

Miaari, Sami H.; Khattab, Nabil; Kraus, Vered; Yonay, Yuval P.

Working Paper

Ethnic Capital and Class Reproduction: Comparing the Impact of Socio-Economic Status on Children's Educational Attainment across Ethno-Religious Groups in Israel

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 14053

Provided in Cooperation with:

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Suggested Citation: Miaari, Sami H.; Khattab, Nabil; Kraus, Vered; Yonay, Yuval P. (2021) : Ethnic Capital and Class Reproduction: Comparing the Impact of Socio-Economic Status on Children's Educational Attainment across Ethno-Religious Groups in Israel, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 14053, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/232805>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 14053

**Ethnic Capital and Class Reproduction:
Comparing the Impact of Socio-Economic
Status on Children's Educational Attainment
across Ethno-Religious Groups in Israel**

Sami H. Miaari
Nabil Khattab
Vered Kraus
Yuval P. Yonay

JANUARY 2021

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 14053

Ethnic Capital and Class Reproduction: Comparing the Impact of Socio-Economic Status on Children's Educational Attainment across Ethno-Religious Groups in Israel

Sami H. Miaari

*Tel-Aviv University, Oxford University and
IZA*

Nabil Khattab

*Doha Institute for Graduate Studies and
University of Bristol*

Vered Kraus

University of Haifa

Yuval P. Yonay

University of Haifa

JANUARY 2021

Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but IZA takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The IZA Institute of Labor Economics is an independent economic research institute that conducts research in labor economics and offers evidence-based policy advice on labor market issues. Supported by the Deutsche Post Foundation, IZA runs the world's largest network of economists, whose research aims to provide answers to the global labor market challenges of our time. Our key objective is to build bridges between academic research, policymakers and society.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ISSN: 2365-9793

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Schaumburg-Lippe-Straße 5–9
53113 Bonn, Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Email: publications@iza.org

www.iza.org

ABSTRACT

Ethnic Capital and Class Reproduction: Comparing the Impact of Socio-Economic Status on Children's Educational Attainment across Ethno-Religious Groups in Israel

This article investigates the relationships between ethnicity, class, and prospects of educational success. For this purpose, we compared the effects of family socio-economic characteristics on children's educational attainment in four ethno-religious groups in Israel (Muslim, Christian, and Druze Palestinians; Jews). Information from the 1995 census on the households with at least one child born in the cohort of 1975-1985 is matched with Ministry of Education records on all those who achieved matriculation certificates and academic degrees between 1995 and 2012. The results show that the educational outcomes of Christian and Druze children are less dependent on their family characteristics compared to Muslim and Jewish children. We suggest that the disadvantage of Palestinian schools in a Jewish-dominated state is offset by the tougher competition Jewish children from disadvantaged strata face in schools attended by those from affluent strata. Family background is more important for academic degrees than for the matriculation certificate. Furthermore, the education and occupation of mothers and fathers both have an equally important impact on child outcomes.

JEL Classification: J15, I24, I26, J62

Keywords: ethnic capital, class, inequality, educational attainment, Israel

Corresponding author:

Sami H. Miaari

Department of Labor Studies

Tel-Aviv University and Blavatnik School of Government, Oxford University

E-mail: samimiaari@tauex.tau.ac.il

1. Introduction

The impact of social origin on educational attainment has been widely studied for many years in many advanced industrial societies, including Israel. Many scholars expected that the impact of social origin would shrink considerably, leading to increasing equality of educational attainment as a result of an enormous expansion of secondary and post-secondary education. Several studies have indeed indicated that, at least in some countries, educational opportunities have become more accessible to children from less privileged backgrounds (Ballarino et al. 2009). Yet other studies have found that social origin continues to be an important source of social inequality and a significant determinant of educational opportunities and credentials (Bar-Haim and Shavit 2013; Breen and Jonsson 2005; Shavit and Blossfeld 1993) leaving scholars divided in relation to the effect of social origin on educational attainment.

Another important question that has not been sufficiently addressed is whether social origins have the same impact within majority and minority ethno-religious groups. A well-documented finding has been that minority children, who are more likely to come from economically disadvantaged families, have lower chances of achieving educational success (Breen and Johnson 2005; Cameron and Heckman 2001; Haveman and Wolfe 1995; Hout 2015; Lawrence and Breen 2016; Sirin 2005). However, would the chances of those minority kids improve with the socio-economic success of their parents in the same way that such success affects the educational attainment of majority children? A few studies addressing this question have reached conflicting conclusions. Some studies found a similar impact of class position on educational attainment among minority and majority children (Li and Heath 2016; Rothon 2007), whereas others found important differences in the impact of class on majority and minority students (Ball, Reay, and David 2002; Modood 2003). However, such studies are scant and more studies are necessary to understand the interactive effects of class and ethnicity on educational outcomes (Strand 2014). This study aims to answer these questions in the context of Israel, which as in many advanced industrial societies, has witnessed major reforms in secondary education and extensive expansion of tertiary education in recent decades benefiting all ethnic groups in Israel (Ayalon and Shavit 2004; Kraus and Yonay 2000; Kraus and Yonay 2018; Okun and Friedlander 2005; Shavit 1990;).

However, we don't know whether all members of the same ethnic group enjoy the same level of access to these educational opportunities. For example, do economically less advantaged members of minority groups (Palestinians) have the same opportunities to educational success as their counterparts in the majority group (Jews)? In other words, does

the impact of class position on educational attainment vary across minority and majority groups?

In this article, we use longitudinal data created by merging the 1995 census with administrative data on matriculation and graduation from the Ministry of Education to inspect the closeness or openness of educational processes within the various ethno-religious groups in Israel.¹ An educational process is considered “open” if the successes of children are not heavily dependent on the socioeconomic status of their parents. That is, we examine the impact of human capital, occupational standing, and economic resources of Israeli parents on the educational attainment of their children, distinguishing between Israeli-Palestinian parents (further divided into Muslims, Druze, and Christians) and Jewish parents. We analyze two crucial educational attainments: (i) the matriculation certificate, a prerequisite for acceptance to academic programs; and (ii) an academic degree, a key to high-prestige jobs. Since many studies have shown that parents invest differently in girls and boys, our analysis is conducted separately for each gender. The findings in this study indicate that Muslim Palestinian children are as dependent on their parents' standing in accessing educational opportunities as majority Jewish children. The results for the smaller Arabic-speaking minorities of Christian and Druze Palestinians are mixed. We argue that the disadvantage of Palestinian schools in a Jewish-dominated state is offset by the tougher competition Jewish children from disadvantaged strata face in schools attended by those from affluent strata.

The article is organized as follows: the next section discusses the theoretical background. In the third section, we discuss the Israeli context of the study, followed by a description of the research question, data and methods in the fourth section. In the fifth section, we present the findings of the study and then, in the last section, consider the implications of our findings.

2. Theoretical Review

According to the modernization theory, education is the main engine for social mobility in modern societies. Drawing on liberal ideas of equal opportunity and meritocracy, educational expansion has been posited as the main contributor to the erosion of class inequality by weakening the relationship between children's social origin and their educational attainment (Bell 1973; Blau and Duncan 1967; Durkheim 1933; Parsons 1970; Treiman 1970). The reproduction approach is much less optimistic about the equalizing effects of education

and maintains that family background still has a large impact on one's education. According to this approach, family effects may indeed decrease over the years with respect to the lower educational transitions due to educational expansion, but remain unchanged or even increase on the transition to higher and more desirable levels of education (Boudon 1974; Bowles and Gintis 1976; Karabel and Halsey 1977; Oakes 1985).

The process that generates the reproduction of educational inequality is well summarized by Raftery and Hout's Maximally Maintained Inequality (MMI) model (1993). According to this model, educational expansion would reduce inequality only when the advantaged social group reaches saturation on a given educational level. Thus, as long as the advantaged group can still advance its position further at a given educational level, educational expansion will have little or no effect on the disadvantaged groups and educational inequality will persist or even increase. Further expansion of the above model introduces qualitative educational differentiation (tracking) within a given educational level (Breen and Jonsson 2000; Lucas 2001). Lucas proposed the Effectively Maintained Inequality (EMI) model. When a given level of education reaches full absorption, social background influences who enters the most prestigious and selective tracks. Graduating from such tracks strongly improves the student's chances of making further educational transitions in the future. Due to the educational expansion, children from disadvantaged social groups complete secondary education and even obtain a bachelor degree, but at less prestigious institutions and tracks, and hence their class mobility chances remain low.

The meritocratic modernization approach is supported by studies that found equalization in educational attainment (Breen and Jonsson 2005). Evidence supporting this conclusion was found in Germany (Henz and Maas 1995; Müller and Haun 1994), Italy and Spain (Ballarino et al. 2009) and France (Vallet 2004). In a recent study of European countries, Breen et al. (2009) found a decline in educational inequality over the 30 years in the middle of the century (comparing the cohorts born between 1908 and 1924 and those born between 1945 and 1954). The decline, however, greatly differed among the countries, being much larger in Sweden, the Netherlands, Britain, Germany and France than in Italy, Ireland, and Poland.

Further support for the reproduction approach is provided by studies that found inequality persisting (Shavit, Yaish, and Bar-Haim 2007). Evidence obtained from the late 1970's up to the early 1990's suggests that inequalities have remained unchanged despite the expansion of schooling at the elementary and secondary levels (Featherman and Hauser 1978; Halsey, Heath, and Ridge 1980; Shavit and Blossfeld 1993). Examining cohorts born between

the 1950s and the 1970s in 24 European countries, Bar-Haim and Shavit (2013) found that educational expansion enhanced inequality in tertiary education for all cohorts and inequality in secondary education for those born in the 1970s only. Rotman, Shavit, and Shalev (2016) claim that if we use relative measures of education, taking into account not only nominal degrees but also their scarcity, inequality in educational attainment is greater than previous studies have shown. They demonstrate it in the case of two recent cohorts in Israel, but suggest that similar conclusions are expected to hold in other countries.

The contradicting outcomes are likely to be attributed to the differences in educational systems among the various industrialized societies due to their “historical, institutional, or political peculiarities” (Müller and Karle 1993:19). Such differences produce variation in the level of closure or openness of the education systems across countries (Borgna and Contini 2014). Yet while there might be a decline in the relationship between social origins and educational inequalities in some European countries, the overall conclusion of most of the studies quoted above, is that educational inequalities are still resilient to change and are not likely to fade away any time soon.

While researchers agree that the socio-economic standing of parents is a strong predictor of children’s educational attainment (Mare 1981; Nam and Huang 2011), it is also widely accepted that in multi-ethnic societies, class is only one of many factors preserving social inequality overtime. One of the main other factors that is closely associated with class, but which has independent effects on social stratification, is ethno-religious background (Khattab et al. 2011; Platt 2005; Rothon 2007; Yaish 2001).

Parents from disadvantaged minorities have lower income and are often less educated than parents belonging to the majority group. The educational attainment of their children are therefore lower on average than those of the latter. This is a class effect that lowers the attainment of minority students not due to their ethnicity per se, but because of the class position of their families (Sirin 2005:420). Yet ethnicity may affect educational success not only through class affiliation, and in fact, class effects may differ across ethno-religious groups (Platt 2005; Strand 2014). The impact of ethno-religious affiliation might be negative or positive. On the negative side, minority children may suffer more deprivation than that associated with their families' socio-economic standing. They might be discriminated against by teachers and other pupils and might suffer from harassment and abuse due to their "otherness" in terms of race, ethnicity, and religion. Such ill-treatment may lower their attainment in comparison to majority children from the same class location. It is also possible

that schools in which minority kids are concentrated get fewer resources. For example, qualified teachers may avoid working in those schools due to lower salaries, difficulties in accessing them, and teachers own negative prejudice against certain minorities (Oakes and Rogers 2006).

On the positive side, ethnic and religious affiliation might be associated with certain resources which counterbalance the impact of the family socio-economic origin on the access to educational resources. Drawing on Borjas (1999) and Modood (2004), we refer to these resources as "ethnic capital." The term is defined as the "quality of the ethnic environment" which includes a whole set of ethnic characteristics, such as social support and specific community opportunities (Borjas 1999). The 'ethnic capital' hypothesis argues that ethnicity is used as a resource to support a strict "success frame" (Lee and Zhou 2014). Some minority groups are aware that they are likely to face discrimination and other structural barriers in society and reckon that to counterbalance the effect of these barriers, they need to ensure the educational success of the next generation. These groups are able to draw on their ethnic and community-based resources (Fleischmann et al. 2013) offering a range of resources such as afterschool tutoring, supplementary educational programs, and social networking and information (Lee and Zhou 2014). Ethnic-group resources influence the educational attainment of children of minorities and immigrants by instilling high aspirations for future social mobility (Modood 2004). An ethnic group that accumulates on average good human capital at the community level enables its members to maintain a head start over other ethnic groups which, due to various reasons, could not manage to gain the same level of ethnic capital. This implies that the lack of ethnic capital would increase the dependence of people on their family's social origin because they are unable to rely on community-based resources.²

The empirical findings concerning whether the effect of class on educational outcomes depends on ethnicity are mixed. Li and Heath (2016) examined whether patterns of class reproduction apply to ethnic minorities with a migration background in the same way as to the white majority group in Britain. They found that while first-generation minority men and women had higher absolute rates of downward mobility than white men and women, there was little overall difference between minorities and whites with respect to the trends and rates of relative mobility and the overall level of fluidity. This led them to conclude that the standard processes of class reproduction apply to second-generation visible minorities as to the white majority, which in turn lends support to Rethon's conclusion that social class operates in a similar way for all ethnic groups without a specifically 'ethnic effect' that mitigates its impact

in certain groups (2007:306).

Contrasting this claim, Strand (2014) reported that the correlation between socioeconomic status (SES) and educational attainments was smaller among pupils from most ethnic minorities in England than among White pupils and Black Caribbean ones. The contrast between Strand's findings and those of Li and Heaths might be attributed, however, to the recent immigration of many minorities. Children of immigrants improve their English substantially when entering school and therefore their advancement is faster than that of native English speakers, which is why Black Caribbean kids whose native language is also English do not show the same level of relative progress as kids from other countries.

Given the limited number of studies on the impact of ethnicity on educational achievements (controlling for socio-economic background), more studies on this topic are needed. In this paper we follow this direction by examining the relative importance of family social background on access to various educational levels in a social environment consisting of a politically-advantaged majority group in Israel (Jews) and three underprivileged Palestinian minority groups (Muslims, Christians, Druze) which have distinct relationships with the state. In the next section, we discuss the context of the study and provide more information about the groups under study.

3. The Context of the Study

The population in Israel consists of two major national groups, a Jewish majority and a Palestinian minority, which is divided into three religious groups (Muslims, Christians and Druze). The state is defined as a Jewish state and its policies are aimed at advancing Jewish immigration and control of the country, whereas Palestinians are regarded as second-degree citizens. They are entitled to the same rights and services as Jews but get less than their share systematically (Ghanem 2001; Miaari and Khattab 2013; Smoocha 2002; Yiftachel 2006). The 1.44 million Palestinians constitute approximately 18 percent of the total population of the State of Israel (not including the annexed East Jerusalem) of which about 84 percent are Muslim and the rest are roughly evenly divided between Christians and Druze. Palestinians live mainly in segregated Palestinian communities, with only eight percent living in mixed cities such as Tel-Aviv-Jaffa, Ramla, Haifa, and Acre (Kraus and Yonay 2018). The residential segregation of Palestinians in Israel has facilitated the state's control over its Palestinian citizens and its differential treatment compared to the Jewish group (Bäumel 2007, Ghanem 2001, Pappé

2011, Yiftachel 2006). The three religious Palestinian groups differ from each other culturally, residentially, and in their social and economic characteristics (Kraus and Yonay 2018). Christians are more likely to reside in urban areas, have lower fertility rates, study in private (mostly church-run) schools, and have an occupational status that is considerably higher than that of Muslims and Druze (McGahern 2011; Shdema 2012). The Druze live in villages in the northern part of Israel only and share similar cultural patterns with Muslims, but unlike other Palestinians, they serve in the Israeli military (men only) and many of them develop professional careers in the armed forces. Although they still suffer from discrimination and prejudice by Jews who do not distinguish between the different Arab-speaking groups, this military service opens economic opportunities for the Druze that other Palestinians lack (Firro 1999 and 2001; Frisch 1993; Hajjar 2001). The Jewish population is also not homogeneous. It is composed mostly of two loosely defined groups of *Ashkenazi* Jews from European origins and *Mizrahi* Jews from Middle-Eastern and North-African origins. *Mizrahi* Jews also suffer from discrimination and prejudice, and their economic achievements are still lower, on average, than those of *Ashkenazi* Jews (Cohen, Haberfeld, and Kristal 2007; Khazzoom 2003; Kraus and Yonay 2000; Mizrahi and Herzog 2012; Shenhav 2006; Yonay and Kraus 2017).

The Israeli School System. The Compulsory Education Law, requiring all children to finish primary school (grades 1-8) was one of the first laws enacted by the Knesset in 1949, but it took many years until it was implemented in Palestinian communities (Abu-Saad 2006; Al-Haj 1995). This law has been amended several times since then, and in 1995, the year of the census, compulsory education included education to the 10th grade, but provided free education for all high-school classes. At the end of high school, graduates take the matriculation exams which they need to complete successfully in order to proceed to academic education. There are two kinds of high schools: academically oriented schools that focus on preparing students for matriculation, and the vocational ones, which have been established mostly for Jews in order to provide academically less able Jewish children with some occupational skills.³ The lack of vocational schools in many Palestinian communities may encourage students to continue in academic tracks, but those who lack the necessary skills and motivation have no alternative avenues and many drop off schools altogether. Students who take the matriculation exams choose which subjects and at what level they want to be examined, and this early-stage decision is quite consequential because acceptance to prestigious academic programs depends on the type and level of those exams (Ayalon and Shavit 2004).

The Israeli education system is highly centralized. The Ministry of Education is

responsible for certification of teachers and their training, curriculum development and authorization, and the matriculation exams. The public system has four separate divisions catering to different population groups. In addition to the main division for non-religious Jews, there is a division for religious orthodox Jews, a division for Palestinians, and two separate divisions for the Druze and Bedouins. In the last three divisions, the language of instruction is Arabic (Al-Haj 1995; Coursen-Neff 2003; Jabareen 2006, Kalekin-Fishman 2004).⁴

Although most Israeli children get public school education, there are also numerous private schools. In Jewish communities, such schools are usually founded to advance specific pedagogical and philosophical doctrines (e.g., open and democratic schools; anthroposophy schools, etc.). Among the Palestinian population, private schools are mostly run by churches and are used by Palestinians in order to avoid the public schools that serve the Arab population which are poorly funded and are of low quality in comparison with Jewish schools (Coursen-Neff 2003). Church schools are very expensive and poor families need financial aid to afford them. Such aid is given by Christian congregations mostly to needy Christian families, a fact that reduces the impact of family background on educational attainment amongst Christians. This kind of organization and help to fellow members of the community is an example of ethnic capital that may help Christians kids from poor families. It is true that church schools are open to non-Christian Palestinians as well, but since these schools have been established in Christian residential areas, they are less accessible to those Muslim and Druze children who do not live within or near Christian communities, and non-Christian children are also less likely to get financial support by the community and church organizations that run the schools.

The Druze are concentrated in few villages and their leaders exert strong pressure to maintain the group boundaries and internal solidarity (Firro 2001). This greater social cohesion might be conceived as ethnic capital because it facilitates help among members of the extended family and the community. Additionally, although the Druze do not have private schools similar to church schools, they have greater autonomy and control than other Palestinians over the state schools that serve their communities (ibid., Frisch 1993, Hajjar 2001). This greater control which ensues from the Druze's political alliance with the state and their favorable discrimination, might also be seen as a kind of ethnic capital. This is so because the educational semi-autonomy is a structural property of the community that is utilized to address directly educational needs and to improve Druze schools' quality in a way not available for non-Druze schools. .

The lower quality of public education in Palestinian communities (Al-Haj 1995; Abu-

Saad 2004; Golan-Agnon 2006) is expected to be especially harmful for the low-income Muslim families who cannot invest in their children's education and do not have access to the community-based capital Christians and Druze do have. Compared to poor Muslim families, affluent and highly-educated Muslim Palestinian parents may remedy the deficiencies of public education by helping their children at home and by paying for extra teaching and extracurricular activities for them. Hence, socio-economic background is expected to play a significant role in determining educational attainment.

Likewise, we expect class to be a significant factor in determining educational attainment among Jews as well. Most Jews live in big urban areas which are diverse in terms of socio-economic background. The children from disadvantaged classes, often of *Mizrahi* background, have to compete with those who come from higher socio-economic background. They may consequently suffer from prejudice and discrimination from teachers and peers and have a more negative evaluation of themselves. Thus the ethnic and class heterogeneity within Jewish schools may lower the chances of those from lower strata to graduate from high schools and countervail the impact of the greater resources Jewish schools have over Palestinian ones.

The academic institutions are strictly regulated by the state through the Council of Higher Education. The academic institutions are where Palestinians and Jews finally meet (Al-Haj 2003). The teaching language is Hebrew, and the Palestinians have to study in a language that is foreign to them. Until the 1990's, most students studied at seven public research universities, but in 1995, the state initiated structural changes in the academic system by establishing a less competitive tier of regional colleges and permitting the establishment of private institutions in addition to the older and more prestigious universities. These changes have expanded educational opportunities significantly, increasing the number of students by a factor of 2.5 between 1990 and 2005 (to over 200,000 in 62 institutions).⁵

The growth in enrolment in tertiary education among Arab Israelis is also impressive. In 1991, only 11 percent of Arab-Israeli high-school graduates enrolled in tertiary education, and this figure increased to 18 percent in 2003; in 1995 only 6.7 percent of Israeli undergraduate students were Palestinians; by 2007, this figure rose to 11 percent. According to Kraus and Yonay (2013), the percentage of tertiary education graduates has steadily increased in all ethno-religious groups in Israel from 1979 to 2007-09, but the upward trend became steeper for all groups (women and men; Jews, Muslims, Christians, and Druze) between 1993 and 2009, the period of expansion of the academic system in Israel. For women, this acceleration of tertiary education attendance is even stronger relative to men (Figure 3.2C, p.

49). Fuchs (2017) notes that between 2008 and 2013 rates of attendance did not change much for men and remained stable among Jewish and Christian women, but has continued to rise for Muslim, Druze and Bedouin-Muslim women, the groups with the lowest rates of academic education. The role of the higher-education expansion in the rise of academic education is evident in the fact that 51 percent of all Jewish students in 2016, and 44 percent of Muslim students, studied at colleges compared with 38 and 35 percent, respectively, at research universities (the rest studied at teacher colleges; Fuchs 2017, Appendix, Figure 3)

4. Research Questions, Data and Variables

Since earlier studies have not yielded unequivocal answer to the differential impact of socio-economic standing on educational attainment in various ethnic groups, we examine the impact of family background—the economic standing and education of parents—on their children's educational attainment, comparing various ethno-religious groups in Israel. Our study addresses the following questions: (1) To what extent are children's educational attainment (matriculation and academic degree) dependent on the socio-economic standing of their parents? (2) Do the effects of family background on educational attainment differ between the various ethno-religious groups? (3) Are those effects stronger when predicting an academic degree relative to matriculation? (4) Do those effects differ among sons and daughters within each of the ethno-religious groups?

Our analysis is based on a subset of the 1995 Population and Housing Census that includes 20 percent of all households in Israel, merged with administrative records from the Ministry of Education.⁶ The subset is comprised of *all* Palestinians born in 1975-1985 (aged 10-20 at the time of the census) and a 25 percent sample of Jews of the same age born in Israel. We concentrated on this age group (10-20) because at this age most Israelis still live with their parents, thus allowing us to use data on the parents' education and work to explain those children's later educational attainments. In our study, we incorporated all cases in which subjects were coded as "a son" or "a daughter" of the head of the household.⁷ We merged the records of the children in the subset with yearly educational records on matriculation and academic graduation obtained from the Ministry of Education for the period from 1995 to 2012.⁸ Merging the two sources of data created a unique data file with information about the family background of the subjects and their educational attainment by 2012.⁹ We excluded Palestinians residing in Jerusalem (mostly outside Israel's internationally-recognized borders) and Druze from the occupied Golan Heights because the education systems and the curricula

in these areas are part of the Palestinian Authority and Syrian systems. Our data thus include 60,792 Jewish, 23,710 Muslim, 3,570 Christian and 3,611 Druze women (see Table 1).

The dependent variable in our analysis is educational attainment. Based on the subject's highest certificate, we divided the subjects in our study into three categories: those holding a secondary certificate or less (i.e. have not obtained the matriculation certificate); those who have obtained that certificate; and those holding an academic degree. Note that we do not have information on the attainment of non-academic post-secondary certificates, and therefore those who have obtained such a degree are included either in our first category if they have not passed the matriculation exams successfully, or in the second category if they have.

The explanatory variables, based on the 1995 census data, are:

- Parents' education: Father's education; Mother's education. Parents' education was measured by the highest certificate they obtained, separated into four categories to fit educational distribution at the time of parents' schooling: 1. Did not study; 2. Elementary (omitted category); 3. Secondary and matriculation; and 4. Tertiary (post-secondary and academic degree).
- Parents' work experience: Father's labor force standing; Mother's labor force standing. Parents' labor force standing was divided into three categories: 1. Not in the labor force; 2. Enrolled in manual occupations (omitted category); 3. Enrolled in non-manual occupations. We did not distinguish further to more refined occupational groups due to the concentrations of Palestinians in a small range of occupations.
- Household characteristics: Log income per person in the household, Availability of a computer in the household. In 1995 personal computers were still quite rare and were owned mostly by those employed in technological and professional occupations.

Our main empirical strategy is a multinomial regression, estimated separately for each of the combinations of ethno-religious groups (Muslims, Christians, Druze, Jews) and gender (8 groups in total), controlling for age and age squared of the respondents and each of their parents. The reference category in each of the equations was secondary certificate or less. We begin with separate regressions for each group in order to simplify the analysis and reduce the number of parameters that the model needs to identify. Having established the differences across ethnic groups, we then use interaction models to examine whether the estimated effects are significantly different across ethnicities. In particular, we ran a pooled regression for all subjects and examined all the possible interaction terms (a) between the independent variables

and the ethno-religious groups (Appendix 1A); (b) and between the independent variables and gender (Appendix 1B).

5. Analysis

5.1 Descriptive statistics

Muslim children attained the lowest education. About 73.4 percent of Muslim sons and almost 60 percent of daughters obtained merely secondary education. Moreover, only 8.3 percent of Muslim sons and 18.9 percent of Muslim daughters obtained an academic degree (see Table 1, Panel A). The highest occurrence of academic degree attained among Palestinian women was by Christians daughters (almost 36 percent) and sons (almost 20 percent), but these rates were still considerably lower than those of Jewish children (43 and 31 percent among women and men respectively). The attainments of Druze children were quite similar to those of Muslims but they were somewhat more successful in passing the matriculation (an advantage of almost more than 5.5 percent among sons and among daughters).

The low educational attainments of Palestinian children are hardly surprising given their family background (Panels B-H in Table 1). Muslims were in the lowest social position, followed by the Druze. While Christian children came from a much higher socio-economic background compared with both Muslims and Druze, nevertheless, the socio-economic attainment of their families were far below those of Jewish families.

Here are some examples. The mean family income per person in 1995 was 701.5 Israeli New Shekels (NIS) among Muslim families, 813.6 NIS among Druze and 1,277 NIS among Christian families. The income per person among Jews, 2,128 NIS, was much higher than that of all Palestinian families (Table 1, Panel B).¹⁰ Only 14.4 percent of Muslim, 17.2 percent of Druze, and 29.7 percent of Christian children grew up in families that owned a computer, while 55.5 percent of Jewish families already had a computer in their homes in 1995 (Table 1, Panel C).

Palestinian children were raised by parents with very low education and low occupational standings. Among them, Christian parents had the highest attainment, Muslims the lowest, and the Druze were in between, whereas Jewish parents had much better attainment. For example, while more than 30 percent of Jewish fathers had tertiary education, the rate was 9.3 percent for Muslims, 13.1 percent for Druze, and 19.5 percent for Christians (Table 1, Panel D). 43 percent of Jewish fathers were employed in non-manual occupations, compared with much lower rates among Muslim, Christians and Druze fathers (16, 27, and 22 percent,

respectively; Table 1, Panel F).

Regarding characteristics of the subjects' mothers, more than one fifth of Muslim (22.6 percent) and 14 percent of Druze mothers did not attend any school. The figures for Christian and Jewish mothers were much lower (4.1 and 1.6 percent, respectively). Many more Jewish than Christian mothers had tertiary education (32 and 16.5 percent, respectively), while only trifling rates of Muslim and Druze mothers had reached that level (4 and 2 percent, respectively; Table 1, Panel E). While the majority of Jewish mothers (70 percent) participated in the paid labor market in 1995, most Israeli Palestinian mothers did not. Among Christian mothers the rate was only about half that of Jewish mothers (36.7 percent), but even this modest rate was more than three times the rate among Muslim mothers (10.5 percent); Druze mothers were somewhere in the middle between Christian and Muslim mothers with 22 percent labor force participation (Table 1, Panel G).

Insert Table 1 about here

The data in the above section clearly shows that the Palestinian parents of our subjects had less education, were extremely less likely to participate in paid labor (mothers), and when employed, had less desirable occupations than Jewish parents. Among the Palestinians, Christian parents had more education and better work positions than Muslim and Druze parents did. In the next section, we turn to examine the net effects of these variables on sons' and daughters' highest certificate obtained within the different ethno-religious groups.

5.2 The multivariate analysis

Obtaining a matriculation certificate

We begin with the determinants affecting the matriculation certificate (Table 2A and 2B, columns 1, 3, 5, 7). We tested the significance of the differences between the ethno-religious groups (see Appendix 1A) and between genders (Appendix 1B) by including the pertinent interaction terms in the regression equations. As in many other studies (Ayalon and Shavit 2004; Duncan et al. 1998; Haveman and Wolfe 1995; Sewell and Hauser 1975), the family's economic standing (measured by log-income per person and the availability of a computer) positively influenced children's attainment among all the ethno-religious groups. For all groups, an increase in log income per person in the household increased children's odds of obtaining a matriculation certificate. For Muslim sons the odds are $e^{0.125}=1.133$ which are

very similar to the odds observed among Christian and Jewish sons. Very much the same effects were observed for daughters, but income had significantly stronger effect on Muslim daughters relative to their Jewish counterparts (see part B of Table 2).

Possessing a computer in the household increased the odds of sons and daughters to obtain matriculation. Possessing a computer in the family had a significantly higher effect on Muslim sons than it had on Jewish sons; the respective figures are $e^{0.764}=2.146$ $e^{0.580}=1.786$ respectively. The impact of possessing a computer on daughters' matriculation was not significantly different among the groups.¹¹

Next, we examine the effect of parents' education and their occupational standing on their children's educational attainment. As in previous studies (e.g. Ermisch and Francesconi 2001, Ermisch and Pronzato 2010), parents' education was an important determinant of children's educational attainment in our study. The higher the parents' education, the higher the odds of their children obtaining a matriculation certificate. For example, having a father with tertiary education increases the son's odds of obtaining matriculation (relative to fathers with elementary education) by $e^{0.866}=2.377$ in the case of Muslims, and by $e^{0.710}=2.033$ in the case of Jews; the respective odds for daughters are somewhat lower and similar for Muslim and Jewish daughters ($e^{0.416}=1.515$ and $e^{0.453}=1.573$, respectively). The greatest effect of fathers' tertiary education was observed for Druze daughters ($e^{1.072}=2.921$), significantly higher compared with the effects on Jewish daughters.

The mothers' education is as important as fathers', especially for Muslim and Jewish children. For example, Muslim mothers with tertiary education increased their sons' odds of obtaining matriculation by $e^{0.650}=1.915$ and their daughters' odds by $e^{0.591}=1.805$ compared to mothers with elementary education. The effect on daughters' matriculation is significantly higher for Muslim mothers than for their Jewish counterparts ($e^{0.142}=1.152$).

Growing up with parents employed in non-manual occupations increased Muslim and Jewish sons' odds of obtaining matriculation (compared to parents in manual jobs) but had no impact on Christian and Druze sons. For example, fathers employed in non-manual occupations increased their sons' odds of obtaining matriculation by $e^{0.167}=1.181$ in the case of Muslims, and by $e^{0.082}=1.085$ in the case of Jews. This effect did not exist in the case of the daughters' whose chances to pass the matriculation were not enhanced by having fathers in non-manual jobs. However, having a father out of the labor force did reduce the Muslim and Jewish daughter's odds of obtaining matriculation (odds of $e^{-0.432}=0.649$ and $e^{-0.139}=0.870$,

respectively).

Although some effects of parents' resources differed between the two largest groups of Muslims and Jews, it seems that in general, the overall importance of parents' education and employment was quite similar in these two groups. Druze and Christian children, in contrast, exhibited a different pattern. For both these groups, what mattered was mainly their parents' education and not their employment.

Finally, when comparing the matriculation attainment between boys and girls within a given ethnic group, an interesting observation was found; in general, among Jews and Muslims, parents' characteristics had a stronger impact on their sons' matriculation than on their daughters'. For example, fathers with tertiary education increase the odds of sons to obtain matriculation by $e^{0.866}=2.377$ for Muslims, and by $e^{0.710}=2.033$ for Jews, while the respective figures for daughters are $e^{0.416}=1.515$ and $e^{0.453}=1.573$, respectively. This trend replicates itself in the case of possessing a computer in the household, which had a stronger effect on sons than on daughters. This is true not only among Jews and Muslims but among Christians as well. Thus possessing a computer in the household increases the odds of Muslim sons to obtain matriculation by $e^{0.764}=2.146$ and daughters' odds only by $e^{0.504}=1.655$ (see Table 2 and Appendix 1B).

Obtaining an academic degree

Columns 2, 4, 6, and 8 of Tables 2A and 2B show how children's family background affect their odds of obtaining an academic certificate. The family's economic standing as measured by income per person and by the possession of a computer was a strong determinant of acquiring an academic degree. For example, computer possession increased Muslim daughters' odds of obtaining an academic certificate by $e^{0.833}=2.300$, not much different from its impact on Jewish daughters' odds ($e^{0.773}=2.166$) but stronger than its impact on Druze and Christian daughters' odds to get the coveted certificate ($e^{0.596}=1.814$ and $e^{0.545}=1.724$, respectively). The impact of computer possession is significantly higher for Muslim sons than for Jewish ones, and within each ethno-religious group (except of the Druze), it had a larger impact on sons than on the daughters.

Log-income per person also increased the children's odds of obtaining an academic degree, but two important exceptions are Christian and Druze boys, whose odds of obtaining an academic degree were not related to their families' income. Notice, that contrary to our expectation, the impact of log-income per person had a stronger significant effect on the

academic attainment of Jewish sons than on those of all Palestinian sons (see Table 2A and Appendix 1A).

Parents' education played a more important role in shaping children's academic education than in determining matriculation attainments. In what follows, we present some figures regarding this link. Muslim fathers' secondary education increased their daughters' odds of obtaining an academic degree by $e^{0.579}=1.784$ (relative to parents with elementary education), and these odds further increased with tertiary education ($e^{1.084}=2.956$). The respective figures for Muslim sons and Jewish children, boys and girls, were very much the same. Christian daughters are significantly less effected by their fathers' education than Christian boys ($e^{0.476}=1.609$ and $e^{1.095}=2.989$, respectively, for fathers' tertiary education). This is also true for Jewish daughters and sons whose fathers attended tertiary education ($e^{1.032}=2.806$ and $e^{1.188}=3.280$, respectively).

Mothers' education was also of great importance for their children's academic qualification, but here the effects were usually stronger for daughters than for sons. Muslim mothers with no education reduced their daughters' odds of obtaining an academic degree (relative to mothers with elementary education) by $e^{-0.469}=0.625$, while Muslim mothers with secondary education increased their daughters' odds by $e^{0.867}=2.379$, similar to the impact of Christians mothers with this level of education on their daughters' chances, and significantly higher than the equivalent impact among Jews. Muslim mothers' tertiary education had an even stronger impact ($e^{1.069}=2.912$), also similar to the corresponding effect among Christians. Examining the effects of mothers' education on their sons' academic attainment, we found that Muslim mothers with secondary education increased their sons' odds of graduation by $e^{0.429}=1.535$, which is significantly less than for their daughters. A similar effect was found among Christians and Jews but not among Druze.

Finally, for sons, it is fathers in non-manual occupations who increased their sons' odds of obtaining an academic certificate, with the exception of Druze fathers (in the case of the latter, the effect is not significant). Muslim fathers enrolled in non-manual occupations increased their sons' odds of graduating with an academic certificate by 1.317 ($e^{0.276}$), relative to fathers in manual jobs. Interestingly, the opposite is true regarding the effect of fathers' enrollment in non-manual occupations on *daughters'* success in academic institutions. Here only Druze daughters are benefited by having fathers in such occupations ($e^{0.376}=1.456$). Notice, that with respect to the effect of fathers' enrollment in non-manual occupations, no significant differences were found between the Palestinian ethno-religion groups and Jews, and

hardly any significant difference was found comparing sons and daughters (within ethnic group) save among the Jewish group. For the later father's enrolled in non-manual jobs increased their son's odds to obtain academic degree by $e^{0.166}=1.180$ and hardly affected their daughters' graduation chances ($e^{0.062}=1.063$).

Fathers not employed significantly reduced only Jewish daughters' odds of achieving an academic degree and did not reveal any significant impact on children from other ethnic groups. Enrollment of mothers in non-manual occupations increased only Muslim and Jewish daughters' odds of attaining academic degrees; the figures are $e^{0.586}=1.796$ for Muslim daughters, and $e^{0.373}=1.452$ for Jewish ones, a difference which is statistically significant. Mothers not employed significantly reduced only Druze children's odds of achieving an academic degree, and did not reveal any significant affect among the other ethnic groups.

To conclude, family economic standing, parents' education and labor force positions are important determinants for children academic attainment among each of the ethnic groups. However, three main patterns can be identified here; (1) the effect of these factors varied across ethnic groups with Muslim and Jewish groups (both boys and daughters) showing the greatest similarity; (2) comparing the educational attainment process for boys and girls within a given ethnic group shows that background characteristics had somewhat stronger effect on sons than on daughters. Yet mothers' education had a stronger effect on their daughters' achievements than on their sons'; and (3) in general, the impact of the family characteristics on children's academic attainment are stronger than that observed on their children's matriculation attainment.

Insert Table 2 about here

6. Discussion and conclusions

This study examined the impact of socio-economic standing on educational attainment in Israel, using longitudinal data obtained by merging the 1995 census with Ministry of Education's records on those who received a matriculation certificate or a B.A. degree. The analysis was carried out separately for each of four ethno-religious groups in Israel, namely, Jews, Muslims, Christians and Druze, distinguishing also between women and men within each group. We examined how the resources various groups have affect the importance of family and parental resources for educational success in matriculation and achieving an academic degree.

Before we discuss the differences among the groups, we should note that the overall findings of this study suggest that class position was still an important factor in determining the attainment of educational credentials of children born in 1975-1985 in Israel. This conclusion is true for all ethno-religious groups, but some reservations will be discussed below. Although we do not have data to compare this result with earlier cohorts, the magnitude of the effects lends support to the reproduction approach that emphasizes the persistence of gaps in educational access in many societies in spite of the expansion of educational systems and their alleged openness in past decades (Shavit and Blossfeld 1993).

Comparing the family background effects on achieving a matriculation certificate with those on achieving an academic degree within the same ethno-religious group, reveals that family characteristics had a larger influence on the acquisition of academic degrees than on the attainment of the matriculation certificate. This is an important finding as it reveals the increasing power of social origin as people move up the educational ladder. This implies that the higher the educational level to be attained, the greater the impact of social origin becomes in the process. To some extent, this finding confirms the Maximally Maintained Inequality (MMI) hypothesis (Raftery and Hout 1993) discussed previously in the article.¹² Since high-school education and a matriculation certificate have become accessible to wider strata, a higher level of education has become more crucial in the labor market and at that level, inequality is larger than in those below it.

Comparing the effects of family characteristics on educational attainment *among* ethno-religious groups, we see that fewer of those variables improved Christian and Druze children's (both girls and boys) odds of passing matriculation and obtaining an academic degree than those of Muslim and Jewish children. For example, log income per person did not have a significant effect on Druze boys' educational attainment and on Christians' chances of obtaining a B.A. Having a mother who was enrolled in non-manual work improved Muslim and Jewish kids' chances of obtaining matriculation and a B.A. degree, but had no effect on Druze and Christian boys and girls. Druze were also the only group whose educational success was not affected by their mothers' education. Similarly, having a father who worked in non-manual job improved Muslim and Jewish kids' chances of obtaining matriculation and a B.A. degree, but had no effect on Druze boys and on Christian boys' odds of passing matriculation. We believe that these outcomes support our expectation that ethnic capital makes families' resources less crucial for educational attainment by offsetting the negative impact of economic hardships and parents' low education, consistent with the ethnic capital hypothesis.

Concerning Christians, the above findings fit our expectation based on the availability of private schools run by churches and Christian communities. These schools provide much better education for Israeli Palestinians than the public system and although they are open to all Arabic speakers, they are very expensive, a fact that reinforces class inequality. Yet church organizations help their own low-income community members to pay for their children, which may explain why family background variables have a smaller impact on Christian children than on Muslims, lending support to the ethnic capital hypothesis.

The Druze were also found to be less dependent on family background, a finding which we attribute to the cohesiveness of Druze communities. This cohesiveness is a form of ethnic capital that may support community members who suffer from economic distress. Muslim community organizations also support their members, but in a large, diverse, and geographically dispersed group such as the Muslim society in Israel, the ability of those organizations to reach out to all those who need help is more limited. The Druze, in contrast, are concentrated in few villages, and their community organizations work more closely together than the diverse Muslim organizations. Due to Druze' political ties with the state, the Druze community has also greater control than other Palestinian communities over the public education in their communities, and this is another kind of a community asset that reduces school children's dependence on family resources. Indeed, due to their political standing, Druze schools may also get more state resources than other Palestinian schools, and we cannot rule out this explanation, but it should be noted that Druze children depend less on family resources than Jewish children as well, and this result cannot be explained by their positive discrimination related to Muslim and Christian Palestinians.

The economic standing of the family and parents' education and labor-market positions had very much the same influence on Muslim and Jewish children. We believe that this finding is the result of the two forces mentioned in our portrayal of the Israeli society. While Jewish schools benefit from more material resources than Palestinian schools, the educational segregation protects Palestinian boys and girls from direct competition with children from affluent Jewish families. Jewish children from disadvantaged background have to compete with those from more prosperous families, and this competition may hinder their academic performance.

Finally, an additional important finding that has been revealed by this study is the importance of mothers' socio-economic backgrounds on their children's educational attainment. Many studies have typically used fathers' socio-economic background to predict

respondents' educational attainment and social inequality. It appears that mothers' educational achievements and occupational positions are as crucial in predicting children's educational attainments. For many groups, including mothers' social background improves the prediction of educational attainment (Korupp, Ganzeboom and Van Der Lippe 2002, Reeder and Conger 1984, Rothon 2008). The present study shows that mothers' social and economic background is crucial and has to be included in the analysis in order to better understand educational attainment and help explaining the persistence of educational inequality in Israel.

Further research is required in order to examine the time dimension by inspecting the importance of family background on other cohorts of young women and men. Nevertheless, we believe that our analysis adds to the scarce literature on the interaction of class and ethnicity and draws the attention to class gaps within ethnic and racial minorities, gaps that might be responsible for the fact that ethnic disparities persist in spite of various efforts to curb them.

7. ENDNOTES

1 We use the term "ethno-religious groups" to emphasize that due to the social distance between Druze, Christians, Muslims, and Jews, each religious group might also be categorized as an ethnic group.

3 Due to pressure to equalize higher-education opportunities, the vocational schools added matriculation-bound tracks, but passing rates are much lower than in the academic schools (Ayalon and Shavit 2004).

4 The state also funds a special system for ultra-orthodox Jews in which, in contrast to the above-mentioned divisions, it has no say in the curriculum and no supervision responsibility.

5 The data concerning the higher education system is taken from a report issued by the Knesset Information Center in 2009 (in Hebrew), <http://www.knesset.gov.il/mmm/data/pdf/m02282.pdf>, retrieved Sep. 1, 2016.

6 The Israeli census includes information on marital status, number of children and their age, education, work characteristics, location of residence and employment, household appliances, and income.

7 We found that there were a few records in which teenage subjects were listed as "head of household". We assume this happened when the teenagers were interviewed by the Central Bureau of Statistics personnel, probably because parents were unavailable or had language and communication problems. Since it was impossible to decide when a teenager was indeed the head of the household or a child thereof, we excluded those few cases from our analysis.

⁸ Ministry of Education's data regarding academic graduation refer to Israeli academic institution only. Since many Arab Israeli men study abroad (Arar and Haj-Yehia 2016), their rates of graduation are underestimated in this study.

9 The matching was carried out by the Central Bureau of Statistics under strict conditions to ensure subjects' privacy.

10 The exchange rate in 1995 was around 3 NIS per American dollar.

11 Notice that income per person had no significant effect on Druze sons' matriculation, and computer possession had no effect on Christian daughters' matriculation.

12 Since we did not have information on high-school tracks, type of matriculation, and fields of academic study, we could not test Lucas' EMI hypothesis.

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu-Saad, I. (2004). Separate and unequal: The role of the state educational system in maintaining the subordination of Israel's Palestinian Arab citizens. *Social Identities*, 10(1), 101-127.
- Abu-Saad, I. (2006). Palestinian education in Israel: The legacy of the military government. *Holy Land Studies*, 5(1), 21-56.
- Al-Haj, M. (1995). Education, *empowerment, and control: The case of the Arabs in Israel*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Al-Haj, M. (2003). Higher education among the Arabs in Israel: Formal policy between empowerment and control. *Higher Education Policy*, 16(3), 351-368.
- Arar, K. & K. Haj-Yehia. (2016). *Higher education and the Palestinian Arab minority in Israel*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ayalon, H., & Shavit, Y. (2004). Educational reforms and inequalities in Israel: The MMI hypothesis revisited. *Sociology of Education* 77(2), 103-120.
- Ball, S., Reay, D. & David, M. (2002). 'Ethnic choosing': Minority ethnic students, social class and higher education choice. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 5(4), 333-357.
- Ballarino, G., Bernardi, F., Requena, M. & Schadee, H. (2009). Persistent inequalities? Expansion of education and class inequality in Italy and Spain. *European Sociological Review*, 25(1), 123-138.
- Bar-Haim, E. & Shavit, Y. (2013). Expansion and inequality of educational opportunity: A comparative study. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 31, 22-31.
- Bäumel, Y. (2007). *A Blue and White Shadow*. Haifa: Pardes. (Hebrew)
- Bell, D. (1973). *The Coming of post-industrial society: A venture in social forecasting*. New York: Basic Books.
- Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (1967). *The American occupational structure*. New York: Wiley.
- Borgna, C., & Contini, D. (2014). Migrant achievement Penalties in Western Europe: Do educational systems matter? *European Sociological Review*, 30(5), 670-683.
- Borjas, G. J. (1999). Immigration and welfare magnets. *Journal of labor economics*, 17(4), 607-637.
- Boudon, R. (1974). *Education, opportunity and social inequality: Changing prospects in Western society*. New York: Wiley.
- Bowles, S., & Herbert G. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Breen, R., & Jonsson, J. O. (2000). Analyzing educational careers: A multinomial transition model. *American Sociological Review*, 65(5), 754-772.
- Breen, R., & Jonsson, J. O. (2005). Inequality of opportunity in comparative perspective: Recent research on educational attainment and social mobility. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31: 223-243.
- Breen, R., Ruud, L., Müller, W., & Reinhard, P. 2009. (2009). Nonpersistent inequality in educational attainment: Evidence from eight European countries. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(5), 1475-1521.
- Cameron, S. V., & Heckman, J. J. (2001). The dynamics of educational attainment for Black, Hispanic, and White males. *Journal of Political Economy*, 109(3), 455-499.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (1997), Statistical Abstract of Israel 1997.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (2017), Statistical Abstract of Israel 2016.
- Cohen, Y., Haberfeld, Y., & Kristal, T. (2007). Ethnicity and mixed ethnicity: Educational gaps among Israeli-born Israelis. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(5), 896-917.
- Coursen-Neff, Z. (2003). Discrimination against Palestinian Arab children in the Israeli education system. *International Law and Politics*, 36: 101-162.

- Duncan, G. J., Yeung, W. J., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Smith, J. R. (1998). How much does childhood poverty affect the life chances of children? *American Sociological Review*, 63(3), 406-423.
- Durkheim, E. (1933). *The division of labor in society*. Trans. George Simpson. New York: Free Press.
- Ermisch, J., & Francesconi, M. (2001). Family matters: Impacts of family background on educational attainments. *Economica*, 68(270), 137-156.
- Ermisch, J., & Pronzato, C. (2010). Causal effects of parents' education on children's education. No. 2010-16, ISER Working Paper Series. Colchester: ISER.
- Featherman, D., & Hauser, R. M. (1978). *Opportunity and change*. New York: Academic Press.
- Firro, K. M. (1999). *The Druzes in the Jewish state: A brief history*. Leiden: Brill.
- Firro, K. M. (2001). Reshaping Druze particularism in Israel. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 30(3), 40-53.
- Fleischmann, F., Deboosere, P., Neels, K., & Phalet, K. (2013). From ethnic capital to ethnic educational inequality: How family and co-ethnic neighbourhood resources affect second-generation attainment in Belgium. *European Sociological Review*, 29(6), 1239-1250.
- Frisch, H. (1993). The Druze minority in the Israeli Military: Traditionalizing an ethnic policing role. *Armed Forces*, 20(1), 51-67.
- Fuchs, H. (2017). Education and employment among young Arab Israelis. *State of the nation report: Society, economy and policy in Israel*, 259-310.
- Ghanem, A. (2001). *The Palestinian Arab minority in Israel: A political study*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Golan-Agnon, D. (2006). Separate but not equal: Discrimination against Arab Palestinian students in Israel. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(8), 1075-1084.
- Hajjar, L. (2001). Speaking the conflict, or how the Druze became bilingual: A study of Druze translators in the Israeli military courts in the West Bank and Gaza. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23(2), 299-328.
- Halsey, A. H., Heath, A., & Ridge, J. M. (1980). *Origins and destinations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Haveman, R., & Wolfe, B. (1995). The determinants of children's attainments: A review of methods and findings. *Journal of economic literature*, 33(4), 1829-1878.
- Henz, U., & I. Maas. (1995). Chancengleichheit durch die Bildungsexpansion? *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 47(4), 605-633.
- Hout, M. (2015). A summary of what we know about social mobility. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 657, 27-636.
- Jabareen, Y. (2006). Law and education: Critical perspectives on Arab Palestinian education in Israel. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(8), 1052-1074.
- Kalekin-Fishman, D. (2004). *Ideology, policy and practice: Education for immigrants and minorities in Israel today*. New York: Kluwer.
- Karabel, J., & Halsey, A. H. (Eds.). (1977). *Power and ideology in education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Khattab, N., Johnston, R., Modood, M., & Sirkeci, I. (2011). Economic activity in the South-Asian population in Britain: The impact of ethnicity, religion, and class. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(9), 1466-1481.
- Khazzoom, A. (2003). The great chain of orientalism: Jewish identity, stigma management, and ethnic exclusion in Israel. *American Sociological Review*, 68(4), 481-510.
- Korupp, S. E., Ganzeboom, H. B. G., & Lippe, T. v. d. (2002). Do mothers matter? A comparison of models of the influence of mothers' and fathers' educational and occupational status on children's educational attainment. *Quality and Quantity*, 36(1), 17-42.

- Kraus, V., & Yonay, Y. P. (2000). The power and limits of ethnonationalism: Palestinians and Eastern Jews in Israel, 1974-1991. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(3), 525-551.
- Kraus, V., & Yonay, Y. P. (2018). *Facing barriers: Palestinian women in a Jewish-dominated labor market*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawrence, M., & Breen, R. (2005). And their children after them? The effect of college on educational reproduction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 122(2), 532-572.
- Lee, J., & Zhou, M. (2014). The success frame and achievement paradox: The costs and consequences for Asian Americans. *Race and Social Problems*, 6(1), 38-55.
- Li, Y., & Heath, A. (2016). Class matters: A study of minority and majority social mobility in Britain, 1982–2011. *American Journal of Sociology*, 122(1):162-200.
- Lucas, S. R. (2001). Effectively maintained inequality: Education transitions, track mobility, and social background effects. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(6), 1642-90.
- McGahern, U. (2011). *Palestinian Christians in Israel: State attitudes towards non-Muslims in a Jewish State*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Mare, R. D. (1981). Change and stability in educational stratification. *American Sociological Review*, 46(1), 72-87.
- Miaari, S., & Khatib, N. (2013). The persistent wage gaps between Palestinians and Jews in Israel, 1997-2009. In N. Khatib and S. Miaari (Eds.), *Palestinians in the Israeli labor market: A multi-disciplinary approach* (61-84). New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Mizrachi, N., & Herzog, H. (2012). Participatory destigmatization strategies among Palestinian citizens, Ethiopian Jews and Mizrahi Jews in Israel. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(3), 418-435.
- Modood, T. (2003). Ethnic differences in educational performance. In D. Mason (Ed.), *Explaining ethnic differences: Changing patterns of disadvantage in Britain* (53-67). Bristol: Policy Press.
- Modood, T. (2004). Capitals, ethnic identity and educational qualifications. *Cultural Trends*, 13(2), 87-105.
- Müller, W., & Karle, W. (1993). Social selection in educational systems in Europe. *European Sociological Review*, 9(1), 1-23.
- Müller, W., & Haun, D. (1994). Bildungsungleichheit Im Sozialen Wandel. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 46(1), 1-42.
- Nam, Y., & Huang, J. (2011). Changing roles of parental economic resources in children's educational attainment. *Social Work Research*, 35(4), 203-213.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Oakes, J., & Rogers, J. (2006). *Learning power: Organizing for education and justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Okun, B. S., & Friedlander, D. (2005). Educational stratification among Arabs and Jews in Israel: Historical disadvantage, discrimination, and opportunity. *Population Studies*, 59(2), 163-180.
- Pappé, I. (2011). *The Forgotten Palestinians: A history of the Palestinians in Israel*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Parsons, T. (1970). Equality and inequality in modern society, or social stratification revisited. *Sociological Inquiry*, 40(2), 13-72.
- Platt, L. (2005). The intergenerational social mobility of minority ethnic groups. *Sociology*, 39(3), 445-461.
- Raftery, A. E., & Hout, M. (1993). Maximally maintained inequality: Expansion, reform, and opportunity in Irish education, 1921-75. *Sociology of Education*, 66(1), 41-62.
- Reeder, A. L., & Conger, R. D. (1984). Differential mother and father influences on the educational attainment of Black and White women. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 25(2), 239-250.

- Rothon, C. (2007). Can achievement differentials be explained by social class alone? An examination of minority ethnic educational performance in England and Wales at the end of compulsory schooling. *Ethnicities*, 7(3), 306-322.
- Rothon, C. (2008). Women, men and social class revisited: An assessment of the utility of a 'combined' scheme in the context of minority ethnic educational achievement in Britain. *Sociology*, 42(4), 691-708.
- Rotman, A., Shavit, Y., & Shalev, M. (2016). Nominal and positional perspectives on educational stratification in Israel. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 43, 17-24.
- Sewell, W. H., & Hauser, R. M. (1975). Education, occupation, and earnings. Achievement in the early career.
- Shavit, Y. (1990). Segregation, tracking, and the educational attainment of minorities: Arabs and Oriental Jews in Israel. *American Sociological Review*, 55(1), 115-126.
- Shavit, Y., & Blossfeld, H. P. (Eds.). (1993). *Persistent inequality: Changing educational attainment in thirteen countries*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Shavit, Y., Yaish, M., and Bar-Haim, E. (2007). The persistence of persistent inequality. In S. Scherer, R. Pollak, G. Otte, & M. Gangl (Ed.), *Origin to Destination: Trends and Mechanisms in Social Stratification Research*, (37-57). Frankfurt/Main: Campus.
- Shdema, I. (2012). The role of socio-economic factors in changing relations between Muslim and Christian Arabs in Israel between 1967 and 2010. *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 23(4), 515-530.
- Shenhav, Y. (2006). *The Arab Jews: A postcolonial reading of nationalism, religion, and ethnicity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 417-453.
- Smooha, S. (2002). The model of ethnic democracy: Israel as a Jewish and democratic state. *Nations and Nationalism*, 8(4), 475-503.
- Strand, S. (2014). Ethnicity, gender, social class and achievement gaps at age 16: Intersectionality and 'getting it' for the White working class. *Research Papers in Education*, 29(2), 131-171.
- Treiman, D. J. (1970). Industrialization and social stratification. *Sociological Inquiry*, 40(2): 207-234.
- Vallet, L. A. (2004). Change in intergenerational class mobility in France from the 1970s to the 1990s and its explanation: An analysis following the Casmin approach. In R. Breen (Ed.), *Social Mobility in Europe* (115-148). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yaish, M. (2001). Class structure in a deeply divided society: Class and ethnic inequality in Israel, 1974-1991. *British journal of Sociology*, 52(3), 409-439.
- Yiftachel, O. (2006). *Ethnocracy: Land, politics and identities in Israel/Palestine*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Yonay, Y. P., & Kraus, V. (2017). The role of the state and the pliability of tradition: Israeli Palestinian and Middle-Eastern Jewish women in the labor force. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 50, 29-39.

Tables

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

		Jews	Muslims	Christians	Druze
Panel A: Last educational level attended in 2012					
Sons					
Secondary or less		48.34	73.40	50.49	65.57
Matriculation		20.64	18.28	29.86	24.01
BA+		31.02	8.32	19.65	10.43
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N		N=30,582	N=12,530	N=1,832	N=1,937
Daughters'					
Secondary or less		35.00	59.87	33.95	55.02
Matriculation		21.58	21.22	30.21	26.76
BA+		43.43	18.91	35.85	18.22
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N		N=30,210	N=11,180	N=1,738	N=1, 674
Panel B: Mean income per person in the household in 1995					
No income		0.98	2.17	2.07	0.69
Median or less		28.55	77.47	50.67	70.95
Higher than median		70.47	20.36	47.25	28.36
		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean income per person in household		2,128 (S.D=2,198)	701.5 (S.D=792)	1,277 (S.D=1,486)	813.6 (S.D=1,089)
Panel C: A computer in the household in 1995					
Have computer		55.54	14.43	29.72	17.17
Panel D: Father's last certificate in 1995					
Did not study		1.37	10.13	2.66	3.53
No certificate		31.79	70.22	59.72	60.94
Secondary or matriculation		36.08	10.32	18.07	22.45
Tertiary		30.75	9.33	19.55	13.07
		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Panel E: Mother's last certificate in 1995					
Did not study		1.59	22.64	4.12	14.03
No certificate		26.31	64.17	51.06	78.23
Secondary or matriculation		39.92	9.17	28.29	5.52
Tertiary		32.18	4.02	16.53	2.22
		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Panel F: Father's labor-force standing in 1995					
Non-manual		43.03	16.08	27.03	22.24
Manual		43.04	58.20	57.37	51.98
Not in the labor force		13.93	25.72	15.60	25.78
		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Panel G: Mother's labor-force standing in 1995					
Non-manual		55.64	5.12	25.80	4.90
Manual		14.32	5.40	10.90	17.11
Not in the labor force		30.04	89.48	63.31	77.98
		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Panel H: Age in 1995					
Age		14.71	14.54	14.72	14.42
Father's age		45.11	45.73	46.91	45.12
Mother's age		41.88	41.40	41.36	40.98

Table 2: Multinomial regressions predicting educational attainments by gender and ethnic group, log-odds coefficients

	Jews		Muslims		Christians		Druze	
A. Sons								
Educational attainment	Matriculation	B.A.	Matriculation	B.A.	Matriculation	B.A.	Matriculation	B.A.
Father's education								
No schooling	-0.225* (0.058)	-0.388 (0.200)	-0.419** (0.105)	-0.470** (0.169)	-0.112 (0.364)	0.034 (0.617)	-0.088 (0.367)	-0.168 (0.556)
Secondary education	0.370** (0.040)	0.588** (0.041)	0.273** (0.080)	0.539** (0.105)	0.297 (0.162)	0.653** (0.187)	0.191 (0.156)	0.835** (0.217)
Tertiary education	0.710** (0.048)	1.188** (0.047)	0.866** (0.087)	1.141** (0.109)	0.543** (0.195)	1.095** (0.217)	0.900* (0.208)	1.543** (0.261)
Father's occupation								
Non-manual occupations	0.082* (0.036)	0.166** (0.034)	0.167* (0.071)	0.276** (0.095)	0.019 (0.155)	0.347* (0.176)	-0.120 (0.163)	0.256 (0.228)
Not in the labor force	-0.254** (0.051)	-0.080 (0.051)	-0.080 (0.068)	-0.155** (0.106)	-0.139 (0.183)	-0.250 (0.244)	-0.053 (0.147)	0.280 (0.213)
Mather's education								
No schooling	-0.032 (0.151)	-0.239 (0.186)	-0.086 (0.070)	-0.171 (0.108)	-0.229 (0.328)	-2.226* (0.995)	-0.454* (0.194)	-0.305 (0.273)
Secondary education	0.205** (0.042)	0.372** (0.043)	0.460** (0.083)	0.429** (0.109)	0.408** (0.141)	0.598** (0.173)	0.063 (0.269)	-0.060 (0.361)
Tertiary education	0.506** (0.050)	0.933** (0.049)	0.650** (0.139)	0.794** (0.167)	0.520** (0.200)	0.705** (0.243)	-0.187 (0.474)	-0.797 (0.594)
Mother's occupation								
Non-manual occupations	0.184** (0.049)	0.350** (0.049)	0.355* (0.155)	0.532** (0.201)	0.046 (0.218)	0.198 (0.260)	0.135 (0.350)	0.117 (0.453)
Not in the labor force	-0.009 (0.051)	0.098 (0.062)	0.169 (0.112)	0.213 (0.163)	0.070 (0.180)	0.015 (0.236)	-0.185 (0.208)	-0.696** (0.250)
Family characteristics								
Log income per person in the household	0.117** (0.016)	0.293** (0.020)	0.125** (0.023)	0.165** (0.034)	0.133* (0.056)	0.108 (0.071)	0.061 (0.052)	0.096 (0.067)
Computer in the household	0.580** (0.035)	0.840** (0.034)	0.764** (0.067)	1.010** (0.086)	0.704** (0.135)	0.987** (0.149)	0.484** (0.1491)	0.578** (0.198)
Constant	1.775 (0.792)	-9.392 (0.849)	1.644 (0.961)	-3.284 (1.396)	-0.026 (2.736)	-13.195 (3.733)	3.013 (2.217)	-6.224 (3.508)
Observations	30,582		12,530		1,832		1,937	
B. Daughters	Jews		Muslims		Christians		Druze	

Educational attainment	Matriculation	B.A.	Matriculation	B.A.	Matriculation	B.A.	Matriculation	B.A.
Father's education								
No schooling	-0.178 (0.140)	-0.196 (0.160)	-0.352** (0.103)	-0.355** (0.124)	0.007 (0.398)	-0.058 (0.456)	0.466 (0.384)	-1.072 (0.778)
Secondary education	0.253** (0.039)	0.558** (0.037)	0.345** (0.081)	0.579** (0.084)	0.072 (0.191)	0.087 (0.186)	0.575** (0.164)	0.627** (0.194)
Tertiary education	0.453** (0.051)	1.032** (0.045)	0.416** (0.106)	1.084** (0.099)	0.541* (0.224)	0.476* (0.210)	1.072* (0.238)	1.248** (0.256)
Father's occupation								
Non-manual occupations	0.034 (0.038)	0.062 (0.034)	0.101 (0.075)	0.122 (0.078)	-0.378 (0.200)	0.021 (0.167)	0.291 (0.170)	0.376* (0.160)
Not in the labor force	-0.432** (0.050)	-0.360** (0.047)	-0.139* (0.067)	-0.058 (0.078)	-0.218 (0.185)	-0.253 (0.209)	-0.165 (0.159)	-0.021 (0.191)
Mother's education								
No schooling	0.040 (0.127)	-0.004 (0.144)	-0.346** (0.070)	-0.469** (0.087)	-0.262 (0.304)	-0.195 (0.333)	-0.415 (0.221)	-0.500 (0.270)
Secondary education	0.209** (0.041)	0.479** (0.040)	0.506** (0.093)	0.867** (0.090)	0.510** (0.166)	0.896** (0.164)	-0.293 (0.324)	0.576 (0.300)
Tertiary education	0.142** (0.083)	0.779** (0.047)	0.591** (0.173)	1.069** (0.168)	0.379 (0.252)	0.993** (0.232)	-0.508 (0.586)	0.396 (0.551)
Mother's occupation								
Non-manual occupations	0.289** (0.049)	0.373** (0.045)	0.259 (0.168)	0.586** (0.175)	0.079 (0.252)	0.201 (0.239)	0.075 (0.432)	0.326 (0.433)
Not in the labor force	-0.005 (0.049)	-0.053 (0.047)	-0.059 (0.105)	0.223 (0.121)	0.227 (0.202)	0.174 (0.202)	-0.640** (0.222)	-0.667* (0.269)
Family characteristics								
Log income per person in the household	0.094** (0.014)	0.307** (0.018)	0.146** (0.023)	0.283** (0.031)	0.144** (0.048)	0.281** (0.061)	0.117* (0.050)	0.262* (0.073)
Computer in the household	0.463** (0.035)	0.773** (0.032)	0.504** (0.075)	0.833** (0.075)	0.147 (0.160)	0.545** (0.151)	0.789** (0.179)	0.596** (0.199)
Constant	3.183 (0.812)	-6.572 (0.814)	-5.986 (0.966)	-3.708 (1.185)	0.881 (2.992)	-4.300 (3.023)	5.122 (2.338)	2.946 (3.205)
Observations	30,210		11,180		1,738		1,674	

** p<0.01, * p<0.05; standard errors in parentheses. Prediction is relative to subjects' secondary education and less. In parents' education, the reference group is elementary education; in parents' occupation, the reference group is manual work. Controlled also for subjects' and parents' age and age squared.

Appendix: Additional Figures and Tables

Appendix 1A: Multinomial regressions predicting educational attainments by gender, interaction with ethno-religious groups, log-odds coefficients

	Sons		Daughters	
Educational attainment	Matriculation	B.A.	Matriculation	B.A.
Muslim X Father's education				
No schooling	-0.203 (0.189)	0.023 (0.259)	-0.175 (0.173)	-0.147 (0.202)
Secondary education	-0.097 (0.089)	0.025 (0.114)	0.110 (0.090)	0.050 (0.092)
Tertiary education	0.139 (0.100)	0.001 (0.119)	-0.040 (0.11)	0.066 (0.110)
Muslim X Father's occupation				
Non-manual occupations	0.074 (0.080)	0.122 (0.101)	0.066 (0.085)	0.069 (0.086)
Not in the labor force	0.149 (0.085)	-0.024 (0.114)	0.291** (0.083)	0.295** (0.090)
Muslim X Mather's education				
No schooling	-0.092 (0.163)	-0.026 (0.211)	-0.385** (0.14)	-0.531** (0.165)
Secondary education	0.244** (0.092)	0.178 (0.118)	0.328** (0.10)	0.463** (0.098)
Tertiary education	0.095 (0.148)	-0.073 (0.176)	0.461** (0.180)	0.321 (0.174)
Muslim X Mother's occupation				
Non-manual occupations	0.171 (0.162)	0.173 (0.208)	-0.032 (0.175)	0.215 (0.182)
Not in the labor force	0.175 (0.123)	0.142 (0.170)	-0.038 (0.116)	0.306* (0.130)
Muslim X Family characteristics				
Log income per person in household	0.011 (0.028)	-0.131** (0.040)	0.056* (0.028)	-0.016 (0.037)
Computer in the household	0.184* (0.075)	0.171* (0.093)	0.028 (0.083)	0.049 (0.082)
Christians X Father's education				
No schooling	0.139 (0.396)	0.287 (0.650)	0.083 (0.423)	0.198 (0.476)
Secondary education	-0.138 (0.163)	0.067 (0.191)	-0.269 (0.190)	-0.475** (0.187)
Tertiary education	-0.242 (0.199)	-0.088 (0.223)	0.045 (0.228)	-0.559** (0.213)
Christians X Father's occupation				
Non-manual occupations	-0.016 (0.158)	0.212 (0.180)	-0.409* (0.184)	-0.015 (0.169)
Not in the labor force	0.171 (0.185)	-0.250 (0.251)	0.190 (0.185)	0.059 (0.210)
Christians X Mather's education				
No schooling	-0.257 (0.354)	-2.033* (1.006)	-0.313 (0.326)	-0.206 (0.362)
Secondary education	0.208	0.274	0.261	0.479**

	(0.146)	(0.178)	(0.167)	(0.166)
Tertiary education	-0.025 (0.219)	-0.219 (0.251)	0.110 (0.251)	0.137 (0.231)
Christians X Mother's occupation				
Non-manual occupations	-0.122 (0.222)	-0.144 (0.268)	-0.197 (0.253)	-0.143 (0.243)
Not in the labor force	0.080 (0.186)	-0.103 (0.244)	0.227 (0.204)	0.242 (0.208)
Christians X Family characteristics				
Log income per person in household	0.011 (0.059)	-0.178** (0.071)	0.048 (0.050)	-0.026 (0.064)
Computer in the household	0.140 (0.139)	0.176 (0.153)	-0.292 (0.162)	-0.196 (0.153)
Druze X Father's education				
No schooling	0.111 (0.386)	0.266 (0.581)	0.541 (0.393)	-0.714 (0.773)
Secondary education	-0.231 (0.157)	0.178 (0.216)	0.342* (0.167)	0.004 (0.194)
Tertiary education	0.129 (0.212)	0.342 (0.260)	0.582** (0.243)	0.155 (0.256)
Druze X Father's occupation				
Non-manual occupations	-0.176 (0.166)	0.112 (0.225)	0.239 (0.179)	0.320 (0.198)
Not in the labor force	0.202 (0.154)	0.380 (0.214)	0.292 (0.165)	0.340 (0.194)
Druze X Mather's education				
No schooling	-0.344 (0.237)	-0.007 (0.321)	-0.381 (0.249)	-0.428 (0.293)
Secondary education	-0.191 (0.267)	-0.450 (0.351)	-0.471 (0.331)	0.197 (0.319)
Tertiary education	-0.743 (0.478)	-1.683** (0.597)	-0.629 (0.595)	-0.336 (0.553)
Druze X Mother's occupation				
Non-manual occupations	0.018 (0.348)	-0.189 (0.446)	-0.285 (0.431)	-0.024 (0.428)
Not in the labor force	-0.145 (0.210)	-0.763** (0.263)	-0.702** (0.224)	-0.593* (0.269)
Druze X Family characteristics				
Log income per person in household	-0.066 (0.054)	-0.223** (0.067)	0.040 (0.059)	-0.059 (0.077)
Computer in the household	-0.093 (0.152)	-0.239 (0.199)	0.301 (0.183)	-0.181 (0.202)
Constant	1.716** (0.570)	-7.849** (0.712)	4.346** (0.588)	-5.188** (0.640)
Observations	46,881		44,802	

** p<0.01, * p<0.05; standard errors in parentheses. Prediction is relative to subjects' secondary education and less. In parents' education, the reference group is elementary education; in parents' occupation, the reference group is manual work. Controlled also for subjects' and parents' age and age squared and for ethno-religious affiliation.

Appendix 1B: Multinomial regressions predicting educational attainments by gender, interaction with gender, log-odds coefficients

	Jews		Muslims		Christians		Druze	
Educational attainment	Matriculation	B.A.	Matriculation	B.A.	Matriculation	B.A.	Matriculation	B.A.
Male X Father's education								
No schooling	-0.090 (0.210)	-0.199 (0.256)	-0.118 (0.146)	-0.067 (0.206)	-0.122 (0.539)	0.072 (0.760)	-0.583 (0.525)	0.805 (0.952)
Secondary education	0.125 * (0.056)	0.018 (0.055)	-0.098 (0.114)	-0.029 (0.133)	0.257 (0.245)	0.536* (0.262)	-0.453* (0.221)	0.162 (0.288)
Tertiary education	0.276** (0.070)	0.138* (0.065)	0.438** (0.137)	0.051 (0.147)	0.027 (0.296)	0.616* (0.302)	-0.173 (0.314)	0.298 (0.362)
Male X Father's occupation								
Non-manual occupations	0.046 (0.053)	0.099* (0.049)	0.049 (0.103)	0.150 (0.122)	0.396 (0.237)	0.297 (0.241)	-0.387 (0.237)	-0.091 (0.300)
Not in the labor force	0.162* (0.071)	0.253** (0.068)	0.132 (0.094)	-0.081 (0.128)	0.107 (0.253)	-0.010 (0.317)	0.108 (0.214)	0.293 (0.283)
Male X Mather's education								
No schooling	-0.064 (0.194)	-0.224 (0.232)	0.245* (0.096)	0.270* (0.132)	0.039 (0.441)	-2.153* (1.045)	-0.003 (0.284)	0.186 (0.373)
Secondary education	0.010 (0.059)	-0.133* (0.058)	-0.086 (0.123)	-0.436** (0.140)	-0.083 (0.216)	-0.331 (0.236)	0.247 (0.419)	-0.768 (0.475)
Tertiary education	0.392** (0.071)	0.109 (0.067)	0.027 (0.221)	-0.313 (0.236)	0.204 (0.328)	-0.284 (0.332)	0.240 (0.750)	-1.307 (0.808)
Male X Mother's occupation								
Non-manual occupations	-0.102 (0.070)	-0.024 (0.067)	0.090 (0.228)	-0.060 (0.266)	-0.037 (0.331)	0.000 (0.352)	0.159 (0.550)	-0.158 (0.620)
Not in the labor force	0.003 (0.070)	0.148 (0.071)	-0.211 (0.154)	-0.003 (0.203)	-0.166 (0.269)	-0.198 (0.311)	0.547 (0.297)	0.009 (0.377)
Male X Family characteristics								
Log income per person in household	0.021 (0.022)	-0.004 (0.027)	-0.012 (0.033)	-0.127** (0.046)	-0.014 (0.073)	-0.168 (0.094)	-0.074 (0.076)	-0.167 (0.097)
Computer in the household	0.132** (0.050)	0.039 (0.046)	0.284** (0.100)	0.189 (0.114)	0.551** (0.208)	0.466* (0.212)	-0.285 (0.232)	-0.012 (0.280)
Constant	2.922 (0.570)	-7.355 (0.591)	4.214 (0.689)	-3.355 (0.924)	0.201 (2.003)	-7.881 (2.320)	4.312 (1.601)	-1.107 (2.377)
Observations	60,792		23,710		3,570		3,611	

** p<0.01, * p<0.05; standard errors in parentheses. Prediction is relative to subjects' secondary education and less. In parents' education, the reference group is elementary education; in parents' occupation, the reference group is manual work. Controlled also for subjects' and parents' age and age squared and for gender.