

Bennett, Patrick; Botros, Jessica

Working Paper

Intergenerational Mobility, Economic Shocks, and the Role of Human Capital

CESifo Working Paper, No. 11527

Provided in Cooperation with:

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Bennett, Patrick; Botros, Jessica (2024) : Intergenerational Mobility, Economic Shocks, and the Role of Human Capital, CESifo Working Paper, No. 11527, CESifo GmbH, Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/308423>

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.

Intergenerational Mobility, Economic Shocks, and the Role of Human Capital

Patrick Bennett, Jessica Botros

Impressum:

CESifo Working Papers

ISSN 2364-1428 (electronic version)

Publisher and distributor: Munich Society for the Promotion of Economic Research - CESifo GmbH

The international platform of Ludwigs-Maximilians University's Center for Economic Studies and the ifo Institute

Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany

Telephone +49 (0)89 2180-2740, Telefax +49 (0)89 2180-17845, email office@cesifo.de

Editor: Clemens Fuest

<https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp>

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- from the SSRN website: www.SSRN.com
- from the RePEc website: www.RePEc.org
- from the CESifo website: <https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp>

Intergenerational Mobility, Economic Shocks, and the Role of Human Capital

Abstract

How do economic shocks at labor market entry shape patterns of intergenerational mobility? Both family background and negative shocks matter for future labor market success, and these two forces interact with each other. Negative economic shocks disproportionately harm those from disadvantaged backgrounds and, as a result, a one standard deviation increase in unemployment causes an 11–15% decrease in intergenerational mobility. Mobility decreases as higher unemployment widens the pre-existing gap in university education by socioeconomic status, and we show that differences in human capital are a key factor which explain rates of both relative and absolute mobility.

Patrick Bennett

University of Liverpool / United Kingdom

Patrick.Bennett@liverpool.ac.uk

Jessica Botros

University of Liverpool / United Kingdom

j.botros@liverpool.ac.uk

October 2024

The authors acknowledge financial support from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

1 Introduction

In many countries, the dream of upward mobility appears to be fading, with “sticky floors” prevailing as a significant barrier. This term describes the phenomenon where children born into poverty face substantial challenges in ascending the economic ladder, while those born into wealth enjoy a considerable advantage. On the one hand, the concept of a level playing field and equality of opportunity has gained increased importance in contemporary society. There is a growing emphasis that every individual should have the opportunity to achieve economic prosperity, irrespective of their parental background. However, in most countries, achieving this ideal remains a distant reality marked by varying levels of intergenerational mobility. The increase in relative upward mobility among cohorts born between 1955 and 1975 in OECD countries was followed by stagnation for individuals born after 1975 (OECD, 2018).

In this paper, we offer a novel perspective on the extent of intergenerational persistence in disadvantage by asking how economic shocks shape intergenerational mobility. Both growing up in a family with a low socioeconomic standard and facing adverse macroeconomic conditions after graduation are factors an individual cannot influence. No one chooses in which type of family they are born and no individual decision can shape the condition of the national economy at the time of labor market entry. Both factors, however, greatly shape the economic future of the individual (Oreopoulos, von Wachter and Heisz, 2012; Black and Devereux, 2011). In addition, we assess how intergenerational mobility is causally impacted by adverse economic shocks. While an extensive literature emphasizes the importance of family background for child outcomes (Black and Devereux, 2011; Björklund and Salvanes, 2011), less is known about the extent to which individual decisions and government policy can increase intergenerational mobility. We, therefore, examine how economic shocks shape intergenerational mobility and the role which child human capital plays in mediating the impacts of economic shocks.

We find that negative shocks play an important role in shaping intergenerational mobility, where increased unemployment at the time of entering the labor market decreases rates of mobility. In addition, differential levels of human capital by socioeconomic status are a key factor which explains why economic shocks shape mobility. We combine data from the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC) published by the OECD with unemployment time series data. The PIAAC data is a cross-country nationally representative dataset including individual-level data on both participants’ own education, skill, and labor market outcomes as well as their parents’ level of education. This makes it particularly well-suited for studying intergenerational mobility and the role of human capital. We use unemployment rate data to measure exogenous macroeconomic conditions. Leveraging the variation across cohorts and countries, we measure the effect of unemploy-

ment rates at labor market entry on later labor market success. We categorize individuals according to their family background using parent's education data in PIAAC. We test the relative importance of economic shocks in shaping intergenerational mobility by comparing individuals across countries and cohorts who differentially face unemployment rates at young ages and come from different socioeconomic backgrounds. While the relationship between family background and labor market outcomes can involve various pathways (genetically transferred abilities, individual's own education, etc.), we can causally estimate the influence of exogenous economic conditions on future labor market outcomes and intergenerational mobility. This is because individual decisions do not affect the national unemployment rate experienced by a person at a certain age, which is solely determined by their birth year.

From the PIAAC dataset, we include 21 countries for which we can have data on unemployment. We restrict our sample to those aged 35-59 to both focus on long-term labor market effects for prime-age workers and avoid the influence of retirement. We use two different measures of intergenerational mobility, a relative and an absolute one. We define relative mobility as the difference in the adult earnings decile between those with low educated parents and those with high educated ones, while the fraction of individuals with low-educated parents who reach high-skilled occupations measures absolute mobility. Relative mobility compares the outcomes of individuals with low to those with high educated parents, while absolute mobility measures the degree to which individuals with low-educated parents reach the top (high skilled occupations).

We provide an understanding of how a child's own education and skill explain relative intergenerational mobility as well as how much differences in human capital accumulation across countries explain the variation in absolute intergenerational mobility from an international perspective. We decompose both measures of intergenerational mobility to understand the role of children's human capital investment as an engine for social mobility. To break down our measure of relative mobility, we employ the decomposition method as in [Gelbach \(2016\)](#). This decomposition method is similar to the usual Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition method but solves the issue of sequence sensitivity. We also use the same decomposition to understand how differences in human capital between both groups explain why economic shocks disproportionately harm individuals from a low socioeconomic background. Lastly, we construct a variance decomposition to understand how much human capital differences in comparison to other country-specific factors explain the international variation in absolute mobility rates.

We present three sets of results. First, we show that economic shocks during early adulthood and family disadvantage both significantly impact economic conditions later in adulthood. Macroeconomic conditions at this critical stage have persistent effects on long-term earnings and career progression: a one standard deviation increase in the average unemployment rate when transitioning from education

to the labor market decreases long-run earnings by 2 percentiles and the probability of being in a high-skilled occupation by 1.6 percentage points. Consistent with the literature on intergenerational mobility, there exist sizable gaps in labor market outcomes between children from low- and high-educated parents. Adulthood earnings are 13 percentiles lower for children of low-educated parents compared to those of highly-educated parents, and similarly large gaps exist in moving to the top of the skill distribution in a high-skilled occupation. In a heterogeneity analysis we find that the intergenerational persistence in disadvantage is lower for individuals with low educated parents in countries with more vocationally-oriented education systems. This suggests that education matters not just in quantity but also in different fields of study.

Second, we show that unemployment at the time of entering the labor market shapes rates of relative intergenerational mobility, where adverse macroeconomic shocks further widen the gap between those from low and high SES backgrounds. While the *average* impact of unemployment on labor market outcomes is smaller relative to the overwhelming importance of family background, these two forces interact with each other to causally impact rates of intergenerational mobility. Those from low SES backgrounds are significantly more afflicted by unemployment shocks, where a one standard deviation increase in unemployment causes a 11–15% decrease in relative intergenerational mobility. In contrast, those from middle SES backgrounds are equally impacted by such shocks relative to those from high SES families. Education is a key factor in explaining these patterns, as the effects of unemployment on education also differ by SES. High SES students increasingly invest in university education during times of high unemployment relative to those from low SES backgrounds. These differential changes in education by SES are a key mechanism behind why adverse economic shocks decrease rates of relative mobility.

Finally, we investigate the role of human capital in breaking the ties to disadvantaged family backgrounds, given the variation in intergenerational mobility across different educational systems and the differential response of education to economic shocks by SES. We focus on a measure of human capital which combines the importance of both education and skills, as both matter for intergenerational mobility and labor market outcomes (Blanden, Gregg and Macmillan, 2007; Hanushek, Schwerdt, Wiederhold and Woessmann, 2015). We quantify the importance of education and skills in two ways. First, we decompose our relative measure of mobility into a part mediated by own education level, skill level and a remaining unexplained part. We find that the majority of differences in earnings and occupational mobility between those from low and high SES backgrounds is explained by differences in child education and skills. In addition, child human capital is a key reason behind why economic shocks shape intergenerational mobility, as differences in human capital account for 61% of the additional impact of unemployment shocks on low SES children. Second, we measure how much of the variation in absolute mobility across countries is caused by differences in human capital accumulation,

measured as an index of both education and skills. We find that while average human capital investment of the different countries can explain 49% of the variation in absolute mobility across countries, roughly half of this variation remains unexplained, pointing towards a potentially important role in economic conditions and institutions across different countries.

Taken together, these findings paint a stark picture: the persistence in disadvantage across generations is strong and economic shocks serve to further widen inequality. Most of the gaps between socioeconomic groups are explained by differences in human capital while adverse macroeconomic conditions further widen the education gaps between the different groups. This emphasizes the need for policy interventions focused on investments in human capital for those from underprivileged backgrounds as well as supporting the disadvantaged when entering the labor market in times of recession.

Our research bridges two distinct strands of literature: intergenerational mobility and the long-term effect of macroeconomic conditions at labor market entry. There exists an extensive literature on intergenerational mobility in both earnings and education ([Black, Devereux and Salvanes, 2005](#); [Holmlund, Lindahl and Plug, 2011](#); [Black and Devereux, 2011](#); [Björklund and Salvanes, 2011](#); [Manduca et al., 2024](#)), which highlights the importance of changes over time ([Chetty, Hendren, Kline, Saez and Turner, 2014b](#)), variation across geographic region ([Chetty, Hendren, Kline and Saez, 2014a](#)), neighborhoods ([Chetty and Hendren, 2018a,b](#)), and multi-generational measures of mobility ([Nybom and Stuhler, 2024](#)). However, far less is known about the importance of factors which cause shifts in patterns of intergenerational mobility. While [Pekkarinen, Uusitalo and Kerr \(2009\)](#); [Nybom and Stuhler \(2024\)](#) and [Bütikofer, Dalla-Zuanna and Salvanes \(2022\)](#) establish the causal impacts of education reforms and the discovery of oil on intergenerational mobility respectively, we leverage a general economic shock which affects all workers at the time of joining the labor market.

Building on these foundations, we measure the extent of intergenerational persistence in disadvantage and quantify the importance of the role of education. We show that adverse economic shocks, facing a recessions at the time of first entry into the labor market, has disproportionate effects by socioeconomic status. As such, we add new insights to the literature on the long-term consequences of adverse macroeconomic conditions ([Kahn, 2010](#); [Oreopoulos et al., 2012](#); [Liu, Salvanes and Sørensen, 2016](#); [Schwandt and von Wachter, 2019](#); [Arellano-Bover, 2022](#)). Our results emphasize the importance of education and skills, and demonstrate that education policy matters for intergenerational mobility ([Biasi, 2023](#)). At the same time, policymakers should also consider the importance of initial labor market outcomes when focusing on rates of intergenerational mobility, which also have important distributional consequences.

2 Data and Methodology

In the first part of this section, we discuss the sources of our data, and the criteria applied for sample restriction, provide an overview of our sample, and detail the methodology for constructing our key measures. Next, we describe our empirical strategy.

2.1 Data Overview and Sample Selection

We use data from the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC) provided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) together with unemployment time series data gathered from different sources.

PIAAC The PIAAC data surveys individuals aged 16-65 years in 39 different countries, with thousands of participants in every country. We use the first cycle of PIAAC, which comprises three rounds of implementation. The data collection process took place between 2011 and 2012 for 25 of those countries, while the remaining countries participated in the second and third rounds in 2014-2015 and 2017, respectively. PIAAC includes a background questionnaire with data on parental educational background in three categories. Parents' education is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. We use these measures in our study of intergenerational mobility as a proxy for parental socioeconomic standards categorized into three groups: low, mid, and high SES. Additionally, the questionnaire collects rich data on the demographics of the individual such as immigration background, age, and gender. It also includes an assessment that measures cognitive skills divided into literacy, numeracy, and problem-solving in technology-rich environments. The literacy and numeracy segments evaluate individuals' abilities to comprehend and utilize information from written texts and quantitative data across various scenarios. Additionally, problem-solving in technology-rich environments evaluates individuals' competence in using ICT skills to effectively address a range of challenges and tasks.

Information about the respondents' own education level and labor market outcomes such as current occupation and income are also gathered in PIAAC. In the data, occupations are categorized using the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-08) in one and two-digit categories as well as four skill-level categories. We use the four skill-based categorization reporting the current or last occupation of the respondent, which is comprised of skilled occupations (e.g. civil engineers, pharmacists, commercial managers, etc.), semi-skilled white-collar occupations (e.g. customer services clerks, sales workers, etc.), semi-skilled blue-collar occupations (e.g. agricultural workers, drivers, etc.) and elementary occupations (e.g. cleaners, package deliverers, etc.). For earnings, we use the decile where the individual lies in his country when comparing monthly earnings including bonuses for wage and

salary earners and self-employed. The education variable we employ includes five categories: lower secondary or less, upper secondary, post-secondary, non-tertiary, tertiary – professional degree, and tertiary - bachelor/master/research degree.

A major advantage of the PIAAC dataset is that it is nationally representative within participating countries. The sample of adults surveyed and assessed is reflective of the broader adult population in terms of key demographic characteristics such as age, gender, education level, and region. This method of representative sampling, coupled with the incorporation of provided survey weights which we use in our analysis throughout, enables us to conduct valid cross-country comparisons of intergenerational mobility.

Taken together, all those factors make the PIAAC dataset well-suited for measuring intergenerational mobility and ideal for providing valuable international insights on the drivers of intergenerational mobility across countries.

Unemployment Time Series We merge the PIAAC dataset with the unemployment time series around the age of joining the labor market for the different cohorts in each country. The main source of our unemployment data is the Main Economic Indicators database published by the OECD and retrieved from FRED, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. For countries where early unemployment rate data was not available in this dataset, we supplemented it with unemployment time series from other sources (e.g. International Monetary Fund). For a full list of the sources of unemployment data by country see appendix table [A.1](#).

Sample Restriction We restrict our sample to individuals aged 35–59 as in [Arellano-Bover \(2022\)](#). We drop those older than 59 to avoid retirement issues influencing our main outcome variables (earning decile and current occupation). Younger participants are still in education or starting work with low experience. We therefore focus on respondents older than 35 to capture the long-term persistent effects of bad economic conditions at market entry instead of immediate short-term effects upon labor market entry. Individuals who migrated to their current country of residence after the age of 15 are also dropped because they graduate with different degrees and face different labor market conditions in their home countries than the rest of their cohort in their current country of residence around the period of joining the labor market. We include only countries for which we can match unemployment data early enough for older cohorts. For this reason, we end up with 21 countries, five of which are excluded in some results due to lack of access to specific age data. The main results on intergenerational mobility are robust to the inclusion/exclusion of these countries (table [B.2](#)) and also the choice of younger age ranges.

2.2 Summary Statistics and Measurement of Key Variables

Sample Descriptive Statistics Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for our sample of nearly 60,000 participants across 21 countries. Most of the individuals in the sample have low or mid educated parents, which makes it a suitable sample for testing the extent of upward intergenerational mobility in those countries. Roughly 23% of our sample have high educated parents while 38% and 39% have mid and low educated parents, respectively.

The biggest fraction of our sample (approximately 39%) have obtained upper secondary education while almost 20% dropped out of formal education after lower secondary or before and nearly 24% have a university degree. In our paper we investigate the role different educational systems can affect the rate of intergenerational mobility comparing countries with more vocational education to those with more general education. About a third of our sample's qualifications are vocationally oriented. There is, however a big variation in that rate across countries. Appendix figure A.3 shows how in some countries the fraction of those with vocational education is as low as 11%, 14% and 21% in Italy, Spain and the US, while almost three quarters of the population has vocational education in Austria and Germany.¹

In our main analysis we use the numeracy skill score for several reasons. The problem-solving in technology-rich environments assessment is missing for a third of our sample as the assessment did not take place in three of the main countries in our analysis and respondents who chose the paper format in all the other countries also did not undergo this assessment. The correlation between the literacy and numeracy score in our sample is 0.91. Therefore, following the existing literature (Hanushek et al., 2015), we focus on numeracy skills which are comparable across countries relative to other measures of skills. The scale of the score is from zero till 500 with 500 being the highest possible achievable score. The PIAAC data includes ten plausible values for each individual, which we average to have one measure of numeracy skill. The mean of this measure in our sample is 264.

The majority of our sample have no immigration background since more than 97% are native born. Men and women are equally represented in our sample where females comprise 51% of the participants. Since we focus on individuals between the age of 35 and 59, the average age is 45.5 years.

In constructing our measures of mobility we use two main labor market outcomes, occupation and earnings decile. Since our sample consists of prime age workers, the average decile is 6.2 and a large fraction of them are in skilled occupations. While approximately 39% are skilled, 17% are unemployed, and 43% are semi-skilled.

¹If an individual's highest level of education is secondary school or post secondary non-tertiary, the participant is asked whether his degree was vocationally oriented or not. Following Hanushek, Schwerdt, Woessmann and Zhang (2017) and Hampf and Woessmann (2017) we add to those who responded yes to this question the ones who graduated with a tertiary professional degree which have a tertiary professional degree which is equivalent to level 5B in the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED 5B).

Measuring Unemployment To ensure that unemployment rates provide a consistent measure of economic conditions across different countries, we standardize unemployment rates on a country-by-country basis as in [Arellano-Bover \(2022\)](#). Specifically, for each country, we compute a standardized measure by subtracting the mean unemployment rate during the study period from each data point and then dividing by the standard deviation of unemployment in that country:

$$u_{ct}^* = \frac{u_{ct} - \bar{u}_c}{\sigma_c^u} \quad (1)$$

where u_{ct}^* represents the standardized unemployment rate for year t and country c , u_{ct} is the actual unemployment rate at that year and country, \bar{u}_c and σ_c^u are the mean and the standard deviation of the unemployment rate for country c over all the years included, respectively. This approach generates a time series of standardized unemployment rates u_{ct}^* , expressed in units of standard deviations, which facilitates meaningful comparisons over time and across nations. Appendix figure [A.2](#) shows plots of standardized unemployment rates across the 21 countries in our sample, revealing that there is sufficient variation in unemployment across years and countries to measure its effect on labor market outcomes.

We assign to each individual in the PIAAC dataset the average of the standardized unemployment rate in their country in the years when they were 18 to 25 years old. We choose this age bin following [Arellano-Bover \(2022\)](#), as it represents the age span, where the majority of participants in our sample finish formal education. We show the results for other ages as well in Table [B.1](#) where the coefficient for family background remains robust in all specifications. Additionally, previous literature documents that unemployment is the most critical and has the biggest impact on long-term labor market outcomes during this phase. For example, [Oreopoulos et al. \(2012\)](#) show that the effect of unemployment on individuals earnings is much higher for labor market entrants compared to already employed ones. This result is also confirmed by [Arellano-Bover \(2022\)](#) who finds no statistically significant effect of unemployment between the ages of 26-30 and 31-35 on individuals' log-run skill development. We therefore use unemployment at graduation age to study the effect of exogenous economic shocks where their effect is the most critical.

Measuring Intergenerational Mobility We use two distinct measures of intergenerational mobility defining an absolute intergenerational mobility rate and a relative one. Our relative intergenerational mobility measure captures the difference in adult earnings decile of individuals coming from a low (mid) socioeconomic background compared to high socioeconomic background. We contrast this measure with the effect of external economic shocks proxied by a standard deviation increase in unemployment.

Our variance decomposition employs the absolute mobility measure. Because the average decile

low SES individuals reach across countries shows limited variation, we use an alternative labor market outcome, occupation. We define a country's absolute intergenerational mobility as the share of individuals from low-educated families who end up in high-skilled occupations, reflecting bottom-to-top mobility as in [Chetty et al. \(2014a\)](#). They measure the fraction of people for whom the "American dream" came true by ending up in the top quintile despite being raised in a bottom quintile family. Our measure exhibits substantial variation across countries, as depicted in Figure 2. In the least mobile country, Turkey, only 13% of the people with low-educated parents make it to the top, in contrast to 66% of those with high educated parents. Similarly, Germany, Greece and Korea have rates below 20%. While three quarters of those with high educated parents have a high skilled occupation in Italy, barely 20% of those with low educated parents make it to the top. On the other side of the distribution, Denmark, Sweden, New Zealand, Canada and the Netherlands all have absolute mobility rates above 40%.

There exist considerable gaps between groups from different socioeconomic backgrounds in our sample. For example, the average decile of those with high educated parents is 6.9 while those with mid and low educated parents have an average decile of 6.2 and 5.6 , respectively. A quarter of the low SES individuals are unemployed and only 23% of them have a high skilled occupation while less than 9% of the high SES are unemployed and 60% of them have a high skilled occupation (Table A.2). Comparing the different cohorts in our sample we can see that over time the fraction of individuals with high and mid educated families grew (Panel A of Figure 1). Despite the downward trend, the fraction of those with low educated families remains the highest for all cohorts. Among those born in low educated families, the fraction attaining high education themselves is rising while that of mid education falls and low education remains on average constant. This suggests a rise in intergenerational education mobility overall for the cohorts and countries we study. However, the fact that the fraction of low educated individuals from low educated families remains constant and the highest fraction among high and mid educated low SES people throughout shows some persistence.

Panel C in Figure 1 illustrates our measure of absolute mobility over various cohorts. It reveals a strong persistence in socioeconomic status, where the proportion of high-skilled individuals remains relatively stable across all cohorts on average. Specifically, individuals with highly educated parents consistently have the highest proportion of skilled occupations, averaging around 60%, while those from low socioeconomic backgrounds consistently have the lowest proportion, never exceeding one-third. Additionally, there is a modest decrease in absolute mobility over time, indicated by the slight negative trend in the proportion of high-skilled individuals among those with low educated parents. Throughout the quarter-century under study, the threat of being stuck at the bottom persists across all cohorts.

	Observations	Mean	SD
Age	38,254	45.510	6.697
High Educated Family	59,088	0.227	0.419
Mid Educated Family	59,088	0.382	0.486
Low Educated Family	59,088	0.390	0.488
Lower secondary or less	59,064	0.196	0.397
Upper secondary	59,064	0.388	0.487
Post-secondary, non-tertiary	59,064	0.052	0.223
Tertiary – professional degree	59,064	0.125	0.330
Tertiary - bachelor/master/research degree	59,064	0.239	0.427
Vocational Education	59,088	0.323	0.468
Numeracy skill score	59,088	264.127	51.156
Skilled occupations	59,088	0.386	0.487
Semi-skilled white-collar occupations	59,088	0.254	0.435
Semi-skilled blue-collar occupations	59,088	0.179	0.383
Elementary occupations	59,088	0.065	0.247
NEET	59,063	0.169	0.375
Monthly earned income in deciles	43,295	6.159	2.852
Female	59,088	0.507	0.500
Native Born	59,088	0.973	0.162
Unemp. age 18-25	59,088	0.109	0.660

Table 1 Summary Statistics

Notes: This table presents summary statistics for our sample comprising individuals aged 35 to 59. Survey weights are used to calculate the means and standard deviations reported in columns 2 and 3. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Numeracy test score is calculated for each individual as the average of plausible values. It ranges from 0 to 500. NEET stands for not currently employed and did not participate in education or training in the last 12 months. Deciles of monthly earnings include bonuses for wage and salary earners and self-employed.




Figure 1 Trends in Intergenerational Mobility

Notes: This figure shows how several characteristics have evolved over time using cohort averages. Panel A plots the fraction of each SES group (individuals with low, mid and high educated parents) in each cohort. In panel B we restrict the sample to low SES individuals and plot the fraction of individuals who have low, mid, and high education themselves. Finally, panel C plots the fraction of individuals in high skilled occupations by SES. All figures are generated using survey weights to ensure national representativeness.



Figure 2 Intergenerational Mobility by Country

Notes: This figure shows the fraction of individuals with low-educated and high-educated families that end up in skilled occupations. The green bars are our measure of absolute mobility. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Survey weights are used to ensure national representativeness.

2.3 Empirical Strategy

Our empirical analysis includes three main parts: a baseline regression, a Gelbach decomposition and a variance decomposition.

Baseline Regressions In this part of our analysis, we examine the impact of exogenous economic conditions and the significance of fixed family factors. We measure initial labor market conditions using the standardized unemployment rate at the time of graduation and examine the fixed determinant of originating from a family with either low or middle educational attainment. We identify the causal effect of graduation in bad economic conditions by leveraging the variation in unemployment rate across countries and cohorts using the following linear model:

$$y_{ic} = \beta_1 low_SES_i + \beta_2 mid_SES_i + \gamma u_{a(i)c}^{18-25} + \delta_c + \delta_{a(i)} + X_i' \lambda + \epsilon_{ic} \quad (2)$$

where y_{ic} is the outcome measure for individual i in country c and age cohort a . Our main labor market outcome measures are earnings decile and a dummy variable that equals one if the individual has a skilled occupation. low_SES_i and mid_SES_i are dummy variables that equal one if the education level of the individual's parents is low and middle, respectively. To measure exogenous economic conditions we use the standardized unemployment rate, $u_{a(i)c}^{18-25}$. For each individual, we assign the average unemployment rate they faced in their country when they were between the ages of 18 and 25 after standardizing it by country as described in section 2.2. The age fixed effects, denoted as $\delta_{a(i)}$, account for age-related factors that impact labor market outcomes and are consistent across countries.

This ensures that our comparisons are based on individuals of the same age. On the other hand, the country fixed effects denoted as δ_c , capture variations in labor market outcomes across different countries that apply for all cohorts. These differences can stem from various factors, such as the distribution of occupations within each country (e.g., specialization in certain industries leading to more skilled or semi-skilled occupations). Our controls, X_i' , include gender and immigration, where we include a dummy that equals one if the respondent is native-born and another for females. We cluster standard errors on the country-cohort level.

In this regression, β_1 captures how much lower the average outcome variable is for the individuals with a low socioeconomic background compared to those with a high socioeconomic background. Similarly, β_2 captures this penalty for individuals with parents who had a mid-level education. β_1 and β_2 test the persistence of outcomes across generations and measure equality of opportunity. The more labor market outcomes in late adulthood are influenced by family background, the less inter-generational mobility and equality of opportunity there is. On the other hand, γ captures the effect of a one standard deviation higher unemployment rate during the period of transition from education to the labor market. Both factors are exogenous to the individual in the sense that no decision by the individual can influence in which family they are born (the education of their parents) or what unemployment rate they face at a certain age since this is determined by the birth year of the individual and external macroeconomic conditions.

Next, we investigate how those two forces interact, examining how adverse economic conditions shape intergenerational mobility, by interacting the family background variables with the unemployment measure:

$$y_{ic} = \beta_1 low_SES_i + \beta_2 mid_SES_i + \gamma u_{a(i)c}^{18-25} + \beta_3 (low_SES_i \times u_{a(i)c}^{18-25}) + \beta_4 (mid_SES_i \times u_{a(i)c}^{18-25}) + \delta_c + \delta_{a(i)} + X_i' \lambda + \epsilon_{ic} \quad (3)$$

This allows us to directly test how the effect of economic shocks differ by socioeconomic background and how a one standard deviation increase in unemployment differentially impacts the gap in labor market outcomes between low and high SES individuals (β_3) and mid and high SES individuals (β_4). By interacting $u_{a(i)c}^{18-25}$ with indicators for low and mid SES in this specification, γ is interpreted as the effect of unemployment among those from high SES backgrounds.

Many factors can explain the association between parents' education and adult labor market outcomes. It could be genetically transferred abilities, the individual's own education, the neighborhoods they grew up in or many other factors. One main channel often studied in the literature is the individual's own human capital (Björklund and Salvanes, 2011; Black et al., 2005). Children born to well educated parents are much more likely to get higher educational attainment, which in turn leads to

better labor market outcomes.² Not only does education stand out as a vital channel for intergenerational mobility (or lack thereof), but it may also serve as an important mechanism explaining how adverse macroeconomic conditions influence intergenerational mobility (Arellano-Bover, 2022). Next we, therefore, use different decomposition methods to understand the extent to which human capital explains differences in labor market outcomes and differences in the impact of economic shocks between individuals from low versus high socioeconomic backgrounds.

Gelbach Decomposition Since human capital is a main mediator through which family background impacts children’s outcomes in adulthood, we decompose the relative intergenerational persistence measure to quantify the contribution of the individual’s own education and skill, first on the individual level. This decomposition quantifies to what extent educational interventions are important for equalizing opportunities for children from disadvantaged backgrounds.

For this decomposition we use the method developed by Gelbach (2016). Using the omitted variable bias formula, Gelbach (2016) decomposes the effect of adding more explanatory variables to the base specification on the change in the coefficient of interest in the full specification. This method has the same objective as the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition. However, sequentially adding variables and seeing how the coefficient changes does not correctly identify the contribution of each added variable to the change in the coefficient if the added variables are correlated. This is important in our context given the correlation between education and skill measures. To avoid this sequence sensitivity, Gelbach (2016) develops a method that identifies what share of change in the coefficient of interest is attributed to each variable and in which direction the change goes. We use this method to understand what share of the association between child’s labor market outcomes and family background is explained by both the level of education and the skill level of the child jointly as well as the share of each separately. Our base specification is therefore equation 2 while our full specification, which decomposes the importance of child education and skill is:

$$y_{ic} = \beta_1 low_SES_i + \beta_2 mid_SES_i + \gamma u_{a(i)c}^{18-25} + \beta_5 skill_i + \sum_{e=1}^5 E_{ei} \beta_{6e} + \delta_c + \delta_{a(i)} + X_i' \lambda + \epsilon_{ic} \quad (4)$$

This differs from the base regression only by $\beta_5 skill_i + \sum_{e=1}^5 E_{ei} \beta_{6e}$, where $skill_i$ is the numeracy score level and E_{ei} are five dummy variables for the five education levels as explained in the data section 2.2. This method then allows us to measure how much each own education and skill accounts for the change in our coefficient of interest β_1 between equation (2) and (4). β_1 measures relative mobility by capturing the difference in labor outcome measures between the low and the high SES. In other words, this decomposition answers the question on how much of intergenerational persistence is due

²In addition to education, we also use skill as a measure of human capital.

to differences in human capital among individuals from different socioeconomic family backgrounds. While education dummy variables only account for the broad level of education of the individual (e.g. upper-secondary only or university degree), this may mask considerable heterogeneity among the actual amount of education people with the same degree in the same country and cohort could have. This could be due to differences in the quality of education across schools or regions in the same country or also differences in the grades they graduated with. The variable measuring numeracy skill from the PIAAC test score therefore goes a step further to account for the actual difference among the skills of those individuals. Adding numeracy skill accounts for differences in inherent ability as well as a combination of learned skills and experiences to provide a more comprehensive understanding of human capital.

In addition to our measure of relative mobility (β_1) we also decompose the impact of adverse economic conditions on relative mobility (coefficient β_3 in equation 3). This decomposition measures how much of the difference in the impact of a standard deviation increase in unemployment between low and high SES groups can be explained by differences in their levels of human capital. It answers the question of whether human capital gaps are the main reason behind why economic shocks influence those two socioeconomic groups differently. It also examines whether education choices and skill development are the main channels through which economic shocks increase the intergenerational persistence in disadvantage.

Variance Decomposition We build upon the individual perspective in the decomposition as in Gelbach (2016), which focuses on understanding the drivers of relative mobility, to a cross-country perspective understanding the drivers of absolute mobility. In the Gelbach decomposition, we decompose the *difference* in the fraction of low SES individuals reaching high skilled positions compared to high SES individuals reaching high skilled positions within the same country (relative mobility within a country). In this variance decomposition exercise, however, we decompose the variation in the fraction of those from low SES families reaching the top across countries (absolute mobility across countries). While the Gelbach decomposition decomposes the difference between low and high SES individuals keeping the country-specific context constant, the variance decomposition zooms out to compare absolute mobility of the low SES across different countries. In this variance decomposition we examine whether differences in human capital across countries explain the variation in cross-country absolute mobility rates or whether other country-specific factors play a major role.

The cross-country variance decomposition exercise provides an understanding of how much of the variation in absolute mobility is explained by the variation in human capital. As the starting point for this exercise, equation (5) specifies absolute mobility at the individual-level as a function of child human capital, the additional impact of their home country, and an individual specific error term:

$$absolute_mobility_{i,c} = \theta H_{i,c} + \delta_c + \omega_{i,c} \quad (5)$$

where $absolute_mobility_{i,c}$ is an indicator for absolute mobility for individual i in country c , $H_{i,c}$ represents human capital, and δ_c measures the contribution of country-specific factors towards mobility.

$H_{i,c}$ can also be written as the contribution of the country average human capital and some individual-specific error term:

$$H_{i,c} = \overline{H_c} + v_{i,c} \quad (6)$$

Plugging equation (6) into equation (5) and rearranging gives:

$$absolute_mobility_{i,c} = (\theta \overline{H_c} + \delta_c) + (\theta v_{i,c} + \omega_{i,c}) \quad (7)$$

Similar to equation (6) which defines individual human capital, $absolute_mobility_{i,c}$ can also be written as the contribution of the country average mobility and some individual-specific error term:

$$absolute_mobility_{i,c} = \overline{absolute_mobility_c} + \zeta_{i,c} \quad (8)$$

A comparison of equations (7) and (8) provide the basis for the variance decomposition exercise, as the country average rates of absolute mobility is given by:

$$\overline{absolute_mobility_c} = \theta \overline{H_c} + \delta_c \quad (9)$$

which allocates a component of absolute mobility explained by average levels of human capital and the return to education ($\theta \overline{H_c}$) and a component which is unexplained by human capital (δ_c).

We measure the variance of average mobility at the country level and decompose it into the relative contribution of the terms in equation (9) by:

$$Var(\overline{absolute_mobility_c}) = \theta^2 Var(\overline{H_c}) + Var(\delta_c) + 2\theta Cov(\overline{H_c}, \delta_c) \quad (10)$$

The variance in average rates of absolute mobility across countries can be decomposed into a part explained by the variation in average human capital across countries ($\theta^2 Var(\overline{H_c})$). The variance decomposition exercises uses the cross-country variation in absolute mobility given in equation (10), where we define absolute mobility as the fraction of low SES reaching high skilled occupations, as depicted in figure A.1.

3 The Impacts of Economic Shocks and Family Background on Future Labor Market Outcomes

We test the relative importance of family background and macroeconomic conditions for labor market outcomes in adulthood. Across all specifications, both factors matter for earnings in adulthood. Table 2 reports results which include in the regression only family background (columns 1 and 4), only unemployment at labor market entry (columns 2 and 5), and finally both factors in the same regression as in equation (2) (columns 3 and 6). For earnings, reported in columns 1–3, a one standard deviation increase in the average unemployment rate an individual faces when joining the labor market significantly reduces long-run earnings by 0.22 deciles. Consistent with a diverse literature on intergenerational mobility, coming from a lower SES family also matters: those coming from a low (middle) socioeconomic background are on average 1.3 (0.65) deciles lower than those with highly educated parents.

Similar patterns are observed for occupational choices later in life (columns 4–6).³ Indeed, differences in earnings among individuals with different family backgrounds could stem from different occupational choices, and high unemployment at graduation could cause graduates to settle for worse jobs which might hurt their career progression (Oreopoulos et al., 2012). Defining skilled occupations as in section 2.1, a one standard deviation increase in unemployment significantly reduces the probability of being in a high-skilled occupation by 1.6 percentage points. Those with a low (middle) SES background are 31.4 (16) percentage points less likely to be in a high-skill occupation than those from a high SES. While both economic shocks and family background matter for future labor market outcomes, the magnitude of the intergenerational persistence in disadvantage is larger than the effects of unemployment. The fact that family background still matters when children are 35–59 years old highlights the strong intergenerational persistence in socioeconomic standards.

3.1 Robustness

In this section, we outline four different robustness checks for our baseline regression. We test the robustness of our results to measuring unemployment at different ages, adding more countries, adding country-specific quadratic age-trends and interacting the family background variables with country and cohort fixed effects.

Since some individuals might enter the labor market before the age of 18, we measure in a robustness check the effect of the unemployment rate when the individual is 16, 17, and 18 years old. We find that a one standard deviation increase in unemployment decreases earnings decile in the long

³The sample sizes in columns 4–6 are higher than that of columns 1–3 as those without any occupation (and hence also without any earnings) are included in the sample of these regressions. Results are similar if we restrict the sample to be the same as those in columns 1–3.

VARIABLES	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) Earnings Decile	(4) High Skilled	(5) High Skilled	(6) High Skilled
Low Educated Family	-1.297*** (0.070)		-1.299*** (0.070)	-0.314*** (0.012)		-0.314*** (0.012)
Mid Educated Family	-0.647*** (0.067)		-0.650*** (0.067)	-0.159*** (0.010)		-0.159*** (0.010)
Unemp. age 18-25		-0.217*** (0.042)	-0.221*** (0.042)		-0.015* (0.008)	-0.016** (0.008)
Observations	27,440	27,440	27,440	38,254	38,254	38,254
R-squared	0.192	0.170	0.193	0.112	0.065	0.112
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Avg. outcome	6.155	6.155	6.155	0.399	0.399	0.399

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 2 The Impacts of Economic Shocks and Family Background on Labor Market Outcomes

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) with survey weights. In columns 1-3, the dependent variable is the earnings decile of the individual, and in columns 4-6 it is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual is in a skilled occupation according to the ISCO-08 classification as defined in section 2.1. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual was between 18-25 years old as explained in section 2.2. In all columns, we add controls for gender and immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

run by 0.09 to 0.1 deciles (Table B.1). Our chosen measure of macroeconomic conditions (averaging unemployment between the ages of 18 and 25) is therefore a measure of economic shocks that are more persistent. Still, the unemployment rate when the individual is 16, 17, and 18 years old has a significant long-term effect on labor market outcomes.

Table 2 excludes 5 countries from our analysis (Austria, Canada, Germany, USA and New Zealand) since we only have age categories in 5-year bins for those countries but not continuous age data. As a robustness check, we impute the average of the unemployment rate for all the years where the individual could have been between 18 and 25 according to his age bin for those 5 countries. We use age bin fixed effects instead of precise age fixed effects. Since here we cannot capture specific yearly cohort effects and use imprecise estimates of the unemployment rate for 5 countries because we average across more years, the coefficient on unemployment is not statistically significant in table B.2 but it is still negative. In contrast, family background coefficients remain negative and statistically significant at all conventional levels of confidence. In fact, adding those countries increases the family background coefficients slightly to 1.46 for low SES and 0.7 for mid compared to 1.3 and 0.65 respectively in our main specification

Additionally, we run a specification of equation (2) that includes country-specific quadratic age trends, $\delta_c a(i) + \delta_c a(i)^2$ following Arellano-Bover (2022) to account for non-linear country-specific variations in how age (or time) influences labor market outcomes. The age-earnings profile would look different in different countries for example. Those country-specific quadratic trends would also capture changes in the institutional framework. The results are provided in Table B.3. Earnings decile results are robust to adding those trends for both unemployment and family coefficients have almost

the same magnitude. Only the unemployment coefficient's statistical significance drops since controlling for the age trends by country takes away much of the variation in unemployment trends. This also explains why we see no statistically significant effect of unemployment on high-skilled occupations in the last column of the table.

Finally, we test whether our results are robust to interacting family background variables (low_SES_i and mid_SES_i) with country fixed effects (δ_c) and cohort fixed effects ($\delta_{a(i)}$). This accounts for the fact that the association between parental education (our proxy for parental socioeconomic standards) and an individual's earnings may vary between countries and across time. In table B.4 columns two and four show that our main results hold even with the more flexible specification.

3.2 Heterogeneity: Gender and Vocational Education

While family background and exogenous economic conditions both matter for long-run labor market outcomes, here we ask whether everyone is equally affected. Specifically, we study heterogeneity by gender and assess the importance of the types of education systems in the different countries. The results suggest that relative mobility is slightly lower for women compared to men while the effect of macroeconomic conditions is similar for both. Repeating the analysis using the mother's and father's education separately we find that the gap in labor market outcomes between the high and the low SES is higher when we use the father's education compared to using the mother's. Countries with more vocationally-oriented education systems show a lower intergenerational persistence of disadvantage for individuals from a low SES family background.

Table B.5 shows that the average earnings decile of men is 7 in our sample and 5.2 for women. Additionally, women from low SES have a 1.4 lower earnings decile on average compared to high SES ones while this penalty is 1.2 for men. Middle SES also have a bigger difference for women (0.7) compared to high SES where for men it is 0.5. For the effect of unemployment, the coefficient is very similar for both genders and close to the baseline coefficient; a standard deviation increase in the average unemployment rate during the transition to the labor market decreases the earnings decile in the long run by 0.22 to 0.23 deciles for both men and women.

In the baseline results, we use the highest among the father and mother's education as an indicator of family background. In table B.7 we repeat the analysis by each parent's education level separately. We find that the gaps between the high and the low SES are more pronounced when we use the father's education compared to using the mother's. This result also holds for both daughters and sons separately (Table B.8 and B.9).

It is expected to find that the relationship between family and labor market outcomes differs by the type of educational system available in each country. One aspect that varies significantly across countries concerning educational opportunities is the extent to which vocational versus general education

is provided. As discussed in section 2, appendix figure A.3 shows this variation across countries where only 11% have vocational education in Italy in contrast to 73% in Germany. In table B.6 we interact the family background dummy variables with a standardized measure of the intensity of vocational education in each country. Vocational education intensity variable is the fraction of individuals with vocational education in each country. Our vocational intensity measure therefore varies across countries and is standardized to have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one.⁴

Our results in table B.6 show that countries with more vocationally-oriented education systems show a lower intergenerational persistence of disadvantage for individuals from a low SES family background. While on average a low socioeconomic family background is associated with a 1.4 decile decrease in the earnings decile of an individual, in a country that has a one standard deviation higher intensity in vocational education this association is lower by 0.2 deciles, an effect which is statistically significant. For middle SES where the penalty is 0.7 deciles, higher vocational intensity countries do not seem to do better than lower ones as the interaction variable is not statistically significant. Those results suggest that vocational education works as an engine of social mobility for individuals with low-educated family backgrounds which is consistent with findings in the literature (Bennett, Foley, Green and Salvanes, 2024).

4 How do Economic Shocks When Joining the Labor Market Impact Intergenerational Mobility?

Given the importance of family background for labor market success, an important question is what factors lead to causal shifts in intergenerational mobility. Whether economic shocks increase or decrease rates of relative intergenerational mobility depends crucially on whether the impacts of unemployment on labor market outcomes differ across SES groups. Indeed, while the *average* impact of adverse economic conditions on labor market outcomes may be smaller compared to the importance of family background, this may mask considerable differences in the impacts of unemployment by socioeconomic status.

Table 3 confirms that economic shocks shape patterns of intergenerational mobility. The effect of adverse economic conditions on long-term labor market outcomes is mainly driven by low SES, and macroeconomic downturns further widen the gap between those from low and high SES backgrounds. Columns 2 and 4 of table 3 interact the unemployment rate with the variables capturing socioeconomic background to differentially estimate the effect of unemployment by socioeconomic group. The effect

⁴In this specification, we use all 21 countries (including the 5 countries where we only have the age bin, not the specific age of individuals) because the five countries include ones that lie on both ends of the distribution of vocational intensity such as Germany and Austria with the highest intensities and the US, which is among the lowest. The relevant baseline comparison for this table is therefore the version of the baseline table where the five countries are included in the robustness section. B.2.

of unemployment is driven exclusively by those from low SES backgrounds, irrespective of whether occupation or earnings are used as an outcome measure. A one standard deviation increase in unemployment reduces the earnings of a low SES individual by 2 percentiles and the probability of having a high-skill occupations by 3.5 percentage points over and above the impact of unemployment on high SES children. These correspond to a considerable portion of the difference in labor market outcomes between low and high SES children, where a one standard deviation increase in unemployment would decrease relative mobility by 11–15%. In contrast, the effects of unemployment are similar between mid and high SES children. Table 3 reveals that while family background still matters considerably for labor market outcomes, adverse economic conditions at labor market entry further widen rates of relative mobility between low and high SES children and further increase the persistence of disadvantage at the bottom.

VARIABLES	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) High Skill	(4) High Skill
Low Educated Family	-1.299*** (0.070)	-1.289*** (0.070)	-0.314*** (0.012)	-0.312*** (0.012)
Mid Educated Family	-0.650*** (0.067)	-0.647*** (0.068)	-0.159*** (0.010)	-0.159*** (0.011)
Unemp. age 18-25	-0.221*** (0.042)	-0.104 (0.083)	-0.016** (0.008)	0.007 (0.017)
Low x Unemp. age 18-25		-0.188** (0.094)		-0.035** (0.017)
Mid x Unemp. age 18-25		-0.034 (0.102)		-0.010 (0.015)
Observations	27,440	27,440	38,254	38,254
R-squared	0.193	0.193	0.112	0.113
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Avg. outcome	6.155	6.155	0.399	0.399

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 3 The Effect of Unemployment by Family Background

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) with survey weights in columns 1 and 3. Columns 2 and 4 add to equation (2) two interactions: “Low x Unemp. age 18-25” and “Mid x Unemp. age 18-25” are family education dummies interacted with the standardized average unemployment rate. In columns 1-2, the dependent variable is the earnings decile of the individual, and in columns 3-4 it is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual is in a skilled occupation according to the ISCO-08 classification as defined in section 2.1. Family’s education is the maximum among a respondent’s two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual was between 18-25 years old as explained in section 2.2. In all columns, we add controls for gender and immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

A remaining question is why those from high SES backgrounds are not affected in the same way by negative economic shocks. Table 4 and figure C.1 point to the importance of the ability of high SES students to pursue more education to avoid joining the market in times of recession. While on average, there is no impact of unemployment on education (column 1), there exist considerable differences across SES groups. Those from high SES families see changes in education which are countercyclical, that is, when unemployment increases at the time of entering university, high SES children increasingly

pursue a university degree. In contrast, there is no overall change in the education choice of those from low SES families.⁵ Relative to the increase in education among high SES families, the SES gap in education widens as a result of increases in unemployment, where unemployment shocks lower education levels of low SES children relative to those from high SES families. As such, the differential education response by SES is a key mechanism behind why adverse economic shocks decrease rates of relative mobility.

VARIABLES	(1) University Degree	(2) University Degree
Low Educated Family	-0.404*** (0.011)	-0.410*** (0.010)
Mid Educated Family	-0.264*** (0.010)	-0.269*** (0.010)
Unemp. age 18	0.001 (0.005)	0.036*** (0.010)
Low x Unemp. age 18		-0.040*** (0.010)
Mid x Unemp. age 18		-0.035*** (0.011)
Observations	37,974	37,974
R-squared	0.144	0.145
Age FE	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes
Avg. outcome	0.240	0.240
Clustered standard errors in parentheses		
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1		

Table 4 The Effect of Unemployment on University Degrees by Family Background

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) with survey weights. Column 2 adds to equation (2) two interactions: "Low x Unemp. age 18" and "Mid x Unemp. age 18" are family education dummies interacted with the standardized unemployment rate. The dependent variable is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual has a university degree (Tertiary degree: bachelor/master/research degree ISCED 5A/6). Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Unemployment is the national rate of unemployment in the country of residence when the individual was 18 years old measured in country-specific standard deviations. In all columns, we add controls for gender and immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

5 Understanding the Drivers of Patterns of Mobility: The Importance of Human Capital

Why are the gaps in labor market outcomes between children from low and high SES families so large? Building on the persistence of intergenerational disadvantage documented previously, and how adverse economic conditions exacerbate it, we further examine the factors that drive those results. Identifying these drivers is crucial to understanding potential interventions for promoting intergenerational mobility. As there exist sizable differences in education levels by family background (Björklund and Salvanes, 2011), differences in human capital between children from different families may be an important determinant of the intergenerational persistence in labor market outcomes.

⁵The overall effect among those from low SES families is roughly 0, as 0.036 and the added effect of -0.04 cancel out.

To shed light on the underlying drivers of mobility, we employ two decomposition methods: a Gelbach decomposition and a variance decomposition. The Gelbach decomposition examines the drivers of relative mobility, how much of the difference between the fraction of low and high SES children reaching the top (as well as the difference in the average earnings decile of the low and high SES) is due to both groups having different education and skill levels. In addition, we assess the role of child human capital in explaining why economic shocks shape intergenerational mobility by disproportionately harming those from low SES families. On the other hand, the variance decomposition examines the drivers of absolute mobility, showing how much of the difference across countries in the fraction of low SES reaching the top is due to the low SES having more human capital or human capital being more important for reaching the top in this country.

5.1 Gelbach Decomposition

Table 5 decomposes the role that child human capital plays in explaining the disadvantage gap in labor market outcomes. Human capital, as measured by both education levels and skills, is a key factor which explain why family background matters for future labor market outcomes and, in addition, why economic shocks shape patterns of intergenerational mobility.

Differences in child human capital explain a considerable component of the earnings gaps between low and high educated families.⁶ Without accounting for differences in child education and skills, the earnings gap between low and high SES children is 1.3 deciles (the “base” coefficient, as in equation (2), presented in the lower panel of column 1). By accounting for human capital, the earnings gap declines from 1.3 to 0.13 deciles (the “full” coefficient, as in equation (4), which is the same coefficient after accounting for human capital differences). Both education and skills are significant factors which explain the earnings gap, with a larger fraction explained by education relative to skills.

Education and skills are also important drivers of why unemployment shocks disproportionately harm those from low educated families. As seen previously, a one standard deviation increase in unemployment lowers the earnings of low SES children by 0.19 deciles over and above the impact of unemployment shocks on those from high SES families. Accounting for differences in child human capital lowers this additional penalty for children from low SES families by 61%, from 0.19 to 0.07. As seen in Table 4, differences in child human capital are an important factor behind why economic shocks decrease intergenerational mobility.

Similar results are seen for relative mobility, the difference between the fraction of low and high SES children reaching the top in a high skilled occupation. Child human capital explains a similar fraction of the gap in relative mobility and the differential effect of unemployment shocks on low SES

⁶Appendix Tables D.2 and D.3 perform the same decomposition exercise separately by each country. While there does exist some cross-country variation in the importance of child human capital for equality of opportunity, child human capital is a crucial factor for intergenerational mobility in each country.

children (columns 3 and 4 respectively). The vast majority of the gap in relative mobility between low and high SES as well as the impact of economic shocks on this gap can be explained by the difference in a child's own human capital.

	Earnings Decile		High Skilled	
	(1) Low Educated Family	(2) Low x Unemp. age 18-25	(3) Low Educated Family	(4) Low x Unemp. age 18-25
main				
Total Explained	-1.1650*** (0.0449)	-0.1143*** (0.0441)	-0.2567*** (0.0081)	-0.0210** (0.0091)
Own Education	-0.7898*** (0.0393)	-0.0671** (0.0295)	-0.2105*** (0.0074)	-0.0138* (0.0071)
Skill Score	-0.3752*** (0.0255)	-0.0473** (0.0205)	-0.0462*** (0.0031)	-0.0072*** (0.0027)
Observations	27436	27436	38246	38246
Base coefficient	-1.298	-0.187	-0.314	-0.034
Full coefficient	-0.133	-0.072	-0.057	-0.013
% unexplained	10.2	38.8	18.3	39.1
% explained	89.8	61.2	81.7	60.9
Own Education	60.9	35.9	67.0	40.0
Skill Score	28.9	25.3	14.7	20.9

Table 5 The Importance of Child Human Capital in Explaining Intergenerational Mobility

Notes: This table provides results of decomposing several coefficients (as indicated by the column titles) from our previous analysis into a part explained by education, another by skill score, and an unexplained part. In columns 1 and 2, the dependent variable is the earnings decile of the individual, and in columns 3 and 4 it is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual is in a skilled occupation according to the ISCO-08 classification as defined in section 2.1. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual was between 18-25 years old as explained in section 2.2. In all columns, we add controls for gender and immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level. We use the method proposed by Gelbach (2016) as described in section 2.3. Skill score is the score of the numeracy skill test provided in PIAAC. It is computed as the average of plausible values. Own education stands for education fixed effects in five categories of education level as described in section 2.1. Observations are weighted using survey weights.

5.2 Variance Decomposition: Explaining Bottom to Top Mobility

Across the countries in our sample, there exists substantial variation in rates of bottom to top mobility, defined as coming from a low-SES family and being employed in a high-skilled occupation. Why do some countries, such as Turkey, Greece, and Italy, have low rates of absolute mobility and other countries such as the Netherlands, Canada, and Sweden have high rates of absolute mobility (Figure 3)? We decompose the factors that determine the difference in rates of absolute mobility across countries. Specifically, we ask how much differences in human capital across countries explain the cross-country variation in rates of absolute mobility. Given the importance of both educational qualifications and skills seen for relative mobility, we construct a measure of overall index of human capital as the combined influence of schooling and skills. As in Carneiro, Cattan, Dearden, Van der Erve, Krutikova and Macmillan (2022), we regress an individual's earnings decile on education qualifications and skills:

$$y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 skill_i + \sum_{e=1}^5 E_{ei} \alpha_{2e} + \epsilon_i \quad (11)$$

Our index of human capital H_i is then the predicted earnings decile of individual i , \hat{y}_i , based solely on an individual's schooling and skills from the previous equation:

$$H_i = \hat{y}_i \quad (12)$$

Figure 3 reveals considerable differences in rates of absolute mobility: low mobility countries have rates of absolute mobility of around 15% while high mobility countries mobility rates are around 45%.⁷ There exists a strong positive relationship between absolute mobility and our index of human capital revealing that places which have a higher human capital index tend to have higher absolute mobility on average. Since there is a strong correlation between average mobility rates and human capital across countries, we would expect cross-country differences in human capital to be an important driver of rates of absolute mobility across countries.




Figure 3 The Relationship Between Rates of Absolute Mobility and Human Capital Index

Notes: This figure plots the absolute mobility measure against the average human capital index for each country with a fitted regression line. Absolute mobility is measured as the fraction of individuals with low educated parents who end up in high skilled occupations (bottom-to-top intergenerational mobility). The human capital index is the national average of the predicted earnings calculated using education level and skill score as described in section 5.2. Survey weights are used to ensure national representativeness.

Table 6 presents a formal decomposition of the variance as detailed in Section 2.3. This decomposition asks to what extent the cross-country variation in absolute mobility is explained by the variation in human capital across countries and what part remains unexplained by human capital. Cross-country differences in human capital are a key factor explaining cross-country variation in rates of absolute mobility: nearly 50% of the variation in mobility is explained by variation in human capital. While human capital is clearly a key factor in why some countries have high and low rates of mobility, it is also not everything. The remaining 50% of variation in absolute mobility is unexplained by human capital, pointing to the importance of differences in labor market institutions and other country-specific factors across different countries. Yet, both decomposition exercises point to the importance of human capital in intergenerational mobility. Indeed, we show that human capital is key in explaining both relative

⁷Consistent with Figure 3, Figure E.1 shows a considerable variation in the distribution of both variables across all countries.

mobility, comparing low and high-SES individuals, and absolute mobility, coming from a low-SES family and ending up in a high-skilled occupation.

	(1)
	Variance in Upward Mobility
Share Explained by:	
Human Capital Index	0.489
Country Fixed Effects	0.539
Covariance	-0.028
Number of Countries	21
Variance in Upward Mobility	0.010

Table 6 Decomposing the Importance of Human Capital for Cross-Country Variance in Absolute Mobility

This table shows the results of the variance decomposition described in section 2.3. Absolute mobility is measured as the fraction of individuals with low-educated parents who end up in high skilled occupations (bottom-to-top intergenerational mobility). The human capital index is the national average of the predicted earnings calculated using education level and skill score as described in section 5.2. Survey weights are used in all computations to ensure national representativeness.

6 Conclusion

Individuals' long-term labor market outcomes significantly differ by family background and macroeconomic conditions faced at labor market entry. These two forces interact with each other, such that economic shocks further widen these gaps to exacerbate existing inequalities. We show that adverse macroeconomic conditions, high unemployment rates at labor market entry, disproportionately affect long-term earnings and career progression for individuals from lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

Our findings show that gaps in child human capital, measured by differences in education and skills, play a significant role in explaining these findings. We find that a significant portion of the gap in earnings and occupational outcomes between the different socioeconomic groups is attributed to differences in education and skill levels. Those differences in human capital also account for most of the disproportionate impact of economic shocks on long-term labor market outcomes and intergenerational mobility. Human capital investment emerges as a crucial lever for breaking the cycle of disadvantage, with education playing a pivotal role in enhancing equality of opportunity. These insights emphasize the need for targeted policies aimed at leveling the playing field for individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds and supporting them when leaving education at times of high unemployment as a key measure for enhancing intergenerational mobility.

References

- Arellano-Bover, Jaime (2022) "The Effect of Labor Market Conditions at Entry on Workers' Long-Term Skills," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 104 (5), 1028–1045, [10.1162/rest.a.01008](https://doi.org/10.1162/rest.a.01008).
- Bennett, Patrick, Kelly Foley, David A. Green, and Kjell G. Salvanes (2024) "Education and inequality: an international perspective," *Fiscal Studies*, 45 (3), 429–454, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-5890.12394>.
- Biasi, Barbara (2023) "School finance equalization increases intergenerational mobility," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 41 (1), 1–38.
- Björklund, Anders and Kjell G Salvanes (2011) "Education and family background: Mechanisms and policies," in *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, 3, 201–247: Elsevier.
- Black, Sandra E. and Paul J. Devereux (2011) "Chapter 16 - Recent Developments in Intergenerational Mobility," 4 of *Handbook of Labor Economics*, 1487–1541: Elsevier, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218\(11\)02414-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218(11)02414-2).
- Black, Sandra E., Paul J. Devereux, and Kjell G. Salvanes (2005) "Why the Apple Doesn't Fall Far: Understanding Intergenerational Transmission of Human Capital," *American Economic Review*, 95 (1), 437–449, [10.1257/0002828053828635](https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828053828635).
- Blanden, Jo, Paul Gregg, and Lindsey Macmillan (2007) "Accounting for intergenerational income persistence: noncognitive skills, ability and education," *The Economic Journal*, 117 (519), C43–C60.
- Bütikofer, Aline, Antonio Dalla-Zuanna, and Kjell G Salvanes (2022) "Breaking the links: Natural resource booms and intergenerational mobility," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1–45.
- Carneiro, Pedro, Sarah Cattan, Lorraine Dearden, Laura Van der Erve, Sonya Krutikova, and Lindsey Macmillan (2022) "Intergenerational Income Mobility in England and the Importance of Education," Technical report, IFS Working Paper.
- Chetty, Raj and Nathaniel Hendren (2018a) "The Impacts of Neighborhoods on Intergenerational Mobility I: Childhood Exposure Effects*," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133 (3), 1107–1162, [10.1093/qje/qjy007](https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjy007).
- (2018b) "The Impacts of Neighborhoods on Intergenerational Mobility II: County-Level Estimates*," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133 (3), 1163–1228, [10.1093/qje/qjy006](https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjy006).
- Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, and Emmanuel Saez (2014a) "Where is the land of Opportunity? The Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129 (4), 1553–1623, [10.1093/qje/qju022](https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju022).

- Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, Emmanuel Saez, and Nicholas Turner (2014b) "Is the United States still a land of opportunity? Recent trends in intergenerational mobility," *American Economic Review*, 104 (5), 141–147.
- Gelbach, Jonah B. (2016) "When Do Covariates Matter? And Which Ones, and How Much?" *Journal of Labor Economics*, 34 (2), 509–543.
- Hampf, Franziska and Ludger Woessmann (2017) "Vocational vs. General Education and Employment over the Life Cycle: New Evidence from PIAAC," *CESifo Economic Studies*, 63 (3), 255–269, [10.1093/cesifo/ix012](https://doi.org/10.1093/cesifo/ix012).
- Hanushek, Eric A, Guido Schwerdt, Simon Wiederhold, and Ludger Woessmann (2015) "Returns to skills around the world: Evidence from PIAAC," *European Economic Review*, 73, 103–130.
- Hanushek, Eric A., Guido Schwerdt, Ludger Woessmann, and Lei Zhang (2017) "General Education, Vocational Education, and Labor-Market Outcomes over the Lifecycle," *Journal of Human Resources*, 52 (1), 48–87, [10.3368/jhr.52.1.0415-7074R](https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.52.1.0415-7074R).
- Holmlund, Helena, Mikael Lindahl, and Erik Plug (2011) "The Causal Effect of Parents' Schooling on Children's Schooling: A Comparison of Estimation Methods," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 49 (3), 615–51, [10.1257/jel.49.3.615](https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.49.3.615).
- Kahn, Lisa B. (2010) "The long-term labor market consequences of graduating from college in a bad economy," *Labour Economics*, 17 (2), 303–316, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2009.09.002>.
- Liu, Kai, Kjell G Salvanes, and Erik Ø Sørensen (2016) "Good skills in bad times: Cyclical skill mismatch and the long-term effects of graduating in a recession," *European Economic Review*, 84, 3–17.
- Manduca, Robert, Maximilian Hell, Adrian Adermon et al. (2024) "Measuring absolute income mobility: lessons from North America and Europe," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 16 (2), 1–30.
- Nybom, Martin and Jan Stuhler (2024) "Interpreting Trends in Intergenerational Mobility," *Journal of Political Economy*, 132 (8), 2531–2570, [10.1086/729582](https://doi.org/10.1086/729582).
- OECD (2018) *A Broken Social Elevator? How to Promote Social Mobility*, 352, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264301085-en>.
- Oreopoulos, Philip, Till von Wachter, and Andrew Heisz (2012) "The Short- and Long-Term Career Effects of Graduating in a Recession," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 4 (1), 1–29, [10.1257/app.4.1.1](https://doi.org/10.1257/app.4.1.1).

Pekkarinen, Tuomas, Roope Uusitalo, and Sari Kerr (2009) “School tracking and intergenerational income mobility: Evidence from the Finnish comprehensive school reform,” *Journal of public Economics*, 93 (7-8), 965–973.

Schwandt, Hannes and Till von Wachter (2019) “Unlucky Cohorts: Estimating the Long-Term Effects of Entering the Labor Market in a Recession in Large Cross-Sectional Data Sets,” *Journal of Labor Economics*, 37 (S1), 161–198, [10.1086/701046](https://doi.org/10.1086/701046).

Appendix

A Data and Descriptives

Country	Start Year	End Year	Source
Austria	1968	2011	OECD
Belgium	1970	2011	OECD
Canada	1968	2011	OECD
Denmark	1969	2011	OECD
Finland	1968	2011	OECD (LFS)
France	1969	2012	OECD
Germany	1968	2011	OECD
Greece	1977	2014	OECD
Ireland	1971	2011	OECD (LFS)
Israel	1971	2014	ILO
Italy	1970	2011	OECD (LFS)
Japan	1968	2011	OECD
Korea	1969	2011	ILO
Netherlands	1970	2011	OECD
New Zealand	1971	2014	OECD
Norway	1972	2011	OECD
Spain	1972	2011	OECD (LFS)
Sweden	1968	2011	OECD (LFS)
Turkey	1980	2014	IMF
United Kingdom	1971	2011	OECD
United States	1968	2011	OECD

Table A.1 Unemployment Data Sources

Notes: This table shows the sources of our unemployment data for each country included in our dataset. “OECD” only refers to the Main Economic Indicators complete database published by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. When “LFS” is indicated in brackets, it refers to the OECD’s Labour Force Statistics Indicators database. IMF is the International Monetary Fund.

	(1) Low	(2) Mid	(3) High	(4) Total
Age	46.17 (6.603)	44.83 (6.721)	44.28 (6.708)	45.51 (6.697)
Lower secondary or less	0.401 (0.490)	0.0826 (0.275)	0.0340 (0.181)	0.196 (0.397)
Upper secondary	0.387 (0.487)	0.472 (0.499)	0.248 (0.432)	0.388 (0.487)
Post-secondary, non-tertiary	0.0255 (0.158)	0.0766 (0.266)	0.0580 (0.234)	0.0524 (0.223)
Tertiary – professional degree	0.0834 (0.277)	0.144 (0.351)	0.163 (0.370)	0.125 (0.330)
Tertiary - bachelor/master/research degree	0.103 (0.303)	0.225 (0.418)	0.497 (0.500)	0.239 (0.427)
Vocational Education	0.281 (0.449)	0.386 (0.487)	0.288 (0.453)	0.323 (0.468)
Numeracy skill score	243.8 (50.48)	269.9 (46.91)	289.4 (45.06)	264.1 (51.16)
Skilled occupations	0.234 (0.424)	0.413 (0.492)	0.603 (0.489)	0.386 (0.487)
Semi-skilled white-collar occupations	0.260 (0.439)	0.271 (0.444)	0.215 (0.411)	0.254 (0.435)
Semi-skilled blue-collar occupations	0.226 (0.419)	0.180 (0.384)	0.0965 (0.295)	0.179 (0.383)
Elementary occupations	0.100 (0.300)	0.0529 (0.224)	0.0260 (0.159)	0.0653 (0.247)
NEET	0.248 (0.432)	0.138 (0.345)	0.0868 (0.282)	0.169 (0.375)
Monthly earned income in deciles	5.599 (2.792)	6.193 (2.821)	6.882 (2.817)	6.159 (2.852)
Female	0.513 (0.500)	0.501 (0.500)	0.506 (0.500)	0.507 (0.500)
Native Born	0.968 (0.177)	0.986 (0.118)	0.961 (0.194)	0.973 (0.162)
Unemp. age 18-25	0.0467 (0.703)	0.137 (0.642)	0.170 (0.601)	0.109 (0.660)
Observations	59088			

Table A.2 Summary Statistics by SES using weights

Notes: This table presents summary statistics using survey weights for our sample comprising individuals aged 35 to 59. Columns one, two, three, and four show means and standard deviations for individuals with low-educated families, mid-educated families, high-educated families, and the whole sample, respectively. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Numeracy test score is calculated for each individual as the average of plausible values. It ranges from 0 to 500. NEET stands for not currently employed and did not participate in education or training in the last 12 months. Deciles of monthly earnings include bonuses for wage and salary earners and self-employed. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.




Figure A.1 Absolute Intergenerational Mobility by Country

Notes: This figure shows the fraction of individuals with low-educated families that end up in skilled occupations (our measure of absolute mobility). Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Survey weights are used to ensure national representativeness.

Standardized Unemployment Rate




Figure A.2 Standardized Unemployment Rate by Country

Notes: This figure shows unemployment time series by country. The plotted unemployment rate is standardized to be measured in country-specific standard deviations as explained in section 2.2.




Figure A.3 Vocational Education Rate by Country

Notes: This figure shows the fraction of individuals who have vocational education in every country. If an individual's highest level of education is secondary school or post secondary non-tertiary, the participant is asked whether his degree was vocationally oriented or not. Following [Hanushek et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Hampf and Woessmann \(2017\)](#) we add to those who responded yes to this question the ones who graduated with a tertiary professional degree which have a tertiary professional degree which is equivalent to level 5B in the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED 5B). Survey weights are used to ensure national representativeness.

B Robustness and Heterogeneity

B.1 Unemployment Rate at Different Ages

VARIABLES	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) Earnings Decile	(4) Earnings Decile
Low Educated Family	-1.296*** (0.070)	-1.293*** (0.070)	-1.297*** (0.070)	-1.299*** (0.070)
Mid Educated Family	-0.648*** (0.068)	-0.647*** (0.068)	-0.648*** (0.068)	-0.650*** (0.067)
Unemp. age 16	-0.090*** (0.035)			
Unemp. age 17		-0.096*** (0.034)		
Unemp. age 18			-0.099*** (0.035)	
Unemp. age 18-25				-0.221*** (0.042)
Observations	27,440	27,064	27,285	27,440
R-squared	0.192	0.192	0.192	0.193
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Avg. decile	6.155	6.155	6.155	6.155

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B.1 Unemployment at Different Ages

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) with survey weights but every column includes unemployment measured at a different age as indicated. "Unemp. age 16" means that every individual is assigned the standardized national unemployment rate they faced in their country of residence when they were 16 years old. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. The dependent variable is the earnings decile of the individual. In all columns, we add controls for gender and immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

B.2 Full, imputing average for missing countries

Table B.2 includes five countries for which we only have 5-year age bins data not the specific age of all individuals. We therefore average the unemployment rate around the years when the individual could have been between 18-25 years old. Those 5 countries are Germany, the United States of America, Canada, Austria and New Zealand)

VARIABLES	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) Earnings Decile	(4) High Skill	(5) High Skill	(6) High Skill
Low Educated Family	-1.459*** (0.085)		-1.460*** (0.085)	-0.348*** (0.017)		-0.348*** (0.017)
Mid Educated Family	-0.699*** (0.051)		-0.699*** (0.051)	-0.186*** (0.010)		-0.186*** (0.010)
Unemp. age 18-25		-0.042 (0.067)	-0.055 (0.064)		0.004 (0.008)	0.001 (0.008)
Observations	43,295	43,295	43,295	59,088	59,088	59,088
R-squared	0.158	0.129	0.158	0.107	0.051	0.107
Age Bin FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Avg. outcome	6.168	6.168	6.168	0.428	0.428	0.428

Clustered standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B.2 Basline on Sample of 21 Countries

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) with survey weights but includes 5 more countries than the baseline sample in table 2. In columns 1-3, the dependent variable is the earnings decile of the individual, and in columns 4-6 it is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual is in a skilled occupation according to the ISCO-08 classification as defined in section 2.1. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual could have been between 18-25 years old approximated using 5-year age bins. In all columns, we add controls for gender and immigration, age bin, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

B.3 Country-Specific Quadratic Age Trends

In a robustness check we run a specification of equation (2) that includes country-specific quadratic age trends, $\delta_c a(i) + \delta_c a(i)^2$ following Arellano-Bover (2022) to account for non-linear country-specific variations in how age (or time) influence labor market outcomes:

$$y_{ic} = \beta_1 low_SES_i + \beta_2 mid_SES_i + \gamma u_{a(i)c}^{18-25} + \delta_c + \delta_{a(i)} + \delta_c a(i) + \delta_c a(i)^2 + X_i' \lambda + \epsilon_{ic} \quad (13)$$

The age-earnings profile would look different in different countries for example. Those country-specific quadratic trends would also capture changes in the institutional framework. The results are provided in Table B.3. Earnings decile results are robust to adding those trends for both unemployment and family coefficients have almost the same magnitude. Only the unemployment coefficient's statistical significance drops since controlling for the age trends by country takes away much of the variation in unemployment trends. This also explains why we see no statistically significant effect of unemployment on high skilled occupations in the last column of the table.

VARIABLES	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) High Skilled	(4) High Skilled
Low Educated Family	-1.299*** (0.070)	-1.306*** (0.071)	-0.314*** (0.012)	-0.318*** (0.012)
Mid Educated Family	-0.650*** (0.067)	-0.655*** (0.068)	-0.159*** (0.010)	-0.161*** (0.010)
Unemp. age 18-25	-0.221*** (0.042)	-0.195* (0.100)	-0.016** (0.008)	0.015 (0.014)
Observations	27,440	27,440	38,254	38,254
R-squared	0.193	0.195	0.112	0.117
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country-specific quadratic age trends	No	Yes	No	Yes
Avg. outcome	6.155	6.155	0.399	0.399

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B.3 Adding Country-Specific Quadratic Age Trends

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) in columns 1 and 3 and equation (13) in columns 2 and 4. Survey weights are used in all specifications. In columns 1-2, the dependent variable is the earnings decile of the individual, and in columns 3-4 it is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual is in a skilled occupation according to the ISCO-08 classification as defined in section 2.1. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual was between 18-25 years old as explained in section 2.2. In all columns, we add controls for gender and immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

B.4 Interacting Family Background with Country and Cohort Fixed Effects

VARIABLES	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) High Skilled	(4) High Skilled
Low Educated Family	-1.299*** (0.070)	-1.316*** (0.077)	-0.314*** (0.012)	-0.347*** (0.011)
Mid Educated Family	-0.650*** (0.067)	-0.585*** (0.086)	-0.159*** (0.010)	-0.179*** (0.013)
Unemp. age 18-25	-0.221*** (0.042)	-0.213*** (0.041)	-0.016** (0.008)	-0.018** (0.007)
Observations	27,440	27,440	38,254	38,254
R-squared	0.193	0.199	0.112	0.123
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Family SESxAge FE	No	Yes	No	Yes
Family SESxCountry FE	No	Yes	No	Yes
Avg. outcome	6.155	6.155	0.399	0.399

Clustered errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B.4 Interacting Family Background with Country and Cohort Fixed Effects

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) in columns 1 and 3 but adding interaction of family background variables with country and cohort fixed effects ($low_SES_i \times \delta_c$, $low_SES_i \times \delta_{a(i)}$, $mid_SES_i \times \delta_c$ and $mid_SES_i \times \delta_{a(i)}$) in columns 2 and 4. Survey weights are used in all specifications. In columns 1-2, the dependent variable is the earnings decile of the individual, and in columns 3-4 it is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual is in a skilled occupation according to the ISCO-08 classification as defined in section 2.1. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual was between 18-25 years old as explained in section 2.2. In all columns, we add controls for gender and immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

B.5 Hetrogeneity

VARIABLES	Male			Female		
	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) Earnings Decile	(4) Earnings Decile	(5) Earnings Decile	(6) Earnings Decile
Low Educated Family	-1.191*** (0.085)		-1.194*** (0.085)	-1.371*** (0.110)		-1.370*** (0.110)
Mid Educated Family	-0.544*** (0.088)		-0.549*** (0.088)	-0.738*** (0.110)		-0.738*** (0.110)
Unemp. age 18-25		-0.227*** (0.053)	-0.234*** (0.054)		-0.226*** (0.068)	-0.224*** (0.068)
Observations	14,318	14,318	14,318	13,122	13,122	13,122
R-squared	0.066	0.043	0.068	0.083	0.057	0.084
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Avg. decile	7.048	7.048	7.048	5.180	5.180	5.180

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B.5 Heterogeneity by Gender

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) with survey weights. In columns 1-3, the sample is restricted to include only male individuals while the sample of columns 4-6 is restricted to females. The dependent variable in all columns is the earnings decile of the individual. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual was between 18-25 years old as explained in section 2.2. In all columns, we control for immigration background and add cohort and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

VARIABLES	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) Earnings Decile
Low Educated Family	-1.394*** (0.075)		-1.396*** (0.074)
Low x Voc	0.219*** (0.064)		0.215*** (0.065)
Mid Educated Family	-0.693*** (0.048)		-0.694*** (0.048)
Mid x Voc	0.010 (0.038)		0.009 (0.039)
Unemp. age 18-25		-0.042 (0.067)	-0.047 (0.066)
Observations	43,295	43,295	43,295
R-squared	0.159	0.129	0.159
Age Bin FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes
Avg. decile	6.168	6.168	6.168

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B.6 Heterogeneity by Education Type

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) with survey weights. "Low x Voc" and "Mid x Voc" are family education dummies interacted with a measure of vocational education intensity that varies on the country level as described in section 3.2. The dependent variable in all columns is the earnings decile of the individual. Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual was between 18-25 years old as explained in section 2.2. In all columns, we add controls for gender and immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

VARIABLES	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) High Skill	(4) High Skill
Low Educated Mother	-0.900*** (0.082)		-0.242*** (0.015)	
Mid Educated Mother	-0.226** (0.093)		-0.081*** (0.014)	
Unemp. age 18-25	-0.222*** (0.043)	-0.218*** (0.041)	-0.016** (0.008)	-0.015** (0.008)
Low Educated Father		-1.013*** (0.073)		-0.260*** (0.011)
Mid Educated Father		-0.449*** (0.078)		-0.117*** (0.011)
Observations	27,440	27,440	38,254	38,254
R-squared	0.182	0.185	0.091	0.100
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Avg. outcome	6.155	6.155	0.399	0.399

Clustered standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B.7 Baseline using Mother and Father's Education Separately

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) with survey weights. In columns 1-2, the dependent variable is the earnings decile of the individual, and in columns 3-4 it is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual is in a skilled occupation according to the ISCO-08 classification as defined in section 2.1. Mother and father's education is defined as low if the parent's highest level of education is lower secondary or less (ISCED 1,2, 3C short or less). Mid education is upper secondary (ISCED 3A-B, C long) or post-secondary, non-tertiary (ISCED 4A-B-C). High education is tertiary education degrees including professional degrees (ISCED 5B) or bachelor/master/research degrees (ISCED 5A/6). Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual was between 18-25 years old as explained in section 2.2. In all columns, we add controls for gender and immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

VARIABLES	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) High Skill	(4) High Skill
Low Educated Mother	-0.920*** (0.121)		-0.216*** (0.020)	
Mid Educated Mother	-0.281** (0.131)		-0.069*** (0.021)	
Unemp. age 18-25	-0.225*** (0.069)	-0.227*** (0.067)	-0.013* (0.008)	-0.014* (0.008)
Low Educated Father		-1.045*** (0.110)		-0.235*** (0.015)
Mid Educated Father		-0.486*** (0.119)		-0.115*** (0.014)
Observations	13,122	13,122	19,914	19,914
R-squared	0.069	0.075	0.090	0.099
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Avg. outcome	5.180	5.180	0.370	0.370

Clustered standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B.8 Daughters

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) with survey weights. The sample used here is restricted to female individuals only (daughters). In columns 1-2, the dependent variable is the earnings decile of the individual, and in columns 3-4 it is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual is in a skilled occupation according to the ISCO-08 classification as defined in section 2.1. Mother and father's education is defined as low if the parent's highest level of education is lower secondary or less (ISCED 1,2, 3C short or less). Mid education is upper secondary (ISCED 3A-B, C long) or post-secondary, non-tertiary (ISCED 4A-B-C). High education is tertiary education degrees including professional degrees (ISCED 5B) or bachelor/master/research degrees (ISCED 5A/6). Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual was between 18-25 years old as explained in section 2.2. In all columns, we add controls for immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

VARIABLES	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) Earnings Decile	(3) High Skill	(4) High Skill
Low Educated Mother	-0.839*** (0.106)		-0.265*** (0.021)	
Mid Educated Mother	-0.151 (0.115)		-0.086*** (0.022)	
Unemp. age 18-25	-0.235*** (0.054)	-0.228*** (0.053)	-0.019* (0.011)	-0.017 (0.010)
Low Educated Father		-0.940*** (0.092)		-0.285*** (0.016)
Mid Educated Father		-0.387*** (0.102)		-0.117*** (0.017)
Observations	14,318	14,318	18,340	18,340
R-squared	0.057	0.060	0.084	0.094
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Avg. outcome	7.048	7.048	0.431	0.431

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B.9 Sons

Notes: This table shows results of OLS regressions based on equation (2) with survey weights. The sample used here is restricted to male individuals only (sons). In columns 1-2, the dependent variable is the earnings decile of the individual, and in columns 3-4 it is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual is in a skilled occupation according to the ISCO-08 classification as defined in section 2.1. Mother and father's education is defined as low if the parent's highest level of education is lower secondary or less (ISCED 1,2, 3C short or less). Mid education is upper secondary (ISCED 3A-B, C long) or post-secondary, non-tertiary (ISCED 4A-B-C). High education is tertiary education degrees including professional degrees (ISCED 5B) or bachelor/master/research degrees (ISCED 5A/6). Unemployment is measured in country-specific standard deviations and averaged across the years where the individual was between 18-25 years old as explained in section 2.2. In all columns, we add controls for immigration, cohort, and country fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered on the country-cohort level.

C Impact of Economic Shocks on Education




Figure C.1

Notes: This figure plots the fraction of individuals with a university degree against the unemployment rate faced by the cohort at the age of 18. It is plotted separately for each socioeconomic group (individuals with low, mid and high educated parents). Family's education is the maximum among a respondent's two parents. It is defined as high if at least one parent has tertiary education, mid if the highest educated among both parents has an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary degree, and low if neither of them has attained upper secondary education. Unemployment is the national rate of unemployment in the country of residence when the individual was 18 years old measured in country-specific standard deviations. Survey weights are used to ensure national representativeness and additionally we control for age fixed effects, country fixed effects, gender and immigration background.

D Gelbach (2016) Decomposition

Since both labor market outcomes and family background are correlated with education and skill, the β_1 in equations 2 and 4 will not be identical. We will denote the one in the base regression equation 2 as β_1^{base} and the other as β_1^{full} . According to the omitted variable formula, the β_1^{base} would be a combination of the β_1^{full} and a bias:

$$\beta_1^{base} = \beta_1^{full} + \eta \quad (14)$$

where η is the difference between the base and the full coefficient due to controlling for both the skill and the education of the individual. According to the omitted variable formula, the bias, η is equal to a combination of the direct effect of the omitted variable on the outcome measure scaled by its effect on the variable of interest. In our case:

$$\beta_1^{base} - \beta_1^{full} = \eta = \tau^{skill} \beta_5 + \sum_{e=1}^5 \tau_e^{educ} \beta_{6e} \quad (15)$$

where τ^{skill} and τ^{educ} are the coefficients from the auxiliary regressions of the omitted variables (education and skill) on our family background variable (here we focus on low_SES_i) and the controls. β_5 and β_{6e} are the coefficients on skill and education category dummies from equation 4. Each of the two terms in the last equation specifies the part of the bias explained by each omitted variable: $\tau^{skill}\beta_5$ is the part explained by skill and $\sum_{e=1}^5 \tau_e^{educ}\beta_{6e}$ is the part explained by education level. This method then allows us to measure how much each own education and skill accounts for the change in our coefficient of interest β_1 . In other words, this decomposition answers the question on how much of intergenerational persistence is due to differences in education and skill among individuals from different socioeconomic family backgrounds. Education dummy variables only account for the broad level of education of the individual (e.g upper-secondary only or university degree) which masks some heterogeneity among the actual amount of education people with the same degree in the same country and cohort could have. This could be due to differences in the quality of education across schools and universities or regions in the same country or also differences in the grades they graduated with. The variable measuring numeracy skill from the PIAAC test score therefore goes a step further to account for the actual difference among the skills of those individuals. Adding it accounts for differences in inherent ability as well as a combination of learned skills and experiences. This can capture also differences in the quality of education among individuals with the same level of education.

	(1) Earnings Decile	(2) High Skilled
Low Educated Family		
Total Explained	-1.2711*** (0.0206)	-0.2855*** (0.0035)
Own Education	-0.8209*** (0.0179)	-0.2171*** (0.0032)
Skill Score	-0.4502*** (0.0135)	-0.0684*** (0.0020)
Observations	43284	59064
Base coefficient	-1.458	-0.348
Full coefficient	-0.187	-0.062
% unexplained	12.8	17.9
% explained	87.2	82.1
Own Education	56.3	62.4
Skill Score	30.9	19.7

Table D.1 Decomposition using Gelbach (2016)

Notes: This table provides results of decomposing our measure of relative mobility into a part explained by education, another by skill score, and an unexplained part. We use the method proposed by Gelbach (2016) as described in section 2.3. Skill score is the score of the numeracy skill test provided in PIAAC. It is computed as the average of plausible values. Own education stands for education fixed effects in five categories of education level as described in section 2.1. For this table, we include the five countries that were excluded in the previous tables due to lack of specific age data. We therefore do not include the unemployment measures and specific age-fixed effects in this estimation. We only include fixed effects for age bins instead. We also control for gender and immigration. Observations are weighted using survey weights.

Appendix table D.1 reports the same results for including the five countries that do not report specific age in years.⁸ Since tables D.1 and 5 both pool all countries together using country fixed

⁸In this specification we therefore only use the available age bins and do not include the unemployment measure.

effects, they might mask a vast heterogeneity in levels of intergenerational persistence. We therefore report the same descriptive results separately for each country in appendix tables [D.2](#) and [D.3](#). Human capital measures generally matter a lot in all countries where in some countries they explain almost all of the gap between high and low SES families (such as Denmark and Norway) and in some places they explain around 70%. Human capital might play a relatively bigger or smaller role in intergenerational mobility due to differences in labor market structure, pay scales and institutional frameworks across countries.

	(1) AUT	(2) BEL	(3) CAN	(4) DEU	(5) DNK	(6) ESP	(7) FIN	(8) FRA	(9) GBR	(10) GRC	(11) IRL
Low Educated Family											
Total Explained	-0.9466*** (0.0929)	-1.3050*** (0.1025)	-0.9593*** (0.0373)	-1.3384*** (0.1157)	-0.8257*** (0.0666)	-1.4879*** (0.1339)	-1.1346*** (0.1006)	-1.5795*** (0.1046)	-1.3249*** (0.0854)	-1.2244*** (0.1564)	-1.6176*** (0.1399)
Own Education	-0.5310*** (0.0739)	-0.8316*** (0.0910)	-0.6289*** (0.0325)	-0.7913*** (0.0945)	-0.5191*** (0.0538)	-1.1997*** (0.1248)	-0.8303*** (0.0851)	-0.9703*** (0.0885)	-0.8197*** (0.0716)	-1.1984*** (0.1607)	-1.1901*** (0.1279)
Skill Score	-0.4155*** (0.0627)	-0.4735*** (0.0670)	-0.3304*** (0.0254)	-0.5471*** (0.0773)	-0.3065*** (0.0406)	-0.2882*** (0.0691)	-0.3043*** (0.0498)	-0.6092*** (0.0679)	-0.5053*** (0.0613)	-0.0261 (0.0842)	-0.4275*** (0.0834)
Observations	1762	1693	8876	1962	2468	1439	2101	2352	2549	913	1138
Base coefficient	-0.989	-1.390	-0.957	-1.434	-0.916	-1.582	-0.746	-1.637	-1.477	-1.622	-1.868
Full coefficient	-0.043	-0.085	0.002	-0.096	-0.090	-0.094	0.388	-0.057	-0.153	-0.398	-0.250
% unexplained	4.3	6.1	-0.2	6.7	9.9	5.9	-52.0	3.5	10.3	24.5	13.4
% explained	95.7	93.9	100.2	93.3	90.1	94.1	152.0	96.5	89.7	75.5	86.6
Own Education	53.7	59.8	65.7	55.2	56.7	75.8	111.2	59.3	55.5	73.9	63.7
Skill Score	42.0	34.1	34.5	38.1	33.5	18.2	40.8	37.2	34.2	1.6	22.9

	(1) ISR	(2) ITA	(3) JPN	(4) KOR	(5) NLD	(6) NOR	(7) NZL	(8) SWE	(9) TUR	(10) USA
Low Educated Family										
Total Explained	-1.3907*** (0.1418)	-1.4670*** (0.1795)	-0.7491*** (0.0720)	-0.8799*** (0.0737)	-0.9391*** (0.0777)	-0.9475*** (0.0905)	-0.7734*** (0.0748)	-0.7752*** (0.0759)	-2.2048*** (0.3178)	-1.5542*** (0.1261)
Own Education	-0.8077*** (0.1199)	-1.0718*** (0.1603)	-0.4000*** (0.0628)	-0.5892*** (0.0655)	-0.6895*** (0.0688)	-0.5316*** (0.0684)	-0.4761*** (0.0617)	-0.4584*** (0.0635)	-1.7450*** (0.2804)	-0.9413*** (0.1070)
Skill Score	-0.5830*** (0.1071)	-0.3952*** (0.0866)	-0.3491*** (0.0481)	-0.2907*** (0.0456)	-0.2496*** (0.0417)	-0.4159*** (0.0600)	-0.2973*** (0.0482)	-0.3168*** (0.0500)	-0.4599*** (0.1340)	-0.6129*** (0.0906)
Observations	827	1398	2120	2606	1857	1497	1705	1643	835	1543
Base coefficient	-1.584	-1.688	-0.971	-1.008	-1.099	-1.043	-0.703	-0.774	-1.983	-1.947
Full coefficient	-0.193	-0.221	-0.222	-0.128	-0.160	-0.095	0.070	0.001	0.221	-0.393
% unexplained	12.2	13.1	22.8	12.7	14.5	9.1	-10.0	-0.1	-11.2	20.2
% explained	87.8	86.9	77.2	87.3	85.5	90.9	110.0	100.1	111.2	79.8
Own Education	51.0	63.5	41.2	58.5	62.8	51.0	67.7	59.2	88.0	48.3
Skill Score	36.8	23.4	36.0	28.8	22.7	39.9	42.3	40.9	23.2	31.5

Table D.2 Gelbach Decomposition by Country for Earnings Deciles

Notes: This table provides results of decomposing our measure of relative mobility into a part explained by education, another by skill score, and an unexplained part for each country separately. The outcome variable here is the earnings decile of the individual. We use the method proposed by Gelbach (2016) as described in section 2.3. Skill score is the score of the numeracy skill test provided in PIAAC. It is computed as the average of plausible values. Own education stands for education fixed effects in five categories of education level as described in section 2.1. For this table, we include the five countries that were excluded in the previous tables due to lack of specific age data. We therefore do not include the unemployment measures and specific age-fixed effects in this estimation. We only include fixed effects for age bins instead. We also control for gender and immigration. Observations are weighted using survey weights.

	(1) AUT	(2) BEL	(3) CAN	(4) DEU	(5) DNK	(6) ESP	(7) FIN	(8) FRA	(9) GBR	(10) GRC	(11) IRL
Low Educated Family											
Total Explained	-0.2262*** (0.0174)	-0.3063*** (0.0183)	-0.2123*** (0.0066)	-0.3333*** (0.0232)	-0.2318*** (0.0151)	-0.3100*** (0.0187)	-0.2565*** (0.0207)	-0.3152*** (0.0167)	-0.2910*** (0.0143)	-0.3185*** (0.0220)	-0.3130*** (0.0206)
Own Education	-0.1644*** (0.0150)	-0.2556*** (0.0176)	-0.1281*** (0.0055)	-0.2474*** (0.0206)	-0.1778*** (0.0131)	-0.2779*** (0.0182)	-0.2058*** (0.0182)	-0.2223*** (0.0145)	-0.2048*** (0.0125)	-0.3052*** (0.0218)	-0.2742*** (0.0200)
Skill Score	-0.0619*** (0.0088)	-0.0506*** (0.0093)	-0.0842*** (0.0045)	-0.0858*** (0.0113)	-0.0540*** (0.0068)	-0.0321*** (0.0080)	-0.0507*** (0.0075)	-0.0928*** (0.0096)	-0.0861*** (0.0093)	-0.0133** (0.0059)	-0.0388*** (0.0104)
Observations	2327	2213	11638	2451	2923	2472	2592	3125	3555	2078	1798
Base coefficient	-0.338	-0.430	-0.241	-0.403	-0.223	-0.394	-0.317	-0.355	-0.337	-0.455	-0.391
Full coefficient	-0.111	-0.124	-0.029	-0.070	0.009	-0.084	-0.061	-0.040	-0.046	-0.136	-0.078
% unexplained	33.0	28.8	11.9	17.3	-4.0	21.3	19.1	11.3	13.6	30.0	19.9
% explained	67.0	71.2	88.1	82.7	104.0	78.7	80.9	88.7	86.4	70.0	80.1
Own Education	48.7	59.5	53.1	61.4	79.8	70.6	64.9	62.6	60.8	67.1	70.1
Skill Score	18.3	11.8	34.9	21.3	24.2	8.2	16.0	26.1	25.6	2.9	9.9

	(1) ISR	(2) ITA	(3) JPN	(4) KOR	(5) NLD	(6) NOR	(7) NZL	(8) SWE	(9) TUR	(10) USA
Low Educated Family										
Total Explained	-0.3494*** (0.0221)	-0.4434*** (0.0286)	-0.1958*** (0.0135)	-0.1752*** (0.0111)	-0.2379*** (0.0160)	-0.2679*** (0.0215)	-0.1788*** (0.0138)	-0.2041*** (0.0167)	-0.3766*** (0.0301)	-0.3337*** (0.0209)
Own Education	-0.2388*** (0.0191)	-0.4028*** (0.0270)	-0.1578*** (0.0128)	-0.1419*** (0.0106)	-0.1942*** (0.0148)	-0.1919*** (0.0178)	-0.1226*** (0.0116)	-0.1564*** (0.0143)	-0.3579*** (0.0296)	-0.2304*** (0.0185)
Skill Score	-0.1105*** (0.0149)	-0.0406*** (0.0085)	-0.0380*** (0.0068)	-0.0332*** (0.0056)	-0.0437*** (0.0075)	-0.0760*** (0.0102)	-0.0562*** (0.0077)	-0.0477*** (0.0076)	-0.0187** (0.0074)	-0.1033*** (0.0143)
Observations	1386	2285	2567	3530	2314	1695	2227	1839	1874	2175
Base coefficient	-0.443	-0.540	-0.227	-0.247	-0.286	-0.261	-0.179	-0.244	-0.530	-0.405
Full coefficient	-0.093	-0.096	-0.031	-0.072	-0.048	0.006	-0.000	-0.040	-0.153	-0.071
% unexplained	21.1	17.8	13.8	29.2	16.9	-2.5	0.1	16.3	28.9	17.6
% explained	78.9	82.2	86.2	70.8	83.1	102.5	99.9	83.7	71.1	82.4
Own Education	54.0	74.7	69.5	57.4	67.8	73.4	68.5	64.1	67.6	56.9
Skill Score	25.0	7.5	16.7	13.4	15.3	29.1	31.4	19.6	3.5	25.5

Table D.3 Gelbach Decomposition by Country for High Skill Occupations

Notes: This table provides results of decomposing our measure of relative mobility into a part explained by education, another by skill score, and an unexplained part for each country separately. The outcome variable is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual is in a skilled occupation according to the ISCO-08 classification as defined in section 2.1. We use the method proposed by Gelbach (2016) as described in section 2.3. Skill score is the score of the numeracy skill test provided in PIAAC. It is computed as the average of plausible values. Own education stands for education fixed effects in five categories of education level as described in section 2.1. For this table, we include the five countries that were excluded in the previous tables due to lack of specific age data. We therefore do not include the unemployment measures and specific age-fixed effects in this estimation. We only include fixed effects for age bins instead. We also control for gender and immigration. Observations are weighted using survey weights.

E Cross-Country Distribution of Absolute Mobility and Human Capital Index




Figure E.1 Cross-Country Distribution of Absolute Mobility and Human Capital Index

Notes: This figure shows the distribution of our absolute mobility measure (on the left) and the average human capital index (on the right) at the country level. Absolute mobility is measured as the fraction of individuals with low educated parents who end up in high skilled occupations (bottom-to-top intergenerational mobility). The human capital index is the national average of the predicted earnings calculated using education level and skill score as described in section 5.2. Survey weights are used to ensure national representativeness.