

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](https://www.sciencedirect.com)

Journal of Comparative Economics

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jce

Do non-cognitive skills matter for alcohol consumption? Evidence from Russia

Ksenia Rozhkova^{a,*}, Sergey Roshchin^a, Yana Roshchina^b^a *Laboratory for Labour Market Studies, National Research University Higher School of Economics, 11 Pokrovsky Boulevard, 109028 Moscow, Russian Federation*^b *Laboratory for Studies in Economic Sociology, National Research University Higher School of Economics, 11 Myasnitkaya street, 101000 Moscow, Russian Federation*

ARTICLE INFO

JEL Classification:

I12
I24
Z13

Keywords:

Alcohol consumption
Non-cognitive skills
Personality
Russia

ABSTRACT

Economic and sociological research that touches upon the determinants of alcohol consumption is mostly centered on the traditional factors of human capital (e.g., education). While much attention is given to education as a valid instrument to reduce alcohol misuse, less is given to the impact of non-cognitive skills. Data are collected from a nationally representative Russian panel survey, 2016–2018. We estimate a random-effects probit model for the probability of abstinence and a random-effects tobit model with a Heckman correction for the volume of alcohol consumption. Non-cognitive skills are consistent predictors of drinking in Russia. In both genders, conscientiousness and extraversion have strong connections to the probability and the volume of alcohol consumption, while openness to experience and neuroticism only affect the volume. The estimates for education differ substantially when the Big Five variables are excluded from the model, which suggests that a major part of the effect of education on alcohol consumption patterns may be mediated through non-cognitive skills. Although educational interventions are often seen as a method of solving excessive drinking problems, introducing personality traits into the analysis raises the question of the effectiveness of such interventions.

1. Introduction

There is a growing body of literature studying the importance of non-cognitive skills, also referred to as personality traits¹, in predicting social outcomes (Heckman et al., 2006). As a vital component of human capital, non-cognitive skills are found to affect educational attainment (Humburg, 2017), unemployment (Cuesta and Budria, 2017), wages (Brunello and Schlotter, 2011; Gensowski, 2018), mobility (Ayhan et al., 2020), and health-related outcomes, including longevity (Saveljev, 2020; Saveljev and Tan, 2019). Alcohol consumption is another essential part of social behavior, which may have harmful effect on one's well-being in case of excessive drinking. Although the relationship between personality and drinking patterns has been extensively studied in psychology,

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: krozhkova@hse.ru (K. Rozhkova).

¹ There is no single agreement on the preferred term. “Non-cognitive skills” is mostly used in the economic literature, while “personality traits” is an older terminology common in other social sciences, especially psychology. We prefer the term “non-cognitive skills” to stress the ability of policy to shape them at the earlier stages of individual development. “Skills” can be fostered through interventions, while “traits” represent some immutable patterns associated with one's behavior (see a discussion concerning use of terms in Kautz et al., 2014). In this paper, we use terms “personality traits” and “non-cognitive skills” interchangeably.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jce.2022.11.005>

Received 23 August 2022; Accepted 22 November 2022

Available online 9 December 2022

0147-5967/© 2022 Association for Comparative Economic Studies. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

research in other social sciences, such as economics and sociology, has generally explained alcohol consumption with social factors and has claimed the existence of a negative correlation between alcohol abuse and education (Droomers et al., 1999; Cutler and Lleras-Muney, 2010; Conti and Hansman, 2013). However, to understand, why some individuals are involved in heavy drinking, while others abstain, a more complex approach, combining both social and psychological perspectives, should be used.

Excessive alcohol consumption implies high costs both for an individual and the society in terms of health and economy. Russia is a particularly interesting context to study. First, Russia is known for high levels of alcohol consumption and northern drinking patterns which is characterized by the prevalence of strong spirits, and a high burden of alcohol-related mortality (Nemtsov et al., 2011). Although Russia has been moving away from previous drinking levels (Radaev and Roshchina, 2019; Radaev et al., 2020;), risky episodic drinking remains a widespread problem (WHO, 2019). To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies to document the relationship between non-cognitive skills and alcohol consumption in the Russian context.

There are several mechanisms linking alcohol consumption to non-cognitive skills. First, problem-drinking among parents has negative effects on children, including lower educational attainment and the development of drinking problems (Mangiavacchi and Piccoli, 2018). Since non-cognitive skills are closely linked to genetics and the social environment during the early stages of childhood, they can serve as a mediator for the process of inheriting alcohol addiction. Second, different non-cognitive skills are reportedly related to different drinking motives (Theakston et al., 2004). Finally, non-cognitive skills may influence educational attainment, while education is viewed as an important factor against excessive alcohol consumption (Cutler and Lleras-Muney, 2010; Conti and Hansman, 2013).

To address non-cognitive skills, the existing research generally relies on the Big Five model, which is an effective framework for identifying and structuring personality attributes. The model consists of openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (John and Srivastava, 1999). Openness to experience is defined as curiosity and open-mindedness. Conscientiousness is associated with dutifulness, self-discipline, diligence, and other productive facets. Extraversion reflects sociability and assertiveness. Agreeableness refers to one's ability to avoid conflicts, cooperate, and help others. Finally, neuroticism is a tendency towards emotional instability, anxiety, and self-consciousness. The psychology literature reports vast evidence that the Big Five correlates with alcohol-related behavior. Since conscientiousness implies following social norms and demonstrating effective self-control, being high in conscientiousness is often negatively correlated with different types of risky and unhealthy behaviors, such as avoiding physical activity, following an unhealthy diet, or having various addictions (Meyer et al., 2001; Bogg and Roberts, 2004). The overall protective effect of conscientiousness on health is three times higher than that of other social and economic factors (Roberts et al., 2007). In contrast to conscientiousness, extraversion increases the chances of developing alcohol-related problems (Erevik et al., 2017) as drinking is often perceived as an element of social interaction (Flory et al., 2002; Wicki et al., 2010). Finally, neuroticism is frequently related to different types of psychopathologies, including depression and anxiety. It is also associated with alcohol misuse (Hampson and Friedman, 2008; Adan et al., 2017). The evidence on the relation between alcohol consumption and the rest of the Big Five categories remains disputed.

In this paper, by adopting the Five Factor model, we explore the effect of non-cognitive skills on the probability and the volume of alcohol consumption in Russia by combining the existing psychological evidence with other socially important factors. Data are collected from a nationally representative panel survey, 2016–2018. We estimate a random-effects probit model for the probability of abstinence and a random-effects tobit model with a Heckman correction for the volume of alcohol consumption. We find that conscientiousness and extraversion have strong connections to the probability and the volume of alcohol consumption in both genders. On average, a one standard deviation increase in conscientiousness is associated with an increase in the probability of abstinence of 2 percentage points, while a one standard deviation increase in extraversion reduces this probability by 2.3 percentage points for men and 4.1 percentage points for women. Conscientiousness, extraversion, openness to experience, and neuroticism also affect the volume of consumed alcohol. Moreover, we point out that the estimates for education differ substantially when the Big Five variables are excluded from the model, which suggests that a major part of the effect of education on alcohol consumption may be mediated through non-cognitive skills. Since the negative consequences of alcohol consumption might differ between personality types, providing insight into the relation between alcohol consumption, education, and non-cognitive skills can be useful for correcting the focus of alcohol-related policy. We further check the stability of our results, as well as possible reversed causality in a large battery of robustness checks. The results are robust to alternative models and samples.

The contribution of this paper is threefold. First, much of the empirical literature dedicated to the link between non-cognitive skills and alcohol consumption is based on small samples without sufficient controls for other socioeconomic characteristics and lacks any discussion of causality. In contrast, this paper is based on data collected from an annual nationally representative panel survey which allows us to explore the problem of reversed causality. Second, this paper adds to the limited literature in the field of health economics which studies the relationship between non-cognitive skills and health-related behaviors. Lastly, it is based on data from a country with a longstanding problem of excessive alcohol consumption.

2. Methods

2.1. Data and sample

For the empirical investigation, we use 2016–2018 data from the Russian panel household survey RLMS-HSE², in which each member of the household is interviewed. The survey uses multistage probability sampling with primary sampling units selected from geographically determined strata, making it nationally representative. The dataset contains detailed information about individual socio-demographic characteristics, non-cognitive skills, and alcohol consumption practices. The sample is unbalanced and consists of approximately 24,280 observations corresponding to 10,700 individuals. It is restricted to individuals aged 20–60³ since non-cognitive skills are known to remain relatively stable throughout one's working life (Almlund et al., 2011).

2.2. Measures

The dataset contains two questions dedicated to alcohol consumption that differ from each other in terms of the time reference. The first question is more general and measures the probability of abstinence: “Do you consume alcoholic beverages, including beer, at least sometimes (Yes/No)?” Respondents who answered “No” are considered to be abstainers. The second question is more specific and is formulated as follows: “In the last 30 days, have you consumed alcoholic beverages (Yes/No)?” Those who gave a positive answer are referred to as current consumers. Due to the narrow 30-day time window, not all consumers are classified as current consumers. 70% of respondents claim to consume alcohol at least occasionally, while only 49% of the respondents consumed alcohol in the 30 days preceding the survey. Those who can be classified as neither abstainers nor current consumers are viewed as episodic drinkers. The dummy variable for current consumption equals to 1 if the respondent consumed alcohol in the 30 days preceding the survey, while the zero value captures both episodic drinkers and abstainers. In this study, we prefer abstinence as the core measure of the probability of alcohol consumption; however, we use both measures for a robustness check.

After estimating the probability of abstinence, we measure the volume of alcohol consumed for current consumers based on a set of consecutive questions: 1) “Which of these alcoholic beverages have you drunk in the last 30 days? 2) “For those beverages that you have drunk, how many grams do you usually consume per day?” and 3) “How many days in a month do you usually drink these beverages?” The list of alcoholic beverages includes beer, wine, champagne, fortified wine, moonshine, vodka, cognac, whiskey, liquor, and alcoholic cocktails. For each of the 10 beverages, the volume was recalculated in grams of pure ethanol consumed in a month to allow for comparisons while ignoring the specifics of different drinks⁴.

The Big Five model has multiple variations that differ from one another by the number of measured facets. The most popular model is NEO-PI-R (McCrae and John, 1992), which consists of 240 elements. The survey module in RLMS-HSE dedicated to non-cognitive skills is based on a short Big Five inventory called BFI-S (John and Srivastava, 1999), consisting of 24 questions. Each question represents a facet related to one of the Big Five categories (for complete mapping, see Table 1 in the Appendix). Compared to NEO-PI-R, short scales have been proven to be valid, reliable, and easily understandable instruments that make it possible to use them in empirical investigations (Hahn et al., 2012). A similar inventory is used in the Skills Towards Employability survey (STEP) conducted by the World Bank (Pierre et al., 2014). Responses are self-evaluated, ranging from 1 (“almost never”) to 4 (“almost always”), depending on the frequency with which the facet is observed in the respondent's behavior. Each category is calculated as an average of all the included facets, standardized with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1.

The survey module dedicated to non-cognitive skills was first introduced to RLMS-HSE in 2016 and is designed to be repeated once every five years. Although the majority of the respondents answered the personality questions in 2016, some of the respondents who joined the survey in more recent years answered them only in the year they were first surveyed. Therefore, data on personality traits for each individual are available only in one wave. Due to the short-term stability of non-cognitive skills (Schäfer, 2017; Cobb-Clark and Schurer, 2012), we extrapolate the cross-sectional data on personality traits from one wave to the two other waves. Using data for three years instead of one enables us to exploit the panel nature of the survey to obtain more reliable results.

Based on the literature, we propose several hypotheses regarding the relationship between non-cognitive skills and alcohol consumption. First, we suppose that conscientiousness should be positively related to the probability of abstinence and negatively to the

² *Russia Longitudinal Monitoring Survey*, (RLMS-HSE), conducted by the National Research University Higher School of Economics and OOO “Demoscope” together with the Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the Institute of Sociology of the Federal Center of Theoretical and Applied Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. (RLMS-HSE web sites: <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/rlms-hse>, <http://www.hse.ru/org/hse/rlms>).

³ The age limits come from the empirical literature, primarily in the field of economics. Cobb-Clark, Schurer (2012) demonstrate that the Big Five categories are stable in the short term among adults aged 25–64. Most of the empirical research is conducted on samples with age limits: the lower bound is usually set between 16 (Nyhus, Pons, 2005) and 25 years (Braakmann, 2009; Van Eijck, Graaf, 2004), while the upper bound is set between 60 (Heineck, Anger, 2010) and 70 years (Van Eijck, Graaf, 2004). The psychology literature argues that personality consistency peaks at age 30 (Terracciano, Costa, & McCrae, 2006). We address the issue in a series of robustness checks.

⁴ There is a general measure of alcohol use in the literature, which is referred to as a “standard drink”. A “standard drink” reflects the volume of an alcoholic drink with a fixed amount of pure ethanol, independent of the type of the drink (Dawson, 2003; Gmel, Rehm, 2004). This concept appeared in countries with a developed bar and restaurant culture, where any consumer by ordering an alcoholic drink receives roughly the same volume of pure ethanol. In contrast, there is no official definition of a standard drink in Russia and no corresponding volume of pure ethanol since alcohol use at home prevailed for a long time.

Table 1

Distribution of responses to the non-cognitive skills questions, according to the Big Five taxonomy, %.

	Almost always	Frequently	Sometimes	Almost never
Openness				
Do you come up with ideas other people haven't thought of before?	10.63	21.71	48.89	18.77
Are you very interested in learning new things?	34.82	42.49	20.29	2.41
Do you enjoy beautiful things, like nature, art and music?	50.52	33.64	14.28	1.56
Conscientiousness				
When doing a task, are you very careful?	35.56	51.37	11.98	1.09
Do you finish whatever you begin?	33.04	51.88	13.57	1.50
Do you work very hard? For example, do you keep working when others stop to take a break?	16.29	34.01	35.87	13.83
Do you prefer relaxation more than hard work?*	12.26	31.44	47.21	9.09
Do you enjoy working on things that take a very long time (at least several months) to complete?	7.86	18.95	38.65	34.54
Do you work very well and quickly?	27.32	51.05	18.56	3.06
Do you think carefully before you make an important decision?	27.76	49.30	19.91	3.03
Extraversion				
Are you talkative?	27.27	38.52	29.19	5.02
Do you prefer to keep your opinion to yourself?*	13.85	40.70	37.31	8.15
Are you outgoing and sociable, for example, do you make friends very easily?	20.16	37.23	32.28	10.34
Agreeableness				
Do you forgive other people easily?	15.80	41.81	35.27	7.11
Are you very polite to other people?	38.09	50.57	10.75	0.59
Are you generous to other people with your time or money?	10.86	31.19	44.41	13.54
Do you ask for help when you don't understand something?	21.18	44.07	31.00	3.76
Neuroticism				
Do people take advantage of you?	5.26	15.21	51.28	28.26
Do you tend to worry?	12.47	29.51	48.16	9.87
Do you think about how the things you do will affect you in the future? *	28.31	42.49	24.26	4.94
Are you relaxed during stressful situations?*	12.74	36.81	37.93	12.52
Do you get nervous easily?	12.16	25.72	51.82	10.30
Are people mean/not nice to you?	2.17	8.72	36.35	52.76
Do you think about how the things you do will affect other?*	22.33	46.77	26.43	4.47

Note: (*) the scale in the marked questions was not reversed for the sake of coherence with other components of the category.

volume of alcohol consumed due to the negative correlation between conscientiousness and unhealthy habits (Bogg and Roberts, 2004). Moreover, conscientiousness is shown to be negatively correlated with heavy drinking among high-IQ individuals (Savellyev, Tan, 2019). Second, we expect extraversion to be negatively related to the probability of abstinence due to the high social interaction of extraverts which might entail frequent drinking. However, we do not expect it to be related to higher volumes of alcohol consumption. Third, we expect neuroticism to be negatively associated with the probability of abstinence but positively with the volume of alcohol consumption. Lack of emotional stability may lead to alcohol consumption as a coping mechanism. Fourth, we do not expect any statistically significant relationship with alcohol consumption for openness to experience or agreeableness. While openness has positive correlation with IQ and education (Almlund et al., 2011), which might drive the probability of excess alcohol consumption downwards, it is also associated with a desire of new experiences which may imply health risks. Previously openness showed mixed results regarding health outcomes for different gender groups, while agreeableness was not statistically significant (Savellyev, Tan, 2019). Finally, since conscientiousness, openness to experience, and neuroticism reportedly affect educational attainment (Kassenboehmer et al., 2018; Lundberg, 2013), including them into the estimated model would drive the coefficients related to education downwards.

2.3. Statistical analysis

Our empirical strategy is based on the double-hurdle theoretical model (Labeaga, 1999), which suggests that consumer choice is carried out in two stages. First, one decides whether to drink or not, which in the context of this paper is measured as the probability of abstinence. After the initial decision is made, one decides on the frequency of consumption and the volume of alcohol. This methodological approach is quite common in research dedicated to alcohol consumption (Radaev et al., 2020). Using a random-effects probit model, we first estimate the relation between non-cognitive skills and the probability of abstinence. The inclusion of random effects helps us to account for individual-level heterogeneity in alcohol consumption, thus controlling for the addictive nature of alcohol. However, the use of a random effects model does not allow us to establish the direction of causality, which is a drawback. We suppose that the effect goes from non-cognitive skills to alcohol consumption patterns due to relative stability of the Big Five (Allen et al., 2015). Moreover, changes in personality traits are likely to occur with a time lag. Since we observe constant personality traits in our sample, we can suppose that these traits affect alcohol consumption and not vice versa. The dependent variable equals 1 if the respondent claimed to have never consumed alcohol, and 0 otherwise.

For the second stage, we estimate the factors determining the volume of alcohol consumption using a random-effects tobit model with a Heckman correction for the selection of abstinence. Due to the volatility in alcohol consumption for some individuals who are not classified as abstainers but who avoided drinking over the last 30 days, the information about volume is missing, meaning that data are censored. Using the tobit model allows us to account for this censoring. We perform a Heckman correction by including the inverse

Mills ratio calculated from a cross-sectional probit model for the probability of abstinence similar to that estimated at the first stage. The dependent variable in the second-stage model is the natural logarithm of the volume of pure ethanol in grams consumed in the last 30 days.

The controls for the models in both stages are divided into several subgroups. The first subgroup is a set of variables that reflect individual socio-demographic features, including gender, age divided by 10 and its square, ethnicity (a binary variable that equals 1 if the individual reports to be of Slavic origin—either Russian, Ukrainian, or Belorussian—and 0 otherwise), education (university, college⁵, or below as a reference category), the logarithm of the household's per capita income, marital status (a binary variable that equals 1 if the respondent is married, either formally or informally, and 0 otherwise), the presence of children younger than 18 years old, the number of adults in the household (excluding the respondent if aged 18+ and her spouse, if applicable), the type of settlement (Moscow and Saint Petersburg as the two capital cities, regional center, city, or village as a reference category), and body weight divided by 10. We also include religion (a binary variable that equals 1 if the respondent defines herself as Muslim, and 0 otherwise) into our first stage estimation as an important predictor of the probability of alcohol consumption but exclude it in the second stage (as an exclusion restriction). To control for the significant inter-regional heterogeneity in Russia, a second subset of variables consists of regional characteristics, including average regional air temperature in January as a proxy for climate, regional per capita income, and average regional prices for beer and vodka as the prices for the most common alcoholic beverages. All monetary values are log transformed and adjusted to 2018 levels using regional the Consumer Price Index. We additionally add dummies for the year of observation to control for possible bi-directional effects. Table 2 in the Appendix presents descriptive statistics for all the variables used in the analysis. We carry out the estimations separately for men and women due to gender-specific differences in alcohol consumption.

2.4. Limitations

We recognize several limitations of this research. First, our measures of alcohol consumption and the Big Five are based on survey data, which are often subject to measurement errors due to cultural and social norms. Second, the time frame of 30 days for alcohol reporting does not capture all drinkers, although it has a minimal risk of underreporting. Finally, in terms of health risks, we are more interested in risky excessive drinking that combines volume and frequency of consumption rather than the fact of alcohol consumption. Some literature dedicated to alcohol consumption touches upon models of drinking (e.g., Adan et al., 2017), which differ by both content and consequences. Although non-cognitive skills can be related to such behavioral models, this paper does not focus on them due to lack of data. We also ignore the specific features that can be related to the consumption of different alcoholic beverages.

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive statistics

Table 2 in the Appendix presents the percentage of abstainers depending on their socio-demographic characteristics. Our data show that abstinence is more common among women. In terms of volume, women drink 66 g of pure ethanol per month, which is four times less than men ($M=284$). This is in line with the literature and suggests that men are generally more prone to alcohol abuse and related problems (Nolen-Hoeksema, 2004). Regarding personality traits, women tend to have a higher mean level of all the Big Five categories which is a common phenomenon across different nations (Schmitt et al., 2008). We also observe nonlinearity between the probability of alcohol consumption and age. The greatest proportion of consumers is concentrated in the 30–39 age group, in which 54% of respondents drank at least once during the last 30 days. The youngest age group (20–29) contains the largest proportion of abstainers (34%), the lowest proportion of current consumers (45%), and the lowest volume of consumed alcohol in grams of pure ethanol (116 g compared to 186 g in the 30–39 age group and 168.3 g in the 40+ age group) among current consumers. The descriptive statistics do not provide much evidence of the existence of a relationship between education and alcohol consumption. The volume of pure ethanol consumption per month is similar between university and college graduates (114 and 122, respectively). However, compared to groups with a lower level of education (171), individuals with a college diploma or university degree drink significantly less. Since higher education provides more job opportunities and more financial stability, university and college graduates may also focus on the quality of the consumed alcohol rather than its quantity.

Table 3 in the Appendix reports the differences in summery statistics between abstainers and current consumers. On average, compared to current and occasional consumers, abstainers demonstrate significantly higher levels of conscientiousness and agreeableness, while lower levels of extraversion, and openness to experience. Similar patterns are found for the volume of consumed alcohol. Higher levels of conscientiousness are associated with lower volumes of alcohol consumption. Individuals with scores in the top quartile of conscientiousness consumed on average 120 g of pure ethanol per month, while those in the lowest quartile drank 255 g. In contrast, scores in the top quartile of neuroticism correspond to higher volumes of consumed alcohol (206 g) compared to scores in the lowest quartile of neuroticism (130 g).

⁵ When speaking of a “college”, we refer to vocational college graduates

Table 2
Average values of variables for male and female samples.

	Male Mean	SD	Female Mean	SD
Abstainer	0.24	0.43	0.33	0.47
Pure alcohol consumption in 30 days (LN)	3.23	2.88	1.81	2.31
Openness	−0.08	1.02	0.07	0.96
Conscientiousness	−0.06	1.02	0.07	0.95
Extraversion	−0.14	1.00	0.14	0.97
Agreeableness	−0.14	0.99	0.14	0.96
Neuroticism	−0.12	1.00	0.09	0.96
Age /10	3.97	1.09	4.09	1.11
Age squared /100	16.97	8.95	17.97	9.26
Household per capita income (LN)*	9.73	0.67	9.74	0.65
College	0.21	0.41	0.25	0.44
University	0.26	0.44	0.37	0.48
Ethnicity (Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians)	0.87	0.34	0.89	0.31
Muslims	0.08	0.26	0.06	0.23
Married	0.78	0.42	0.70	0.46
Body weight (/10)	8.07	1.44	7.06	1.59
Presence of children	0.72	0.45	0.83	0.37
Number of adults in a household. except the respondent and the living spouse 18+	1.87	1.68	1.80	1.64
Moscow and St. Petersburg	0.09	0.29	0.11	0.31
Regional center	0.31	0.46	0.31	0.46
City (not the regional center)	0.28	0.45	0.28	0.45
Village	0.32	0.47	0.31	0.46
Prices of the Russian beer in the region (LN)	4.71	0.07	4.72	0.07
Prices of the Russian vodka in the region (LN)	6.41	0.12	6.42	0.12
Average temperature in January in the region	−12.07	6.21	−12.49	6.35
Income per capita in the region	10.32	0.32	10.34	0.32
Years				
2016	0.35	0.48	0.35	0.48
2017	0.33	0.47	0.33	0.47
2018	0.32	0.47	0.32	0.47
Number of observations	10,422		13,858	

Note: (*) all monetary values are adjusted to 2018 via regional Consumer price Index.

3.2. The effect of non-cognitive skills on alcohol consumption

Detailed results of the regression analysis are shown in Tables 4 and 5 in the Appendix. The results reveal the presence of a statistically significant relationship between alcohol consumption and non-cognitive skills. The estimates are close to each other in both genders. On average, conscientiousness is associated with a slightly higher possibility of abstinence. A one standard deviation increase in conscientiousness is associated with an increase in the probability of abstinence of 2.3 percentage points for men and 2.5 percentage points for women. In contrast, a one standard deviation increase in extraversion reduces this probability by 2.3 percentage points for men and 4.1 percentage points for women. The rest of the Big Five categories are not statistically significant for the probability of abstinence.

Table 5 in the Appendix further reveals a strong relationship between non-cognitive skills and the volume of consumed alcohol. All the Big Five categories, except for openness, demonstrate the same direction of the effects for both men and women, although the magnitude of these effects has gender-specific differences. The estimated effect of the Big Five categories is significantly larger in the volume models, suggesting that personality traits mostly influence frequency and consumption patterns rather than the probability of drinking itself. The results suggest that extraversion is positively related to the volume of consumption among both men and women. A one standard deviation increase in extraversion is associated with a rise in the log volume of consumed alcohol of 26 percentage points for men and 22.2 percentage points for women. The close results for extraversion for men and women imply that the social context is equally important for both genders. In contrast, a one standard deviation increase in openness to experience, which is usually related to novelty seeking and consequent psychoactive substance abuse, is associated with a 11.2 percentage point reduction in the log of alcohol consumption volume among men. For women, openness to experience provides an opposite effect of 7 percentage point increase which is weakly statistically significant. Different effect of openness for males and females is also documented in the previous literature (Savel'yev, Tan, 2019). The effect of neuroticism is statistically significant only for women. A one standard deviation increase in neuroticism increases the log volume of consumed alcohol by 13 percentage points for women. This finding could be due to gender differences in drinking motives. While drinking among men is frequently associated with conformity and enhancement motives, women are more prone to use alcohol as a coping mechanism to help them escape negative emotions (Cooper, 1994). Moreover, higher neuroticism is associated with depressive episodes, which are more likely to be experienced by women (Van de Velde et al., 2010). In this context, alcohol can also serve as an instrument of self-medication for depressive symptoms. Contrary to neuroticism, the effect of conscientiousness is substantially greater for men than for women both in terms of the probability of abstinence and in terms of the volume of alcohol consumption. A one standard deviation increase in conscientiousness reduces the log volume of alcohol

Table 3
Average values of variables for current consumers and abstainers.

	Abstainer		Current consumer	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Openness	−0.05	1.02	0.02	0.98
Conscientiousness	0.04	1.00	−0.03	0.98
Extraversion	−0.05	0.98	0.05	1.01
Agreeableness	0.05	1.01	0.01	0.98
Neuroticism	0.01	1.01	0.00	0.99
Age /10	4.05	1.18	4.02	1.06
Age squared /100	17.80	9.77	17.31	8.76
Household per capita income (LN)*	9.62	0.69	9.82	0.65
College	0.24	0.42	0.22	0.41
University	0.30	0.46	0.33	0.47
Ethnicity (Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians)	0.81	0.39	0.92	0.27
Muslims	0.13	0.34	0.03	0.18
Married	0.68	0.47	0.76	0.43
Body weight (/10)	7.27	1.58	7.65	1.61
Presence of children	0.75	0.43	0.80	0.40
Number of adults in a household, except the respondent and the living spouse 18+	2.09	1.90	1.68	1.50
Moscow and St. Petersburg	0.08	0.27	0.12	0.33
Regional center	0.25	0.43	0.34	0.47
City (not the regional center)	0.27	0.44	0.29	0.45
Village	0.40	0.49	0.25	0.43
Prices of the Russian beer in the region (LN)	4.71	0.07	4.72	0.07
Prices of the Russian vodka in the region (LN)	6.42	0.13	6.41	0.12
Average temperature in January in the region	−11.36	6.59	−12.95	6.17
Income per capita in the region	10.29	0.30	10.36	0.34
Years				
2016	0.35	0.48	0.35	0.48
2017	0.33	0.47	0.34	0.47
2018	0.32	0.47	0.32	0.46
Number of observations	7,284		11,897	

Note: (*) all monetary values are adjusted to 2018 via regional Consumer price Index.

consumption by 43.9 percentage points for men and 25.4 percentage points for women. Conscientiousness can affect alcohol consumption via more developed self-control and more effective decision-making when it comes to health investments. Since conscientiousness is positively associated with all types of healthy behaviors (Bogg and Roberts, 2004), including avoiding addictive substances, it can be viewed as farsightedness expressing itself in consistent human capital accumulation (both in terms of health and education). Finally, agreeableness is the only trait not linked to either the probability of consuming or the volume consumed.

3.3. Non-cognitive skills and education

Our results demonstrate that education is not statistically significant for the probability of abstinence. However, a clear relationship exists between education and the volume of alcohol intake. Columns 3 and 4 in Table 5 in the Appendix show the results of the model without the Big Five variables. A university degree decreases the log quantity of monthly consumed alcohol by 36 percentage points for men and 24.9 percentage points for women. A college diploma yields a 32.4 percentage point reduction in alcohol consumption for men and 12 percentage point reduction for women in the model without the Big Five. All the coefficients are statistically significant at the 0.05 percent level. Adding non-cognitive skills to the analysis (Columns 1 and 2 in Table 5 in the Appendix) substantially reduces the effect of tertiary education in both genders. The effect of a university degree is lowered to 22.3 percentage points for men and 19.6 percentage points for women. A less dramatic but still notable reduction is observed for college diploma. A college diploma reduces the log volume of alcohol consumption by 27.8 percentage points for men when personality traits are present. For women, the coefficient becomes statistically insignificant. This is an interesting result which was not previously documented in the literature. Although the positive association between education and alcohol consumption is well-established (Cutler and Lleras-Muney, 2010), non-cognitive skills may partly mediate the observed relationship. Moreover, a recent study suggests that individuals with higher non-cognitive skills have higher chances to quit smoking in response to education (Hai, Heckman, 2022).

Previous research conducted on the same data but covering a different time period and age group revealed a statistically significant negative effect of education with regard to the probability of abstinence (Radaev et al., 2020). We hypothesize that the reason our result differs from that in previous research could be due either to the time frame or to the age restrictions that we imposed on our data. To test these hypotheses, we first ran our models for the probability of abstinence and the volume of consumption without non-cognitive variables on a sample without age restriction for 2016–2018, then we ran our models with the age restriction but for 2012–2015. Both a university degree and college diploma were significantly negatively associated with the probability of abstinence and with the volume of consumed alcohol in both genders when age was not restricted. Restricting the sample to individuals aged 20–60 for 2012–2015 yielded results similar to those obtained in our paper.

Finally, some insights can be obtained from the analysis of the control variables. First, the results are mostly in line with research

Table 4

Marginal effects at sample mean from the random effects probit model with the status of abstinence as a dependent variable.

	Male (1)	Female (2)	Male (3)	Female (4)
<i>Big Five</i>				
Openness	0.00684 (0.00586)	−0.00678 (0.00921)		
Conscientiousness	0.0233*** (0.00628)	0.0255** (0.00941)		
Extraversion	−0.0230*** (0.00525)	−0.0410*** (0.00780)		
Agreeableness	0.00496 (0.00567)	0.00442 (0.00836)		
Neuroticism	−0.000144 (0.00527)	−0.00672 (0.00784)		
<i>Control variables</i>				
Age /10	−0.216*** (0.0366)	−0.407*** (0.0491)	−0.201*** (0.0355)	−0.391*** (0.0491)
Age squared/100	0.0269*** (0.00451)	0.0492*** (0.00609)	0.0252*** (0.00439)	0.0480*** (0.00611)
Income per capita (LN)	−0.0156* (0.00699)	−0.0637*** (0.0108)	−0.0133* (0.00660)	−0.0640*** (0.0108)
College	0.0143 (0.0110)	−0.00560 (0.0159)	0.0165 (0.0108)	−0.00460 (0.0160)
University	−0.00205 (0.0113)	0.00473 (0.0165)	0.00508 (0.0113)	0.00735 (0.0164)
Slavs	−0.0265 (0.0226)	−0.0955*** (0.0289)	−0.0281 (0.0225)	−0.108** (0.0363)
Muslims	0.226*** (0.0543)	0.360*** (0.0577)	0.220*** (0.0550)	0.368*** (0.0584)
Married	−0.0507** (0.0157)	−0.00902 (0.0149)	−0.0433** (0.0148)	−0.0100 (0.0150)
Body weight (/10)	−0.0109** (0.00351)	−0.0148** (0.00481)	−0.0103** (0.00340)	−0.0172*** (0.00481)
Presence of children	−0.0233* (0.0106)	−0.0499** (0.0170)	−0.0210* (0.0102)	−0.0508** (0.0171)
Number of adults in a household, except the respondent and the living spouse 18+	0.00677* (0.00282)	0.0209*** (0.00430)	0.00696* (0.00276)	0.0205*** (0.00432)
Moscow and St. Petersburg (Village is base category)	−0.0800*** (0.0233)	−0.112** (0.0348)	−0.0830*** (0.0220)	−0.124*** (0.0343)
Regional center	−0.0906*** (0.0154)	−0.120*** (0.0209)	−0.0892*** (0.0152)	−0.129*** (0.0210)
City (not the regional center)	−0.0530** (0.0165)	−0.0549* (0.0221)	−0.0491** (0.0164)	−0.0577* (0.0225)
Prices of the Russian beer in the region (LN)	0.0146 (0.0788)	−0.271* (0.112)	0.0318 (0.0766)	−0.264* (0.113)
Prices of the Russian vodka in the region (LN)	0.169** (0.0515)	0.0836 (0.0784)	0.176*** (0.0499)	0.103 (0.0785)
Average temperature in January in the region	0.00266** (0.000836)	0.00574*** (0.00119)	0.00239** (0.000817)	0.00564*** (0.00120)
Income per capita in the region				
Years (2016 is base category)				
2017	0.0305*** (0.00623)	0.0545*** (0.00944)	0.0288*** (0.00605)	0.0535*** (0.00948)
2018	0.0419*** (0.00720)	0.0212* (0.00996)	0.0407*** (0.00706)	0.0206* (0.00999)
<i>Number of observations</i>	10,422	13,858	10,422	13,858

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses;

*** $p < 0.001$,** $p < 0.01$,* $p < 0.05$

dedicated to the factors for alcohol consumption in Russia. We observe a significant inverse u-shape relationship between alcohol consumption and age, which is well-documented both in the Russian and the international context (Radaev and Roshchina, 2019). There are also significant time effects in our models, which demonstrate the general trend of decreasing alcohol consumption in Russia. Second, most of the coefficients remain stable in the models with and without the presence of non-cognitive variables. Finally, an inverse Mills ratio is also significant for volume regressions, affirming the need to perform a Heckman correction for the problem of self-selection into abstinence.

Table 5

Marginal effects at sample mean from the random effects tobit model with the pure alcohol consumption in 30 days (ln) as a dependent variable.

	Male (1)	Female (2)	Male (3)	Female (4)
<i>Big Five</i>				
Openness	−0.112** (0.0380)	0.0705* (0.0287)		
Conscientiousness	−0.439*** (0.0391)	−0.254*** (0.0292)		
Extraversion	0.260*** (0.0333)	0.222*** (0.0243)		
Agreeableness	0.0393 (0.0364)	0.0243 (0.0259)		
Neuroticism	0.0393 (0.0341)	0.131*** (0.0246)		
<i>Control variables</i>				
Age /10	2.858*** (0.245)	2.049*** (0.172)	2.759*** (0.246)	1.904*** (0.172)
Age squared/100	−0.346*** (0.0301)	−0.252*** (0.0212)	−0.335*** (0.0303)	−0.240*** (0.0212)
Income per capita (LN)	0.405*** (0.0462)	0.564*** (0.0366)	0.347*** (0.0462)	0.555*** (0.0366)
College	−0.278*** (0.0680)	−0.0972 (0.0515)	−0.324*** (0.0682)	−0.120* (0.0515)
University	−0.223** (0.0736)	−0.196*** (0.0510)	−0.360*** (0.0728)	−0.249*** (0.0502)
Slavs	0.992*** (0.0902)	0.862*** (0.0603)	1.012*** (0.0909)	0.868*** (0.0606)
Married	0.523*** (0.0802)	0.0551 (0.0459)	0.413*** (0.0810)	0.0505 (0.0462)
Body weight (/10)	0.140*** (0.0218)	0.0761*** (0.0148)	0.130*** (0.0219)	0.0909*** (0.0149)
Presence of children	0.305*** (0.0719)	0.264*** (0.0548)	0.279*** (0.0725)	0.265*** (0.0551)
Number of adults in a household, except the respondent and the living spouse 18+	−0.0846*** (0.0198)	−0.0990*** (0.0152)	−0.0904*** (0.0201)	−0.0972*** (0.0153)
Moscow and St. Petersburg (Village is base category)	0.737*** (0.167)	0.409*** (0.114)	0.881*** (0.171)	0.510*** (0.117)
Regional center	0.695*** (0.0873)	0.402*** (0.0616)	0.737*** (0.0883)	0.456*** (0.0619)
City (not the regional center)	0.551*** (0.0855)	0.348*** (0.0615)	0.513*** (0.0858)	0.351*** (0.0613)
Prices of the Russian beer in the region (LN)	−1.036* (0.508)	1.327*** (0.368)	−1.397** (0.512)	1.075** (0.369)
Prices of the Russian vodka in the region (LN)	−1.710*** (0.354)	−0.725** (0.265)	−1.895*** (0.358)	−0.910*** (0.266)
Average temperature in January in the region	−0.0504*** (0.00540)	−0.0455*** (0.00382)	−0.0481*** (0.00546)	−0.0452*** (0.00385)
Income per capita in the region	0.987*** (0.150)	0.587*** (0.108)	0.877*** (0.151)	0.631*** (0.109)
Years (2016 is base category)				
2017	−0.241*** (0.0464)	−0.111** (0.0341)	−0.237*** (0.0465)	−0.0971** (0.0341)
2018	−0.322*** (0.0489)	−0.0339 (0.0354)	−0.328*** (0.0491)	−0.0271 (0.0354)
Inverse Mills ratio	−4.816*** (0.163)	−3.159*** (0.109)	−4.894*** (0.171)	−3.175*** (0.110)
<i>Number of observations</i>	10,416	13,857	10,416	13,857

Note: Standard errors in parentheses;

*** $p < 0.001$.** $p < 0.01$.* $p < 0.05$.

3.4. Sensitivity analysis

3.4.1. Alternative specifications

We use random-effects probit for the first stage and random-effects tobit for the second stage as benchmark models for further analysis. In addition, we run several other models to ensure the robustness of our findings. First, we run a pooled probit model with standard errors clustered at the individual level as a robustness check for the first stage (see Columns 1–2 in Table 6 in the Online Appendix). The estimates obtained this way are more stable to possible autocorrelation and heteroscedasticity, while using clustered

errors allows us to control for the dependence between observations belonging to the same individuals in different survey waves. We also run a first-stage model taking the probability of consumption in 30 days as the dependent variable instead of the probability of abstinence (see Columns 3–4 in Table 6 in the Online Appendix). The dependent variables equal 1 if the respondent consumed alcohol during the past 30 days, and 0 otherwise. The results are close to those of the baseline model. Since the relationship between the first-stage probability model and the second-stage “volume” model runs through a Heckman correction for selection into abstinence, we find it more convenient to report the results of the probit model with the status of abstinence as a dependent variable as the benchmark model in this paper.

Second, we run a panel Heckman model for current consumers with a correction for selection into current consumption (see Table 7 in the Online Appendix). Religion is used as an exclusion restriction variable in the selection equation. The selection equation also included the logarithm of each household’s per capita income, age divided by 10 and its square, gender, education, the presence of children, ethnicity, religion, body weight divided by 10, regional income, type of settlement, and the Big Five categories.

Third, since some of the Big Five categories, namely conscientiousness, openness to experience, and neuroticism, may affect educational attainment (Almlund et al., 2011), we add interaction effects between the Big Five and education into our models (see Table 15 for the first-stage model results and Table 16 for the second-stage model results in the Online Appendix). Significantly positive interactions are found between college and conscientiousness in males and between university and openness in females for the abstinence models. Moreover, there is a statistically significant effect between university and conscientiousness (positive), as well as university and neuroticism (negative) in the female sub-sample. However, marginal effects from probit and tobit estimations remain unchanged.

3.4.2. Reversed causality

First, we exploit the panel structure of our data by using several lagged control variables, meaning that their values are taken from the previous wave of the survey. These variables are marital status, body weight divided by 10, and per capita income in the household. We assume that all of them can be affected by individual drinking behavior. The results are very close to those obtained from the baseline models. The only difference concerns openness to experience losing its statistical significance in the female sub-sample (see Table 10 and Table 11 in the Online Appendix).

Second, given the debate that personality is less malleable after 30 years old (Terracciano et al., 2006) and that early-20 s may be considered as a transformative period, we check the stability of our results for an older age group (30–60 instead of 20–60). The results from the first-stage probability model reflect a reduced effect of extraversion on abstinence in both genders and a loss of statistical significance for conscientiousness in the female sub-sample (see Table 8 in the Online Appendix). The results from the second-stage “volume” model remain almost unchanged compared to the baseline model.

Third, we implement an approach presented in Groves (2005); Heineck and Anger (2010); Ayhan et al. (2020) and predict residuals from OLS regressions of the Big Five on age and its square. The residuals are standardized with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. The predicted residuals are then used as an age-free component of the Big Five to estimate the impact of non-cognitive skills on alcohol consumption. The estimated effects for both the first-stage probability model and the second-stage “volume” model are close to those of the baseline model (see Table 12 and Table 13 in the Online Appendix). This observation proves that our key assumption regarding the stability of the Big Five factors across working-age population appears to hold.

Finally, we perform a direct reversed causality test on our data. As mentioned previously, the survey module dedicated to non-cognitive skills was first introduced to RLMS-HSE in 2016 and is repeated once every five years. The survey was repeated for the second time in 2020. Due to the panel nature of the study, it is possible to measure the changes that occurred to personality measures over these five years. Following the approach used in Ayhan et al. (2020), we construct five variables illustrating the change in each of the Big Five measures between 2016 and 2020. These variables are separately regressed on an abstinence dummy measured in 2016 and pure alcohol consumption in 30 days measured in 2016. The regressions are estimated separately for males and females due to gender-specific variations in alcohol consumption and personality traits. The results are provided in Table 14 in the Online Appendix. Most of the coefficients are statistically insignificant. Though we observe statistically significant results for neuroticism in both genders and extraversion and conscientiousness in the female sub-sample, the F-tests for these regressions are statistically insignificant. We conclude that the reversed causality has no effect on our results.

Overall, the results are robust to using various measures of alcohol consumption and econometric techniques, which points at the significant relation between non-cognitive skills and alcohol consumption.

4. Discussion

The results yield two important insights. First, our analysis suggests that non-cognitive skills have a statistically significant link with alcohol consumption and strongly predict both the probability and the volume of consumption after controlling for social and economic factors. The results are very consistent with previous research conducted in other countries. We find strong and stable links between conscientiousness and alcohol consumption which are favorable for health both for males and females. The protective effect of conscientiousness on health is documented in economics (Savelyev and Tan, 2019) and psychology (Bogg and Roberts, 2004) and may arise due to better decision-making associated with conscientiousness. Extraversion is positively related to the probability and the volume of alcohol consumption in both genders, which could be due to the high density of social engagement (Savelyev and Tan, 2019; Flory et al., 2002). Openness to experience and neuroticism are only significant for the volume of alcohol consumption and show mixed results across gender groups. While for males higher openness reduces the volume of consumed alcohol, the effect is the opposite for females. Neuroticism is strongly associated with an increase in the volume of drinking, as suggested by the psychology literature (Bogg

and Roberts 2004; Droomers et al., 1999), but only for females. Agreeableness is not associated with alcohol consumption in both genders.

Since the effect of a university degree and college diploma on the volume of alcohol consumption substantially differs with and without the inclusion of non-cognitive skills, we suppose that personality can serve as an intermediate point between education and alcohol-related behavior. Therefore, by avoiding personality traits, we overestimate the effect of education on alcohol consumption. We believe that personality serves as a mediator for this relationship (and not vice versa) as some personality traits are formed before formal, especially tertiary, education. Although universities and colleges provide students with a new social environment that promotes their sociability and agreeableness (Kassenboehmer et al., 2018), the personality traits that are related to alcohol consumption the most (i.e., conscientiousness or neuroticism) are less affected. Moreover, there is a strong self-selection to higher education of individuals high on conscientiousness and openness, but low on neuroticism (Kassenboehmer et al., 2018; Lundberg, 2013). Twin research suggests that 30–50% of self-assessed personality traits are inherited (Loehlin et al., 1998) with extraversion and neuroticism being the most heritable categories of the Big Five and conscientiousness mostly representing the result of primary socialization. Therefore, adding non-cognitive skills to the analysis allows us to re-evaluate the effect of tertiary education on alcohol-related behavior. Further policy interventions aiming to reduce risky behaviours, including alcohol abuse, should focus on the formation of non-cognitive skills related to conscientiousness during school as part of early socialization. The interventions within tertiary education aimed at building particular skills might be less effective.

Second, social norms play an important role when it comes to gender differences in alcohol consumption. Cultural expectations around traditional gender roles imply that women should not drink, while men are less stigmatized for bad habits, including alcohol consumption (Erol et al., 2015). Future initiatives to reduce alcohol misuse need to focus on changing social normative beliefs and attitudes around alcohol consumption.

5. Conclusion

The growing literature on non-cognitive skills suggests their importance in a wide range of social outcomes. The present study extends previous research evaluating the relationship between the Five-Factor Model of personality and alcohol consumption by using representative Russian panel data. The results demonstrate a strong and persistent relationship between alcohol consumption and individual personality traits. Extraversion and neuroticism are positively related to the probability and the volume of alcohol consumption, while conscientiousness and openness to experience show the opposite result. Agreeableness is not statistically significantly related to our measures of alcohol consumption. The effects differ between men and women. Conscientiousness demonstrates a larger effect in the male sample, while neuroticism is strongly associated with alcohol consumption in females. Openness to experience shows a negative statistically significant result in males and a positive result in females. These results are retained when controlling for individual socioeconomic characteristics and for cross-regional heterogeneity. The analysis is robust to using different econometric techniques and measures of alcohol consumption.

Though the link between personality traits and alcohol consumption has already been discussed in the psychological literature (Bogg and Roberts, 2004), it has remained largely absent from economic and sociological research, lacked any connection to any socioeconomic characteristics of individuals, and was mostly based on small samples (with few exceptions, e.g., Savelyev and Tan, 2019). In contrast, our paper is based on a large representative sample and takes into account the complex nature of personality traits by examining their contribution to alcohol consumption while controlling for education. Education is often considered to be an important characteristic which reduces probability of excessive alcohol consumption. Particular policy interventions are designed to prevent alcohol abuse in young adults attending colleges (Larimer, Crouce, 2007). However, our analysis suggests that policy interventions in tertiary education can be ineffective since those personality traits that further promote alcohol consumption are already formed by the time an individual graduates from high school. Therefore, we suggest that policy interventions aimed at reducing alcohol consumption should be focused on the formation of non-cognitive skills, namely high levels of conscientiousness, during school.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None.

Acknowledgements

This paper is an output of a research project implemented as part of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE)

Supplementary materials

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at [doi:10.1016/j.jce.2022.11.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jce.2022.11.005).

Appendix

Section A. Descriptive statistics

Table 1, Table 2, Table 3

Section B. Baseline models

Table 4, Table 5

References

- Adan, Ana, Forero, Diego A., Navarro, José F., 2017. Personality traits related to binge drinking: a systematic review. *Front. Psychiatry* 8, 134.
- Allen, Mark S., Vella, Stewart A., Laborde, Sylvain, 2015. Health-related behaviour and personality trait development in adulthood. *J. Res. Pers.* 59, 104–110.
- Almlund, Mathilde, Duckworth, Angela L., Heckman, James J., Kautz, Tim, 2011. Personality psychology and economics. In Hanushek, Eric A., Machin, Stephen J., Woessmann, Ludger (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, Elsevier, Vol. 4, pp. 1–181.
- Ayhan, Sinem H., Gatskova, Kseniia, Lehmann, Hartmut, 2020. The impact of non-cognitive skills and risk preferences on rural-to-urban migration in Ukraine. *J. Comp. Econ.* 48 (1), 144–162.
- Bogg, Tim, Roberts, Brent W., 2004. Conscientiousness and health-related behaviors: a meta-analysis of the leading behavioral contributors to mortality. *Psychol. Bull.* 130 (6), 887.
- Braakmann, Nils, 2009. The role of psychological traits for the gender gap in full-time employment and wages: evidence from Germany. In: *SOEP Paper*, p. 162.
- Brunello, Giorgio, Schlotter, Martin, 2011. Non-cognitive skills and personality traits: labour market relevance and their development in education & training systems. IZA Discussion Paper 5743.
- Cobb-Clark, Deborah A., Schurer, Stefanie, 2012. The stability of big-five personality traits. *Econ. Lett.* 115 (1), 11–15.
- Cooper, M.Lynne, 1994. Motivations for alcohol use among adolescents: development and validation of a four-factor model. *Psychol. Assess.* 6, 117–128.
- Conti, Gabriella, Hansman, Christopher, 2013. Personality and the education-health gradient: a note on “Understanding differences in health behaviors by education”. *J. Health Econ.* 32, 480–485.
- Cuesta, Maite Blázquez, Budría, Santiago, 2017. Unemployment persistence: how important are non-cognitive skills? *J. Behav. Exp. Econ.* 69, 29–37.
- Cutler, David M., Lleras-Muney, Adriana, 2010. Understanding health differences by education. *J. Health Econ.* 29, 1–28.
- Dawson, Deborah A., 2003. Methodological issues in measuring alcohol use. *Alcohol Res. Health* 27 (1), 18.
- Droomers, Mariël, Schrijvers, Carola T., Stronks, Karien, van de Mheen, Dike, Mackenbach, Johan P., 1999. Educational differences in excessive alcohol consumption: the role of psychosocial and material stressors. *Prev. Med.* 29 (1), 1–10.
- Erevik, Eilin K., Pallesen, Ståle, Vedaa, Øystein, Andreassen, Cecilie S., Torsheim, Torbjørn, 2017. Alcohol use among Norwegian students: demographics, personality and psychological health correlated of drinking patterns. *Nordic Stud. Alcohol Drugs* 34 (5), 415–429.
- Erol, Almila, Karpyak, Victor M., 2015. Sex and gender-related differences in alcohol use and its consequences: contemporary knowledge and future research considerations. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 156, 1–13.
- Flory, Kate, Lynam, Donald, Milich, Richard, Leukefeld, Carl, Clayton, Richard, 2002. The relations among personality, symptoms of alcohol and marijuana abuse, and symptoms of comorbid psychopathology: results from a community sample. *Exp. Clin. Psychopharmacol.* 10 (4), 425.
- Gensowski, Miriam, 2018. Personality, IQ, and lifetime earnings. *Labour Econ.* 51, 170–183.
- Gmel, Gerhard, Rehm, Jürgen, 2004. Measuring alcohol consumption. *Contemp. Drug Probl.* 31 (3), 467–540.
- Groves, Melissa Osborne, 2005. How important is your personality? Labor market returns to personality for women in the US and UK. *J. Econ. Psychol.* 26 (6), 827–841.
- Hai, Rong, Heckman, James J., 2022. The Causal Effects of Youth Cigarette Addiction and Education. National Bureau of Economic Research. Working paper w30304.
- Hahn, Elisabeth, Gottschling, Juliana, Spinath, Frank M., 2012. Short measurements of personality—Validity and reliability of the GSOEP Big Five Inventory (BFI-S). *J. Res. Pers.* 46 (3), 355–359.
- Hampson, Sarah E., Friedman, Howard S., 2008. Personality and health: a life span perspective. In: John, Oliver P., Robins, Richard W., Pervin, Lawrence A. (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*. Guilford Press, New York, pp. 770–794.
- Heckman, James J., Stixrud, Jora, Urzua, Sergio, 2006. The effects of cognitive and noncognitive abilities on labor market outcomes and social behavior. *J. Labor Econ.* 24 (3), 411–482.
- Heineck, Guido, Anger, Silke, 2010. The returns to cognitive abilities and personality traits in Germany. *Labour Econ.* 17 (3), 535–546.
- Humburg, Martin, 2017. Personality and field of study choice in university. *Educ. Econ.* 25 (4), 366–378.
- John, Oliver P., Srivastava, Sanjay, 1999. The Big Five trait taxonomy: history, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In Pervin, Lawrence A., John, Oliver P. (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and Research*, Vol. 2 Guilford Publications, New York, pp.102–138.
- Kassenboehmer, Sonja C., Leung, Felix, Schurer, Stefanie, 2018. University education and non-cognitive skill development. *Oxf. Econ. Pap.* 70 (2), 538–562.
- Kautz, Tim, Heckman, James J., Diris, Ron, ter Weel, Bas, Borghans, Lex, 2014. Fostering and Measuring skills: Improving cognitive and Non-Cognitive Skills to Promote Lifetime Success. National Bureau of Economic Research. Working paper w20749.
- Labeaga, José M., 1999. A double-hurdle rational addiction model with heterogeneity: estimating the demand for tobacco. *J. Econom.* 93, 49–72.
- Larimer, Mary E., Cronce, Jessica M., 2007. Identification, prevention, and treatment revisited: individual-focused college drinking prevention strategies 1999–2006. *Addict. Behav.* 32 (11), 2439–2468.
- Loehlin, John C., McCrae, Robert R., Jr, Costa, Paul, T., John, Oliver P., 1998. Heritabilities of common and measure-specific components of the Big Five personality factors. *J. Res. Pers.* 32 (4), 431–453.
- Lundberg, Shelly, 2013. The college type: personality and educational inequality. *J. Labor Econ.* 31 (3), 421–441.
- Mangiavacchi, Lucia, Piccoli, Luca, 2018. Parental alcohol consumption and adult children’s educational attainment. *Econ. Hum. Biol.* 28, 132–145.
- McCrae, Robert R., John, Oliver P., 1992. An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *J. Pers.* 60 (2), 175–215.
- Meyer, Gregory J., Finn, Stephen E., Eyde, Lorraine D., et al., 2001. Psychological testing and psychological assessment: a review of evidence and issues. *American psychologist* 56 (2), 128–165.
- Nemtsov, Alexander V., Levchuk, N.M., Davydov, Kirill V., 2011. Alcohol related mortality in Ukraine and Russia (1980–2007). *ICAP Periodic Rev. Drink. Culture* 6, 3–14.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, Susan, 2004. Gender differences in risk factors and consequences for alcohol use and problems. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* 24 (8), 981–1010.
- Nyhus, Ellen K., Pons, Empar, 2005. The effects of personality on earnings. *J. Econ. Psychol.* 26 (3), 363–384.
- Pierre, Gaele, Puerta, Sanchez, Maria, L., Valerio, Alezandria, Rajadel, Tania, 2014. STEP Skills Measurement Surveys: Innovative Tools For Assessing Skills. World Bank. Washington, DC.

- Radaev, Vadim, Roshchina, Yana, Daria, Salnikova, 2020. The decline in alcohol consumption in Russia from 2006 to 2017: do birth cohorts matter? *Alcohol Alcohol.* 55 (3), 323–335.
- Radaev, Vadim, Roshchina, Yana, 2019. Young cohorts of Russians drink less: age–period–cohort modelling of alcohol use prevalence 1994–2016. *Addiction* 114 (5), 823–835.
- Roberts, Brent W., Kuncel, Nathan R., Shiner, Rebecca, Caspi, Avshalom, Goldberg, Lewis R., 2007. The power of personality: the comparative validity of personality traits, socioeconomic status, and cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* 2 (4), 313–345.
- Savelyev, Peter A., Tan, Kegan T., 2019. Socioemotional skills, education, and health-related outcomes of high-ability individuals. *Am. J. Health Econ.* 5 (2), 250–280.
- Savelyev, Peter A., 2020. Conscientiousness, Extraversion, college education, and longevity of high-ability individuals. *J. Hum. Resour.* 0918–9720R2.
- Schäfer, Konrad C., 2017. An Investigation Into the Stability of the Big-Five in Germany. Vol. 60. *Hannover Economic Papers*, Hannover, pp. 1–28.
- Schmitt, David P., Realo, Anu, Voracek, Martin, Allik, Jüri, 2008. Why can't a man be more like a woman? Sex differences in Big Five personality traits across 55 cultures. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 94 (1), 168.
- Terracciano, Antonio, Costa Jr., Paul T., McCrae, Robert R., 2006. Personality plasticity after age 30. *Person. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 32 (8), 999–1009.
- Theakston, Jennifer A., Stewart, Sherry H., Dawson, Marliese Y., Knowlden-Loewen, Sarah A.B., Lehman, Darrin R., 2004. Big-Five personality domains predict drinking motives. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 37 (5), 971–984.
- Van de Velde, Sarah, Bracke, Piet, Levecque, Katia, 2010. Gender differences in depression in 23 European countries. Cross-national variation in the gender gap in depression. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 71, 305–313.
- Van Eijck, Koen, de Graaf, Paul M., 2004. The Big Five at school: the impact of personality on educational attainment. *Netherlands' J. Soc. Sci.* 41 (1), 24–42.
- Wicki, Matthias, Kuntsche, Emmanuel, Gmel, Gerhard, 2010. Drinking at European universities? A review of students' alcohol use. *Addict. Behav.* 35 (11), 913–924.
- World Health Organization (WHO), 2019. Alcohol Policy Impact Case study: the Effects of Alcohol Control Measures On Mortality and Life Expectancy in The Russian Federation. World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen.