

Appendix

Table A1: Indicators used to construct indices for the three properties of educational systems

| | Indicators |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Stratification | |
| tracking | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• number of tracks at secondary level• duration of tracking at secondary level |
| selection | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether or not access to upper secondary is based on tests/grades at primary/lower secondary level• whether or not access to upper secondary is based on teachers' recommendations at primary/lower secondary level |
| Decommodification | |
| public expenditure | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• total spending on public education as % of GDP• total spending on secondary education as % of GDP |
| private education | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• % of students enrolled in private institutions at secondary level |
| direct costs of tertiary education | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• level of annual tuition fees as % of annual disposable household income |
| Standardisation | |
| budget making | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether budget made at local, central, or mixed level |
| examinations | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether examinations fully, partly, or not standardised |
| school curriculum | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether school curricula fully, partly, or not standardised |

Table A2: Coding rules for stratification

| Score | Tracking | Selectivity |
|--------------------|--|---|
| low (0) | no tracking | guaranteed progression, free access to all upper secondary tracks |
| medium-low (0.25) | tracking after lower secondary level and few tracks (≤ 2) | guaranteed progression, restricted access to some upper secondary tracks |
| medium (0.5) | tracking after lower secondary level and many tracks (>2) | limited progression (one selection barrier), free access to all upper secondary tracks |
| medium-high (0.75) | tracking after primary level and few tracks | limited progression (one selection barrier), restricted access to some upper secondary tracks |
| high (1.0) | tracking after primary level and many tracks | limited progression (two or more selection barriers) |

Table A3: Coding rules for decommodification

The decommodification score is derived by taking the average of its four sub-components, rounded up or down onto a five-point ordinal scale (low (0), medium-low (0.25), medium (0.5), medium-high (0.75), high (1)). Three sub-components (total education spending, secondary education spending, private education) are constructed using Ragin's (2008) method of calibration, which uses logistic transformation to convert interval-scale variables onto a 0 to 1 scale. The fourth component (direct cost of tertiary education) is coded based on a manual coding of the cost of tuition relative to the disposable household income. In the following tables, we display the raw and the transformed data for the calibrated measures; for the cost of tertiary education, we display the coding rules.

Table A3.1: Total education spending

| Raw data: Total education spending as % of GDP (average per decade) | | | | | | |
|---|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| UK | 3.10 | 4.34 | 5.45 | 5.06 | 4.91 | 5.38 |
| Sweden | 2.18 | 6.80 | 7.73 | 7.37 | 7.40 | 7.00 |
| Germany | 2.40 | 3.10 | 4.70 | 4.30 | 4.61 | 4.61 |
| Italy | 2.72 | 4.51 | 4.90 | 4.80 | 4.57 | 4.59 |
| Calibrated data using Ragin's (2008) method of calibration | | | | | | |
| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| UK | 0.18 | 0.39 | 0.59 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.58 |
| Sweden | 0.03 | 0.86 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.98 | 0.90 |
| Germany | 0.07 | 0.18 | 0.45 | 0.38 | 0.44 | 0.44 |
| Italy | 0.12 | 0.42 | 0.48 | 0.47 | 0.43 | 0.43 |
| 5-point ordinal scale | | | | | | |
| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| UK | Medium-low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Sweden | Low | High | High | High | High | High |
| Germany | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Italy | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium |

Note: The thresholds for calibration are as follows: upper threshold 7.5 (average of top three OECD countries), cross-over point 5 (OECD average), lower threshold 2.5 (average of bottom three OECD countries).

Table A3.2: Secondary education spending

| Raw data: Total spending on secondary education as % of GDP (average per decade) | | | | | | |
|--|-------|------------|--------|-------------|--------|------------|
| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| UK | 0.54 | 1.76 | 2.30 | 2.20 | 1.65 | 1.53 |
| Sweden | 0.48 | 1.61 | 4.80 | 3.35 | 2.20 | 2.12 |
| Germany | 0.76 | 1.07 | 2.40 | 2.30 | 1.89 | 1.78 |
| Italy | 0.84 | 1.85 | 2.10 | 1.90 | 2.15 | 2.08 |
| Calibrated data using Ragin's (2008) method of calibration | | | | | | |
| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| UK | 0.01 | 0.42 | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.38 | 0.34 |
| Sweden | 0.00 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 0.55 | 0.53 |
| Germany | 0.09 | 0.19 | 0.60 | 0.58 | 0.46 | 0.43 |
| Italy | 0.11 | 0.45 | 0.53 | 0.47 | 0.54 | 0.52 |
| 5-point ordinal scale | | | | | | |
| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| UK | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium-low |
| Sweden | Low | Medium | High | Medium-high | Medium | Medium |
| Germany | Low | Medium-low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Italy | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium |

Note: The thresholds for calibration are as follows: upper threshold 4 (average of top three OECD countries), cross-over point 2 (OECD average), lower threshold 0.5 (average of bottom three OECD countries).

Table A3.3: Private education

| Raw data: Private education as % of secondary education (average per decade) | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| UK | 7.59 | 5.66 | 5.46 | 5 | 5.75 | 6.46 |
| Sweden | 1.8 | 1.7* | 1.3* | 0.9 | 2.6 | 7.7 |
| Germany | 2.64 | 3.13 | 3.52 | 5.44 | 6.14 | 6.74 |
| Italy | 20.1* | 20.1 | 0.15 | 10.6 | 9.7 | 9.7 |
| Calibrated data using Ragin's (2008) method of calibration | | | | | | |
| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| UK | 0.38 | 0.28 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.29 | 0.323 |
| Sweden | 0.09 | 0.08* | 0.07* | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.385 |
| Germany | 0.13 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.337 |
| Italy | 1.00* | 1.00 | 0.75* | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.485 |
| 5-point ordinal scale | | | | | | |
| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| UK | Medium | Medium-low | Medium-low | Medium-low | Medium-low | Medium-low |
| Sweden | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low | Medium |
| Germany | Medium-Low | Medium-Low | Medium-Low | Medium-Low | Medium-Low | Medium-Low |
| Italy | High | High | Medium-low | Medium | Medium | Medium |

Note: The thresholds for calibration are as follows: upper threshold 20 (average of top three OECD countries), cross-over point 10 (OECD average), lower threshold 0 (average of bottom three OECD countries).

* Values linearly imputed.

Table A3.4: Private education

| Score | Description |
|--------------------|--|
| high (1.0) | no tuition fees |
| medium-high (0.75) | tuition fees less than 5% of annual disposable household income |
| medium (0.5) | tuition fees between 5% and 10% of annual disposable household income |
| medium-low (0.25) | tuition fees between 10% and 15% of annual disposable household income |
| low (0) | tuition fees greater than 15% of annual disposable household income |

Table A4: Coding rules for standardisation

| Score | Budget making | Examinations | Curricula |
|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| low (0) | local | unstandardised | unstandardised |
| medium (0.5) | local/central mix | partly standardised | partly standardised |
| high (1.0) | central | standardised | standardised |

Table A5: Scores for sub-dimensions of the three properties of educational systems

| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>Stratification</i> | | | | | | |
| Tracking | | | | | | |
| Britain ^{8, 12, 26} | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.00 |
| Sweden ^{5, 10, 22} | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Germany ^{13, 14} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Italy ^{1, 16, 19} | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Selectivity | | | | | | |
| Britain ^{8, 26} | 1.00 | 0.75 | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.00 |
| Sweden ^{5, 10, 22} | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Germany ^{13, 14} | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Italy ^{1, 16, 17} | 1.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| <i>Decommodification</i> | | | | | | |
| Total spending on education | | | | | | |
| Britain ²⁰ | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Sweden ^{15, 27, 28} | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Germany ⁴ | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Italy ^{15, 28} | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Total spending on secondary education | | | | | | |
| Britain ^{15, 21, 28} | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.50 | 0.25 |
| Sweden ^{15, 27, 28} | 0.00 | 0.25 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Germany ^{15, 28} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Italy ^{15, 18} | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Private education | | | | | | |
| Britain ^{3, 15} | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Sweden ^{6, 10} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 |
| Germany ¹³ | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Italy ^{6, 10, 19, 23} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.75 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Direct costs of tertiary education | | | | | | |
| Britain ⁸ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.25 |
| Sweden ^{5, 22} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Germany ^{7, 9} | 0.25 | 0.75 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.75 |
| Italy ^{1, 2, 11, 17, 19} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 |

Table A5: Cont.

| | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>Standardisation</i> | | | | | | |
| Centralisation of budget making | | | | | | |
| Britain ^{8, 25, 26} | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Sweden ^{5, 10, 22} | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Germany ^{13, 24} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Italy ^{1, 16, 19} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Centralisation of examinations | | | | | | |
| Britain ^{8, 26} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sweden ^{5, 10, 22} | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Germany ^{13, 24} | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Italy ^{1, 16, 19} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Centralisation of school curriculum | | | | | | |
| Britain ^{8, 25, 26} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sweden ^{5, 10, 22} | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Germany ^{24, 13} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Italy ^{1, 16, 19} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Sources:

1. Barone, C. and A. Schizzerotto. 2008. The application of the ISCED-97 to Italy. In *The International Standard Classification of Education: An Evaluation of Content and Criterion Validity for 15 European Countries*, ed. Silke Schneider. Mannheim: MZES.
2. Brunello G., Comi S. and Lucifora C. 2000. "The Returns to Education in Italy: A New Look at the Evidence", IZA DP No. 130. Department of Education. *Statistics of Education*. London: Department of Education.
3. Diebolt, C. 2000. Long Memory Time Series and Fractional Integration: A Cliometric Contribution to French and German Economic and Social History. *Historical Social Research* 15(3): 4–22.
4. Erikson, Robert, and Jan O Jonsson. 1996. The Swedish Context: Educational Reform and Long-term Change in Educational Inequality. In *Can Education Be Equalized? The Swedish Case in Comparative Perspective*, eds. Robert Erikson and Jan O Jonsson. Oxford: Westview Press.
5. Eurostat. "Mean and median income by household type. EU-SILC survey" http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=ilc_di04&lang=en
6. Federal Statistical Office. "Facts & Figures." <https://www.destatis.de/EN/FactsFigures/FactsFigures.html>
7. Gillard, D. 2014. Education in England. www.educationengland.org.uk.

8. Göseke, Gerhard; Bedau, Klaus-Dietrich 1974, *Verteilung und Schichtung der Einkommen der privaten Haushalte in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland von 1950 bis 1970*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
9. Halldén, K. 2008. The Swedish educational system and classifying education using the ISCED-97. In *The International Standard Classification of Education: An Evaluation of Content and Criterion Validity for 15 European Countries*, ed. Silke Schneider. Mannheim: MZES.
10. Italian Ministry of Education 2014. *Rapporto sullo stato del sistema universitario e della ricerca 2013*, Rome.
11. Jones, Ken. 2003. *Education in Britain*. Cambridge: Polity.
12. Köhler, H., and P. Lundgreen. 2014. *Allgemein bildende Schulen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1949-2010*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
13. Neugebauer, M., D. Reimer, S. Schindler, and V. Stocké. 2013. Inequality in Transitions to Secondary and Tertiary Education in Germany. In *Determined to Succeed?: Performance versus Choice in Educational Attainment*, ed. Michelle Jackson. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
14. OECD. "StatExtracts." www.stats.oecd.org.
15. OECD. 1969. *Italy. Reviews of National Policies for Education*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
16. OECD. 1985. *Educational Reforms in Italy*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
17. OECD. 1992. *Public Educational Expenditure, Costs and Financing : An Analysis of Trends 1970-1988*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
18. OECD. 1998. *Italy. Reviews of National Policies for Education*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
19. Office for Budget Responsibility. 2015. "Public Finances Databank." www.budgetresponsibility.org.uk.
20. Office for National Statistics. *Annual Abstracts of Statistics*. London: H.M.S.O.
21. Rudolphi, F. 2013. Ever-Declining Inequalities? Transitions to upper Secondary and Tertiary Education in Sweden, 1972-1990 Birth Cohorts. In *Determined to Succeed?: Performance versus Choice in Educational Attainment*, ed. Michelle Jackson. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
22. Scarangelo, A. 1964. *Progress and Trends in Italian Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Welfare.
23. Schneider, S. L. 2006. Applying the ISCED-97 to the German educational qualifications. In *The International Standard Classification of Education: An Evaluation of Content and Criterion Validity for 15 European Countries*, ed. Silke Schneider. Mannheim: MZES.
24. Schneider, S. L. 2008. The application of the ISCED-97 to the UK 's educational qualifications. In *The International Standard Classification of Education: An Evaluation of Content and Criterion Validity for 15 European Countries*, ed. Silke L Schneider. Mannheim: MZES.
25. Simon, B. 1999. *Education and the Social Order*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
26. Statistics Sweden. *Statistical Yearbooks of Sweden*. Stockholm: SCB.
27. UNESCO. *Statistical Yearbooks*. Paris: UNESCO. [25]

Table A6.1: Descriptive statistics for the whole and the analytical samples (%), BRITAIN

| | Whole sample | Analytical sample |
|--|--------------|-------------------|
| <i>Cohort (%)</i> | | |
| 1946 | 16.3 | 17.8 |
| 1958 | 43.7 | 41.0 |
| 1970 | 40.1 | 41.3 |
| Missing | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Gender (%)</i> | | |
| Male | 51.4 | 50.3 |
| Female | 48.6 | 49.7 |
| Missing | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Educational attainment (%)</i> | | |
| Upper secondary or higher | 28.9 | 29.5 |
| Tertiary | 13.3 | 13.3 |
| Missing | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Parental class [NS-SEC] (%)</i> | | |
| higher managerial and professional occupations (Class 1) | 8.6 | 8.4 |
| lower managerial and professional occupations (Class 2) | 17.9 | 18.5 |
| intermediate occupations (Class 3) | 11.5 | 12.9 |
| small employers and own account workers (Class 4) | 8.3 | 8.5 |
| lower supervisory and technical occupations (Class 5) | 19.8 | 21.8 |
| routine and semi-routine occupations (Class 6-7) | 27.0 | 30.0 |
| Missing | 6.9 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Parental status [0-1]</i> | | |
| mean | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| s.d. | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Missing (%) | 6.9 | 0.0 |
| <i>Parental education [0-1]</i> | | |
| mean | 0.38 | 0.37 |
| s.d. | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Missing (%) | 5.7 | 0.0 |
| N | 23666 | 20148 |

Table A6.2: Descriptive statistics for the whole and the analytical samples (%), SWEDEN

| | Whole sample | Analytical sample |
|---|--------------|-------------------|
| <i>Cohort (%)</i> | | |
| 1948 | 29.9 | 27.6 |
| 1953 | 24.8 | 26.2 |
| 1967 | 22.7 | 23.9 |
| 1972 | 22.7 | 22.3 |
| Missing | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Gender (%)</i> | | |
| Male | 51.2 | 50.9 |
| Female | 48.8 | 49.1 |
| Missing | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Educational attainment (%)</i> | | |
| Upper secondary or higher | 45.0 | 44.2 |
| Tertiary | 16.5 | 17.5 |
| Missing | 2.6 | 0.0 |
| <i>Parental class [EGP] (%)</i> | | |
| higher salariat (I) | 9.5 | 10.3 |
| lower salariat (II) | 16.3 | 17.3 |
| routine non-manual employees (IIIa) | 14.3 | 15.0 |
| small employers and own account workers (IVabc) | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| lower supervisory and skilled manual workers (V+VI) | 22.1 | 21.7 |
| non-skilled workers (VIIab) | 18.9 | 20.8 |
| Missing | 3.9 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Parental status [0-1]</i> | | |
| mean | 0.42 | 0.43 |
| s.d. | 0.15 | 0.16 |
| Missing (%) | 3.9 | 0.0 |
| <i>Parental education [0-1]</i> | | |
| mean | 0.31 | 0.32 |
| s.d. | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Missing (%) | 6.6 | 0.0 |
| N | 32609 | 28741 |

Table A6.3: Descriptive statistics for the whole and the analytical samples (%), GERMANY

| | Whole sample | Analytical sample |
|---|--------------|-------------------|
| <i>Cohort (%)</i> | | |
| 1945-54 | 25.1 | 24.6 |
| 1955-64 | 43.6 | 43.7 |
| 1965-74 | 31.4 | 31.7 |
| Missing | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Gender (%)</i> | | |
| Male | 48.2 | 48.3 |
| Female | 51.8 | 51.7 |
| Missing | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Educational attainment (%)</i> | | |
| Upper secondary or higher | 41.1 | 41.7 |
| Tertiary | 24.7 | 25.0 |
| Missing | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| <i>Parental class [EGP] (%)</i> | | |
| higher salariat (I) | 9.7 | 10.8 |
| lower salariat (II) | 20.5 | 22.5 |
| qualified routine non-manual workers (IIIa) | 5.3 | 5.7 |
| self-employed and farmers (IVabc) | 10.4 | 11.5 |
| skilled manual workers, technicians (V+VI) | 18.1 | 20.0 |
| unqualified manual workers (VIIa) | 20.8 | 22.2 |
| unqualified routine non-manual workers (VIIb) | 6.9 | 7.3 |
| Missing | 8.4 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Parental status [0-1]</i> | | |
| mean | 0.45 | 0.46 |
| s.d. | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Missing (%) | 8.9 | 0.00 |
| <i>Parental education [0-1]</i> | | |
| mean | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| s.d. | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| Missing (%) | 5.5 | 0.00 |
| N | 6622 | 5743 |

Table A6.4: Descriptive statistics for the whole and the analytical samples (%), ITALY

| | Whole sample | Analytical sample |
|---|--------------|-------------------|
| <i>Cohort (%)</i> | | |
| 1939-53 | 36.7 | 34.7 |
| 1954-64 | 30.9 | 31.3 |
| 1965-75 | 32.5 | 33.9 |
| Missing | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Gender (%)</i> | | |
| Male | 49.1 | 48.9 |
| Female | 50.9 | 51.1 |
| Missing | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Educational attainment (%)</i> | | |
| Upper secondary or higher | 47.9 | 49.9 |
| Tertiary | 11.2 | 11.9 |
| Missing | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| <i>Parental class [ESEC] (%)</i> | | |
| higher salariat (ESEC 1) | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| lower salariat (ESEC 2) | 5.2 | 6.4 |
| intermediate occupations, lower supervisory (ESEC 3,6) | 10.9 | 13.3 |
| self-employed (not in agriculture) (ESEC 4) | 16.9 | 20.6 |
| farmers (ESEC 5) | 10.8 | 13.1 |
| lower technical and lower services occupations (ESEC 7-8) | 17.0 | 20.8 |
| routine occupations (ESEC 9) | 20.6 | 25.1 |
| Missing | 17.9 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>Parental status [0-1]</i> | | |
| mean | 0.30 | 0.30 |
| s.d. | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| Missing (%) | 17.9 | 0.0 |
| <i>Parental education [0-1]</i> | | |
| mean | 0.26 | 0.27 |
| s.d. | 0.30 | 0.31 |
| Missing (%) | 1.4 | 0.0 |
| N | 29301 | 23992 |

Table A7: Distribution of individuals by highest level education (%)

| | | Men | | | Women | | |
|---------|---------|---------------------------|----------|------|---------------------------|----------|------|
| | | Upper secondary or higher | Tertiary | N | Upper secondary or higher | Tertiary | N |
| Britain | 1946 | 24.8 | 8.3 | 1879 | 9.9 | 2.7 | 1705 |
| | 1958 | 28.6 | 12.3 | 4182 | 27.2 | 9.5 | 4071 |
| | 1970 | 34.7 | 17.8 | 4075 | 32.7 | 17.5 | 4236 |
| Sweden | 1948 | 36.5 | 16.9 | 4037 | 36.7 | 16.7 | 3903 |
| | 1952 | 38.4 | 14.5 | 3785 | 41.3 | 15.0 | 3736 |
| | 1967 | 39.7 | 13.2 | 3489 | 50.0 | 18.6 | 3388 |
| | 1972 | 45.6 | 17.4 | 3308 | 57.5 | 28.0 | 3095 |
| Germany | 1945-54 | 38.6 | 28.6 | 734 | 24.7 | 16.8 | 679 |
| | 1955-64 | 48.0 | 31.3 | 1177 | 38.4 | 20.1 | 1335 |
| | 1965-74 | 47.7 | 30.4 | 863 | 47.2 | 22.3 | 955 |
| Italy | 1939-53 | 38.1 | 10.1 | 4055 | 29.8 | 7.5 | 4280 |
| | 1954-64 | 53.3 | 12.5 | 3666 | 52.0 | 11.1 | 3849 |
| | 1965-75 | 60.8 | 13.7 | 4011 | 66.8 | 16.8 | 4131 |

Table A8.1: Descriptive statistics for the three components of social origins, *Britain*

| | 1946 cohort | 1958 cohort | 1970 cohort |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <i>Parental class [NS-SEC] (%)</i> | | | |
| higher managerial and professional occupations (Class 1) | 4.3 | 5.5 | 11.5 |
| lower managerial and professional occupations (Class 2) | 8.1 | 17.8 | 20.9 |
| intermediate occupations (Class 3) | 8.6 | 16.8 | 8.6 |
| small employers and own account workers (Class 4) | 8.3 | 5.3 | 12.2 |
| lower supervisory and technical occupations (Class 5) | 17.9 | 27.7 | 19.2 |
| routine and semi-routine occupations (Class 6-7) | 52.9 | 26.9 | 27.6 |
| <i>Parental status</i> | | | |
| mean | 0.30 | 0.45 | 0.50 |
| s.d. | 0.24 | 0.23 | 0.24 |
| <i>Parental education</i> | | | |
| mean | 0.27 | 0.34 | 0.39 |
| s.d. | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 |

Table A8.2: Descriptive statistics for the three components of social origins, *Sweden*

| | 1948 cohort | 1953 cohort | 1967 cohort | 1972 cohort |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <i>Parental class [EGP] (%)</i> | | | | |
| higher salariat (I) | 6.5 | 7.1 | 11.4 | 16.3 |
| lower salariat (II) | 11.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 23.1 |
| routine non-manual employees (IIIa) | 12.5 | 12.4 | 18.0 | 17.0 |
| small employers and own account workers (IVabc) | 21.5 | 18.0 | 13.2 | 7.2 |
| lower supervisory and skilled manual workers (V+VI) | 24.3 | 24.6 | 20.1 | 17.9 |
| non-skilled workers (VIIab) | 24.2 | 22.8 | 17.4 | 18.6 |
| <i>Parental status</i> | | | | |
| Mean | 0.37 | 0.39 | 0.46 | 0.48 |
| s.d. | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| <i>Parental education</i> | | | | |
| Mean | 0.24 | 0.28 | 0.38 | 0.39 |
| s.d. | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.32 | 0.31 |

Table A8.3: Descriptive statistics for the three components of social origins, *Germany*

| | 1945-54 | 1955-64 | 1965-74 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|
| <i>Parental class [EGP] (%)</i> | | | |
| higher salariat (I) | 8.6 | 10.8 | 12.5 |
| lower salariat (II) | 21.0 | 22.3 | 23.9 |
| qualified routine non-manual workers (IIIa) | 4.8 | 5.6 | 6.4 |
| self-employed and farmers (IVabc) | 13.5 | 11.3 | 10.3 |
| skilled manual workers, technicians (V+VI) | 22.2 | 19.9 | 18.3 |
| unqualified manual workers (VIIa) | 23.1 | 22.7 | 20.6 |
| unqualified routine non-manual workers (VIIb) | 6.7 | 7.4 | 7.8 |
| <i>Parental status</i> | | | |
| Mean | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.47 |
| s.d. | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| <i>Parental education</i> | | | |
| Mean | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.31 |
| s.d. | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.38 |

Table A8.4: Descriptive statistics for the three components of social origins, *Italy*

| | 1939-53 | 1954-64 | 1965-75 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|
| <i>Parental class [ESeC] (%)</i> | | | |
| higher salariat (ESeC 1) | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.5 |
| lower salariat (ESeC 2) | 4.6 | 6.5 | 8.2 |
| intermediate occupations, lower supervisory (ESeC 3, 6) | 9.9 | 13.2 | 16.9 |
| self-employed (not in agriculture) (ESeC 4) | 17.5 | 21.2 | 23.3 |
| farmers (ESeC 5) | 20.1 | 11.8 | 7.1 |
| lower technical and lower services occupations (ESeC 7-8) | 19.7 | 21.7 | 21.0 |
| routine occupations (ESeC 9) | 27.8 | 25.2 | 22.2 |
| <i>Parental status</i> | | | |
| mean | 0.27 | 0.30 | 0.33 |
| s.d. | 0.17 | 0.19 | 0.21 |
| <i>Parental education</i> | | | |
| mean | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.30 |
| s.d. | 0.26 | 0.30 | 0.35 |

Table A9: Binary logistic regression of exceeding (or not) two educational thresholds, on parental status and education (average marginal effects with standard errors)

| | Men | | Women | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| | Higher secondary or higher vs. lower | Degree vs. lower | Higher secondary or higher vs. lower | Degree vs. lower |
| <i>Parental status</i> | | | | |
| Britain | 0.190 [0.024] ** | 0.099 [0.017] ** | 0.140 [0.021] ** | 0.071 [0.015] ** |
| Sweden | 0.282 [0.039] ** | 0.128 [0.027] ** | 0.239 [0.037] ** | 0.137 [0.032] ** |
| Germany | 0.386 [0.107] ** | 0.164 [0.062] * | 0.357 [0.093] ** | 0.257 [0.072] ** |
| Italy | 0.345 [0.046] ** | 0.180 [0.028] ** | 0.304 [0.043] ** | 0.170 [0.026] ** |
| <i>Parental education</i> | | | | |
| Britain | 0.224 [0.012] ** | 0.160 [0.010] ** | 0.217 [0.011] ** | 0.148 [0.009] ** |
| Sweden | 0.215 [0.014] ** | 0.111 [0.012] ** | 0.215 [0.014] ** | 0.143 [0.011] ** |
| Germany | 0.273 [0.025] ** | 0.224 [0.023] ** | 0.339 [0.020] ** | 0.221 [0.019] ** |
| Italy | 0.437 [0.017] ** | 0.160 [0.009] ** | 0.402 [0.016] ** | 0.149 [0.008] ** |

Note: Parental class is also included in models.

*: $p < 0.05$; **: $p < 0.01$

Table A10: Binary logistic regression of exceeding (or not) two educational thresholds, on parental class (average marginal effects with standard errors)

| | Men | | Women | |
|--|--|------------------|--|------------------|
| | Higher secondary or higher vs. lower | Degree vs. lower | Higher secondary or higher vs. lower | Degree vs. lower |
| <i>Britain</i> | | | | |
| routine and semi-routine occupations (ref.) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| lower supervisory and technical occupations | 0.060 [0.011] ** | 0.018 [0.010] | 0.026 [0.010] * | 0.017 [0.010] |
| small employers and own account workers | 0.029 [0.016] | 0.026 [0.012] * | 0.063 [0.014] ** | 0.038 [0.010] ** |
| intermediate occupations | 0.085 [0.014] ** | 0.052 [0.011] ** | 0.066 [0.013] ** | 0.034 [0.010] ** |
| lower managerial and professional occupations | 0.071 [0.015] ** | 0.050 [0.011] ** | 0.109 [0.013] ** | 0.058 [0.009] ** |
| higher managerial and professional occupations | 0.152 [0.020] ** | 0.192 [0.018] ** | 0.146 [0.016] ** | 0.179 [0.015] ** |
| <i>Sweden</i> | | | | |
| routine and semi-routine occupations (ref.) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| lower supervisory and technical occupations | 0.068 [0.017] ** | 0.035 [0.016] * | 0.024 [0.011] * | 0.008 [0.009] |
| small employers and own account workers | 0.055 [0.025] * | 0.039 [0.018] * | 0.104 [0.018] ** | 0.053 [0.018] ** |
| intermediate occupations | 0.121 [0.016] ** | 0.065 [0.019] ** | 0.115 [0.017] ** | 0.047 [0.020] * |
| lower managerial and professional occupations | 0.184 [0.018] ** | 0.084 [0.018] ** | 0.184 [0.019] ** | 0.090 [0.017] ** |
| higher managerial and professional occupations | 0.299 [0.022] ** | 0.157 [0.017] ** | 0.274 [0.024] ** | 0.132 [0.019] ** |
| <i>Germany</i> | | | | |
| unqualified workers (ref.) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| unqualified routine non-manual workers | 0.111 [0.043] * | 0.065 [0.040] | 0.099 [0.038] | 0.025 [0.033] |
| self-employed and farmers | -0.103 [0.037] ** | -0.030 [0.034] | 0.001 [0.035] | 0.009 [0.031] |
| skilled manual workers, technicians | -0.016 [0.028] | -0.001 [0.027] | -0.018 [0.027] | -0.002 [0.025] |
| qualified routine non-manual workers | 0.133 [0.050] * | 0.074 [0.046] | 0.049 [0.042] | -0.007 [0.034] |
| lower salariat | 0.110 [0.043] * | 0.109 [0.038] ** | 0.049 [0.036] | 0.047 [0.031] |
| higher salariat | 0.077 [0.056] | 0.087 [0.049] * | 0.074 [0.050] | 0.025 [0.038] |
| <i>Italy</i> | | | | |
| routine occupations (ref.) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| lower technical and lower services occupations | 0.021 [0.012] | -0.002 [0.010] | 0.015 [0.013] | -0.004 [0.009] |
| farmers | -0.056 [0.014] ** | -0.012 [0.011] | -0.038 [0.013] ** | 0.001 [0.011] |
| self-employed (not in agriculture) | 0.050 [0.014] ** | 0.018 [0.011] | 0.103 [0.013] ** | 0.053 [0.010] ** |
| intermediate occupations, lower supervisory | 0.053 [0.022] * | 0.015 [0.014] | 0.078 [0.020] ** | 0.047 [0.013] ** |
| lower salariat | 0.068 [0.095] | 0.053 [0.032] | 0.047 [0.081] | 0.096 [0.034] ** |
| higher salariat | 0.037 [0.036] | 0.035 [0.021] | 0.110 [0.035] ** | 0.044 [0.019] * |

Note: Parental status and education are also included in models.

*: $p < 0.05$; **: $p < 0.01$

Table A11: Derivation of three parental groups

| | Parental class | | | |
|---------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | Britain | Sweden | Germany | Italy |
| | NS-SeC | EGP | EGP | ESeC |
| Level 1 | 1, 2 | I, II | I, II | 1, 2 |
| Level 2 | 3, 4, 5 | III, IV, V-VI | III, IV, V-VI | 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| Level 3 | 6, 7 | VII | VII | 7, 8, 9 |
| | Parental status | | | |
| | Britain | Sweden | Germany | Italy |
| Level 1 | | top third | | |
| Level 2 | | middle third | | |
| Level 3 | | bottom third | | |
| | Parental education | | | |
| | Britain | Sweden | Germany | Italy |
| Level 1 | tertiary | tertiary | tertiary | tertiary |
| Level 2 | below tertiary | below tertiary | below tertiary | below tertiary |
| Level 3 | no qualification | compulsory only | lower secondary only | no qualification |

Table A12: Derivation of combined origins

| Combined origins | Components of parental background | | |
|------------------|---|---------|-----------|
| | class | status | education |
| Most advantaged | Level 1 | Level 1 | Level 1 |
| | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
| | Level 1 | Level 1 | Level 2 |
| | Level 2 | Level 1 | Level 1 |
| Intermediate | Other combinations of the three components of parental background | | |
| | Level 3 | Level 3 | Level 3 |
| | Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 3 |
| | Level 3 | Level 3 | Level 2 |
| Least advantaged | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 3 |

Note: The construction rules of Level 1, 2, and 3 are shown in Table A8.

Notes

¹ If educational reforms occurred during a decade, we coded the characteristics of the educational system prevalent in most of the years of the decade. If reform occurred in the middle of a decade, we took the average.

² The individual scores for each sub-dimension, alongside the sources of information are presented in *Table A5*.

³ The data-sets have some missing values, due to attrition, recall error, etc. The proportions of cases lost due to missing values on key variables are the following: Britain, 7%; Sweden, between 2 and 7%, depending on survey sweeps; Germany, around 10%; Italy, around 18%. For all four countries, we conducted statistical tests of various kinds to check whether or not missing values on our key variables can be taken as random. Our results, in all four cases, are affirmative (available upon request). Furthermore, to illustrate that missing values are, indeed, missing at random, *Tables A6.1-6.4* show the distributions of all of our variables, separately for the whole and for the analytical sample. Moreover, in auxiliary analyses we were able to demonstrate that, in the British and the Italian cases, results from analyses using data produced by multiple imputation do not differ significantly from those from analyses using 'complete cases', regarding the relationship between cohort members' social origins and their educational attainment.

⁴ The correlation between the CAMSIS and the Chan-Goldthorpe scales is high, 0.9.

⁵ Although the three components of parental background are obviously correlated with each other (the highest level of correlation – between 0.52 and 0.72 – shows up between parental

class and parental status in all four countries and in all cohorts alike), a problem of multicollinearity never arises.

⁶ The main difference between the binary logistic and the transitions – or Mare – models is that the former is concerned with inequalities in the odds of exceeding or not any particular educational thresholds, while the latter is concerned with inequalities in the odds of making a given transition, conditional on being at risk of doing so. As Breen *et al.* (2009) show, the results from the two approaches lead to generally similar conclusions, regarding over-time trends.

⁷ The *gross* effects of parental class in fact show up in the same fashion in all four countries: the highest AME is observed for the higher salariat. But there is country variation in the pattern of the *net* effects of parental class, due to country differences in the relationship between parental class, status and education.

⁸ To check whether the effects of social origins change across cohorts, we included interactions between the three parental characteristics and cohorts. We refer to ‘changes’ of the effects of social origins only in cases where these interactions were statistically significant.