Conceivably, this might affect some of our class comparisons, since this bias is undoubtedly greater in the working class than in other classes. On the other hand, as already indicated in the discussion of the income variables, the exclusion of transfer income probably tends to increase the returns to education among workers. While there is no reason to assume that these two biases in fact cancel each other out, it does seem unlikely that the net bias in returns to education is terribly large because of the restrictions on the sample.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Rather than encumber the text with endless tables and figures, I have presented only data that are directly discussed in the analysis, and have, therefore, excluded the tables of correlation matrices upon which the regression equations are based. These matrices, along with complete results for all the different income-dependent variables and complete results for the SWC and QES data, can be found in Wright (1976b, pp. 289–375).
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