Introduction

Issues of social stratification and social mobility – i.e. inequality in various social domains and its persistence and fluidity in social groups – are among the core questions of social science. Comparative question about variations in patterns of social stratification between different societies have been asked since the early beginnings of the social sciences, and have not lost any of its relevance as of today. Comparative stratification research continues to belong to the most relevant and most advanced areas of social research.

The Faculty of Social Sciences of the Free University Amsterdam has devoted one of its ‘strategic chairs’ to the study of social stratification and social mobility. ‘Strategic chairs’ are defined here as the appointment of a leading expert in a research area who is endowed with a special grant for a period of five years in order to start up a specialized research team in the field of interest, and who is a member of the Center for Comparative Social Studies, that brings together the best research in the Faculty, and hosts its Research Masters and PhD programs, and administers all research funds of the Faculty.

Harry B.G. Ganzeboom was appointed at VUA as Professor of Sociology and Social Research Methodology in September 2002 to fill the strategic chair and be the principal investigator to its various research projects. The appointment is situated in the Department of Social Research Methodology. Apart from the strategic chair, Ganzeboom has been appointed to develop and administer the 2-year Research Masters program that has started in September 2005.

This research plan reviews the (historical) background of comparative stratification research in general, summarizes earlier contributions of the PI to the field, and identifies short-term plans and long-term goals in the program. The research plan will be renewed on an annual basis, in order to develop new initiatives and report to the Faculty Board about the development.

Historical and intellectual background

Sociologists have studied social stratification and social mobility in particular in the realm of occupational status – representing social standing in general --, such in contrast to economists, who have traditionally focused on income inequality and income attainment. The sociological approach is characterized by a strong connection between questions of social stratification proper (i.e. inequality of social positions) and questions of social mobility (how unequal positions are maintained in social groups, e.g. between parents and children, between spouses, between other family members or in a social network), or remain stable during the life course. Research on social stratification and social mobility in sociology has a long, continuous and active tradition, having roots in the classics (Marx and Weber), but turning modern (i.e.
empirical and quantitative) with the founding study of Pitirim Sorokin, Social and Cultural Mobility (1927), probably the oldest readable sociological study in existence (still in print).

Comparative stratification research made a marked upswing in the late 1940’s, when UNESCO fostered the founding of the International Sociological Association and its Research Committee, that under the direction of the British demographer and mobility researcher David Glass took comparative stratification research as its main agenda. The history of modern stratification research, which is very much the history of this research tradition (currently the Research Committee 28 on Social Mobility of the International Sociological Association), its various subgroups and generations, has been described by Ganzeboom, Treiman & Ultee (1991) and Treiman & Ganzeboom (1998). These authors distinguish four generations of stratification research:

1. The first generation, around the original research program of the ISA-RC, generated a modest number of national prestige *cum* social mobility surveys, and conducted mostly tabular (inflow/outflow) analyses. The comparative work of this generation was summed up by Lipset & Zetterberg (1956, 1959) and Miller (1960), with as its best remembered conclusion that social mobility patterns are “much the same” in different countries. However, this conclusion has been contested by various subsequent researchers, who reanalyzed the data.

2. The second generation is the one propelled by Blau & Duncan’s work on continuous measures of occupational status (Duncan 1961) and the use of such measures in multivariate, indirect effects, status attainment models (Blau & Duncan 1968). The generation gave rise to a batch of national stratification surveys, mostly spun off from Blau & Duncan’s (1962) “Occupational Change in a Generation” survey. As explained by Ganzeboom et al. (1992), this generation of research still awaits its comparative conclusion, as it was prematurely aborted by new methodological developments, that gave rise to the third generation.

3. The third generation was inspired by the applicability of loglinear models to social mobility patterns, which made it possible to decompose bivariate associations into meaningful components, such at the expense of the multivariate questions that had been asked by the previous generations. Researchers of this generation profited from the widely available data collected from the early 1970’s onwards (often with the aim to conduct second generation research), and the many pertinent surveys held thereafter. This generation of research culminated in the Erikson & Goldthorpe’s “The Constant Flux” (1992), recently being replicated by Breen et al. (2004).

4. The fourth generation of mobility research is primarily concerned with longitudinal (career and life course) models of social stratification – in issue already present, but not effectively treated by the first generation. Also, there is a growing concern with multi-actor representations of social stratification, as mutual influences of spouses, multiple offspring of parents, and both father and mother are brought into the picture. The best representation of comparative working this generation probably is the work of Blossfeld.

The history of Dutch stratification research to a large part mirrors these international developments. The Netherlands (Van Heek) was very active in the first generation, in fact one of the two countries complying to the original agenda of the ISA Research committee. The second generation of research found only a late echo in our country, with the prestige and social mobility survey of Ultee & Sixma in 1982, thus missing the events in the 1970’s when most of the data used in second and third generation research were collected. While the Dutch became very active again in the third generation from 1983 onwards, they missed its early development (1975-1982) and were for this reason left out of the CASMIN project that
became The Constant Flux. However, several Dutch researchers, amongst whom the PI, have been active at the international level since and have published authoritative studies of patterns and trends in social mobility, became officers in the RC28 and were represented in most comparative studies.

The PI has been involved in (comparative) stratification research since 1983, nationally in close collaboration with the members of the Utrecht Mobility Seminar (Wout Uittee, Ruud Luijkx, Paul de Graaf, Nan Dirk de Graaf, Wim Jansen, Jos Dessens) and internationally primarily in association with Donald J. Treiman (UCLA). The main goals of the research have been:

- To use existing data on social mobility patterns in the Netherlands to their full exhaustion and collect relevant new data on a periodical basis. This work has generated a very large pool of harmonized social mobility data in our country (that was conspicuously absent from comparative projects until very recently), as well as a number of new studies which collected stratification information in a household contact on a longitudinal basis (Family Surveys, Household in the Netherlands).
- To produce periodical assessments of trends in social mobility and its components in the Netherlands.
- To create an authoritative database on social mobility patterns in other countries around the world, industrial, post-industrial, and pre-industrial, both in terms of published tabulations, but primarily as harmonized unit data.
- To produce periodical assessments of variations in social mobility and its components in time and space, i.e. in countries around the world, primarily in the second half of the twentieth century.
- To produce international and historical harmonization tools for core stratification variables, in particular occupational and employment status, and educational attainment.
- To develop better models and define higher standard for the analysis of social mobility data.

Recent expansion and evolution of the Programme at the Free Universitit Amsterdum

The present research programme has started with the appointment of the PI at the Free University as of September 1st 2002. Since its onstart, the programme has expanded and evolved not only by the work on the core topics, but also by the participation of a number of affiliated researchers and projects, that are closely related with comparative stratification projects. These are in particular:

- The PI has become the National Coordinator in the Netherlands of and received supplementary funding for two important cross-national data-collections the International Social Survey Project and the European Social Survey. This research is conducted with assistance of Saskia Opdam.
- Ineke Nagel was appointed as assistant professor at the VUA in order to continue her research on cultural participation among Dutch adolescents and expand the associated panel data “School and Culture” that was started at Utrecht University in 1998. Nagel and Ganzeboom have received supplementary funding for this project from the Social and Cultural Planning Office.(Jos de Haan).
- Aat Liefbroer was appointed as parttime (0.2 fte) Professor of Family Demographo at VU-FSW. Complementing his primary appointment at NIDI (The Hague), Liefbroer works in close association with Nagel and Ganzeboom on the life-course and family formation data collected among adolescents on the School & Culture panel. Liefbroer has
also developed collaborative relationships with other researchers affiliated with the programme (Elzinga).

- **Hilde Bras** has joined the programme in 2006 as a Veni grant researcher on “Sibling and the Life Course”. Bras works on historical demographic data and is associated with the Historical Population Sample of the Netherlands.
- **Maarten Wolbers** had joined the programme in 2005 in particular to study the education/occupation link in a comparative perspective.
- **Cees Elzinga** has joined the programme in 2006. Elzinga conducts methodological and substantial research on categorical time series data, which is in particular relevant for the modeling of occupational careers.
- **Maarten Buis** is a graduate student in the programme who studies long term trends in inequality of educational opportunity in the Netherlands using the ISMF data.
- **Kadri Taht** is an NWO funded graduate student who studies the relationship between work schedules and quality of family life in modern service economies using the recently collected data of the Netherland Kinship Panel Study. She has worked earlier on life course model in comparative settings.
- **Irma Reci** is a graduate student whose research focuses on unemployment careers. She works primarily on the OSA panel data.

**Available means**

- Research appointment of the PI. The PI has a 0.5 research appointment, which can be devoted to work on stratification and social mobility.

- Strategic Grant: VU-FSW has dedicated a sum of euro 150,000 for a total of five years to the strategic chair (total: euro 750,000). These funds are targeted at recruiting four junior researchers, who will receive 5-year contracts for a 0.6 research appointment; a 0.4 teaching appointment will supplement their research contract. However, part of the money can also be invested in graduate students or post-docs, data collection or other alternatives. The funds are being spent in close consultation with the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences.

- External funds: the PI will apply for external funding (NWO, EU, National Ministries) on a periodical basis, in order to recruit graduate students and post-docs, or to fund new data collection.

- Other internal VU-funds: the PI can apply for internal VU-FSW funds.

- Departmental funds: researchers in the program have access to departmental funds for travel, secretarial assistance and materials on the same basis as other department members.

- Other revenues: Revenues from advisory and other refunded activities will be used to fund travel and conferences for researchers in the program.

**Budget and appointments**

The research positions to be filled are:
Post-doc Researcher, primarily devoted with maintaining and expanding the ISMF.
  Martin van der Gaag 2003/09-2004/08 0.2 fte

Post-doc Researcher, primarily devoted to maintaining en expanding the School & Culture panel data.
  Ineke Nagel 2004/01-2004/08 0.4 fte
  2004/09 onwards 0.6 fte

Graduate Student, primarily working on educational mobility in the Netherlands
  Maarten Buis 2003/05-2008/04 0.8 fte

Post-doc Researcher, primarily devoted to the comparative analysis of educational mobility in international perspective.
  Maarten Wolbers 2005/06-… 0.6 fte

Data collection (School & Culture panel data)
  2004 sweep School & Culture data kE 50
  2006 sweep School & Culture data kE 50
  2005 International Social Survey Program k€ 25
  2006 International Social Survey Program k€ 35

Associated researchers
  Hilde Bras (NWO/VENI) 0.8 fte
  Cees Elzinga 0.3 fte
  Aat Liefbroer 0.2 fte

Associated Promovendi
  Irma Reci 1.0 fte
  Kadri Täht 1.0 fte
NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hofmeyer-Zlotnik, Jürgen</td>
<td>Mannheim</td>
<td>Comparative Measurement of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kreidl, Martin</td>
<td>Pilzen</td>
<td>Cross-national comparison of education/occupation link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luijkx, Ruud</td>
<td>Tilburg</td>
<td>Trend in occupational mobility in the Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Güveli, Ayse</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meraviglia, Cinzia</td>
<td>Alessandria</td>
<td>Trends in educational and occupational mobility in Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Archiving and documenting social mobility data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treiman, Donald J.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Comparative analysis of social mobility and status attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Velden; Buechner,</td>
<td>Maastricht</td>
<td>Social background, educational attainment and labour market integration: an exploration of underlying processes and dynamics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luijkx, Ruud; Barbieri,</td>
<td>Tilburg, Milaan</td>
<td>Atypical Employment and Welfare Regimes: Employment insecurity at labor market entry and its impact on early working careers in the Netherlands. (EqualSoc project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paolo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blossfeld, Hans-Peter</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>Labor market entry and early career development among school-leavers in the Netherlands since the mid-1980s. (Flexcareer project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kok, Jan</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Family territories in migration Impact of sex and birth order on marriage behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egerbladh, Inez</td>
<td>Umeå</td>
<td>Impact of kin on mortality in old age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Poppel, Frans &amp; Kees</td>
<td>Den Haag / Amsterdam</td>
<td>Kin marriage in The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandemakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Tilburg, Theo</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Regional effects on sibling relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haanstra</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damen</td>
<td>Groningen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Velden; Buechner,</td>
<td>Maastricht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects

Project 1: The International Stratification and Mobility File [ISMF]

The International Stratification and Mobility File consists of a large number of harmonized extracts from datasets from a large number of countries around the world. The basic criteria for inclusion are that a dataset is (A) (sub)nationally representative, (B) contains at a minimum a measure of father’s occupation and respondent’s education and occupation. In addition to these, the list of harmonized variables includes mother’s, father’s and spouse’s education, occupation and income, respondent’s first job, personal and household income and a number of ancillary variables on employment status, marital status. The occupations are harmonized by using the International Classification of Occupations [ISCO], educations are harmonized with respect to hierarchical level and duration.

At present [February 2004], the ISMF contains some 250 harmonized studies from 42 countries. The ISMF is expanded on a continuous basis. These data are used primarily by the principal investigator and collaborators to conduct historical and cross-national analyses of occupational and educational status attainment and mobility. In future projects, the ISMF will be put to use for projects on other phenomena related to social mobility, such as on class voting, fertility, consumption patterns and occupational careers.

As a byproduct, creating the ISMF generates a large number of conversion tools of national educational and occupational classifications into international standards. Access to the ISMF data itself is restricted, but the conversion tool and harmonization tools are available for the taking. The principal investigator maintains an internet site, from which these tools are available.

One-year plan:
1. Revise and document all the harmonized extracts in the ISMF up to the 2004 standard (see Appendix A) and adapt the associated files to the SPSS-Windows platform.
2. Create a website that documents the ISMF and its harmonizing procedures and makes the harmonization tools available to other users.

Long-term target
1. Expand the ISMF with available new and old data. We should be able to add at least 20 studies each year to the database.
2. Deposit the ISMF database and its documentation in a data-archive.

Earlier publications and papers-in-progress


Http://www.fsw.vu.nl/~Ganzeboom/ismf

Nieuweerta, Paul; Ganzeboom, Harry B.G.: "International Stratification, Mobility and Politics File." Steinmetz P1145.
Project 2: The Comparative Measurement of Occupational Status

Occupations are the “single best indicator” to measure social status in a society. They are highly differentiated, but at the same time there is impressive agreement on their desirability across countries and historical episodes, even in the very long run. Nevertheless, the measurement, classification and use of occupational status information are wrought with problems and debates. The project is aimed at contributing to these debates by the empirical analysis of occupational status measures. In the past, the PI (primarily in collaboration with Donald J. Treiman, UCLA) has propagated the use of the International Classification of Occupation [ISCO] as a tool to harmonize occupations across time and space, and has generated much used conversion of national classifications into ISCO, and from ISCO into frequently used occupational status measure, i.e. Treiman’s Standard Index of Occupational Prestige [SIOPS], Ganzeboom’s & Treiman International Socio-Economic Index of occupational status [ISEI] and Erikson & Goldthorpe’s social class typology [EGP].

In this project, this work will be continued and elaborated, by expanding the number of conversions for national classifications and upgrading the existing tools to newer versions of ISCO. A new point of focus in this respect is the reliability and validity of occupational information itself, in particular by studying multiple-indicator models.

One-year plan
1. Document the electronic versions of the conversion tools and make these available on the internet.
2. Review and revise the conversions of Dutch national classifications into international standards and derived status variables.
3. Revise the semi-automated occupational coding source for Dutch occupations to boost its precision.
4. Produce an accurate Dutch translation of ISCO-88, with a wealth of examples from the occupational title data source.
5. Present, revise and submit the Dutch & English language versions of the multiple indicator model of occupational measurement.
6. Revise and submit the paper on crude occupational measurement with international data.

Long term goals
1. Become acknowledged and cited as the authoritative database on occupational measurement and conversions.
2. Keep up with newly published or revised occupational classifications, in particular ISCO and English language (American, British, Australian) classifications.

Publications and papers in progress


Project 3: The Comparative Measurement of Education (Ganzeboom, Wolbers)

In addition to occupational status, the second core measure in comparative stratification and mobility research concerns education. Unlike occupations, educational institutions are highly variable and idiosyncratic between countries, as well as between historical time episodes. Educational systems are much more institutionally arranged than occupations, and therefore harder to compare. This is even so at the level of classification: while there exists a (UNESCO produced) International Standard Classification of Educations [ISCED], it is hardly comparable to its (ILO maintained) International Standard Classification of Occupations [ISCO]. ISCED is limited to a small number of countries, not sensitive to historical variations (describes educational systems as they are now, which is hardly relevant to comparative stratification research), rather complicated to use, and leads in the end not to a detailed comparative classification.

Fortunately, some properties of education counteract to potentially insurmountable problem of comparing them. In particular, whatever the institutional arrangements and the politically driven discussions around it, a core property of educational outcomes is that they are – to a very large extent – uni-dimensionally ordered with respect to important outcome variables in the status attainment process, such as occupational status, earnings or spousal status, as well as with respect to the its main determinants, parental statuses. If the originally classification is not overly detailed, this hierarchy can easily be reconstructed from data, and very often researchers (who present closed question formats with ranked alternatives) and respondents (who are asked to respond to these categories, despite their obvious negligence of historical and institutional variations) are well aware of this. This hierarchy can be expressed in several interpretable metrics, such as relative order (percentiles), optimal scaling, metric level (measured in years needed to achieve a certain level), or duration (actual time used). Given these strong measurement properties in all educational systems, one can begin to ask to what extent educational systems actually vary with respect to the validity of these unidimensional representations, how large the distances between levels are and how they change over time (diploma inflation).

The aim of this project is to produce a companion to the ISCED classification that survey researchers can use to measure and (re)classify educational attainment data. The sources for this will be the two existing issues of ISCED, related literature, expert advice from around the world, as well as the survey data in the ISMF, that can be used to generate optimal or metric scalings.

**One-year plan**
1. Fully document the ISMF data with respect to educational classifications used and how they are currently harmonized. Review and revise these conversions.
2. Start analyzing the ISMF data with respect to variation in returns to education.

**Long term targets**
1. Create a companion guide to ISCED that documents and standardizes educational classifications, as they frequently occur in social mobility (and other) surveys.
2. Write an authoritative piece on measuring and scaling educations.
Earlier publication and paper in progress


Project 4: Long-term Trends in Educational Mobility in the Netherlands (Buis)

Long term trends in educational mobility in the Netherlands have been studied with two different designs. One tradition of research uses cohort data from pooled cross-section surveys to study the relationship between educational outcomes and social background (primarily parental education and occupation). Using this retrospective information from birth cohorts, these studies go back to events in the early twentieth century and have documented a spectacular increase of educational mobility since. In the second approach, student cohort data (available from 1965 onwards) are compared. These analyses have typically reported no or limited change in educational mobility. The differences between the two approaches are multiples: they use different time windows (1900-1980 vs. 1965-1999), data collection techniques (retrospective vs. panel), different set of independent variables (students panels contain measures of early school ability and indications of parental income), and models of analyses. All of these may be in part responsible for the different results. In this project, the first aim is to expand the available evidence by adding newly collected or recovered data to the existing pool and thus refresh and detail the existing analyses. A second aim is to compare the two different approaches and bringing in another, and hitherto underused source of data, retrospective educational careers.

One year plan
1. Revise and execute project plan of Maarten Buis.
3. Start writing a paper on returns to education, corrected for social background effects.

Long-term targets
1. Publish authoritative updates of trend reports on educational mobility in the Netherlands, using both survey data and student panel data.
2. Compare various educational attainment models (final metric score, ordinal score, transitions, gain scores) and analyze role of selection bias.

Earlier publications and paper-in-progress


Project 5: Long-term trends in Social Mobility and Occupational Status Attainment in the Netherlands (Ganzeboom)

Intergenerational occupational (or: social) mobility remains the best indicator to study the openness of social groups in a society. The pattern of social mobility in the Netherlands was first documented for 1954 by the Van Heek group (see Van Tulder 1962). Replication and the study of trends began in the 1980s and showed from its onstart that social mobility has considerably risen over the last half century, by approximately 1% per annum. The PI has been adding evidence to the existing database on a continuous basis: the Dutch part of the ISMF now contains 35 studies, and covers a wider time window than almost all of the other countries. The ISMF data allow one to estimate multivariate models of social mobility, but also to make further distinctions in occupational attainment (first / current jobs, full occupational careers). Questions about pattern, degree and trends in intergenerational occupational status reproduction are this elaborated into questions about mechanisms of transfers and questions about timing of transfers. The aim of this project is to refresh and extend these existing analyses, by taking into account newly collected or reconstructed data, and adding new analytical insights.

One year plan
1. Begin writing a paper about even more recent trends than in the paper for the Breen book, for submission to Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences (with Ruud Luijkx).

Long-term targets
1. Analysis of education/first job association, with controls for parental background; critiquing common labor market analysis on this association.
2. Analysis of first job/current job association.
3. Start project on relation between geographical and social mobility in a long term historical perspective.

Publications and papers-in-progress:


Project 6: Ascription and Achievement in Comparative Perspective (Ganzeboom, with Donald J. Treiman, UCLA)

In their 1968 monograph “The American Occupational Structure”, Blau & Duncan reformulated the traditionally studies social mobility relationship (association between fathers’ and sons’ occupation) into the elementary status attainment model, in which father’s education, father’s occupation, education, occupational status at career beginning and current/final occupational status are causally connected. The status attainment model made it possible to calculate direct and indirect effects and dissect the social mobility relationship into ascriptive components (father’s direct effects) and achievement components (effects of education on later occupational attainment). It also made it possible to pinpoint different transition in time (cohorts) and this allowed for precise historical comparisons. Finally, the model can be easily extended with other relevant variables / units, such as mothers’ socio-economic and cultural characteristics, multiple offspring (career models), multiple occupations (career models), spouses’ socio-economic characteristics (homogamy models) and multiple indicators (structural equation models with measurement error). The status attainment model would have been the most often used workhorse for comparative stratification research, had not methodological innovations interfered. The stratification literature from 1975 onwards focuses on discrete measurement of occupational status (“class analysis”) and educational attainment (“transition analysis”), thereby complicating the use of simple covariances to model the relationship in the status attainment model. Issues of quality of measurement and indirect effects were dropped from the research agenda, to the advantage of discrete models of bivariate relationships (“loglinear relationships”). It is only recently that researchers have learned how to combine discrete data and multivariate causal relationships into parsimonious models.

The present project aims at estimating the elementary (end expanded) status attainment models in a large scale comparative perspective and analyzes how the ascriptive and achievement effects in these models respond to exogenous conditions, in particular economic development, political regime and institutional changes (educational and labor market arrangements). Papers concentrate on a single part of the status attainment models (such as educational achievement, occupational status attainment at career beginning, occupational status attainment during the career), and model these relationship with advanced techniques at the individual (discrete, multivariate) and aggregated (XT-models, multi-level models).

One year plan
1. Finish and submit paper on educational transitions in comparative perspective (New York).
2. Draft a paper on direct/indirect channels of reproduction (Neuchatel).

Long term target
1. Writing a monograph (together with Donald Treiman) on “Ascription and Achievement in Comparative Perspective”, that puts the Blau-Duncan model in a large scale comparative perspective, taking into account the different methodological developments since. The book has 8 chapters (1) History of the problem (2) A Theory of Social Mobility (3) The International Stratification and Mobility File (4) Comparative Measures of Social Stratification (5) A World-wide Regime of Social Mobility (6) Educational Mobility (7) Social Mobility at Career Beginnings (8) Social Mobility during the Life Course.
Earlier Publications and Papers in Progress


Stratification research often has been the breeding ground of methodological innovation in the social sciences, in particular in sociology. Measurement and scaling procedures (for occupational prestige and SEI), path modeling of indirect effects, loglinear and log-multiplicative models, longitudinal life-course models were all introduced to sociology via stratification research. The general aim of the “Comparative Stratification Research” program is to conduct comparative stratification research to the best currently available standards, but its primary goal is to make substantive contributions, not purely methodological ones. Nevertheless, methodology can flourish at the outskirts of substantive research, and be useful footnotes to others, inside and outside the field of stratification analysis.

A particular important development over the last few years has been the integration of discrete data and continuous approaches into parsimonious conditional logit models. These models are distinct from the commonly used multinomial logit model, by being capable of allowing for multidimensional metric constraints on the dependent variables. It is thus a promising way to integrate loglinear models, that are often used to model bivariate mobility data (and other square tabulations), with multivariate regression-type models. Such models have been applied in some earlier publications of the PI. As a follow-up, it will be shown how such models can be estimated in new software, in particular LEM.

A second possible methodological contribution to the field is in the strategy of comparative analysis via XT-designs, in which cross-sectional information (countries) is combined with historical variations (cohorts). Such models can be commonly estimated in STATA’s XT-modules, but their estimation can be improved by using generalized variance component models, e.g. in ML-Win.

One-year plan
1. Finish and publish inaugural lecture.

Long-term targets
1. Unspecified

Earlier publications and work in progress


Project 8: School & Culture – A Panel Study of the Adolescent Life Course (Ineke Nagel, Liefbroer)

The School & Culture panel study of adolescents was started in 1998 with the collection of write-in questionnaire data on culture consumption, social and cultural background and associate variables among 1521 14-16 years old students in 69 school classes in 24 secondary school in 8 cities in the Netherlands. The students were reinterviewed (using telephone and mail questionnaires) after 1 year, and 3 years. New fresh waves were added in 2000 and 2001, with now a total of over 3800 adolescents between 14-22 year of age in the study, each of which was interviewed 2 or 3 times. At the first reinterview, also one of the parents of the adolescents was asked to fill in a mail questionnaire or was interviewed by phone. The data collection was originally developed to evaluate new arts education programs in secondary schools for which their cultural behavior, preferences and tastes were measured, but at the same time constitutes a rich source of data on the other leisure behavior, life styles and educational choices, all in combination with family background data, obtained from the adolescent and a parent independently. As the data collection were started in school classes with almost perfect response by the students, we do have a complete coverage of the panel before attrition and non-response sets in. Another strong point of the data is that we do have simultaneous information in the school and family contexts.

In future sweeps, starting in 2002, new waves will be added and the current waves will be reinterviewed at an interval of 2 years (last measurement was in 2002). We intend to broaden the score of the survey, dropping some of the details on culture consumption and add new modules on moral and demographic attitudes, educational and occupational choices.

One-year plan
1. Start and field the new wave
2. Finish the documentation on the 1998-2002 sweeps

Long-term targets
1. Continue to build up the database and prepare for 2006 and 2008 sweeps
2. Find external funds for data collection cost

Earlier publication and papers-in-progress


Ganzeboom, Harry; Haanstra, Folkert; Damen, Marie-Louise; Nagel, Ineke (2003). "Momentopnames CKV1-Eindrapportage CKV1-Volgproject." Utrecht: Cultuurnetwerk Nederland [Cultuur + Educatie #8].
Culture consumption belongs to the most unequally distributed distinction markers among social groups (Bourdieu). Access to formal culture is an important resource in status attainment, in particular in the attainment of (further) education, occupational status and the choice of a marriage partner. Access to formal culture is to a very large extend generated in early life – the required knowledge, taste and codes develop early or not. In much of the literature, formal education is credited for the acquisition of cultural capital: school select children with respect to cultural background and develop these features systematically. Recent analysis suggest that the role of the educational system is much smaller than conceived in this literature and to a large extend limited to selection: almost all of the systematic variation in culture consumption is family generated, with causal effects of education taking second place at a considerable distance. This project studies the effects of socio-economic background and cultural resources in the parental family and the acquisition of cultural resources among offspring and its effects in their early life course (educational attainment, first jobs, marriage partner selection), using the School & Culture student panel data.

Earlier publications and papers-in-progress


The transition from school to work has become a major research topic in comparative stratification research over the last few years (see among others Kerckhoff, 2000; Müller & Gangl, 2003; Shavit & Müller, 1998). The main reason for this increased attention is probably the occurrence of persistently high youth unemployment rates since the 1980s. A considerable number of young people are unemployed in the period after leaving school, and even those who immediately find a job are often working in vulnerable positions (low status occupations, temporary contracts, and so on). This makes the integration of young people into the labor market far from smooth and the transition from school to work can, therefore, be characterized as a turbulent and uncertain period for young people. However, there are large differences between countries and over time. In some countries and periods, young people are smoothly integrated into the labor market, while in other countries and periods they experience serious and persistent problems. For the explanation of this variation in transition patterns, a specific micro-macro model is often pursued. It is assumed that there are similar mechanisms by which education allocates individuals to labor market positions in different countries and periods (i.e. school-leavers and their families on the one hand and employers on the other hand have basically the same aims and similar resources relevant for the allocation process), but the structural and institutional conditions under which the allocation process takes place vary substantially between countries and over time.

The aim of this project is to analyze school-to-work transitions from a comparative perspective. With respect to earlier research dealing with this topic, we make progress in at least three ways. First, we broaden our horizon by extending the number of countries and the historical time period under investigation. While the studies mentioned above principally refer to the situation of Europe (and some other countries such as Australia, the United States and Japan) in the 1990s, the ISMF data allows us to investigate patterns in school-to-work transitions in more than 40 countries for the last 30 years at least. We can use the ISMF data with observations on first jobs, as well as restrict the data to persons in the beginning of their careers. Second, since detailed information on parental statuses is available in this data set, the labor market returns of educational credentials can be estimated, adequately controlling for social background effects. What in earlier research has been interpreted as effects of educational qualifications on labor market outcomes, may in fact be due less to education than to social background. This would be the case if successful labor market outcomes mainly resulted from social background characteristics and if these characteristics also guided young people to those educational qualifications that are connected with successful labor market outcomes. Third, since the transition from school to work is a process rather than a single event from full-time initial education to stable full-time employment, we analyse school-to-work transitions from a dynamic perspective in contrast with earlier research that exclusively concentrated on a cross-sectional approach. In stead, we use longitudinal data from, for example, the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) and the European Union Labour Force Survey (EU LFS) 2000 ad hoc module on school-to-work transitions to address empirically the individual trajectories between school and work. Moreover, a longitudinal approach makes it possible to study other transitions to adulthood (such as partnership formation or starting a household or family) that often take place concurrently, and also in connection with the transition from school to work.

References


**One-year plan**
1. Start analyzing school-to-work transitions on the basis of the ISMF data.
2. Apply for a NWO PhD grant in order to fund a project about the causes and consequences of labor market insecurity among young people in Europe.

**Long term target**
1. Publish international papers on explaining school-to-work transitions from a comparative perspective.

**Earlier publications**


Project 11: Siblings and the Life Course. Mutual Relations, Diversity and Interdependence in the Life Courses of Brothers and Sisters (19th - 20th centuries) (NWO / VENI 016044010) (Bras)

Up until the middle of the twentieth century, most people in Western societies grew up surrounded by a much larger number of brothers and sisters than we do today. Apart from their numerousness, siblings played an important part in everyday lived reality, for example as caregivers for younger brothers and sisters, or as mediators in occupational and marriage choice. One of the most intriguing aspects of siblings is their two-sided quality of ‘unity in difference’. They were equals in the sense that they shared a common background, childhood memories, family resources and traditions. Yet, they were also different. Hierarchy and inequality among siblings were the result of differences in age, gender and birth position. Surprisingly little research has been devoted to siblings in almost every academic discipline, including family history and studies of historical kinship. This is unjustified, because knowledge about the historical meaning of siblings in the life course can contribute in significant ways in explaining how social inequalities in past lives were produced and reproduced. Therefore, the project aims to answer the question ‘why and under which circumstances did lives of siblings differ, in what ways were their lives mutually dependent, and how did ties between siblings change over a life time?’ By applying a life course approach, the lives and relations of siblings are studied in a dynamic way, focusing on transitions, positions and trajectories while emphasising the social networks to which they belonged and the historical, cultural and geographic context in which lives were embedded. Quantitative data from historical demographic sources such as population registers and vital registration as well as contemporary survey data are used to study lives and relations of sibling sets during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

One-year plan:
1. Write, present (December 2006 Lyon) and submit paper on ‘Diverging Pathways. Siblings’ Life Chances in an Urbanizing Region of The Netherlands’, co-authored by Jan Kok.
4. Write and present (November 2007, Chicago) a paper on ‘Family Territories’, co-authored by Jan Kok.

Long-term target
1. Revise and submit presented papers.
2. Produce, as a co-editor, a volume on ‘Friendship and Kinship’.
3. Produce, as a co-editor, a volume and journal special issue on research based on data from the Historical Sample of The Netherlands (HSN).
4. Explore possibilities for a comparative Eurasian research paper / project on siblings/kin.
5. Explore possibilities for submitting a proposal within the context of the NWO financed research framework ‘Quality of life: The dynamics of life courses’.
Earlier publications and papers in progress

Hilde Bras and Theo van Tilburg (submitted), Kinship and Social Networks: A Regional Analysis of Sibling Relations in Twentieth-Century Netherlands. Journal of Family History


Other

Program leader (together with Michel Oris and Hanne Van Baelen) of working group on ‘Kinship and Social and Demographic Behavior’, Scientific Research Community Historical Demography which is collaboration between Belgium and The Netherlands.

Coordinator of session on ‘Sibling coresidence in adulthood and old age’ organized at the European Social Science History Association, March 2006 in Amsterdam.
Project 12: Intergenerational Reproduction of Demographic Behaviour (Liefbroer)

The process through which young adults gain independence from their parental family and constitute a family of their own has changed considerably over the last decades. Important events in this process, like marriage and parenthood, have been postponed. Living in a one-person household and unmarried cohabitation, status positions that were quite uncommon during the 1950’s and 1960’s, have gained in popularity. Finally, unions have become much more fragile, leading to a huge increase in dissolutions of both marital and non-marital unions. As a result of these changes, the family-life course of current young adults differs substantially from that of their parents. Therefore, it is questionable whether children will use the behaviors of their parents as guidelines in deciding on their own trajectories through young adulthood. In addition, in a society in which the importance of autonomy is emphasized, children may want to assert this autonomy with regard to crucially important decisions concerning family life.

The aim of this project is to study the extent to which demographic choices of young adults are influenced by their parental background. More specifically, two general research questions are studied:

1. To what extent do children resemble their parents regarding their demographic choices and related attitudes, and how can the level of resemblance be explained?
2. To what extent and in what ways does parental background influence the demographic choices and related attitudes of young adults?

The first research question focuses on the intergenerational reproduction of demographic behaviors and behavioral patterns. Examples are the intergenerational transmission of divorce or the intergenerational transmission of the timing of childbearing. Aim is to establish whether demographic choices are reproduced, to what extent, and what mechanisms account for this level of reproduction. In particular, attention is paid to the mechanisms of value socialization, observational learning / role modeling, and status inheritance.

The second research question focuses on the role played by young adults’ parental background in explaining social differentials in the transition to adulthood. It studies the ways in which the socio-economic and socio-cultural situation in the parental home leads to different pathways through young adulthood. Examples are the influence of parental socio-economic status on demographic choices of young adults and the influence of living arrangements during childhood on the transition to adulthood. Attention is also devoted to ethnic differences in how parents influence the transition to adulthood of their children.

**Data and collaborations**

To answer these research question, use is made of a variety of data sources. The most important ones are (a) the Jongeren en Cultuur dataset (see project x), (b) the Netherlands Kinship Panel Survey (Liefbroer is one of the members of the Board of Directors of this panel survey), and (c) the US-based National Survey of Families and Households.

To answer the research questions, Liefbroer cooperates both with other members of the research programme (Cees Elzinga, Ineke Nagel, Harry Ganzeboom) and with scientists outside the research programme (Liesbeth Steenhof [CBS], Matthijs Kalmijn en Jannes de Vries [UvT], and Francesco Billari [Bocconi University, Milano, Italy]).

**Work plan**

For 2007, a number of activities are envisaged:

1. Preparation of a special (book) issue of the Dutch journal Mens & Maatschappij devoted to ‘Intergenerational Transmission’. Liefbroer will act as guest editor of this issue
(together with Pearl Dykstra [NIDI and UU]). The book will include contributions by other members of the research programme (Ganzeboom, Nagel) as well.
2. Continue collaboration with Elzinga on the interrelationship of family and work careers.
3. Writing an article (with Matthijs Kalmijn and Jannes de Vries [UvT]) on ‘family influences on family values’, to be included in the special issue of M&M.
4. Writing an introduction (with Pearl Dykstra [NIDI and UU]) for the special issue of M&M.
5. Finalizing a paper on ‘the intergenerational transmission of family-related behavior’. A draft of this paper has already been written and needs some relatively minor reworking.
6. Writing an NWO application on ‘Leaving home: a joint decision approach’. A first draft of the application is available but needs some more attention.
7. Writing a paper on ‘parental influences on their children’s timetables for young adulthood’, using Jongeren & Cultuur data.

*Estimated time-expenditure*

This project is mainly carried out by Liefbroer in VU-research time (0.15 fte), with additions from NIDI (0.05 fte)

*Publications (2004-2006) and papers under review*

Billari, F.C., & Liefbroer, A.C. (accepted). Should I stay or should I go? The impact of age norms on leaving home. *Demography*.
Elzinga, C., & Liefbroer, A.C. (submitted), De-Standardization and Differentiation of Family Life Trajectories of Young Adults: A Cross-National Comparison.
Project 13: Unemployment Benefits and Incentives to Work: An Econometric and Longitudinal Approach to Policy Evaluations (Mooi-Reci)

The impact of unemployment insurance (UI) benefits on incentives to re-enter the labor market is a persistent and controversial issue in contemporary research. Yet there is a lack of explicit empirical research that estimates the effects of specific policy changes in the level, duration and eligibility of UI benefits using longitudinal data. The aim of this research is to contribute to the existing unemployment literature by using longitudinal data from the Dutch Organization for Strategic Labor Market Research (OSA) to explore the effects of unemployment benefits on labor dynamics and incentives to work. Drawing on the extensive literature on unemployment and labor market dynamics and using various advanced econometric techniques such as – duration and competing risks modeling; time-series and dynamic analyses – this research examines how changes in unemployment benefits impel or inhibit labor market dynamics. Employing a range of natural experiments – in the form of policy changes on the benefit level and duration – the research addresses three central questions: (a) How strongly do changes in unemployment duration impel or inhibit job search incentives of different groups of individuals over time and what labor market outcomes do these changes predict? (b) What are the consequences of lower job search costs and shorter job search periods for individuals’ post-unemployment earnings? (c) How strongly are unemployment incidence and unemployment persistence related to individuals’ subsequent wages?

One-year plan
1. Make ready for submission the manuscript of the paper on unemployment benefits and post-unemployment earnings (second research question).
2. Presenting the paper on unemployment benefits and post-unemployment earnings at the American Sociological Association Spring Meeting in Yale (2-3 March 2007 New Haven) and at the Society of Labor Economists in Chicago (4-5 May 2007).
3. Start writing the paper on effects of unemployment incidence and unemployment persistence on subsequent wages (third research question).

Long-term plan
2. Publishing the paper on unemployment benefits and job search incentives (first research question) in a high ranked scientific journal.

Earlier publications and papers-in-progress:


Mooi-Reci, Irma and Melinda Mills: “Unemployment Benefits - Do They Improve or Detriment Post-Unemployment Earnings? An Explorative Analysis.” In progress, 2006

Mooi-Reci, Irma, Melinda Mills and Harry Ganzeboom: “The Inter-related Dynamics of Unemployment Incidence, Persistence and Subsequent Wages”. In progress, 2006

Mooi-Reci, Irma: “Job Search Intensity, Channel Selectivity and Success: An empirical analysis”. In progress, 2007

De Bruijn, Jeanne, Irma Mooi -Reci and Inge Bleijenbergh: “Labour Market Transitions at First Motherhood and Beyond: A Comparison between UK, the Netherlands and Sweden”. In progress, 2007
Project 14: Non-Standard Work Schedules and the Life Course (Kadri Täht)

Temporal labour market flexibility is the ability of employers to adjust not only the amount of hours individuals work in accordance to cyclical or seasonal demands, but when labour is required. This translates into non-standard work schedules, or work hours that occur in the ‘fringe times’ of the regular Monday to Friday 9-to-5 work day such as: afternoon, evening, overnight shifts or working on the holidays and weekends. When individuals work atypical times they have the potential to become ‘out of sync’ with family members or formal social institutions.

The goal of the project is to investigate the determinants of temporal labour market flexibility and its consequences for family cohesion in the Netherlands, with comparisons made with the United States. This project poses four central research questions:

1) Where are these jobs located? What types of employers, occupations, industries and labour market regions are more likely to have jobs with higher temporal flexibility?
2) Who is more likely to engage in these jobs? Are specific groups over-represented in these jobs (e.g., specific family phase, gender, ethnicity, social class)? What are the implications for social exclusion?
3) What are the consequences of non-standard work schedules for family cohesion? Specifically: 1) partnership quality, 2) partnership stability, 3) parent-child interaction, and, 4) child-care arrangements.
4) What is the role of institutional context, and particularly work and family policies, in shaping this process?

One year plan:
1) Finish the papers in progress;
2) Start writing the paper on the relationship between non-standard time work and family relations in the Netherlands;
3) Research trip to the University of Maryland, Baltimore (U.S) to work together with Prof. Harriet Presser on the comparative study of non-standard time work and it’s effect on family cohesion in the Netherlands and in the U.S.;
4) Start writing the comparative paper on the relationship between non-standard time work and family relations in the Netherlands and in the U.S.;

Long-term target:
1) Publish international papers on the of prevalence and location of non-standard time work in the Dutch labour market and on the effect of non-standard time work on family cohesion and family relations;
2) Write a dissertation on the non-standard work schedule and life course based on the examples of the Netherlands and the U.S.

Papers-in-progress:


Earlier publications:


Project 15: The International Social Survey Programme: Dutch National Representation (Ganzeboom, Opdam)

The International Social Survey Programme [ISSP] is an academically driven general purpose annual survey that has been held since 1985. The Netherlands have participated since 1987 via the Social and Cultural Planning Office [SCP]. As of 2004, the Dutch membership has been transferred to the Free University, and we have conducted the ISSP survey for the modules 2003 and 2004 (combined) and 2005 and 2006 (combined). The ISSP is conceived as a supplementary (leave behind) questionnaire to an existing survey, but is conducted at the VU as a mail survey (this happens in some other countries too). At present, ISSP is conducted in over 40 countries world-wide, 20 of which are outside Europe and include a number of non-western societies.

The ISSP contents change by year: each year there is a new (or repeated) module that is drafted by an international group of participants. The space is limited: there can be at most 60 questions in each new module, and in repeated module 40 of the 60 questions have to be replicated from earlier issues. The contents of the module is primarily focused on opinions, attitudes and cognitions, but there is also a long list of demographics and other background variables that can be most relevant to comparative stratification research. One problem with the background variables, however, is that they are hard to standardize cross-nationally. This derives partly from the fact that ISSP is conceived as an add-on to existing surveys, with existing background variables. Despite much effort of individual researchers, the use of ISSP data is often complicated by the way background variables are measured and documented. One long term aim of the ISSP participation is to produce better comparable social background variables for earlier conducted ISSP surveys, in particular with respect to education and occupation.

The topics for the ISSP in the near future will be: Leisure and Sports (2007), Religion (2008) and Social Inequality (2009). Ganzeboom has been elected to lead the drafting group for the 2009 module. The preparation of the module will take place in two workshops of the drafting groups to be organized at or by VU. The aim for the 2009 ISSP survey is to collect high quality data on a full status attainment model at a worldwide unprecedented scale.

References

Previous papers and publication

One-year target
- Deposit fully documented and coded data for 2005 & 2006 modules
- Start collecting data for 2007 and 2009 modules (funds?)
- First workshop on 2009 Social Inequality module.

Long-term target
- Draft 2009 module
- Secure funding for continued ISSP participation
Write on trends in attitudes toward social inequality
Project 16: The European Social Survey [ESS]: Dutch National Representation
(Ganzeboom, Opdam)

The European Social Survey [ESS] is an academically driven general purpose data collection in a number of European countries, that has expanded from 21 for the first round (2002) to about 30 in the present 2006 round. The ESS explicitly aims at the highest quality of data-collection in social sciences, also by developing and setting new standards. The first two rounds of the ESS were coordinated at Radboud University Nijmegen, but in 2005 the PI has won the national competition for the National Coordinatorship. This NC position primarily involves implementing the international research design in the Dutch context, with translation, questionnaire development, interviewer training, fieldwork coordination, and data processing as the main activities. This work is primarily conducted by Saskia Opdam. The ESS leaves very few degrees of freedom for the participating researchers, but a few exist and are exploited by the programme. First, ESS allows for temporary modules and allows researchers to apply for such a module on a competitive basis. In 2006, one of the associated researchers to the CSR programme, Aat Liebbror, has won this competition (with international colleagues) and has contributed a module on norms and attitudes on family formation and the life-cycle. The comparative analyses of these data will certainly benefit the CSR programma. Second, Ganzeboom as the Dutch NC has added a number of new questions to the add-on questionnaire of the ESS2006 on occupational variables. The formulation has been taken from the existing formulations for these questions in the ISSP questionnaires for the Netherlands. The aim of adding these questions is to convince ESS that the ISSP formulation would be a better standard question format for all occupational questions. Third and finally, the PI is in charge of promoting the use of ESSdata by social science researchers in the Netherlands, and disseminating results from ESS in this country and elsewhere. In order to fulfill this goal, a workshop will be organized in May-June 2007, in which the trends in ESS data in the 2002-2006 period will be assessed.

The ESS project at the VU is funded by NWO-MAGW (50,000 euro).

References

http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/

Earlier papers and publications


One year plan

- Finish ESS2006 fieldwork and deposit documented an fully coded data early in 2007
- Assess data quality ESS2006
- Write paper on occupational information in ESS2006
- Conference on trends in value climate in the Netherlands 2002-2006 according to ESS Data

Long term target

- Continued participation in ESS as NC for 2008
- Bring improvements of questions on education and occupation for ESS2008.
Project 17: Categorical Time-series Analysis (Elzinga)

Categorical Time Series are abundant in sociological and demographical research that is related to issues of social inequality; e.g. such time series come in the form of educational careers, employment histories, life courses and family formation histories. Since 2002, Elzinga has been studying models and methods of categorical time series. With Hoogendoorn and Dijkstra, he developed new latent class models, so-called Linked Markov Sources, and associated algorithms to evaluate such models on the level of aggregates data. Apart from such probabilistic models, Elzinga investigated the representation of categorical time series as points in metric space. Such geometric representations can be used directly for classificatory purposes or indirectly to quantify dependent or independent variables in models of related phenomena. This research includes the projects mentioned below.

Entropy-representations of categorical time-series: Elzinga (2003, 2005, 2006) developed a number of metric representations of categorical time series that rely on particular interpretation of common order of pairs of sequences. These interpretations were adapted to handle durations as quantities that are associated to the states of the time series. A problem with such representations is that in most (not in all) cases multiple embeddings of subsequences prevent unequivocal assignment of durations. It has appeared that it is possible to define kernel functions based on conditional and unconditional entropy of categorical time series. Such representations avoid the duration assignment problem. We will implement several of these metrics and replicate previous studies that used common-order based metrics.

Representations for multi-facet categorical time series: Most often, categorical time series pertain to a single facet or life domain like education, employment, fertility or family formation. This project aims at formulating the restrictions that single facet representations impose on multifacet representations, i.e. representations of categorical time series that simultaneously pertain to different life domains. If successful, this may lead to metrics that model the multi-facet time series as an explicit function of more elementary time series.

Changes in family formation related to macro-events: Elzinga & Liefbroer (2006) (also Liefbroer & Elzinga 2006) recently investigated changes and transfer of family formation patterns using the methodology of metric representation. Presumably, such changes are not only the result of slowly changing values and norms pertaining to demographic events: such changes are probably also facilitated or inhabited by macro-events like changing legislation, government policy or economic conditions. It is not clear if and how such macro-events should be related to changes. The purpose of the project is to develop adequate methods and investigate different patterns of change as seem to occur in different western countries.

Earlier publications:


Under review
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Appendix A: Harmonization format of ISMF files

VARIABLES IN THE INTERNATIONAL STRATIFICATION AND MOBILITY FILE

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESPNR</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Unique respondent id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASTFIX</td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Date of last fix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHIVE</td>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Originating archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Study akronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Country akronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Year of survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERGNR</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Number of merge file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABNR</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Number of label files</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>(0) male (1) female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Any code for urban residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EDUCATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEDUCTP</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Father's nominal type of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDUCTP</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Mothers nominal type of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCTP</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Resp. nominal type of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDUCTP</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Spouse's nominal type of education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code: Labnr * 1000 + classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUCYR</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Resp's years of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDUCYR</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Father's years of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDUCYR</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Mother's years of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDUCYR</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Spouse's years of education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OCCUPATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOCC</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Father's occupation - detailed national code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCC1</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>First occupation - detailed national code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCC</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Current/last occupation - detailed national code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCC</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Spouse's current/last occupation - detailed national code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code: Labnr * 10000 + local code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FISCO</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Father's occupation - isco-68 code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCO1</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>First occupation - isco-68 code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCO</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Current/last occupation - isco-68 code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISCO</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Spouse's current/last occupation - isco-68 code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISKO</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Father's occupation - isko-88 code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISKO1</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>First occupation - isko-88 code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISKO</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Current/last occupation - isko-88 code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISKO</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Spouse's current/last occupation - isko-88 code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSEEMPL</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Father's job - self-employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMPL1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>First job - self-employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMPL</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Resp. current/last job - self-employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEEMPL</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Spouse's current/last job - self-employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
code: (0) Salaried (1) Self-employment

FSUPVIS  F1  Father's job - supervising status
SUPVIS1  F1  First job - supervising status
SUPVIS   F1  Resp. current/last job - supervising status
SSUPVIS  F1  Spouse's current/last job - supervising status

code: (0) none (5) few (11) many or continuous

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

WORK     F1  Current work status resp.
SWORK    F1  Current work status spouse

code(0) not employed (1) working

HOURS    F2  Current work hours resp.
SHOURS   F2  Current work hours spouse

code: (0) not working (20) part-time (40) full-time or continuous

INCOME

PINC     F10  Personal income respondent
HINC     F10  Household income

code: Local currency