

Social Inequality in the Welfare State

Martin D. Munk¹

Aalborg University

Presented at:

X Nordic Social Policy Seminar, Oslo 17-19 August 2000.

¹ E-mail: mdmunk@socsci.auc.dk, mdmunk@adr.dk

Indhold

Abstract	3
Introduction	4
I: Institutional Contexts	5
Employment Chances 1976-1999	5
The Danish Educational System	5
II: The Empirical Study. Opportunities in the Life Trajectory	7
Opportunities in the Educational and Occupational System	7
Data, Design and Methods	7
The Statistical Analysis and Interpretation of Results	8
III: Sociological Explanations and Perspectives	11
New Educational Strategies and Welfare Policies	11
The Distribution of Capital and the Structure of Inequality	12
Conclusion	14
References	15
Table 1.	19
Table sp1.	20
Table sp2.	21
Table sp3.	22
Table sp4.	23
Table sp5	24
Table sp6.	25
Table sp7.	26

Abstract

In this paper I present a cohort study of inequality, based upon large registers from Statistics Denmark. Over the last 10-20 years, the socio-cultural analysis has been the main focus in many studies. Some of those studies have contributed to greater understanding of contextual variations. However another sort of analysis has, to some degree, been overlooked, that is the cohort-historical approach (Mannheim; Ryder; Elder; Dex). The interesting thing is the relation between social change and the life trajectory (life not is a linear phenomena!) This is especially relevant when studying inequality related to education, and the cohort perspective illuminates that social structure is not unchangeable. In a way it seems that the methodology of cohorts studies supports the idea of a changing society, not just in terms of broad concepts as globalisation and individualisation, but in terms of concrete empirical results.

Key Words: Social Inequality, Education, Cohorts, Data registers, Logistic regression analysis, Welfare state, Policy and Structural homology.

Introduction

A political goal of the welfare state was, among others, to promote social equality and equal opportunities for every citizen. One major aim has been to create possibilities for people to enter and complete different kinds of education, to strengthen the link between education and work, to formalize the process of qualification, and to reduce poverty and inequality.² I take the notion of the welfare state as synonymous with the ‘Danish Model’ with a tradition of strong decommodifications as regulation of the market of commodities (cf. *Esping-Andersen*, 1990). In general, the Nordic Social Democratic welfare state model is renowned for its extensive public sector (*Rinne/Kivirauma*, 1999).

However, several new investigations in Europe show that inequality grows as such, or is at least stable (c.f. *Fritzell*, 1999; *Gustafsson/Johansson*, 1999; *Halleröd*, 1999). This trend is typically measured by economic inequality, either by disposable income or by market income, as dependent variable. The welfare system in Denmark has played a part in reducing inequalities, measured by redistributed disposable income (*Goul Andersen*, 1999; *Taylor-Gooby*, 1999). Despite these tendencies, measured by market income (*Ministry of Finance*, 1999, 2000), opportunity of entering education, and chances of reaching different levels of jobs inequality is increasing, albeit not as much as in other countries.

In this paper, I will focus on *inequality of opportunities* in the perspective of dynamic changes. These changes are of structural (unemployment, system of education etc.) and of demographic kind: “Changes in birth rates and death rates ... affect the ratio between supply and demand for various kinds of positions” (cf. *Baron/Grusky/Treiman*, 1996: 346). Inequality, considering the relation between education and social position, seems to be persistent. I ask, has opportunities changed over the years, when comparing different birth cohorts at the age of 31, measured in the period of 1980-1995, a period characterised by unemployment, cultural and political alterations. Particularly in relation to social position (occupational outcomes), not only seen in relation to the level and composition of educational capital, but also to the type of education and other relevant parameters. To what degree does social inequality exist *between* different birth cohorts in the Danish society, especially related to key issues like general education, adult education, work experience and unemployment? It is important to explain expected variations in rates of inequality, measured by life

² Normally economists measure inequality related to market income and disposable income and maybe even gross income.

chances and odds ratios for entering different social positions especially related to the dimension of education. Therefore, some aspects of (the links between) the system of education in Denmark and social position (work) for different birth cohorts are outlined. The analysis comprises three interrelated sections.

I: Institutional Contexts

Employment Chances 1976-1999

The employment situation in Denmark seems now relatively optimistic, since unemployment has decreased to 5% in 1999 which is rather low considering that 76% of the women are active in the labour force. The unemployment rate is now the same as in 1974, approximating the level at the time of the oil crisis. The rate of unemployment should be seen in light of new welfare policies, activation etc, especially in Denmark (cf. *Martin*, 2000).³ However, the period from 1975 to 1996 was characterised by relatively high rates of unemployment. From 2.5% of the labour force in 1974 to 6.0% in 1975, to 7.0% in 1980, to 9.7% in 1990 and to 10.4% in 1995 (to 5.4% in 1999). The rates were especially high for younger generations, for example 14.8% for 25-34 years old in 1992. There was some variation over the years, especially in the beginning of the period and from 1986 to 1987.

The Danish Educational System

In recent years, there has been a progressively stronger focus upon the future role of education, as a key factor in coping with fast changing 'globalised' labour markets. This is not new. Earlier studies of education have stressed the importance of the kind of system of education. The degree of *standardisation* has a rather firm impact upon the link between education and work (cf. *Allmendinger*, 1989).

The development of universal basic education in Denmark is illustrated by reappearing junctures of

³Changes during the last seven years have limited amount and duration of social benefits for unemployed, marginalized labour, and others from the most deprived parts of the population, but compared to other states, unemployment benefits are still relatively high and long term. Even if the change of policies regarding the labour market, unemployment, and education have been obvious in Denmark during the past years, it is important to include in the analysis the radical changes since the 1960s of economy, technology, workplaces, the educational system, and the welfare state.

system reform through the last 200 years. Different levels of education can be perceived as social historical constructions, articulated as interests of certain social classes, as a reaction or an answer to changing living conditions. With the rise of political parliamentarism about 1900, still more fields of education were constituted as public education supported by the state, and they were institutionally and economically legitimised (see *Wallerstein*, 1999 for a comprehensive argument). The Danish educational system of today is formally characterised by uniformity and is controlled by the state. In principle, every citizen has free access to education, but admittance to higher education (university) depends on grades and final exams in grammar school (*gymnasium*). Admittance to vocational training normally depends on compulsory school exams (*folkeskole*). The sequence of vocational education consists of theory, theory and praxis, e.g. learning at a workplace. Until 1999, there were about 90 study directions, but they have been reduced to seven entries. Parallel to the ordinary system there is an alternative system of adult education in which both employed and unemployed people have opportunities to enter relatively short training courses. The educational system in Denmark was, at least until the 1980s, considered to be a decentralised system in which free-schools (self-driven schools parallel to *folkeskole*), and folk high schools (*folkehøjskoler*) offered a broad range of opportunities in the educational system (*Archer*, 1979: 423-472). During the 1980s, the educational system became more regulated by the state, and has perhaps turned less autonomous. This new institutionalisation, seen as a constraint, is probably important for the strategies by which every person agent endeavours to maintain or even change its position in society. I am especially thinking of two remarkable political constructions in the area of education: on the one hand an increasing use of adult educational systems, mostly attended by the skilled and semi-skilled. On the other hand, a homologizing of higher education (towards an Anglo-Saxon system with bachelor, masters and Ph.D. degrees). The first trend seems to be a way of relegating individuals with less convertible capital to positions or at least occupations where they can be kept 'busy' The second trend seems to act as a tool for more privileged groups to maintain or expand acquired capital. Previously, it was possible to obtain many academic jobs, also within the university, with a master degree (six years, but normally accomplished after eight years of study). Now, students are expected to get a Ph.D. degree like in America, England, France and other countries. These trends should be taken into account when investigating patterns of inequality over the years for different birth cohorts.

II: The Empirical Study. Opportunities in the Life Trajectory

Opportunities in the Educational and Occupational System

A point of departure for the present analysis is a study by *Erik Jørgen Hansen* (1995), of a 1953/1954 cohort, followed as a panel sample taken from school classes in 1968. He concludes that there are still unequal outcome of (higher) education and positions in the labour market for different social origins. During the period from World War II until 1975, recruitment to higher education was more equally distributed. For some thirty years there was some evidence of declining inequality.⁴ Comparing several Danish studies of social recruitment and opportunities one finds a better chance for working class people to obtain further university education, however still much lower than in privileged social groups (*Hansen*, 1997: 12-13). Internationally, there is a strong tradition for the study of the relations between social origin, educational level and social position (cf. *Shavit/Müller*, 1998; *Breen/Goldthorpe*, 1999; *Shavit/Blossfeld*, 1993; *Kerckhoff*, 1993). In some of the studies it has been shown, that not only educational level, social origin and gender influence specific employment chances but also educational track and specific cohorts (e.g. *Buchmann/Sacchi*, 1998: 419-421; *Blossfeld*, 1986; *Krahn/Lowe*, 1999).

Data, Design and Methods

The empirical data of this paper includes official statistics and extracted data from Statistics Denmark, including 3.6 million people of the Danish population born between 1935 and 1980. Additionally, social data from 1980-1995 is be used, especially from 1980, 1985, 1990 and 1995 regarding covariates and outcome variables. The sources of the social data are Statistical Register for Labour Market Research (IDA), Register of Education and Training Statistics, Separate Registers of Adult Education and Register of Population and Housing Censuses from Statistics Denmark. The analysis comprises birth cohorts born in 1954, 1959 and 1964 at the 31st years of age in 1985, 1990 and 1995. I compare social trajectories in these cohorts. Variables included are social origin, sex, education and employment. In the case of Denmark, it is reasonable to speak of cultural capital in terms of educational capital and work experience, since especially institutionalised capital is a very important element in the structure of the social space, connoting the variation over time for different

⁴ I investigate inequality as associations and Odds ratios, although I am aware of the criticism from *Hellevik*, 1997 (with *Stein Ringen*, 1997). Discussions about measuring social inequality are seen in *Acta Sociologica* by *Hellevik*, 1997; *Marshall/Swift*, 1999; *Hellevik*, 2000; *Ringen*, 2000; *Marshall/Swift*, 2000.

cohorts. Regular descriptive cross tabulations, log-linear models and multivariate logistic regression analysis were applied.

The data seems to reveal social patterns which do not appear in normal questionnaire surveys, probably due to non-response problems; thus even though the registers have some limitations, there are clear advantages. To be able to investigate successive total birth cohorts since it is possible to make comparisons and to get rid of the non-response problems.

The Statistical Analysis and Interpretation of Results

In following it will be illustrated that the rates of inequality primarily measured by life-chances for people of different social origin change over time, especially for different birth cohorts (see tables in the end of text).

Social Origin, Education and Job Positions

Cross-tabulations (not shown) show that younger generations are in a more competitive situation than the years after 1945. There are more competitors on the labour market with an academic degree or other kinds of education. At the same time, analyses show that the association between certain origins and education (and social position) is decreasing. Some persons from privileged classes seem to avoid a demanding trajectory in academic fields (descending social mobility), or they have other converting strategies that allow them to enter new sectors compared to the culture of their social origin. All in all, there seems to be a new trend of divisions between social classes and cohorts.⁵ More and more young people have obtained further education, implying that the *social selection process* is delayed regarding the transition from education to social position. However, further education does not necessary lead to academic or executive positions. This is also the case for women. But women in younger cohorts (1964 compared to 1954) have higher probabilities for success in academic institutions.

I then assumed that the social selection trend comprises two social effects: an effect of the *class*

⁵Furthermore a fairly good log-linear model shows that it was reasonable to analyse social origin, education, position, and cohort at the same time (see also *Jonsson, 1993; Marshall et al., 1997*).

habitus (social origin), durable through a lifetime an effect of the *inflation of titles*, in other words a change of the reproduction of social structures (see also *Bourdieu*, 1979/1986; *Munk*, 1998). Several logistic regression analyses were modelled to elucidate these claims (see also *Marshall/Swifts/Roberts*, 1997). I then made an analysis of outcomes with a socio-economic nominal scale going from the position out of labour market to academics and managers, but focusing on academics and skilled workers.

The opposite table 1 (p.19 here) in which the outcome is social position, especially regarding the chance of becoming an academic or executive manager, shows that persons born in 1959 are 31 per cent more likely to succeed than those born in 1964. The birth cohort of 1954 also had a better chance of entering academic and executive positions. However university education still has a great impact upon the chance of becoming an academic or executive manager (cf. table 1 and other tables). The success of this type of trajectory increases with at least one year of work experience. The odds ratio is nearly doubled compared to the odds ratio of the reference group with less than one year in the labour force. In this trajectory, it is obviously not an advantage to complete different kinds of adult education (see also *Jensen/Jensen*, 1996). Trajectories, including social position of academics, are far from life trajectories with “less” education, suggesting that there is still a strong barrier between different sectors in society. Younger people with less capital face a “vulnerable” life, indicating that it is hard to change the direction of a life trajectory (*Blossfeld/Stockmann*, 1999: 13).

Social origin still plays a major role in the process of obtaining a social position as academic or executive manager. The odds ratio for social origin is 2.38 for father as academic or executive manager which would in fact have been higher without controlling for the highest educational level as a variable. In other words, the effect of origin declines when the parameter of highest/longest education is active in the model. This is comparable with the situation in other countries (*Erikson/Jonsson*, 1998a: 25; *Erikson/Jonsson*, 1998b). Thus, children of executive managers and academics have better opportunities of entering higher education than children of skilled or unskilled parents, even though the chance of this latter class actually increased between 1947 and 1976 (*Hansen*, 1997). After this period this trend has to some extent increased; not in the sense that fewer and fewer obtain a university degree, on the contrary. But seen in relation to social origin there is still an unequal distribution of both access to high education and completed high education, meaning that children of managers and academics are “closer” to the university system. In addition, younger generations still have a *smaller chance* of entering the social position of academics. I also controlled for the experience of unemployment between the age of 26 and 31, which in fact furthermore indicates a difference in the odds ratio, implying that persons with less than one year of

unemployment have a much higher chance of entering the position of academic.

When looking at the position of the skilled worker, another picture turns up (see table 1). Especially work experience seems to have an impact on whether or not a person enters the position of skilled worker. Not surprisingly, the older generations have greater chance of entering this position, the reason being that in the past it was more typical to follow a traditional vocational trajectory.⁶ The logistic regression analysis points out that both vocational and adult education have importance for entering the position of skilled worker. However, at the same time there also seems to be an association between skilled worker and unemployment between the ages of 26 and 31 (over one year).

Adult Education and Workers

The selection process is divided into social trajectories, which can include graduated and not graduated segments of adult education. This distinguishes two major trajectories, of which the latter seems to be more socially disadvantaged. However, logistic regression analysis shows that a combination of formal vocational training (four years) and adult education can be of help in some cases. But the unskilled and people outside the labour force with little or no formal education, seems to be cut off from possibilities to make their way through working life.

Governments could prepare educational policies, which consider the possibility of making new formal entries, combining different tracks of education. If the vocational system only is redefined towards a more “academic” mixture, there is a risk of creating greater social selection in the educational system. The expansion and change of the educational system has: ‘led to the displacement of formally less qualified workers by formally higher qualified workers over the past decades ... this has clearly reduced the career opportunities of the man, who has “come up the ladder”’ (*Blossfeld/Stockmann, 1999: 12*).

The fact that some people in the 1964 generation experienced this trend (not shown in table 1) supports this statement.

The overall situation seems to be that more and more people obtain formal education and adult education throughout their life trajectory, implying that agents from different social classes attend

⁶ New official statistics from show that only 44,598 young men (27,895 women) at the age of 20 to 24 years completed a vocational education as their highest education, compared to 83,497 men (61,036 women) between 45 and 49 years of age.

and accomplish progressively higher and further education. But at the same time, still, a number of children, especially those from the working class, enter groups of unskilled workers and groups outside the work force. Speaking in general terms investments in educational capital and other forms of capital can shape the conditions for converting social positions in order to make up new pathways (*Buchmann/Sacchi, 1998*), however not in a straightforward way.

In fact, the present investigations of social inequality in the Danish welfare state show that social differentiation's in the population have changed chances and opportunities in the life trajectory. Obtaining different levels of education and jobs still depend on social origin and gender, and on cohorts. Apparently, there is an effect of cohorts regarding the chances for achieving specific educational and social positions. Measured by the opportunity to get different jobs, including people with educational degrees, there still seems to be a tendency to social inequality.

III: Sociological Explanations and Perspectives

New Educational Strategies and Welfare Policies

Some of the variations in life chances over the years are probably due to policy changes. Certainly the number of students attending higher education increasing from 95,243 in 1980, to 117,153 in 1988 and to 167,291 in 1997, corresponding to a 43% rise from 1980 to 1997, can be attributed implementation of general policies. Besides focusing on general welfare programs and general education policies, there has been an increasing attention to adult education combined with activation of people outside the labour market as a means to solve unemployment problems. All the same, one problem related to adult education is that spending time in this system does not cancel out the risk of unemployment, despite some positive results for younger individuals during the recent years (also found in the study of cohorts). But this is to some degree a contradiction since a greater supply of education can create more inequality regarding opportunities at the labour market (c.f. *Morris/Western, 1999: 632ff.*).

Tendencies of chances in the educational system and in the labour market, associations between education and social position, should be seen in the light of changed welfare systems. This refers to new ways of designing government policies, which focus on the problems of unemployment and globalisation, and motivated by the prospect of tax and spending reductions. There is a shift in the way people are expected to cope with societal changes, not only in relation to the globalised economy and market, but also in relation to a changed welfare system as such, also in Denmark. It

is well known, that the Danish society is more or less regulated by the welfare state, through ‘arrangements’ and laws providing social support for the unemployed and retired etc. But in recent years the transformation of the welfare state has been a major issue, not only on the topics of inequality, opportunities, and education, but also seen in the light of unemployment and marginalisation. This has resulted in new active labour market policy, with a new social policy of activation schemes signifying the ‘rebirth’ of societal duties – a mixed picture in other words. These changes occur in most welfare systems and regimes (*Esping-Andersen*, 1990, 1999; *Kautto et al.*, 1999), but the perspectives are very different on new welfare state policies (*Hay*, 1998; *Taylor-Gooby*, 1997, 1999).

The Distribution of Capital and the Structure of Inequality

The Danish distribution of economic capital, measured by annual income per capita (and family) is quite egalitarian compared to other welfare states. In this way, we have a society differentiated mainly by ordinary and adult educational capital, work experience, gender, employment - and to some degree by economic capital.⁷ Acquiring different kinds of capital is often viewed as an investment in the future, as a ticket to well-paid jobs and positions in general or as a springboard to social mobility. In all societies there are struggles for scarce and attractive resources; people convert different kinds of capital into social positions in order to make up new pathways. According to *Hedström/Swedberg* (1998) it is also necessary to analyse the *social mechanisms* of these structural tendencies.

The distribution of capital is not just given: there is a more or less democratically regulated (*Weber*, 1978) struggle for capital in the power field (a mixture of the cultural, political, economic and the bureaucratic field). This includes also educational capital. Taken from the studies of education and society, it can be concluded that formal credentials and their quantity gain importance and become crucial in the process of social differentiation (*Young*, 1958; *Collins*, 1979).⁸ This process is reproduced and maintained through a *structural homology*, which is a very particular relation of causal interdependence between specific areas in society, as education and the labour market (cf. *Bourdieu*,

⁷ Within a social space one finds production and social fields, related to the field of power (cf. *Munk*, 1998).

Reconversions can be mediated through a particular field, for example transitions between the field of sports and the social space. The conversion rate for many transitions between jobs, and education and jobs is closely related to the fact that Denmark is a society with relatively strong boundaries between fields and between sectors.

⁸ (*Goldthorpe*, 1996) points out Young’s satiric book about meritocracy as the one which started the basic study of how education functions in the social structure as credentials.

1989/1996: 263).

This particular relation is the foundation of inequality, always active despite of state policies. The point is that state policies, old and new ones, are in fact a part of the structural homology, underlining that the distributions of and struggles for capital in the society are effected by state policy. This means that the distribution of different kinds of capital is constrained and imposed by a structural homology, which includes new policies acting as modifications. This mechanism consequently influences the rate of inequality, through practices and strategies in every day life. The relations between different social positions, corresponding to the system of dispositions are thereby redistributed and reproduced. Eventually, the interdependence between labour market and the educational field, mediated by the power field, is strongly connected to the establishment and reproduction of the welfare state. In other words, there seems to be a clear division between the classes, even if there are some differences across age, cohort, and gender.

How can this be explained? I consider policy to be inferior to structural homology even if the disadvantaged classes and generations in the Danish welfare state, compared to other kinds of welfare states, have better living conditions and rights to social assistance from public institutions and possibilities for adult education (especially the skilled workers). “Since inequality in general, is strongly connected to class inequality, a successful social policy can be expected to decrease the inequality between classes” (*Erikson, 1990: 258*). But policy operates as an integrated part of the reproduction of homology – contributing to the structure of inequality. As a matter of fact, the basic structure in society, as pervaded in different fields, operates according to its own rules and laws; it reinforces hierarchies in places and fields, and it contributes to unequal distributions of legitimate capital.

Structural homology imply a rather closed structure with an opposition between the ‘old’ and the ‘new’ persons who enter and act in the fields. It is thus difficult to enter a field and obtain a permanent position, not only because of personal and organisational structures, e.g. embeddedness, (*Granovetter, 1985; Tilly, 1998*), but because of symbolic barriers which correspond with all sorts of settings. So when, for example, a firm or an institution demands groups or a single individual, there are social mechanisms behind our ‘back’ and even behind the constructed regimes.

In sum, it seems that structural ‘effects’ are still operating, also in the welfare state with its very large and expanded social programs, even if those programs have been reformed and adjusted in economical terms. This means that the creation and construction of the welfare state has led to the

support of groups with less capital, thereby changing the distance and transforming the relations between social classes. There is still, however, a relative gap between social classes, in spite of political, social and organisational structures of redistribution (see *Taylor-Gooby*, 1999).

Conclusion

Empirical investigations show no tendency towards a society with less social inequality. Therefore one can conclude that social inequality, related to education, still exists. However, studies of data from official registers at Statistics Denmark revealed that the strength of association varies over time, by birth cohorts. One might speak of new ways of organising social life. This invariance and variation at the same are explained by several factors: different levels of education, work experience, gender, adult education and eventually by social origin. The social mechanism of structural homology seems to be a way of giving a general answer regarding the persisting reproduction of social inequality, which can be interpreted as a reproduction of the relative distance between groups. Periods with unemployment, increasing number of students in the educational institutions, growing size of generations, cohorts in the 1960s, and changed policies connected to institutions of education and labour markets probably explain much of the variation in the linkage between social origin, education and job.

Danish generations born in the mid 1960s are less advantaged than generations born in the mid- and late 1950s, measured by the time when the birth cohorts were 31 years old. Individuals from the 1960s experienced a period of unemployment (from the 1980's until 1996 when unemployment fell, partly because of better conjunctures and changed labour market policies) at the same time as the size of the cohorts increased, culminating in 1966. In this sense, social inequality can increase over the years, though further studies of younger cohorts might reveal other patterns. It might turn out that the competition in the labour market declines, since there are fewer young individuals. "Globalisation" may nevertheless abolish this trend which is likely to take different directions, depending on areas and sectors. Further studies will have to concentrate upon more detailed life trajectories, especially regarding younger cohorts.

References

- Allmendinger, Jutta, 1989: Educational systems and labor market outcomes, in: *European Sociological Review*, 5 (1989), 231-250
- Archer, Margaret, 1979: *Social Origins of Educational Systems*, London
- Baron, James, David Grusky and Donald J. Treiman, (1996): *Social Differentiation and Inequality: Some Reflections on the State of the Field*, in: Baron, James, David Grusky and Donald J. Treiman (eds.), *Social Differentiation and Social Inequality: Essays in Honour of John Pock*, Oxford, Chap. 11
- Blossfeld, Hans-Peter, 1986: Career opportunities in the Federal Republic of Germany: a dynamic approach to the study of life course, cohort and period effects, in: *European Sociological Review*, 2 (1986), 208-225
- Blossfeld, Hans-Peter and Reinhard Stockmann, 1999: Guest Editors' Introduction, *The German Dual System in Comparative Perspective*, in: *International Journal of Sociology*, 28, (1998-1999), 3-28
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 1979/1986: *Distinction. A social critique of judgement of taste*, London
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 1989/1996: *La Noblesse d'État, Grandes Ecoles et esprit de Corps*, Paris/*The State Nobility*, Cambridge
- Breen, Richard and John H. Goldthorpe, 1999: Class inequality and meritocracy: a critique of Saunders and an alternative analysis, in: *British Journal of Sociology*, 50 (1999), 1-27
- Buchmann, Marlis and Stefan Sacchi, 1998: *The Transition from School to Work in Switzerland*, in: Shavit, Yossi and Walter Müller (Eds.): *From School to work, A Comparative Study of Educational Qualifications and Occupational Destinations*, Oxford 1998, Chap. 13
- Collins, Randall, 1979: *The Credential Society*, New York
- Education in OECD Countries, 1993: *A Compendium of Statistical Information*, Copenhagen
- Erikson, Robert, 1990: Politics and Class Mobility – Does Politics Influence Rates of Social Mobility, in Inga Persson (ed), *Generating Equality in the Welfare State. The Swedish experience*, chap. 10, 247-265
- Erikson, Robert and Jan Jonsson, 1998a: Social Origin as an Interest-bearing Asset: Family Background and Labour-market Rewards among Employees on Sweden, in *Acta Sociologica*, 41, (1998), 19-36
- Erikson, Robert and Jan Jonsson, 1998b: Qualifications and the Allocation Process of Young Men and Women in the Swedish Labour Market, in: Shavit, Yossi and Walter Müller (Eds.): *From School to work, A Comparative Study of Educational Qualifications and Occupational Destinations*, Oxford 1998, Chap. 12
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta, 1990: *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta, 1999: *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economics*, Oxford

- Fritzell, Johan, 1999: Changes in social patterning of living conditions, in: Mikko Kautto, ed., *Nordic Social Policy*, London, Chap. 7
- Goldthorpe, John H., 1996: Problems of “Meritocracy”, in: Erikson, Robert and Jan O. Jonsson (Eds.): *Can Education be Equalised? The Swedish Case in Comparative Perspective*, Boulder 1996, Chap. 8
- Goul Andersen, Jørgen, 1999: Changing Labour Markets, New Social Divisions and Welfare State Support, in: Stefan Svallfors and Peter Taylor-Gooby (Eds.): *The End of the Welfare State?* London, Chap. 2
- Granovetter, Mark, 1985: Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness, in: *American Journal of Sociology*, 91, (1985), 481-510
- Gustafsson, Björn and Mats Johansson, 1999: In Search of Smoking Guns: What Makes Income Inequality over Time in Different Countries?, in: *American Sociological Review*, 64 (1999), 585-605
- Halleröd, Björn, 1999: Economic standard of living, a longitudinal analysis of the economic standard among Swedes 1979 to 1995, in: *European Societies*, 1, (1999), 391-418
- Hansen, Erik Jørgen, 1995: En generation blev voksen, 95:8, *Socialforskningsinstituttet*, Copenhagen (English resume 1996)
- Hansen, Erik Jørgen, 1997: Perspektiver og begrænsninger i studiet af den sociale rekruttering til uddannelserne, 97:17, *Socialforskningsinstituttet*, Copenhagen
- Hay, Colin, 1998: Globalisation, Welfare Retrenchement and ‘the logic of no alternative: why second best won’t do’, in: *Journal of Social Policy*, 27 (1998), 525-532
- Hedström, Peter and Richard Swedberg (eds.), 1998: *Social mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*, Cambridge
- Hellevik, Ottar, 1997: Class Inequality and Egalitarian Reform, in: *Acta Sociologica*, 40, (1997), 377-397
- Hellevik, Ottar, 2000: A Less Biased Allocation Mechanism, in: *Acta Sociologica*, 43, (2000), 81-83
- Jensen, Anne M. and Peter Jensen, 1996: *The Impact of Labour Market Training on the Duration of Unemployment*, Centre for Labour Market and Social Research, Aarhus/Göteborg
- Jonsson, Jan O., 1993: Education, Social Mobility, and Social Reproduction in Sweden: Patterns and Change, in: Erik Jørgen Hansen, Stein Ringen, Hanne Uusitalo and Robert Erikson (Eds.): *Welfare Trends in the Scandinavian Countries*, New York 1993, chap. 5
- Kautto, Mikko et al., 1999: *Nordic Social Policy*, London
- Kerckhoff, Alan C., 1993: *Diverging Pathways, Social Structure and Career Reflections*, Cambridge
- Krahn, Harvey and Graham S. Lowe, 1999: School-to-Work Transitions and Postmodern Values: What’s Changing Canada?, in: Walter R. Heinz, (Ed.), *From Education to Work, Cross-National Perspectives*, Cambridge 1999, Chap. 11

- Levevilkår i Danmark. Statistisk oversigt 1992, 1997, København: Danmarks Statistik/Socialforskningsinstituttet 1992 og 1997
- Martin, John P. (2000): What Works among active labour market policies: Evidence from OECD Countries' Experiences, in: *OECD Economic Studies* nr. 30.
- Marshall, Gordon, Adam Swift and Stephen Roberts, 1997: *Against the Odds?*, Oxford
- Marshall, Gordon and Adam Swift, 1999: On the Meaning and Measurement of Inequality, in: *Acta Sociologica*, 42, (1999), 241-250
- Marshall, Gordon and Adam Swift, 2000: Reply to Ringen and Hellevik, in: *Acta Sociologica*, 43, (2000), 85-86
- Ministry of Finance, 1999: *Finansredegørelse 98/99*, Copenhagen,
- Ministry of Finance, 2000: *Finansredegørelse 2000*, Copenhagen,
- Morris, Martina and Bruce Western, 1999: Inequality in the Earnings at the Close of the Twentieth Century, in: *Annual Review of Sociology*, (25) 1999, 623-657
- Munk, Martin, 1998: *Livsbaner gennem et felt, En analyse af eliteidrætsudøveres sociale mobilitet og rekonversioner af kapital i det sociale rum (Trajectories Through a Field: An analysis of top level athletes' social mobility and reconversions of capital in the social space)*, Department of Sociology, Lund university
- Ringen, Stein, 1997: *Citizens, Families and Reform*, Oxford
- Ringen, Stein, 2000: Inequality and Its Measurement, in: *Acta Sociologica*, 43, (2000), 84
- Rinne, Risto and Joel Kivirauma, 1999: Education and Marginalisation: The Changing Position of Poor Education as a Factor in Indigence in Finland, in: *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology*, 36, (1999), 1-31
- Shavit, Yossi and Hans-Peter Blossfeld, (Eds.), 1993: *Persistent Inequality: Changing Educational Attainment in Thirteen Countries*, Boulder
- Shavit, Yossi and Walter Müller, 1998: *From School to work, A Comparative Study of Educational Qualifications and Occupational Destinations*, Oxford
- Statistiske Efterretninger (og Nyt), Kultur/Uddannelse, Arbejdsmarked, Generel erhvervsstatistik og Handel, 1988-2000: Copenhagen, Statistics Denmark
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter, 1997: In Defence of Second-best Theory: State, Class and Capital in Social Policy, in: *Journal of Social Policy*, 26 (1997), 171-192
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter, 1999: Bipolar Bugbears, in: *Journal of Social Policy*, 28 (1999), 299-303
- Tilly, Charles, 1998: *Durable Inequality*, Berkeley
- Uddannelse på kryds og tværs 1996 og 1997, Copenhagen, Ministry of Education
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1999: The Heritage of Sociology, the Promise of Social Science, in: *Current Sociology*, 47, (1999), 1-41

Weber, Max, 1922/1978: *Economy and Society*, I + II, Berkeley

Young, Michael, 1958: *The Rise of the Meritocracy*, Harmondsworth

Acknowledgements:

This project was supported by a grant from the Danish Research Council (No.: 9700145).

Martin D. Munk, Dr.phil (Sociology), Ass. Professor of Political Sociology and Policyanalysis, CCWS - Centre for Comparative Welfare State Studies, Department of Economics, Politics and Public Administration, Fibigerstraede 1, Aalborg University, DK-9220 Aalborg Ø, Denmark, Tel: (+45) 9635 8187/ (+45) 3917 3889/ (+45) 3810 8582, Fax. (+45) 9815 5346, E-mail: mdmunk@socsci.auc.dk, Home Page: <http://www.socsci.auc.dk/institut2/>

Table 1. Logistic Regression of social origin, highest education, sex, unemployment, adult education, cohort and work experience on social position at the age of 31. "Best model". I checked for interaction between covariates. Logit is the link function. The distribution is binominal. N (1954)= 69,514, N (1959)=67,706. N (1964)=76,490. 1124 are totally missing. Standard Error, confidence interval (95 pct.), in parentheses.

	Academics/director		Skilled Worker	
	Parameter estimates	Odds ratios	Parameter estimates	Odds ratios
Intercept	-4.44 (0.06)	0.01 (0.01,0.01)	-1.38 (0.07)	0.25 (0.22, 0.29)
Basic Education/ Gymnasium	-0.09 (0.03)	0.92 (0.86,0.98)	-2.10 (0.02)	0.12 (0.12,0.13)
Vocational Education	0.00 (0.00)	1	0.00 (0.00)	1
Long/Academic Education	3.07 (0.03)	21.45(20.40,22.54)	-3.71 (0.08)	0.02 (0.02, 0.12)
Men	0.00 (0.00)	1	0.00 (0.00)	1
Women	-1.12 (0.02)	0.33 (0.31,0.34)	-2.44 (0.02)	0.09 (0.08, 0.09)
Cohort=1954	0.06 (0.03)	1.06 (1.00,1.11)	0.84 (0.03)	2.31 (2.19, 2.43)
Cohort=1959	0.27 (0.02)	1.31 (1.25,1.37)	0.35 (0.02)	1.42 (1.37, 1.48)
Cohort=1964	0.00 (0.00)	1	0.00 (0.00)	1
Father Academic	0.87 (0.04)	2.38 (2.22,2.56)	-0.51 (0.03)	0.60 (0.56, 0.64)
Father Employed	0.60 (0.04)	1.83 (1.70,1.97)	-0.30 (0.03)	0.74 (0.70, 0.78)
Father Artisan	0.40 (0.04)	1.49 (1.39,1.61)	-0.17 (0.02)	0.84 (0.80, 0.88)
Father Skilled	0.32 (0.04)	1.38 (1.26,1.50)	0.13 (0.03)	1.14 (1.09, 1.20)
Father Unskilled	0.00 (0.00)	1	0.00 (0.00)	1
Father Out o LF	0.25 (0.04)	1.28 (1.18, 1.38)	-0.15 (0.03)	0.86 (0.82,0.90)
Work exp. 0 Years	-1.74 (0.15)	0.18 (0.13, 0.23)	-2.20 (0.21)	0.11 (0.07, 0.17)
Work exp. <1 Years	0.00 (0.00)	1	0.00 (0.00)	1
Work exp. 1 Years	0.68 (0.18)	1.98 (1.39, 2.81)	-0.77 (0.33)	0.46 (0.24, 0.89)
Work exp. 1-5 Years	0.20 (0.05)	1.23 (1.11,1.35)	0.76 (0.07)	2.15 (1.87, 2.46)
Work exp. 5-10 Years	0.11 (0.05)	1.11 (1.01,1.22)	1.27 (0.07)	3.55 (3.09, 4.07)
Work exp. +10 Years	0.10 (0.05)	1.11 (0.99,1.23)	1.63 (0.07)	5.12 (4.45, 5.90)
Unemployed Yes	0.00 (0.00)	1	0.00 (0.00)	1
Unemployed No	0.42 (0.03)	1.52 (1.43,1.61)	-0.59 (0.02)	0.55 (0.53, 0.58)
Adult Education Yes	0.00 (0.00)	1	0.00 (0.00)	1
Adult Education No	0.38 (0.02)	1.47 (1.41,1.53)	-0.47 (0.02)	0.63 (0.61,0.65)
	Deviance (value/DF):2.5/ Pearson Chi-square: 5828.3		Deviance (value/DF):2.0/Pearson Chi-square: 8991.4	

Table sp1. Logistic Regression of the Effects of Highest Education, Cohort, Social Origin, Sex, Work Experience, Unemployment over one year between the age of 26 and 31, and Adult Education on Social position at the age of 31. Interaction between covariates is checked. Logit is the link function. The distribution is binomial. N (1954)= 69,514, N (1959)=67,706, N (1964)=76,410; 1124 are totally missing. The effects of the successive variables are all presented as controlled, except the first one. Type III Analysis confirms that. P=0.0001.

Academics/Managers (Number of events=16590)							
Parameter estimates (Standard Error in parentheses)							
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Intercept	-3.607(0.02)	-3.853(0.02)	-4.115(0.04)	-3.819(0.04)	-4.940(0.07)	-5.108(0.07)	-5.161(0.07)
Basic Education	-0.907(0.04)	-0.931(0.04)	-0.858(0.04)	-0.775(0.04)	-0.632(0.04)	-0.607(0.04)	-0.601(0.04)
Gymnasium	0.887(0.04)	0.916(0.04)	0.841(0.04)	0.918(0.04)	1.070(0.04)	1.061(0.04)	1.051(0.04)
Vocational Education	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Intermediate Education	2.201(0.03)	2.206(0.03)	2.121(0.03)	2.300(0.03)	2.370(0.03)	2.340(0.03)	2.338(0.03)
Long Academic Education	4.279(0.03)	4.310(0.03)	4.192(0.03)	4.274(0.03)	4.655(0.03)	4.615(0.03)	4.591(0.03)
Cohort=1954		0.274(0.02)	0.364(0.03)	0.305(0.03)	0.535(0.03)	0.502(0.03)	0.439(0.03)
Cohort=1959		0.461(0.02)	0.473(0.02)	0.469(0.02)	0.513(0.03)	0.493(0.03)	0.461(0.03)
Cohort=1964		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Academic/Dir .			0.552(0.04)	0.586(0.04)	0.628(0.04)	0.620(0.04)	0.612(0.04)
Father Employed			0.479(0.04)	0.493(0.04)	0.493(0.04)	0.489(0.04)	0.482(0.04)
Father Artisan/selfemp			0.237(0.04)	0.280(0.04)	0.298(0.04)	0.287(0.04)	0.284(0.04)
Father Skilled			0.267(0.04)	0.276(0.05)	0.280(0.05)	0.282(0.05)	0.279(0.05)
Father Unskilled			0.000(0.00)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Out o LF			0.017(0.04)	0.172(0.04)	0.234(0.04)	0.227(0.04)	0.223(0.04)
Men				0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Women				-0.973(0.02)	-0.928(0.02)	-0.925(0.02)	-0.939(0.02)
Work exp. 0 Years					-1.541(0.16)	-1.606(0.16)	-1.608(0.15)
Work exp. <1 Years					0.000	0.000	0.000
Work exp. 1 Years					1.497(0.20)	1.378(0.196)	1.361(0.195)
Work exp. 1-5 Years					0.518(0.05)	0.495(0.05)	0.497(0.05)
Work exp. 5-10 Years					1.052(0.05)	0.947(0.06)	0.950(0.06)
Work exp. +10 Years					1.258(0.06)	1.116(0.06)	1.125(0.06)
Unemployed Yes						0.000	0.000
Unemployed No						0.333(0.03)	0.319(0.03)
Adult Education Yes							0.000
Adult Education No							0.168(0.02)
Pearson Chi- square:	12018.65	11409.17	10781.81	8307.17	7702.82	7703.10	7716.64

Table sp2. Logistic Regression of the Effects of Highest Education, Cohort, Social Origin, Sex, Work Experience, Unemployment over one year between the age of 26 and 31, and Adult Education on Social position at the age of 31. Interaction between covariates is checked. Logit is the link function. The distribution is binomial. N (1954)= 69,514, N (1959)=67,706, N (1964)=76,410; 1124 are totally missing. The effects of the successive variables are all presented as controlled, except the first one. Type III Analysis confirms that. P=0.0001.

Employees=Lower-grade professionals/technicians/administrators (number of events=29872)							
Parameter estimates (Standard Error in parentheses)							
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Intercept	-1.925(0.01)	-2.145(0.01)	-2.324(0.02)	-2.570(0.02)	-3.505(0.05)	-3.748(0.06)	-3.835(0.06)
Basic Education	-1.490(0.02)	-1.522(0.02)	-1.486(0.02)	-1.542(0.02)	-1.424(0.02)	-1.389(0.02)	-1.382(0.02)
Gymnasium	-0.119(0.03)	-0.091(0.03)*	-0.127(0.03)	-0.171(0.03)	-0.068(0.03)**	-0.086(0.03)****	-0.095(0.03)*****
Vocational Education	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Intermediate Education	2.380(0.02)	2.384(0.02)	2.343(0.02)	2.295(0.02)	2.325(0.02)	2.275(0.02)	2.279(0.02)
Long Academic Education	-0.569(0.03)	-0.566(0.04)	-0.633(0.04)	-0.613(0.04)	-0.458(0.04)	-0.535(0.04)	-0.582(0.04)
Cohort=1954		0.394(0.02)	0.426(0.02)	0.479(0.02)	0.609(0.02)	0.533(0.02)	0.416(0.02)
Cohort=1959		0.284(0.02)	0.285(0.02)	0.294(0.02)	0.299(0.02)	0.262(0.02)	0.204(0.02)
Cohort=1964		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Academic/Dir .			0.295(0.03)	0.286(0.03)	0.317(0.03)	0.298(0.03)	0.287(0.03)
Father Employed			0.313(0.03)	0.308(0.03)	0.312(0.03)	0.302(0.03)	0.292(0.03)
Father Artisan/selfemp			0.228(0.02)	0.217(0.02)	0.236(0.02)	0.217(0.02)	0.214(0.02)
Father Skilled			0.161(0.03)	0.159(0.03)	0.162(0.03)	0.160(0.03)	0.156(0.03)
Father Unskilled			0.000(0.00)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Out o LF			0.099(0.02)	0.003(0.03)ns	0.058(0.03)***	0.041(0.03)ns	0.036(0.03)ns
Men				0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Women				0.519(0.01)	0.540(0.01)	0.549(0.01)	0.513(0.01)
Work exp. 0 Years					-2.217(0.18)	-2.329(0.18)	-2.341(0.18)
Work exp. <1 Years					0.000	0.000	0.000
Work exp. 1 Years					0.137(0.20)ns	0.004(0.20)ns	-0.022(0.20)ns
Work exp. 1-5 Years					0.648(0.05)	0.665(0.05)	0.675(0.05)
Work exp. 5-10 Years					0.969(0.05)	0.854(0.05)	0.863(0.05)
Work exp. +10 Years					0.943(0.05)	0.757(0.05)	0.756(0.05)
Unemployed Yes						0.000	0.000
Unemployed No						0.466(0.02)	0.438(0.02)
Adult Education Yes							0.000
Adult Education No							0.295(0.02)
*P=0.0013, **P=0.0184, ***P=0.0231, ****P=0.0030, *****P=0.0010,							
Pearson Chi-square:	13912.64	13501.65	13186.03	12271.43	11555.43	11472.12	11194.68

Table sp3. Logistic Regression of the Effects of Highest Education, Cohort, Social Origin, Sex, Work Experience, Unemployment over one year between the age of 26 and 31, and Adult Education on Social position at the age of 31. Interaction between covariates is checked. Logit is the link function. The distribution is binomial. N (1954)= 69,514, N (1959)=67,706, N (1964)=76,410; 1124 are totally missing. The effects of the successive variables are all presented as controlled, except the first one. Type III Analysis confirms that. P=0.0001.

Self-employed/artisans (number of events=13854)							
Parameter estimates (Standard Error in parentheses)							
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Intercept	-2.438(0.01)	-2.538(0.01)	-2.852(0.03)	-2.573(0.03)	-0.721(0.05)	-1.333(0.05)	-1.441(0.05)
Basic Education	-0.294(0.02)	-0.307(0.02)	-0.243(0.02)	-0.170(0.02)	-0.671(0.02)	-0.582(0.02)	-0.581(0.02)
Gymnasium	-0.321(0.04)	-0.308(0.04)	-0.328(0.04)	-0.250(0.04)	-0.747(0.04)	-0.782(0.04)	-0.797(0.04)
Vocational Education	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Intermediate Education	-1.200(0.05)	-1.203(0.05)	-1.262(0.05)	-1.132(0.05)	-1.419(0.05)	-1.528(0.05)	-1.538(0.05)
Long Academic Education	-0.693(0.05)	-0.691(0.05)	-0.753(0.05)	-0.795(0.05)	-1.538(0.05)	-1.671(0.05)	-1.722(0.05)
Cohort=1954		0.146(0.02)	0.106(0.02)	0.045(0.02)*	-0.842(0.03)	-0.923(0.03)	-1.015(0.03)
Cohort=1959		0.172(0.02)	0.120(0.02)	0.120(0.02)	-0.155(0.02)	-0.218(0.02)	-0.253(0.02)
Cohort=1964		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Academic/Dir .			0.325(0.04)	0.359(0.04)	0.204(0.04)	0.151(0.04)	0.139(0.04)
Father Employed			-0.0004(0.04)ns	0.023(0.04)ns	0.005(0.04)ns	-0.030(0.04)ns	-0.041(0.04)ns
Father Artisan/selfemp			0.931(0.03)	0.953(0.03)	0.909(0.03)	0.847(0.03)	0.842(0.03)
Father Skilled			-0.092(0.04)	-0.076(0.04)**	-0.090(0.04)***	-0.100(0.04)****	-0.103(0.04)*****
Father Unskilled			0.000(0.00)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Out o LF			0.272(0.03)	0.443(0.03)	0.248(0.03)	0.213(0.03)	0.209(0.03)
Men				0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Women				-0.881(0.02)	-1.110(0.02)	-1.093(0.02)	-1.119(0.02)
Work exp. 0 Years					1.089(0.05)	0.900(0.05)	0.869(0.05)
Work exp. <1 Years					0.000	0.000	0.000
Work exp. 1 Years					1.150(0.12)	0.965(0.12)	0.941(0.12)
Work exp. 1-5 Years					-0.435(0.04)	-0.315(0.04)	-0.302(0.04)
Work exp. 5-10 Years					-1.482(0.04)	-1.594(0.04)	-1.574(0.04)
Work exp. +10 Years					-2.852(0.05)	-3.088(0.05)	-3.071(0.05)
Unemployed Yes						0.000	0.000
Unemployed No						0.914(0.03)	0.879(0.03)
Adult Education Yes							0.000
Adult Education No							0.296(0.02)
*P=0.0533, **P=0.0459, ***P=0.0219, ****P=0.0114, *****P=0.0088,							
Pearson Chi-square:	36511.19	36018.59	31193.43	27604.36	10324.13	9621.98	9452.19

Table sp4. Logistic Regression of the Effects of Highest Education, Cohort, Social Origin, Sex, Work Experience, Unemployment over one year between the age of 26 and 31, and Adult Education on Social position at the age of 31. Interaction between covariates is checked. Logit is the link function. The distribution is binomial. N (1954)= 69,514, N (1959)=67,706, N (1964)=76,410; 1124 are totally missing. The effects of the successive variables are all presented as controlled, except the first one. Type III Analysis confirms that. P=0.0001.

Employees/routine manual in administration, commerce and service (number of events=56020)							
Parameter estimates (Standard Error in parentheses)							
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Intercept	-0.614(0.01)	-0.774(0.01)	-0.930(0.01)	-1.580(0.02)	-4.210(0.05)	-4.225(0.05)	-4.257(0.05)
Basic Education	-0.693(0.01)	-0.717(0.01)	-0.712(0.01)	-0.899(0.01)	-0.638(0.01)	-0.636(0.01)	-0.633(0.01)
Gymnasium	0.103(0.02)	0.125(0.02)	0.095(0.02)	-0.019(0.02)	0.294(0.02)	0.292(0.02)	0.288(0.02)
Vocational Education	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Intermediate Education	-1.938(0.03)	-1.950(0.03)	-1.982(0.03)	-2.296(0.03)	-2.293(0.03)	-2.296(0.03)	-2.298(0.03)
Long Academic Education	-2.457(0.04)	-2.458(0.04)	-2.504(0.04)	-2.576(0.04)	-2.063(0.05)	-2.069(0.05)	-2.091(0.05)
Cohort=1954		0.285(0.01)	0.253(0.01)	0.409(0.01)	1.185(0.02)	1.176(0.02)	1.116(0.02)
Cohort=1959		0.226(0.01)	0.232(0.01)	0.270(0.01)	0.514(0.01)	0.511(0.01)	0.483(0.01)
Cohort=1964		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Academic/Dir .			0.247(0.02)	0.215(0.02)	0.300(0.02)	0.299(0.02)	0.291(0.02)
Father Employed			0.393(0.02)	0.389(0.02)	0.386(0.02)	0.385(0.02)	0.379(0.02)
Father Artisan/selfemp			0.021(0.02)	0.005(0.02)ns	0.027(0.02)ns	0.026(0.02)ns	0.023(0.02)ns
Father Skilled			0.191(0.02)	0.182(0.02)	0.174(0.02)	0.174(0.02)	0.171(0.02)
Father Unskilled			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Out o LF			0.253(0.02)	-0.003(0.02)ns	0.144(0.02)	0.143(0.02)	0.141(0.02)
Men				0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Women				1.343(0.01)	1.615(0.01)	1.616(0.01)	1.594(0.01)
Work exp. 0 Years					-2.299(0.14)	-2.307(0.14)	-2.316(0.14)
Work exp. <1 Years					0.000	0.000	0.000
Work exp. 1 Years					1.299(0.16)	1.289(0.16)	1.273(0.16)
Work exp. 1-5 Years					1.322(0.04)	1.325(0.04)	1.329(0.04)
Work exp. 5-10 Years					2.035(0.04)	2.027(0.04)	2.027(0.04)
Work exp. +10 Years					2.970(0.05)	2.954(0.05)	2.946(0.05)
Unemployed Yes						0.000	0.000
Unemployed No						0.033(0.02)*	0.018(0.02)ns
Adult Education Yes							0.000
Adult Education No							0.146(0.01)

*P=0.0325.

Pearson Chi-square (deviance): 40865.65(42484.25) 40049.72(41896.50) 39520.76 (41192.54) 25999.41(25776.13) 25457.07(11283.35) 26630.19(11278.78) 26644.99(11134.26)

Table sp5. Logistic Regression of the Effects of Highest Education, Cohort, Social Origin, Sex, Work Experience, Unemployment over one year between the age of 26 and 31, and Adult Education on Social position at the age of 31. Interaction between covariates is checked. Logit is the link function. The distribution is binomial. N (1954)= 69,514, N (1959)=67,706, N (1964)=76,410; 1124 are totally missing. The effects of the successive variables are all presented as controlled, except the first one. Type III Analysis confirms that. P=0.0001.

Skilled workers (number of events=23841)							
Parameter estimates (Standard Error in parentheses)							
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Intercept	-1.288(0.01)	-1.396(0.01)	-1.200(0.02)	-0.536(0.02)	-1.771(0.07)	-1.508(0.07)	-1.381(0.07)
Basic Education	-2.014(0.02)	-2.034(0.02)	-2.040(0.02)	-2.018(0.02)	-1.924(0.02)	-1.985(0.02)	-2.010(0.02)
Gymnasium	-3.083(0.08)	-3.069(0.08)	-3.009(0.08)	-3.000(0.08)	-2.899(0.08)	-2.878(0.08)	-2.854(0.08)
Vocational Education	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Intermediate Education	-3.706(0.09)	-3.716(0.09)	-3.651(0.09)	-3.525(0.09)	-3.491(0.09)	-3.423(0.09)	-3.421(0.09)
Long Academic Education	-4.781(0.19)	-4.782(0.19)	-4.663(0.19)	-4.889(0.19)	-4.727(0.19)	-4.619(0.19)	-4.529(0.19)
Cohort=1954		0.246(0.02)	0.398(0.02)	0.212(0.02)	0.511(0.02)	0.657(0.03)	0.826(0.03)
Cohort=1959		0.096(0.02)	0.120(0.02)	0.106(0.02)	0.193(0.02)	0.278(0.02)	0.344(0.02)
Cohort=1964		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Academic/Dir .			-0.605(0.03)	-0.565(0.03)	-0.530(0.03)	-0.507(0.03)	-0.481(0.03)
Father Employed			-0.346(0.03)	-0.321(0.03)	-0.319(0.03)	-0.303(0.03)	-0.280(0.03)
Father Artisan/selfemp			-0.242(0.02)	-0.265(0.02)	-0.210(0.02)	-0.172(0.02)	-0.159(0.02)
Father Skilled			0.081(0.02)*	0.117(0.03)	0.125(0.03)	0.130(0.03)	0.142(0.03)
Father Unskilled			0.000(0.00)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Out o LF			-0.559(0.02)	-0.215(0.02)	-0.170(0.03)	-0.156(0.03)	-0.147(0.03)
Men				0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Women				-2.504(0.02)	-2.476(0.21)	-2.502(0.02)	-2.440(0.02)
Work exp. 0 Years					-2.248(0.21)	-2.281(0.21)	-2.215(0.21)
Work exp. <1 Years					0.000	0.000	0.000
Work exp. 1 Years					-1.061(0.33)**	-0.855(0.33)***	-0.784(0.33)****
Work exp. 1-5 Years					0.852(0.07)	0.783(0.07)	0.758(0.07)
Work exp. 5-10 Years					1.099(0.07)	1.271(0.07)	1.250(0.07)
Work exp. +10 Years					1.316(0.07)	1.613(0.07)	1.611(0.07)
Unemployed Yes						0.000	0.000
Unemployed No						-0.621(0.02)	-0.580(0.02)
Adult Education Yes							0.000
Adult Education No							-0.460(0.02)

*P=0.006, **P=0.0015, ***P=0.0105, ****P=0.0190. Notice that Model 5 is better than Model 4 measured by deviance, instead of Pearson Chi-square

Pearson Chi-square (deviance): 26376.12(27023.55) 26097.19(26825.04) 25173.80(25727.49) 12419.83(7852.89) 17528.90(6114.26) 16544.06(5404.63) 13706.59(4630.88)

Table sp6. Logistic Regression of the Effects of Highest Education, Cohort, Social Origin, Sex, Work Experience, Unemployment over one year between the age of 26 and 31, and Adult Education on Social position at the age of 31. Interaction between covariates is checked. Logit is the link function. The distribution is binomial. N (1954)= 69,514, N (1959)=67,706, N (1964)=76,410; 1124 are totally missing. The effects of the successive variables are all presented as controlled, except the first one. Type III Analysis confirms that. P=0.0001.

Unskilled workers (number of events=52926)							
Parameter estimates (Standard Error in parentheses)							
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Intercept	-1.712(0.01)	-2.028(0.01)	-1.763(0.02)	-1.659(0.02)	-2.692(0.04)	-2.315(0.04)	-2.119(0.04)
Basic Education	1.620(0.01)	1.684(0.01)	1.635(0.01)	1.669(0.01)	1.771(0.01)	1.744(0.01)	1.743(0.01)
Gymnasium	0.504(0.02)	0.467(0.02)	0.532(0.02)	0.567(0.02)	0.595(0.02)	0.633(0.02)	0.647(0.02)
Vocational Education	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Intermediate Education	-1.101(0.03)	-1.091(0.03)	-1.014(0.03)	-0.970(0.03)	-1.030(0.03)	-0.941(0.03)	-0.938(0.03)
Long Academic Educa tion	-0.329(0.03)	-0.337(0.03)	-0.217(0.03)	-0.233(0.03)	-0.296(0.03)	-0.168(0.03)	-0.109(0.03)
Cohort=1954		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Cohort=1959		0.229(0.01)	0.246(0.01)	0.264(0.01)	0.240(0.02)	0.174(0.02)	0.109(0.02)
Cohort=1964		0.585(0.01)	0.605(0.01)	0.624(0.01)	0.670(0.02)	0.548(0.02)	0.434(0.02)
Father Academic/Dir .			-0.540(0.02)	-0.533(0.02)	-0.513(0.02)	-0.484(0.02)	-0.469(0.02)
Father Employed			-0.521(0.02)	-0.516(0.02)	-0.507(0.02)	-0.492(0.02)	-0.479(0.02)
Father Artisan/selfemp			-0.325(0.02)	-0.323(0.02)	-0.308(0.02)	-0.276(0.02)	-0.270(0.02)
Father Skilled			-0.331(0.02)	-0.325(0.02)	-0.320(0.02)	-0.321(0.02)	-0.315(0.02)
Father Unskilled			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Out o LF			-0.219(0.02)	-0.156(0.02)	-0.107(0.02)	-0.088(0.02)	-0.083(0.02)
Men				0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Women				-0.319(0.01)	-0.354(0.01)	-0.368(0.01)	-0.329(0.01)
Work exp. 0 Years					-2.630(0.10)	-2.470(0.10)	-2.429(0.10)
Work exp. <1 Years					0.000	0.000	0.000
Work exp. 1 Years					-0.689(0.22)*	-0.507(0.22)**	-0.469(0.22)***
Work exp. 1-5 Years					1.213(0.03)	1.137(0.03)	1.122(0.03)
Work exp. 5-10 Years					1.105(0.03)	1.226(0.03)	1.212(0.03)
Work exp. +10 Years					0.871(0.03)	1.118(0.03)	1.114(0.03)
Unemployed Yes						0.000	0.000
Unemployed No						-0.547(0.01)	-0.517(0.01)
Adult Education Yes							0.000
Adult Education No							-0.300(0.01)

*P=0.0017, **P=0.0209, ***P=0.0326.

Pearson Chi-square (deviance): 20565.08(22674.46) 18693.90(20691.44) 17814.67(19665.46) 17059.70(188545.68) 16773.11(12084.29) 14697.69(10625) 13645.06(9997.08)

Table sp7. Logistic Regression of the Effects of Highest Education, Cohort, Social Origin, Sex, Work Experience, Unemployment over one year between the age of 26 and 31, and Adult Education on Social position at the age of 31. Interaction between covariates is checked. Logit is the link function. The distribution is binomial. N (1954)= 69,514, N (1959)=67,706, N (1964)=76,410; 1124 are totally missing. The effects of the successive variables are all presented as controlled, except the first one. Type III Analysis confirms that. P=0.0001.

Out of Labour force (number of events=8979)							
Parameter estimates (Standard Error in parentheses)							
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Intercept	-3.432(0.02)	-2.801(0.02)	-3.043(0.03)	-2.855(0.03)	-2.157(0.06)	-2.493(0.06)	-2.553(0.06)
Basic Education	0.257(0.03)	0.384(0.03)	0.445(0.03)	0.472(0.03)	0.383(0.03)	0.429(0.03)	0.435(0.03)
Gymnasium	1.177(0.03)	1.092(0.03)	1.024(0.03)	1.082(0.04)	0.995(0.04)	0.971(0.04)	0.966(0.04)
Vocational Education	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Intermediate Education	0.335(0.04)	0.369(0.04)	0.273(0.04)	0.334(0.04)	0.270(0.04)	0.200(0.04)	0.204(0.04)
Long Academic Education	0.978(0.04)	0.976(0.04)	0.827(0.04)	0.810(0.04)	0.638(0.04)	0.550(0.04)	0.526(0.04)
Cohort=1954		-1.361(0.03)	-1.353(0.03)	-1.378(0.03)	-1.495(0.03)	-1.563(0.03)	-1.618(0.03)
Cohort=1959		-1.369(0.03)	-1.383(0.03)	-1.389(0.03)	-1.422(0.03)	-1.466(0.03)	-1.492(0.03)
Cohort=1964		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Academic/Dir .			0.568(0.04)	0.569(0.04)	0.541(0.04)	0.514(0.04)	0.506(0.04)
Father Employed			0.319(0.04)	0.318(0.04)	0.315(0.04)	0.300(0.04)	0.292(0.04)
Father Artisan/selfemp			0.384(0.04)	0.387(0.04)	0.384(0.04)	0.354(0.04)	0.351(0.04)
Father Skilled			0.044(0.04)ns	0.048(0.04)ns	0.047(0.04)ns	0.044(0.04)ns	0.041(0.04)ns
Father Unskilled			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Father Out o LF			0.177(0.04)	0.236(0.04)	0.190(0.04)	01.77(0.04)	0.172(0.04)
Men				0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Women				-0.485(0.02)	-0.526(0.02)	-0.515(0.02)	-0.527(0.02)
Work exp. 0 Years					-0.643(0.09)	-0.770(0.09)	-0.793(0.09)
Work exp. <1 Years					0.000	0.000	0.000
Work exp. 1 Years					-0.479(0.26)*	-0.596(0.26)**	-0.608(0.26)***
Work exp. 1-5 Years					-0.415(0.05)	-0.349(0.05)	-0.341(0.05)
Work exp. 5-10 Years					-0.639(0.05)	-0.693(0.05)	-0.682(0.05)
Work exp. +10 Years					-0.768(0.05)	-0.925(0.05)	-0.912(0.05)
Unemployed Yes						0.000	0.000
Unemployed No						0.526(0.03)	0.509(0.03)
Adult Education Yes							0.000
Adult Education No							0.161(0.02)

*P=0.0625, **P=0.0207, ***P=0.0183.

Pearson Chi-square (deviance): 10304.75(9295.67) 7022.02(5555.08) 6728.88(5264.10) 6187.81(4795.66) 5255.51(4533.72) 5110.93(4236.17) 5159.01(4188.71)