

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Youth in Transition: Longitudinal Comparisons of Youth Transitions in the UK using Cohort and Synthetic Cohort Data

Scott Oatley soatley@ed.ac.uk



Caveat

- I hate Secure Access Applications and so should you
- The 'Synthetic' part of this presentation is currently locked in a deep dark vault
- I will talk a little about it at the end if time permits



Appendix

<u>https://github.com/Scott0atley/YouthTransitions</u>

• Website: https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth In Transition/



Outline

- PhD thesis
- Revisit historical data on youth transitions School-to-work transitions
- Use contemporary statistical techniques to assess prior literature on topic
- Test the underlying influence of structural inequalities on choice and opportunity



Literature Review

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/



A (very short) literature review

- Landscape of the NCDS + BCS cohorts (Bynner 2005; Blanden 2004)
- Structuration vs Individualisation (Beck 2002; Gayle et al 2009)
- 'New Structuralism' (Devine 2017)
- Life Course (Mayer 2004; Elder 1994)



Research Questions

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/



Research Questions

- What are the patterns of social inequality in youth transitions?
- How have patterns and trends in youth transitions changed over time?
- How have the social processes that underpin youth transitions changed over time?
- How can youth transitions be more comprehensively understood within a life course perspective?



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Datasets

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/



National Childhood Development Study (NCDS) - 1958

- The NCDS follows the lives of all people born in England, Scotland and Wales in one week of March 1958
- It is a nationally representative longitudinal social survey (Power and Elliott 2006)
- Analysis uses data from birth until age 23 accounting for five sweeps



NCDS

Year	1958	1965	1969	1974	1981
Sweep	0	1	2	3	4
Age	Birth	7	11	16	23



British Cohort Study (BCS) - 1970

- The BCS follows the lives of all people born in England, Scotland and Wales in one week of April 1970
- It is a nationally representative longitudinal social survey
- Analysis uses data from birth until age 30 accounting for six sweeps (and one subsweep)



BCS

Year	1970	1975	1980	1986	1991	1996	2000
Sweep	0	1	2	3	(sub- sweep)	4	5
Age	Birth	5	10	16	21	26	30



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Model

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/



Proposed model

- Logistic Regression
- Dependent Variable: Economic Activity
- Independent Variables: Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, Semi-Dominance NS-SEC, Cohort
- Each variable has a cohort interaction counterpart: Male # NCDS, Male # BCS etc



The Model

- N=9,985
- Log odds, Average Marginal Effects, Predicted Probabilities and Quasi-variance statistics used to graph results
- See supplements on Github: <u>https://github.com/ScottOatley/YouthTransitions/tree/main/Q-Step</u> to look at full models



Dependent Variable

- Economic Activity
- Derived from post-hoc monthly economic history diaries collected at age 23 (NCDS) and age 21 + 30 (BCS)
- Economic activity reported September Aged 16
 - Dichotomised into a dummy Continuing Schooling versus Not Continuing Schooling



- Educational Attainment
- Derived from the number of O'level passes at age 23 (NCDS) and number of O'level and O'grade passes at age 26 and age 30 (BCS)
- NCDS combined O'levels and O'grades together, BCS did not



- Sex
- Collected at birth from the NCDS, collected at birth and supplemented through each included wave up to wave 3 for BCS
- BCS kept adding participants post-birth wave to supplement immigration numbers each new observation provided a unique identifier



- Housing Tenure
- Collected at age 16 past housing tenure status (NCDS), derived from a set of variables on home ownership status at age 10 and age 16 for BCS



- NS-SEC
- Derived from separate SOC code datafiles (Gregg, 2012)
- .dta files corrupted due to conversion from spss format, manual re-coded was required.
- NCDS only collected data on father's status, BCS has semi-dominance parental measure



Foreshadowing of the problematic dataset...



Descriptive Statistics

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Table 1.01: Descriptive Statistics for Ec	onomic Activity (Pooled Model)	
	n	%
Economic Activity		
Don't Continue Schooling	5,740	57.49%
Continue Schooling	4,245	42.51%
Educational Attainment O'levels		
<5 O-Levels	6,387	63.97%
>5 O-Levels	3,598	36.03%
Sex of Respondent		
Female	5,087	50.95%
Male	4,898	49.05%
Housing Tenure of Respondent		
when Child		
Own Home	5,245	52.53%
Don't Own Home	4,740	47.47%
NS-SEC Social Class of Father when		
Respondent Child SOC2000		
Large Employers and higher	350	3.51%
managerial occupations		
Higher professional occupations	528	5.29%
Lower Managerial and professional	1,334	13.36%
occupations		
Intermediate occupations	984	9.85%
	I	
Small employers and own account	1,194	11.96%
workers		
Lower supervisory and technical	1,630	16.32%
occupations	I	
Semi-routine occupations	1,683	16.86%
Routine occupations	2,282	22.85%
	1	
Member of Cohort		
NCDS	8,411	84.24%
BCS	1,574	15.76%
		0005
		9985
Data Source: NCDS & BCS		

Descriptive Statistics by Cohort				
	Cohort			
	NCDS	BCS	Total	
n	8411 (83.78%)	1574 (15.76%)	9985 (100.00%)	
Economic				
Don't Continue Schooling	5116 (60.83%)	624 (39.64%)	4099 (41.05%)	
Continue Schooling	3295 (39.17%)	950 (60.36%)	5886 (58.95%)	
Educational Attainment				
O'levels				
Less than Five O'levels	5426 (64.51%)	961 (61.05%)	6387 (63.97%)	
Five or More O'levels	2985 (35.49%)	613 (38.95%)	3598 (36.03%)	
Sex of Respondent				
Female	4215 (50.11%)	872 (55.40%)	5087 (50.95%)	
Male	4196 (49.89%)	702 (44.60%)	4898 (49.05%)	
Housing Tenure of				
Respondent when a Child				
Own Home	4045 (48.09%)	1200 (76.24%)	5245 (52.53%)	
Don't Own Home	4366 (51.91%)	374 (23.76%)	4740 (47.47%)	
Semi-Dominant NS-SEC				
Social Class of Parents when				
Respondent was 10 SOC2000				
Large Employers and higher	261 (3.10%)			
managerial occupations		89 (5.65%)	350 (3.51%)	
Higher professional	410 (4.87%)			
occupations	. ,	118 (7.50%)	528 (5.29%)	
Lower Managerial and	1038 (12.34%)			
professional occupations		296 (18.81%)	1334 (13.36%)	
Intermediate occupations	805 (9.57%)	179 (11.37%)	984 (9.85%)	
Small employers and own	1024 (12.17%)	· /		
account workers	. , ,	170 (10.80%)	1194 (11.96%)	
Lower supervisory and	1372 (16.31%)			
technical occupations	· /	258 (16.39%)	1630 (16.32%)	
Semi-routine occupations	1485 (17.66%)	198 (12.58%)	1683 (16.86%)	
Routine occupations	2016 (23.97%)	266 (16.90%)	2282 (22.85%)	



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Results

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/



Coefficient Plots of Logistic Regression Results Not continue schooling as reference category modelling youth's first transition

Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions included in Model



Sex, Housing Tenure, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.



Educational Attainment, Housing Tenure, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.



Educational Attainment, Sex, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of NS-SEC on Continuing Schooling by Cohorts

Data Source: NCDS & BCS, N= 9985, Reference Category NS-SEC 2 for AMEs Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.



Conclusions

- Certain structural inequalities transcend cohorts (socio-historical context) sex
- Certain structural inequalities see a diminished significance Educational Attainment and Social Class
- Certain structural inequalities become irrelevant across cohorts Housing Tenure
- Complicated Story...



An Incomplete Story

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/



An Incomplete Story

- Why NS-SEC?
- Why SOC 2000?
- Is the data truly representative here's looking at you BCS...



Solution

- An in-depth analysis of each cohort
- Sensitivity analysis of social stratification variables does variable selection alter substantive interpretation?
- Sensitivity analysis of SOC codes should we be using SOC 90 for historical datasets over SOC 2000?
- Implementing handling missing data procedures what ones are the best, and how to implement them.

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/



NCDS in-depth analysis

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/
Descriptive Statistics by Economic Activity			
	Continue Schooling or no	t after September when indivi	duals are 16
	Don't Continue Schooling	Continue Schooling	Total
N	5116 (60.83%)	3295 (39.17%)	8411 (100.00%)
Educational Attainment O-levels			
<5 O-Levels	4588 (89.68%)	838 (25.43%)	5426 (64.51%)
>5 O-Levels	528 (10.32%)	2457 (74.57%)	2985 (35.49%)
Sex of Respondent			
Female	2413 (47.17%)	1802 (54.69%)	4215 (50.11%)
Male	2703 (52.83%)	1493 (45.31%)	4196 (49.89%)
Housing Tenure of Respondent when Child			
Own Home	1850 (36.16%)	2195 (66.62%)	4045 (48.09%)
Don't Own Home	3266 (63.84%)	1100 (33.38%)	4366 (51.91%)
NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000			
Large Employers and higher managerial occupations	82 (1.60%)	179 (5.43%)	261 (3.10%)
Higher professional occupations	82 (1.60%)	328 (9.95%)	410 (4.87%)
Lower Managerial and professional occupations	363 (7.10%)	675 (20.49%)	1038 (12.34%)
Intermediate occupations	358 (7.00%)	447 (13.57%)	805 (9.57%)
Small employers and own account workers	6/1 (13.12%)	353 (10.71%)	1024 (12.17%)
Lower supervisory and technical occupations	892 (17.44%)	480 (14.57%)	1372 (16.31%)
Semi-routine occupations	1083 (21.17%)	402 (12.20%)	1485 (17.66%)
Routine occupations	1585 (30.98%)	431 (13.08%)	2016 (23.97%)
RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000	70 (4 4400)	222 (2.222()	262 (1.2020)
Professional Technical	72 (1.41%)	290 (8.80%)	362 (4.30%)
Nanagerial and Technical	685 (13.39%)	1035 (31.41%)	1720 (20.45%)
Skilled manual	416 (8.13%)	489 (14.84%)	905 (10.76%)
Skilled manual	2437 (48.03%)	207 (0 22%)	1205 (14.22%)
Paruy skilled	698 (17.33%)	307 (9.32%)	1205 (14.55%)
Diskilled NS SEC Social Class of Eather when Perpendent Child SOC90	588 (11.49%)	130 (3.95%)	/18 (8.54%)
I area Employers and higher managerial assunations	2 (0.06%)	6 (0.18%)	0 (0 11%)
Large Employers and higher managenal occupations	70 (1 54%)	267 (8 10%)	3 (0.11%)
Lower Managerial and professional occupations	221 (4 22%)	468 (14 20%)	540 (4.11%) 680 (8.10%)
Intermediate accurations	221 (4.3276)	538 (16 33%)	870 (10 34%)
Small employers and own account workers	438 (8 56%)	240 (7 28%)	678 (8 06%)
Lower supervisory and technical occupations	890 (17 40%)	524 (15 90%)	1414 (16 81%)
Semi-routine occupations	1355 (26 49%)	705 (21 40%)	2060 (24 49%)
Routine occupations	1798 (35 14%)	547 (16 60%)	2345 (27.88%)
RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90	1,00 (0011 1,0)	517 (10:00/0)	2010(2710070)
Professional	67 (1.31%)	237 (7.19%)	304 (3.61%)
Managerial and Technical	191 (3.73%)	460 (13.96%)	651 (7.74%)
Skilled non-manual	476 (9.30%)	653 (19.82%)	1129 (13.42%)
Skilled manual	1910 (37,33%)	691 (20.97%)	2601 (30.92%)
Partly skilled	1892 (36.98%)	1048 (31.81%)	2940 (34.95%)
Unskilled	580 (11.34%)	206 (6.25%)	786 (9.34%)
CAMSIS Score of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000	40.49 (11.27)	50.90 (14.53)	44.57 (13.63)
CAMSIS Score of Father when Respondent Child SOC90	38.93 (10.53)	46.87 (14.50)	42.04 (12.84)
Data Source: NC	DS [Sweeps 0-4]		



NCDS Sensitivity Analysis of Social Stratification Variables





Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, and Social Stratification Measures included in Model

KHB Decomposition

		NS-SEC Mo	del	RGSC Mode	el	CAMSIS Mod	lel	
		Log Odds	SE	Log Odds	SE	Log Odds	SE	
Educational	Reduced	3.25***	(0.07)	3.22***	(0.07)	3.25***	(0.07)	
Attainment	Full	2.99***	(0.06)	3.00***	(0.06)	2.97***	(0.06)	Edu
	Difference	0.26***	(0.03)	0.22***	(0.02)	0.27***	(0.03)	ona
Sex	Reduced	-0.50***	(0.06)	-0.50***	(0.06)	-0.50***	(0.06)	Att me Sex
	Full	-0.50***	(0.06)	-0.50***	(0.06)	-0.51***	(0.06)	Ho
	Difference	0.00	(0.02)	0.01	(0.02)	0.01	(0.02)	Ter
Housing Tenure	Reduced	-0.88***	(0.06)	-0.88***	(0.06)	-0.88***	(0.06)	
	Full	-0.63***	(0.06)	-0.64***	(0.06)	-0.60***	(0.06)	

	Model 1			RGSC Mode	el		CAMSIS Mo	odel	
	Confound ing ratio	Confoun ding percenta ge	Rescali ng factor	Confoun ding ratio	Confoun ding percenta ge	Rescali ng factor	Confoun ding ratio	Confoun ding percenta ge	Rescali ng factor
Educati onal Attain ment	1.09	8.03	1.04	1.07	6.78	1.03	1.09	8.45	1.04
Sex	0.99	-0.78	1.04	0.99	-1.35	1.03	0.97	-2.75	1.03
Housin g Tenure	1.40	28.38	1.01	1.37	27.06	1.01	1.48	32.45	1.01

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

(0.03)

-0.25***

(0.03)

-0.24***

-0.29***

(0.03)

Difference

Comaprative Log Odds and Quasi-variance Statistics by Parental Social Class Predictions of Staying in Schooling versus Not



Data Source: NCDS, N=8,411

Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Parental Social Stratification Measures on Continuing Schooling

Data Source: NCDS, N=8,411 Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



NCDS Sensitivity Analysis of SOC codes

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583

Descriptive Statistics compar	Descriptive Statistics comparing NS-SEC by SOC2000 and SOC90 codes										
NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90											
Large	Higher	Lower	Intermediate	Small	Lower	Semi-routine	Routine	Total			
Employers and higher managerial	professional occupations	Managerial and professional	occupations	employers and own account	supervisory and technical occupations	occupations	occupations				
occupations		occupations		workers							

N	9 (0.11%)	346 (4.11%)	689 (8.19%)	870 (10.34%)	678 (8.06%)	1414 (16.81%)	2060 (24.49%)	2345 (27.88%)	8411 (100.00%)
NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000									
Large	9 (100.00%)	18 (5.20%)	19 (2.76%)	87 (10.00%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (0.50%)	121 (5.87%)	0 (0.00%)	261 (3.10%)

Employers and higher managerial occupations	,								
Higher professional	0 (0.00%)	285 (82.37%)	78 (11.32%)	46 (5.29%)	1 (0.15%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	410 (4.87%)

occupations

Lower	0 (0.00%)	43 (12.43%)	526 (76.34%)	184 (21.15%)	19 (2.80%)	8 (0.57%)	174 (8.45%)	84 (3.58%)	1038
Managerial									(12.34%)
and									
professional									
occupations									
	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	13 (1.89%)	528 (60.69%)	61 (9.00%)	86 (6.08%)	103 (5.00%)	14 (0.60%)	805 (9.57%)
Intermediate									

occupations

Small employers and own account workers	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	53 (7.69%)	11 (1.26%)	511 (75.37%)	267 (18.88%)	179 (8.69%)	3 (0.13%)	1024 (12.17%)
Lower supervisory and technical	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	14 (1.61%)	29 (4.28%)	984 (69.59%)	141 (6.84%)	204 (8.70%)	1372 (16.31%)

occupations

Semi-	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	45 (6.64%)	1 (0.07%)	1252	187 (7.97%)	1485
routine							(60.78%)		(17.66%)
occupations									
Routine	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (1.77%)	61 (4.31%)	90 (4.37%)	1853	2016
occupations								(79.02%)	(23.97%)

Data Source: NCDS [Sweeps 0-4]

Descriptive Stat	istics comparing	RGSC by SOC200	0 and SOC90 coc	les			
		RGS	SC Social Class of	Father when Res	oondent Child SO	C90	
	Professional	Managerial	Skilled non-	Skilled manual	Partly skilled	Unskilled	Total
		and Technical	manual				
Ν	304 (3.61%)	651 (7.74%)	1129 (13.42%)	2601 (30.92%)	2940 (34.95%)	786 (9.34%)	8411
							(100.00%)
RGSC Social							
Class of							
Father when							
Respondent							
Child							
SOC2000							
Professional	268 (88.16%)	73 (11.21%)	20 (1.77%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.03%)	0 (0.00%)	362 (4.30%)
Managerial	36 (11.84%)	542 (83.26%)	446 (39.50%)	6 (0.23%)	651 (22.14%)	39 (4.96%)	1720 (20.45%)
and Technical							
Skilled non-	0 (0.00%)	3 (0.46%)	652 (57.75%)	42 (1.61%)	186 (6.33%)	22 (2.80%)	905 (10.76%)
manual							
Skilled	0 (0.00%)	32 (4.92%)	10 (0.89%)	2015 (77.47%)	1349 (45.88%)	95 (12.09%)	3501 (41.62%)
manual							
Partly skilled	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.15%)	1 (0.09%)	191 (7.34%)	753 (25.61%)	259 (32.95%)	1205 (14.33%)
Unskilled	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	347 (13.34%)	0 (0.00%)	371 (47.20%)	718 (8.54%)
			Data Source: NC	DS [Sweeps 0-4]			

CAMSIS2000	
Mean	44.57
Standard Deviation	13.63
CAMSIS90	
Mean	42.04
Standard Deviation	12.84
Ν	8411
	Data Source: NCDS [Sweeps 0-4]



Comaprative Log Odds and Quasi-variance Statistics by SOC construction of Parental NS-SEC Predictions of Staying in Schooling versus Not by Parental NS-SEC

Data Source: NCDS, N=8,411. SOC2000 on left, SOC90 on right. Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Parental NS-SEC on Continuing Schooling by SOC Codes

Data Source: NCDS, N=8,411, SOC 2000 on left, SOC 90 on right Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



Comaprative Log Odds and Quasi-variance Statistics by SOC construction of Parental RGSC Predictions of Staying in Schooling versus Not by Parental RGSC

Data Source: NCDS, N=8,411. SOC2000 on left, SOC90 on right. Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Parental RGSC on Continuing Schooling by SOC Codes

Data Source: NCDS, N=8,411, SOC 2000 on left, SOC 90 on right Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Parental CAMSIS on Continuing Schooling by SOC Codes

Data Source: NCDS, N=8,411, SOC 2000 on left, SOC 90 on right Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model

Coefficient Plots of Logistic Regression Results by SOC Betas and CIs of Logit model analysing structural impacts on continuing schooling



Data Source: NCDS, N=8,411. SOC2000 on left, SOC90 on right.

Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, and Social Stratification Measures included in Model



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Social Stratification Measures on Continuing Schooling by SOC Predictive margins across row one, AMEs across row two

Data Source: NCDS, N=8,411 Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model. Reference Category for AMEs for NS-SEC=2 and RGSC=2.



Handling Missing Data – A Simulation

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583

Table 2.45 Sim	ulation Regressi	on Models Using	g a MAR Principl	e						
	Complete Records 'God Model'	Complete SEM	Missingness Introduced at Independent Variable 3	All Missingness coded as =0	All Missingness coded as =1	Single Use Modal Imputation	FIML	Imputed with no auxiliary variables and 10 imputations	Imputed with 10 imputations	Imputed with 100 imputations
Independent Variable 1	[-0.19, -0.19]	[-0.19, -0.19]	[-0.10, -0,10]	[-0.28, -0.27]	[-0.19,-0.19]	[-0.28, -0.27]	[-0.12,-0.12]	[-0.20, -0.20]	[-0.19, -0.18]	[-0.20, -0.20]
	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.01,0.01)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]
Independent Variable 2	[-0.19, -0.19]	[-0.19, -0.19]	[-0.10, -0,10]	[-0.28, -0.28]	[-0.19,-0.19]	[-0.28, -0.28]	[-0.12, -0.12]	[-0.18, -0.18]	[-0.19, -0.19]	[-0.19, -0.19]
	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.01,0.01)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]
Independent Variable 3	[-0.19, -0.19]	[-0.19, -0.19]	[-0.10, -0,10]	[0.07,0.07]	[-0.19,-0.19]	[0.07,0.07]	[-0.25, -0.25]	[-0.20, -0.20]	[-0.19, -0.19]	[-0.18, -0.18]
	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.01,0.01)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.01.0.01)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]	[(0.02,0.02)]
Number of observations	1000	1000	513	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000

Data Source: Simulation using a MAR principle. 51 per cent missingness introduced.



NCDS Multiple Imputation

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583

Ν	Percent	Educational	Economic	Housing	NS-SEC	Sex
	Complete	Attainment	Activity	Tenure		
	(%)					
8411	67	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
2201	17	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark
1636	13	\checkmark	\checkmark			\checkmark
251	2	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark
Total =						
12536						







BCS in-depth analysis

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583

Continue Schooling or not affer September when individuals are 16 Don't Continue Schooling or 10 tal N 624 (99.64%) 950 (60.36%) 1574 (10.00%) Educational Attainment O'levels 445 (70.88%) 475 (50.00%) 961 (61.05%) SO -Levels 446 (77.88%) 475 (50.00%) 961 (61.05%) SO -Levels 445 (70.98%) 475 (50.00%) 961 (61.05%) Sex of Respondent 209 (47.92%) 573 (60.22%) 772 (44.00%) Housing Tenure of Respondent when Child 325 (52.08%) 377 (39.68%) 1200 (76.24%) Don't Own Home 444 (71.15%) 179 (20.25%) 77 (24.25%) 1200 (76.24%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 11 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.55%) 189 (5.65%) 1.2 30 (481%) 289 (26.0%) 118 (72.0%) 129 (20.6%) 296 (18.5%) 3 61 (0.26%) 116 (21.1%) 1179 (10.37%) 1179 (10.37%) 1179 (10.37%) 119 (12.37%) 119 (12.37%) 119 (12.6%) 119 (12.6%) 119 (12.6%) 119 (12.6%) 119 (12.6%) 119 (12.6%) 119 (12.6%) 119 (12.6%) <t< th=""><th>Descriptive Statistics by Economic Activity</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>	Descriptive Statistics by Economic Activity			
Don't Continue Schooling Continue Schooling Total Fducational Attainment O'levels 94 (39.64%) 940 (60.36%) 961 (61.05%) > 5 O-Levels 486 (77.88%) 4475 (50.00%) 691 (61.05%) > 5 O-Levels 138 (22.12%) 475 (50.00%) 691 (61.05%) > 5 Co-Levels 486 (77.88%) 475 (50.00%) 691 (61.05%) Sex of Respondent 299 (47.92%) 573 (60.32%) 872 (55.40%) Male 325 (52.08%) 377 (62.45%) 1200 (76.24%) Own Home 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 1200 (76.24%) Own Home 440 (21.15%) 299 (20.42%) 374 (23.76%) 1.1 Cass of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.95%) 89 (5.65%) 1.2 374 (43.15%) 209 (20.0%) 226 (18.18%) 134 (12.05%) 129 (12.0%) 2 61 (10.25%) 113 (21.07%) 126 (13.78%) 113 (21.07%) 126 (15.8%) 3 64 (10.25%) 113 (21.07%) 128 (13.47%) 119 (12.58%) 4 50 (20.05%) 133 (21.07%) </td <td></td> <td>Continue Schooling or no</td> <td>ot after September when in</td> <td>dividuals are 16</td>		Continue Schooling or no	ot after September when in	dividuals are 16
N 624 (39.64%) 990 (60.36%) 1372 (100.00%) SH Charlends 445 (77.88%) 475 (50.00%) 961 (60.5%) SO -Levels 138 (22.12%) 475 (50.00%) 613 (88.95%) Female 297 (92.8%) 573 (60.32%) 872 (55.40%) Male 292 (52.08%) 377 (99.68%) 702 (44.60%) Housing Tenure of Respondent when Child 444 (71.15%) 756 (92.58%) 1200 (76.24%) Own Home 444 (71.15%) 756 (92.58%) 1200 (76.24%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 10 120 (76.24%) 374 (23.76%) 1.1 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.95%) 89 (56.5%) 118 (75.0%) 2.2 30 (48.1%) 88 (92.68%) 119 (75.0%) 120 (76.24%) 3.4 64 (10.26%) 113 (17.07%) 129 (12.05%) 286 (15.89%) 4.3 64 (10.26%) 113 (17.07%) 129 (12.05%) 136 (14.87%) 140 (12.85%) 147 (11.05%) 5.5 5.0 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 228 (16.39%) 137 (11.87%) 138 (14.07%) 129 (12.65%) 76 (12.85%) 266 (16.99%) 138 (14.27%) <td< td=""><td></td><td>Don't Continue Schooling</td><td>Continue Schooling</td><td>Total</td></td<>		Don't Continue Schooling	Continue Schooling	Total
Educational Attainment O'levels 43 O-Levels 43 O-Levels 4475 (50.00%) 941 (61.05%) 54 O-Levels 4475 (50.00%) 613 (88.95%) 647 (85.900%) 613 (88.95%) 647 (50.00%) 613 (88.95%) 647 (50.00%) 613 (82.21.2%) 613 (82.21.2%) 613 (82.21.2%) 613 (82.21.2%) 614 (22.25%) 719 (92.0%) 719 (10.0%) 719 (10.0%) 719 (10.0%) 710 (1	N	624 (39.64%)	950 (60.36%)	1574 (100.00%)
s > 0-Levels 138 (77.88%) 475 (60.00%) 613 (89.95%) S > 0-Levels 138 (22.12%) 475 (60.00%) 613 (89.95%) Female 299 (47.92%) 377 (93.66%) 772 (54.60%) Male 325 (52.08%) 377 (93.66%) 772 (44.60%) Own Home 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 1200 (76.24%) Don't Own Home 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 13200 (76.24%) Don't Own Home 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 13200 (76.24%) Don't Own Home 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 13200 (76.24%) Dati Own Home 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 13200 (76.24%) Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 138 (19.22%) 188 (92.65%) 118 (12.11%) 139 (11.67%) 4 10.22 (20.05%) 113 (12.11%) 129 (11.87%) 129 (11.87%) 129 (11.97%) 138 (14.02%) 126 (13.65%) 5 6 65 (13.75%) 112 (11.17%) 128 (12.65%) 126 (13.97%) 126 (13.97%) 126 (13.65%) 127 (10.80%) 137 (14.42%) 226 (16.89%) 127 (10.80%) 137 (14.42%) 226 (16.99%) 127 (10.80%) 137 (14	Educational Attainment O'levels			
>5 O-Levels 138 (221.2) 475 (00.0%) 613 (38.95%) Sex of Respondent 299 (47.92%) 573 (60.32%) 872 (55.40%) Male 325 (52.0%) 377 (39.68%) 702 (44.60%) Housing Tenure of Respondent when Child 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 1200 (76.24%) Don't Own Home 140 (28.85%) 194 (20.42%) 374 (23.76%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 23 (3.69%) 66 (65.5%) 89 (5.65%) 1.1 23 (3.69%) 66 (0.50%) 296 (5.81%) 126 (23.76%) 209 (22.00%) 296 (18.81%) 3 64 (10.26%) 113 (12.11%) 179 (11.37%) 129 (10.60%) 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 228 (16.39%) 6 5 61.376%) 112 (11.7%) 198 (12.58%) 66 (5.5%) 126 (23.6%)	<5 O-Levels	486 (77.88%)	475 (50.00%)	961 (61.05%)
Sex of Respondent (11) Female 299 (47.92%) 573 (60.32%) 872 (55.0%) Male 325 (52.0%) 377 (93.68%) 702 (44.60%) Housing Tenure of Respondent When Child 444 (71.15%) 776 (79.58%) 1200 (76.24%) Don't Own Home 444 (71.15%) 776 (79.58%) 1200 (76.24%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 88 (9.26%) 118 (75.0%) 1.1 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.95%) 89 (5.55%) 1.2 30 (4.81%) 88 (9.26%) 118 (75.0%) 2 371 (13.44%) 209 (22.00%) 296 (18.81%) 3 64 (10.26%) 115 (21.11%) 129 (19.7%) 4 80 (12.82%) 90 (9.47%) 170 (10.80%) 5 6 61.37%) 112 (11.7%) 198 (12.58%) 7 13.22 (20.3%) 236 (45.3%) 292 (26.7%) 286 (16.99%) 8 9.21% 132 (21.5%) 356 (43.2%) 292 (5.84%) 7 13.22 (21.5%) 236 (43.2%) 157 (716.66%) 3 3	>5 O-Levels	138 (22.12%)	475 (50.00%)	613 (38.95%)
Female 299 (47.92%) 573 (60.32%) 872 (55.40%) Male 325 377 (39.68%) 702 (44.60%) Housing Tenure of Respondent when Child 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 1200 (76.24%) Own Home 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 1200 (76.24%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 88 (92.65%) 89 (56.5%) 1.1 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.65%) 89 (56.5%) 18 (75.0%) 3 66 (10.26%) 115 (12.11%) 179 (11.37%) 4 80 (12.6%) 90 (9.47%) 171 (10.80%) 5 12 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 228 (61.39%) 6 86 (13.78%) 112 (11.79%) 198 (12.58%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 128 (61.59%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 128 (61.39%) 7 132 (21.15%) 326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%) 8 68 (71.6%) 92 (54.4%) 139 (14.24%) 128 (64.69%) 7 232 (21.15%) 326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%)	Sex of Respondent			
Male 325 (52.08%) 377 (39.68%) 702 (44.00%) Housing Tenure of Respondent When Child 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 1200 (76.24%) Don't Own Home 180 (28.85%) 194 (20.42%) 374 (23.75%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 1 100 (28.85%) 189 (56.5%) 1.1 23 (46.95%) 66 (6.95%) 89 (56.5%) 1.2 30 (48.1%) 209 (22.0%) 296 (18.1%) 1.4 80 (12.82%) 90 (94.7%) 118 (75.0%) 3 64 (10.26%) 113 (11.1%) 179 (11.37%) 4 80 (12.82%) 90 (94.7%) 170 (10.80%) 5 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 258 (16.39%) 6 63 (13.78%) 112 (11.79%) 198 (12.58%) 7 123 (21.15%) 326 (43.43%) 458 (29.10%) 3 Start 458 (20.90%) 123 (21.15%) 326 (43.32%) 458 (29.10%) 1 4 2 (20.85%) 77 (64.66%) 95 (10.00%) 174 (11.05%) 3 M 68 (10.90%) 124 (23.5%)	Female	299 (47.92%)	573 (60.32%)	872 (55.40%)
Housing Tenure of Respondent when Child Own Home 444 (71.15%) (756 (79.58%) 1200 (6.54%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 - - 1.1 32 (3.69%) 66 (6.55%) 89 (5.65%) 1.2 30 (4.81%) 88 (9.26%) 118 (7.50%) 2 30 (4.81%) 289 (2.00%) 2.96 (16.81%) 3 64 (10.26%) 115 (12.11%) 179 (11.37%) 4 80 (12.82%) 90 (9.47%) 170 (10.80%) 5 20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 228 (16.59%) 6 86 (13.78%) 112 (11.7%) 198 (12.85%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 296 (16.81%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 296 (16.90%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 296 (16.90%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 296 (16.81%) 7 129 (20.67%) 326 (43.23%) 458 (29.10%) 3 86 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 68 (10.90%) </td <td>Male</td> <td>325 (52.08%)</td> <td>377 (39.68%)</td> <td>702 (44.60%)</td>	Male	325 (52.08%)	377 (39.68%)	702 (44.60%)
Own Home 444 (71.15%) 756 (79.58%) 1200 (76.24%) Don't Own Home 180 (28.5%) 194 (20.42%) 374 (23.76%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.95%) 89 (5.65%) 1.1 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.95%) 89 (5.65%) 118 (7.50%) 2 87 (13.94%) 209 (22.00%) 296 (18.81%) 3 64 (10.26%) 115 (12.11%) 179 (11.37%) 4 80 (12.82%) 90 (9.47%) 120 (01.080%) 5 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 258 (16.39%) 6 86 (13.78%) 112 (17.9%) 198 (12.58%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 266 (16.90%) 8 13.23 (21.15%) 326 (54.32%) 96 (12.45%) 3M 283 (6.09%) 39 (4.13%) 77 (4.58%) 5 333 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 3M 283 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90	Housing Tenure of Respondent when Child			
Don't Own Home 180 (28.85%) 194 (20.42%) 374 (23.76%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 1.1 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.95%) 89 (5.65%) 1.2 30 (4.81%) 289 (20.6%) 118 (7.50%) 2 30 (4.81%) 209 (20.0%) 2296 (18.81%) 3 64 (10.26%) 115 (12.11%) 179 (11.87%) 5 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 228 (16.39%) 6 80 (12.82%) 09 (9.47%) 170 (10.48%) 7 129 (20.67%) 133 (14.00%) 228 (16.39%) 6 80 (12.82%) 058 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 126 (15.9%) 80 (21.05%) 133 (14.00%) 228 (45.35%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 30 (21.83 of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 137 (14.42%) 92 (5.84%) 33 (4.12%) 196 (12.45%) 30 (21.81 (35.96) 128 (13.69%) 128 (13.69%) 128 (13.69%) 32 (5.64%) 30 (21.81 (35.61%) 239 (14.58%)	Own Home	444 (71.15%)	756 (79.58%)	1200 (76.24%)
NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.95%) 89 (5.65%) 1.1 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.95%) 89 (5.65%) 1.2 30 (4.81%) 88 (9.26%) 118 (7.50%) 2 87 (713.94%) 209 (22.00%) 296 (15.81%) 3 64 (10.26%) 115 (12.11%) 1179 (11.37%) 4 80 (12.82%) 90 (9.47%) 170 (10.80%) 5 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 228 (16.39%) 6 86 (13.75%) 112 (11.79%) 198 (12.55%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 266 (16.99%) 6 61.00%) 128 (13.47%) 199 (12.45%) 3 64 (10.00%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3 243 (53.5%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 3 140 (20.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3 243 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 111 (10.5%) 27 (21.65%) 85 (5.40%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 2.3 64 (10.26%) 114 (12.05%) 137 (9.45%) 3.4	Don't Own Home	180 (28.85%)	194 (20.42%)	374 (23.76%)
1.1 23 (3.69%) 66 (6.95%) 89 (5.65%) 1.2 30 (481%) 88 (9.26%) 118 (7.50%) 2 87 (13.94%) 209 (2.00%) 22% (18.81%) 3 64 (10.26%) 115 (12.11%) 1.79 (11.37%) 4 88 (0.28%) 113 (14.00%) 258 (16.39%) 5 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 258 (16.99%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.25%) 2266 (16.99%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 43 (38.5%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 2 132 (21.15%) 3326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%) 3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.5%) 557 (36.66%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.5%) 174 (11.05%) 5 300 39 (4.11%) 196 (12.45%) 11 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 114 (12.05%) 174 (11.05%) 12 29 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.01%) 3 64 (0.02.6%)	NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1.2 30 (4.81%) 88 (9.26%) 118 (7.50%) 2 87 (13.94%) 209 (22.00%) 226 (18.81%) 3 64 (10.26%) 115 (12.11%) 179 (10.80%) 4 80 (12.82%) 90 (9.47%) 170 (10.80%) 5 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 258 (16.39%) 6 86 (13.78%) 112 (11.77%) 198 (12.58%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 266 (16.90%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 41 (32.85%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 2 132 (21.15%) 326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 4 79 (12.66%) 95 (10.00%) 174 (11.05%) 5 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 2.4 23 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.2 23 (8.09%) 132 (13.89%) 1	1.1	23 (3.69%)	66 (6.95%)	89 (5.65%)
2 87 (13.4%) 209 (22.0%) 296 (18.1%) 3 64 (10.26%) 115 (12.11%) 179 (11.37%) 4 80 (12.82%) 90 (9.4%) 170 (10.80%) 5 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 228 (16.39%) 6 86 (13.78%) 112 (11.79%) 198 (12.88%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 266 (16.90%) KGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 1 24 (3.85%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 146 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 3 60.90%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 1 110 (12.05%) 57 (36.66%) 1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 3.2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.01%) 3.4 69 (10.42%) 114 (12.00%) 178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (44.11%) 261 (16.85%)	1.2	30 (4.81%)	88 (9.26%)	118 (7.50%)
3 64 (10.26%) 115 (12.11%) 179 (11.37%) 4 80 (12.82%) 90 (9.47%) 170 (10.80%) 5 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 258 (16.39%) 6 86 (13.78%) 112 (11.79%) 198 (12.58%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 266 (16.90%) 8CSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 24 (3.85%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 336 (43.23%) 458 (29.10%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 124 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 174 (11.05%) 174 (11.05%) 1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 112 (12.06%) 78 (82.16%) 132 (8.39%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 132 (8.39%) 132 (8.39%) 2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.01%) 174 (11.05%) 177 (4.89%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 132 (8.39%) 132 (8.39%) 132 (20.11%)	2	87 (13.94%)	209 (22.00%)	296 (18.81%)
4 80 (12.82%) 90 (9.47%) 170 (10.80%) 5 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 228 (16.39%) 6 86 (13.78%) 112 (11.79%) 129 (10.80%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 266 (16.90%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 24 (3.85%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 2 132 (21.15%) 326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%) 3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 4 79 (12.66%) 95 (10.00%) 174 (11.05%) 5 38 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) 1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.2 91 (14.58%) 924 (30.58%) 315 (20.01%) 1.2 91 (14.58%) 924 (30.58%) 315 (20.01%) 3 66 (19.26%) 94 (19.26%) 133 (14.01%) 128 (8.3%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 3 61.026%) 114 (12.00%) 178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%)	3	64 (10.26%)	115 (12.11%)	179 (11.37%)
5 125 (20.03%) 133 (14.00%) 258 (16.39%) 6 86 (13.78%) 112 (11.7%) 198 (12.58%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 266 (16.90%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 137 (14.42%) 266 (16.90%) 1 24 (3.85%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 2 132 (21.15%) 326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%) 3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 4 79 (12.66%) 95 (10.00%) 174 (11.05%) 5 38 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 111 77 (4.89%) 132 (8.39%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) 3.2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.11%) 3 64 (10.26%) 174 (12.03%) 127 (9.37%) 129 (12.64%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 127 (9.97%) 123 (7.81%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6	4	80 (12.82%)	90 (9.47%)	170 (10.80%)
6 86 (13.78%) 112 (11.79%) 198 (12.58%) 7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 266 (16.90%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 24 (3.85%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 2 132 (21.15%) 326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%) 3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 4 79 (12.66%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 11 5 5 1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 1.3 61 (4.10.26%) 114 (12.00%) 1178 (11.31%) 3 60.9% 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 3 60.9% 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 3 61 (12.65%) 114 (12.00%) 1178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%	5	125 (20.03%)	133 (14.00%)	258 (16.39%)
7 129 (20.67%) 137 (14.42%) 266 (16.90%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 24 (3.85%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 1 132 (21.15%) 326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%) 3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 4 79 (12.66%) 95 (10.00%) 1174 (11.05%) 5 38 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90	6	86 (13.78%)	112 (11.79%)	198 (12.58%)
RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000 24 (3.85%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 1 22 (21.15%) 326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%) 3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 4 79 (12.66%) 95 (10.00%) 174 (11.05%) 5 38 (6.09%) 93 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90	7	129 (20.67%)	137 (14.42%)	266 (16.90%)
1 24 (3.85%) 68 (7.16%) 92 (5.84%) 2 132 (21.15%) 326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%) 3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 4 79 (12.66%) 95 (10.00%) 174 (11.05%) 5 38 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 10 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 132 (8.39%) 132 (8.39%) 2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.01%) 178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) 7 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) <td>RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000</td> <td>× ,</td> <td></td> <td>· · · · · ·</td>	RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000	× ,		· · · · · ·
2 132 (21.15%) 326 (34.32%) 458 (29.10%) 3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 3 79 (12.66%) 59 (10.00%) 174 (11.05%) 5 38 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90	1	24 (3.85%)	68 (7.16%)	92 (5.84%)
3NM 68 (10.90%) 128 (13.47%) 196 (12.45%) 3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 4 79 (12.66%) 95 (10.00%) 174 (11.05%) 5 38 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (2.01%) 3 64 (10.26%) 114 (12.00%) 178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 1 12 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 30M 229 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3 5 (5.61%) 88 (9.26%) <td>2</td> <td>132 (21.15%)</td> <td>326 (34.32%)</td> <td>458 (29.10%)</td>	2	132 (21.15%)	326 (34.32%)	458 (29.10%)
3M 283 (45.35%) 294 (30.95%) 577 (36.66%) 4 79 (12.66%) 95 (10.00%) 174 (11.05%) 5 38 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (489%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 11 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 128 (8.39%) 132 (8.39%) 2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.01%) 138 (8.09%) 142 (8.38%) 157 (9.97%) 3 64 (10.26%) 114 (12.00%) 178 (11.31%) 149 (11.47%) 199 (14.65%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 157 (9.97%) 5 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 102 (14.7%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) 86 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) 86 (14.90%) 319 (14.84%) 8 9.26 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 33 (5.61%) 88 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 236 (34.05%) 39 (3NM	68 (10.90%)	128 (13.47%)	196 (12.45%)
4 79 (12.66%) 95 (10.00%) 174 (11.05%) 5 38 (6.09%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.89%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.1 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.01%) 3 64 (10.26%) 114 (12.00%) 178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 227 (15.69%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 5 123 (7.81%) 1 35 (5.61%) 88 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 2 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 5 29 (42.5%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) <td< td=""><td>3M</td><td>283 (45.35%)</td><td>294 (30.95%)</td><td>577 (36.66%)</td></td<>	3M	283 (45.35%)	294 (30.95%)	577 (36.66%)
5 38 (6.0%) 39 (4.11%) 77 (4.8%) NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.2 38 (6.0%) 94 (9.8%) 132 (8.3%) 2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.01%) 3 64 (10.26%) 114 (12.00%) 178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 224 (23.58%) 8 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 132 (13.89%) 244 (15.69%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC2000 40.04 (13.09) 51.5	4	79 (12.66%)	95 (10.00%)	174 (11.05%)
NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 V	5	38 (6.09%)	39 (4.11%)	77 (4.89%)
1.1 20 (3.21%) 65 (6.84%) 85 (5.40%) 1.2 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.01%) 3 64 (10.26%) 114 (12.00%) 178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 09 01 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 107 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 5 29 (46.5%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.078 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81)	NS-SEC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90	() /		. ,
1.2 38 (6.09%) 94 (9.89%) 132 (8.39%) 2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.01%) 3 64 (10.26%) 114 (12.00%) 178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) 7 115 (18.43%) 122 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) 8GSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 391 (24.84%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 44 97 (15.54%) 107 (11.26%) 204 (12.96%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%)	1.1	20 (3.21%)	65 (6.84%)	85 (5.40%)
2 91 (14.58%) 224 (23.58%) 315 (20.01%) 3 64 (10.26%) 114 (12.00%) 178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) 1 35 (5.61%) 88 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 239 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 44.05%) 244 (12.6%) 244.84%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) 64.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52) Data Source: BCS [Sweeps 0-5]	1.2	38 (6.09%)	94 (9.89%)	132 (8.39%)
3 64 (10.26%) 114 (12.00%) 178 (11.31%) 4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90	2	91 (14.58%)	224 (23.58%)	315 (20.01%)
4 79 (12.66%) 78 (8.21%) 157 (9.97%) 5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.6%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 1 35 (5.61%) 88 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 2 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 5 29 (46.5%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52)	3	64 (10.26%)	114 (12.00%)	178 (11.31%)
5 127 (20.35%) 134 (14.11%) 261 (16.58%) 6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 102 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) 1 35 (5.61%) 88 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 2 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 4 97 (15.54%) 107 (11.26%) 204 (12.96%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52)	4	79 (12.66%)	78 (8.21%)	157 (9.97%)
6 90 (14.42%) 109 (11.47%) 199 (12.64%) 7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 33 (5.61%) 88 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 2 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 4 97 (15.54%) 107 (11.26%) 204 (12.96%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52)	5	127 (20.35%)	134 (14.11%)	261 (16.58%)
7 115 (18.43%) 132 (13.89%) 247 (15.69%) RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90	6	90 (14.42%)	109 (11.47%)	199 (12.64%)
RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90 88 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 1 35 (5.61%) 88 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 2 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (54.05%) 4 97 (15.54%) 107 (11.26%) 204 (12.96%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52)	7	115 (18.43%)	132 (13.89%)	247 (15.69%)
1 35 (5.61%) 88 (9.26%) 123 (7.81%) 2 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 4 97 (15.54%) 107 (11.26%) 204 (12.96%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 57.11 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52)	RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90			. ,
2 112 (17.95%) 279 (29.37%) 391 (24.84%) 3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 4 97 (15.54%) 107 (11.26%) 204 (12.96%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC2000 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52)	1	35 (5.61%)	88 (9.26%)	123 (7.81%)
3NM 92 (14.74%) 174 (18.32%) 266 (16.90%) 3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 4 97 (15.54%) 107 (11.26%) 204 (12.96%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52)	2	112 (17.95%)	279 (29.37%)	391 (24.84%)
3M 259 (41.51%) 277 (29.16%) 536 (34.05%) 4 97 (15.54%) 107 (11.26%) 204 (12.96%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52)	3NM	92 (14.74%)	174 (18.32%)	266 (16.90%)
4 97 (15.54%) 107 (11.26%) 204 (12.96%) 5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52)	3M	259 (41.51%)	277 (29.16%)	536 (34.05%)
5 29 (4.65%) 25 (2.63%) 54 (3.43%) CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52) Data Source: BCS [Sweeps 0-5]	4	97 (15.54%)	107 (11.26%)	204 (12.96%)
CAMSIS SOC2000 45.78 (12.51) 51.21 (14.21) 49.06 (13.81) CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52) Data Source: BCS [Sweeps 0-5]	5	29 (4.65%)	25 (2.63%)	54 (3.43%)
CAMSIS SOC90 46.04 (13.09) 51.57 (15.00) 49.38 (14.52) Data Source: BCS [Sweeps 0-5]	CAMSIS SOC2000	45.78 (12.51)	51.21 (14.21)	49.06 (13.81)
Data Source: BCS [Sweeps 0-5]	CAMSIS SOC90	46.04 (13.09)	51.57 (15.00)	49.38 (14.52)
	Data Source:	BCS [Sweeps 0-5]	. ,	. ,



BCS Sensitivity Analysis of Social Stratification Variables





Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, and Social Stratification Measures included in Model

KHB Decomposition

		NS-SEC M	lodel	RGSC Mo	del	CAMSIS M	lodel
		Log	SE	Log	SE	Log	SE
		Odds		Odds		Odds	
Educational	Reduced	1.30***	(0.12)	1.29***	(0.12)	1.29***	(0.12)
Attainment	Full	1.21***	(0.12)	1.19***	(0.12)	1.16***	(0.12)
	Difference	0.09**	(0.04)	0.10**	(0.04)	0.12***	(0.04)
Sex	Reduced	-0.59***	(0.11)	-0.59***	(0.11)	-0.59***	(0.11)
	Full	-0.58***	(0.11)	-0.58***	(0.11)	-0.58***	(0.11)
	Difference	-0.01	(0.03)	-0.01	(0.03)	-0.01	(0.03)
Housing Tenure	Reduced	-0.31**	(0.13)	-0.31**	(0.13)	-0.30**	(0.13)
	Full	-0.20	(0.13)	-0.19	(0.13)	-0.16	(0.13)
	Difference	-0.11**	(0.04)	-0.12***	(0.04)	-0.15***	(0.04)

	NS-SEC M	lodel		RGSC Mo	del		CAMSIS Model			
	Confo unding ratio	Confo unding percen tage	Resc aling facto r	Confo unding ratio	Confo unding percen tage	Resc aling facto r	Confo unding ratio	Confo unding percen tage	Resc aling facto r	
Educ ation	1.07	6.66	1.02	1.09	8.03	1.02	1.11	9.65	1.02	
al										
Attai										
nmen										
t										
Sex	1.01	0.85	1.02	1.01	1.45	1.02	1.01	0.90	1.01	
Hous	1.55	35.61	1.03	1.62	38.35	1.02	1.96	48.96	1.01	
ing										
Tenu										
re										



Comaprative Log Odds and Quasi-variance Statistics by Parental Social Class

Data Source: BCS, N=1,574

Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Parental Social Stratification Measures on Continuing Schooling

Data Source: BCS, N=1,574 Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



BCS Sensitivity Analysis of SOC codes

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583

escriptive	Statistics comparing	NS-SEC by SO	C2000 and SOC90 of	codes					
			NS-SI	EC Social Class	of Father when Re	spondent Child SO	C90		
	Large Employers and higher managerial occupations	Higher professional occupations	Lower Managerial and professional occupations	Intermediate occupations	Small employers and own account workers	Lower supervisory and technical occupations	Semi-routine occupations	Routine occupations	Total

N	85.00	132.00	315.00	178.00	157.00	261.00	199.00	247.00	1574.00
	(5.40%)	(8.39%)	(20.01%)	(11.31%)	(9.97%)	(16.58%)	(12.64%)	(15.69%)	(100.00%)
NS-SEC Social	75	1 (0.76%)	6 (1.90%)	5 (2.81%)	2 (1.27%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	89 (5.65%)
Class of	(88.24%)								
Father when									
Respondent									
Child									
SOC2000									

Large Employers and higher managerial occupations	2 (2.35%)	106 (80.30%)	7 (2.22%)	3 (1.69%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	118 (7.50%)
Higher professional occupations	7 (8.24%)	25 (18.94%)	251 (79.68%)	4 (2.25%)	5 (3.18%)	1 (0.38%)	2 (1.01%)	1 (0.40%)	296 (18.81%)

Lower Managerial and professional occupations	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (2.54%)	156 (87.64%)	1 (0.64%)	7 (2.68%)	4 (2.01%)	3 (1.21%)	179 (11.37%)
Intermediate occupations	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	29 (9.21%)	1 (0.56%)	138 (87.90%)	1 (0.38%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.40%)	170 (10.80%)

Small employers and own account workers	1 (1.18%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (1.59%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (1.27%)	243 (93.10%)	3 (1.51%)	4 (1.62%)	258 (16.39%)
Lower supervisory and technical occupations	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (2.54%)	8 (4.49%)	2 (1.27%)	0 (0.00%)	178 (89.45%)	2 (0.81%)	198 (12.58%)

Semi-routine occupations	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.32%)	1 (0.56%)	7 (4.46%)	9 (3.45%)	12 (6.03%)	236 (95.55%)	266 (16.90%)
Routine occupations	75 (88.24%)	1 (0.76%)	6 (1.90%)	5 (2.81%)	2 (1.27%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	89 (5.65%)

Data Source: NCDS [Sweeps 0-4]

Descriptive Statistics comparing RGSC by SOC2000 and SOC90 codes									
	RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC90								
	Professional	Managerial and Technical	Skilled non- manual	Skilled manual	Partly skilled	Unskilled	Total		
Ν	123 (7.81%)	391 (24.84%)	266 (16.90%)	536 (34.05%)	204 (12.96%)	54 (3.43%)	1574 (100.00%)		
RGSC Social Class of Father when Respondent Child SOC2000									
Professional	90 (73.17%)	1 (0.26%)	1 (0.38%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	92 (5.84%)		
Managerial and Technical	32 (26.02%)	352 (90.03%)	66 (24.81%)	2 (0.37%)	6 (2.94%)	0 (0.00%)	458 (29.10%)		
Skilled non- manual	0 (0.00%)	11 (2.81%)	175 (65.79%)	5 (0.93%)	5 (2.45%)	0 (0.00%)	196 (12.45%)		
Skilled manual	0 (0.00%)	21 (5.37%)	4 (1.50%)	505 (94.22%)	45 (22.06%)	2 (3.70%)	577 (36.66%)		
Partly skilled	1 (0.81%)	6 (1.53%)	7 (2.63%)	19 (3.54%)	137 (67.16%)	4 (7.41%)	174. (11.05%)		
Unskilled	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	13 (4.89%)	5 (0.93%)	11 (5.39%)	48 (88.89%)	77 (4.89%)		
	Data Source: NCDS [Sweeps 0-4]								

CAMSIS2000	
Mean	49.06
Standard Deviation	13.81
CAMSIS90	
Mean	49.38
Standard Deviation	14.52
Ν	1574
Data Source: N	CDS [Sweeps 0-4]



Comaprative Log Odds and Quasi-variance Statistics by SOC construction of Parental NS-SEC

Data Source: BCS, N=1,574

Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Parental NS-SEC on Continuing Schooling by SOC Codes

Data Source: BCS, N=1,574, SOC 2000 on left, SOC 90 on right Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



Comaprative Log Odds and Quasi-variance Statistics by SOC construction of Parental RGSC

Data Source: BCS, N=1,574

Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model


Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Parental RGSC on Continuing Schooling by SOC Codes

Data Source: BCS, N=1,574, SOC 2000 on left, SOC 90 on right Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Parental CAMSIS on Continuing Schooling by SOC Codes

Data Source: BCS, N=1,574, SOC 2000 on left, SOC 90 on right Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model

Coefficient Plots of Logistic Regression Results by SOC Betas and CIs of Logit model analysing structural impacts on continuing schooling



Data Source: NCDS, N=8,411. SOC2000 on left, SOC90 on right.

Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, and Social Stratification Measures included in Model



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Social Stratification Measures on Continuing Schooling by SOC Predictive margins across row one, AMEs across row two

Data Source: BCS, N=1,574 Educational Attainment, Sex, and Housing Tenure also included in Model. Reference Category for AMEs for NS-SEC=2 and RGSC=2.



BCS Multiple Imputation

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583

Ν	Percent	Educational	Economic	Housing	NS-SEC	Sex
	Complete (%)	Attainment	Activity	Tenure		
1575	14	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
3860	34	\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
2806	25			\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
1109	10		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
387	3	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark
Total =						
11,261						





Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, and Social Stratification Measures included in Model

Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of Parental NS-SEC on Continuing Schooling CRA verus MI Models







A Return to Pooled Analysis

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583



Betas and CIs of Logit model analysing structural impacts on continuing schooling

Coefficient Plots of Logistic Regression Results

Data Source: NCDS & BCS

Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, and Social Stratification Measures included in Model

Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of NS-SEC on Continuing Schooling by Cohorts CRA versus MI models



Data Source: NCDS & BCS, Reference Category NS-SEC 2 for AMEs Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.





Data Source: NCDS & BCS

Sex, Housing Tenure, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.



Data Source: NCDS & BCS

Sex, Housing Tenure, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.



Data Source: NCDS & BCS

Sex, Housing Tenure, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.



Data Source: NCDS & BCS

Sex, Housing Tenure, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.



Conclusions

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583



Conclusions

- Structures matter though some cohort dependent
- Social Stratification measures and SOC codes are sensitivity to time
- Handling missing data is important



Youth's First Destination



Critique and Expansion

- Treating youth transitions like a binary is useful but naïve
- Instead of looking at youth's first transition, let us look at their first destination
- Same analytical sample
 - De-dummying dependent variable
 - Economic Activity after mandatory schooling: Employment, Continuing Schooling (REF), Apprenticeship, Unemployment + OLF

Coefficient Plots of Multinominal Logistic Regression Results Betas and CIs of Mlogit model analysing structural impacts on youth's first destination



Data Source: NCDS & BCS, N= 19672. BCS Cohort conditionally imputed.

Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions included in Model

Predictive Margins of Educational Attainment by Cohorts Multnominal logistic regression using continuing schooling as the reference category



Data Source: NCDS & BCS, N= 19672. BCS Cohort conditionally imputed. Sex, Housing Tenure, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.

Predictive Margins of Sex by Cohorts Multnominal logistic regression using continuing schooling as the reference category



Data Source: NCDS & BCS, N= 19672. BCS Cohort conditionally imputed.

Educational Attainment, Housing Tenure, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.

Predictive Margins of Housing Tenure by Cohorts Multnominal logistic regression using continuing schooling as the reference category



 https://scottoa
 Data Source: NCDS & BCS, N= 19672. BCS Cohort conditionally imputed.

 Educational Attainment, Sex, NS-SEC, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.



Predictive and Average Marginal Effects of NS-SEC on Youth's First Destination by Cohorts Multinominal logistic regression using continuing schooling as the reference category

Data Source: NCDS & BCS, Reference Category NS-SEC 2 for AMEs. BCS Cohort conditionally imputed. Educational Attainment, Sex, Housing Tenure, and Cohort interactions also included in Model.



Conclusions

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583



Synthetic Cohorts

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583



Synthetic Cohorts

- Youth Transition black hole the 1980s/90s
- Solution: Construct Synthetic Cohorts using BHPS and UKHLS data



Synthetic Cohort Year (BHPS only)	n	%
1995	154	4.28
1996	178	4.95
1997	156	4.34
1998	149	4.14
1999	194	5.39
2000	185	4.14
2001	268	7.45
2002	302	8.40
2003	272	7.56
2004	265	7.37
2005	302	8.40
2006	313	8.70
2007	319	8.87
2008	271	7.53
2009	269	7.48
Total	3597	100



Concluding Remarks

- Different structural inequalities have varying levels of influence on an individual's transition from school-to-work dependent on the type of transitional category that individual enters.
- Sensitivity analysis presents some interesting takeaways for further research
- Handling missing data is important, but the 'good' methods you choose from are not so much

https://scottoatley.shinyapps.io/Youth_In_Transition/

Influencing the world since 1583



References

- Beck, U., Giddens, A. and Lash, S. (1994) *Reflexive modernization: Politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order*. Stanford University Press.
- Devine, F. (2017) 'The "new structuralism": class politics and class analysis', in *Social Class and Marxism*. Taylor & Francis.
- Elder, G.H. (1994) 'Time, Human Agency, and Social Change: Perspectives on the Life Course', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57(1), p. 4. Available at: <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/2786971</u>.
- Gayle, V., Lambert, P. and Murray, S. (2009) 'School-to-Work in the 1990s: Modelling Transitions with Large-Scale Datasets', in R. Brooks (ed.) *Transitions from Education to Work*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 17–41. Available at: <u>https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230235403_2</u>.
- Mayer, K.U. (2004) 'Whose Lives? How History, Societies, and Institutions Define and Shape Life Courses', *Research in Human Development*, 1(3), pp. 161–187. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427617rhd0103_3.
- Power, C. and Elliott, J. (2006) 'Cohort profile: 1958 British birth cohort (National Child Development Study)', *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 35(1), pp. 34–41. Available at: <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyi183</u>.
- Silverwood, R. et al. (2021) 'Handling missing data in the National Child Development Study: User guide (Version 2).'



Thank You

• Any Questions?