

# The Declining Relative Importance of Ability in Predicting Educational Attainment

Fernando Galindo-Rueda\* and Anna Vignoles\*\*

October 2003

Most countries seek to improve children's educational levels and standards. Commonly, this has taken the form of striving for greater educational attainment by able individuals from poor backgrounds. Britain has certainly experienced a substantial rise in education levels. For example, in 1960, just 12% of all British students stayed past compulsory school leaving age (15); this has since risen to 70%. In this study, we use two unique British panel datasets to test whether this rise in enrolment has been associated with an increased reliance on cognitive ability in determining educational achievement or whether parental income and other measures of socioeconomic status have become better predictors of school attainment. We find that early cognitive ability became a less important predictor of subsequent educational performance. This is partly because the average performance of low ability children increased during the time period.

*\* Centre for the Economics of Education, Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics. Corresponding author: f.galindo-rueda@lse.ac.uk*

*\*\* Institute of Education and Centre for the Economics of Education, Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics*

JEL Classification: I2.

Keywords: Education; Ability; Income; Social Class.

## Acknowledgements

Funding from the Treasury's Evidence Based Policy Fund and the EC Framework 5 EDWIN (Education and Wage Inequality in Europe) grant is gratefully acknowledged.

## **Introduction**

Most countries seek to improve children's educational levels and standards. Indeed in the last fifty years or so, there has been an almost unprecedented increase in educational attainment in most, if not all, developed and developing countries (Barro and Lee (2000)). However, as overall educational attainment has risen, attention has increasingly focused on the related issue of educational inequality. Commonly, egalitarian concerns have taken the form of striving for greater educational attainment by more able individuals from poor backgrounds. From an empirical perspective therefore, the key questions are whether family background (e.g. family income levels and social class) has become steadily less important in determining educational attainment, and, in corollary, whether actual ability has become a more important factor in predicting how well an individual will do in educational terms.

We consider this important policy issue in the context of the British education system, which makes for an interesting case study because it has undergone some dramatic policy changes in the post-war period, and has also experienced a significant increase in educational attainment over the last 40 years or so. Whereas in 1960 just 12% of the cohort stayed on past the compulsory school leaving age of 15, 70% now stay on in school past the age of 16 (the current compulsory school leaving age) and 45% enter higher education. In this paper we use two unique British panel data sets that cover the

early part of this expansion<sup>1</sup>, to examine changes over time in the relationship between cognitive ability and educational achievement.

Our results suggest a decline in the role of cognitive ability in determining educational achievement during the period under consideration. A person's early measured cognitive ability became a poorer predictor of their educational achievement, whilst family background (as measured by parental income at least) became somewhat more important. The fact that cognitive ability became less important would seem to be a retrograde step, especially given the increased importance of family background. Yet part of the explanation for our result is that the achievement of the least able students has risen markedly during the period. In other words, early cognitive ability is a poorer predictor of educational outcomes partly because the qualification levels of the least able have risen so much.

The paper is set out as follows. The next section describes our data, its advantages and the cognitive ability measures we construct. Our results section documents the changes in the extent to which cognitive ability and family background factors determine an individual's education level. We then discuss some changes in British educational policy and end with our conclusions.

---

<sup>1</sup> The older cohort attended school in the late 1960s and 1970s. The younger cohort attended school in the 1970s and 1980s. Thus our results pertain to changes over this period. We cannot comment on the effects of the (accelerated) expansion of the British education system in the 1990s.

## Data

This paper builds on the literature relating cognitive ability to various socio-economic outcomes (see Chevalier and Lanot (2002) for the UK and Cawley *et al.* (1996) for the US). It also relates to earlier empirical evidence on the role of family background factors (e.g. parental income and social class) in determining educational attainment (Haveman and Wolfe (1995)). Our unique data<sup>2</sup> enable us to overcome some of the problems in this literature and thus we spend some time explaining the advantages of our data sets.

We use highly comparable longitudinal information from two British cohorts, namely, the National Child Development Study of 1958 (NCDS) and the British Cohort Study of 1970 (BCS). The former follows the cohort born in Britain in the week of the 3<sup>rd</sup> of March 1958, with follow ups on the children and their families and school environments at the ages of 7, 11 and 16. Further follow up studies were undertaken in 1981 (age 23), 1991 (age 33) and 2000 (age 42). BCS is a longitudinal study of British children born between the 5<sup>th</sup> and the 11<sup>th</sup> of April 1970, with surveys at ages 5, 10, 16, 21, 26 and 30. The two studies are not identical, since respondents were not interviewed at exactly the same ages. Nonetheless, the questions asked of the two sets of respondents were very similar, enabling robust cohort comparisons to be made.

---

<sup>2</sup> The data used in this paper have been applied to other aspects of the relationship between socio-economic background, cognitive ability and socio-economic outcomes (Breen and Goldthorpe (1999, 2001); Currie and Thomas (1999); Dearden (1999); Dearden *et al.* (1997); Feinstein and Symons (1997); Harmon and Walker (2000); McCulloch and Joshi (2000); Saunders (1997). Blanden *et al.* (2002) have also considered intergenerational mobility in these data. There is also a related literature on social mobility: Erikson and Goldthorpe (1985), Saunders (1997) and Schoon *et al.* (2002), to cite just a few.

An advantage of our data is that we have full information on each cohort member's early cognitive ability, with two sets of ability test scores prior to the age of 11. We also have information on respondents' initial social class, details of the school they attended and measures of their subsequent educational attainment. Many other papers in this field have had to rely on more contemporaneous information on cognitive ability, parental social class and respondents' educational attainment, making it difficult to identify any causal relationships<sup>3</sup>.

The descriptive statistics in table 1 indicate that the later cohort has more education than the earlier (1958) cohort, as expected. Furthermore, the social class structure has changed somewhat between the two cohorts, with an increase in the proportion of the later (1970) cohort claiming to come from an intermediate background. In terms of other family background indicators, respondents from the 1958 cohort had less educated parents and fewer siblings.

[Table 1 near here]

In addition to structural changes between the two cohorts, we were also concerned about attrition from the two panels. We therefore undertook various analyses to test for bias due to differential attrition. The proportion of each cohort that attrits, or has incomplete data, by the age of 33 (30 in BCS) is remarkably similar (see Table 1 above). However, we did find some differential attrition by region and other characteristics. Nonetheless all the

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, Cawley *et al.* (1996) use the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth data which tests respondents' ability at a much later age (in high school). Carneiro *et al.* (2003) do attempt to account for the effect of completed schooling on later ability measurements.

results presented here are robust to re-weighting based on estimated attrition probabilities<sup>4</sup>.

Of course the variable that we are most interested in is cognitive ability. We follow the methodology used in Cawley *et al.* (1996) to construct our ability measure. Cognitive ability test scores obtained at the age of 11 for the 1958 NCDS cohort and at age 10 for 1970 BCS<sup>5</sup> cohort constitute the basis for most of the analysis because of the proximity in terms of age across cohorts and the similar type of scores derived<sup>6</sup>. However, we also have ability measures at ages 5 (BCS) and 7 (NCDS), which we use to verify our results. As has been said, all our ability measures precede entry into secondary school and, of course, individuals' eventual educational achievement level.

Because the cognitive ability tests administered to the two cohorts were not exactly identical, it is not possible to use a raw test score in the analysis. Using dummies for quintiles of the distribution of scores has been the standard approach so far, but the relatively high correlation between the different test scores often leads to multicollinearity problems and other missing data issues<sup>7</sup>. We therefore used principal components analysis to construct an index of cognitive ability for each survey, using the first principal component extracted.

---

<sup>4</sup> Further information available from the authors on request.

<sup>5</sup> There is considerable overlap for both cohorts in the specific age at which these tests were taken as the data collection process extends for periods longer than one year in both surveys.

<sup>6</sup> NCDS test scores at the age of 11 were (i) reading, (ii) maths ability, (iii) non-verbal general ability, (iv) verbal general ability and (v) copying designs. BCS test scores at 10 include (i) maths, (ii) reading and (iii) British Ability Scale test of general ability.

<sup>7</sup> Most papers using these data (NCDS and BCS) restrict themselves to using the reading and maths quintiles, neglecting important information from the general ability scores. Breen and Goldthorpe (2001) argue that the general ability scores in both NCDS and BCS, although different, are a good proxy for IQ.

In the psychometric literature, this measure has been frequently associated with the construct *g*, described as the underlying general ability or intelligence factor (Cawley *et al.* (1996)). Arguments about the best way to measure general intelligence continue. We take a pragmatic view. The main reason for using a construct of *g* is to enable the conversion of a set of cognitive ability measures into a single, continuous, cross-cohort comparable variable. Our interpretation of this variable is that of an index that allows us to rank each individual, within her own cohort, in terms of cognitive ability. We do not interpret the index as an absolute measure of cognitive skills, since the average level of cognitive skills may have increased between cohorts, perhaps as a result of increased levels of schooling.

Information about the process of extracting *g* for each cohort from the set of available ability scores is provided in table 2. The first two columns indicate the principal component order and the cumulative proportion of the overall variation explained by each principal component. Columns 3 and 4 specify the correlation between each test score and the first principal component, which can be considered as an indicator of the contribution of each score to the construct *g*.

[Table 2 near here]

Because there are more tests available in NCDS (5) than in BCS (3), we observe that the first principal component in the former case explains a lower proportion of the total variation. Substantial differences in the variation of *g* across cohorts could also be due to

test differences, such as the absence of a copying designs test in BCS. We therefore calculated  $g$  for the NCDS cohort in three different possible ways: including all scores, excluding copying designs, and aggregating verbal and non-verbal ability into one score, and found high (98/99%) correlations between these alternative specifications. In particular the proportion of variance explained by the first component is highly similar across the cohorts, as is the correlations with general ability, maths and reading. This supports the hypothesis that we are not treating different components of ability differently across cohorts.

The distributions of the ability indices are displayed in figure 1. This too confirms the high correlation between different constructs of  $g$  for NCDS. It also reveals a very close similarity between the distribution of  $g$  for NCDS and BCS. This leads us to accept  $g$  as a comparable index of an individual's cognitive ability ranking within their own cohort.

[Figure 1 near here]

Additional controls used in this paper include: father's social class, measures of family income at age 16, parental education and age when child was born and the number of children in the household at age 11/10.

## **Results**

To examine whether cognitive ability played a lesser or greater role in determining educational outcomes for the later cohort, we pooled the data from our two cohorts. We then estimated a generalised ordered logit model, where the dependent variable is the



highest achieved academic qualification level (as measured at age 30 in BCS and 33 in NCDS). The generalised ordered logit model does not impose the effect of the explanatory variables to be identical across thresholds, unlike say the standard ordered logit model<sup>8</sup>. The dependent variable consists of five educational attainment categories:

- (i) no qualifications
- (ii) Certificates of Secondary Education (CSE), grades 2 to 5, or less than 5 Ordinary levels (O levels) – equivalent to less than a high school diploma
- (iii) more than 5 O levels – equivalent to high school diploma
- (iv) Advanced level (A-level) – equivalent to high school plus good Scholastic Aptitude Test scores or the first year of college
- (v) Degree or above - equivalent to college graduate.

Table 3 presents selected results from a model of educational attainment, which controls for cognitive ability and family background, as well as a number of other individual characteristics. For reasons of space we cannot show the coefficients on each variable for each of the five thresholds. The results in Table 3 pertain specifically to an important threshold from a policy perspective, namely that between high school graduation and first year college (i.e. between 5 or more O levels and A levels). The model was estimated separately for men and women. We included a dummy variable indicating whether the person was in the 1970 cohort, with the base case being someone from the 1958 cohort. This allowed for the overall increase in educational attainment across the two cohorts. We then tested for significant interactions between all the controls and the cohort dummy variable, to determine whether cognitive ability, family background and other

---

<sup>8</sup> Indeed the hypothesis that the explanatory variables have similar impacts across thresholds is always rejected in the data.

characteristics had a changing impact on educational attainment across the two cohorts. Our primary focus is the changing role of early cognitive ability in determining educational attainment. We therefore ran our model including very early cognitive ability measures (age 5-7) which are shown in column 1 of Table 3 for boys and column 3 for girls, as well as our preferred age 10/11 ability measures<sup>9</sup>, as shown in column 2 for boys and column 4 for girls.

As is evident from Table 3, a person's early cognitive ability (whenever measured) is an important determinant of their final qualification level, consistent with the other literature in this field. Our results suggested two further striking findings. Firstly, being more able had a lesser impact on your educational attainment if you were from the later cohort, i.e. the ability cohort interaction terms were negatively significant. This implies that cognitive ability became a less important determinant of educational attainment for the more recent cohort. This result held up regardless of whether age 5/7 or age 10/11 tests were used. Furthermore, the reduced importance of early cognitive ability in determining educational outcomes for the later cohort was observed across all the educational thresholds we considered<sup>10</sup>.

Our model also included family background variables, such as parental income and social class. In fact both parental income and parental social class are proxy measures for the true monetary and non-monetary inputs into the child's educational development during childhood, loosely described as family background. Each family background variable has

---

<sup>9</sup> These ability measures are preferred since the age at which the children took the tests is more similar for both cohorts than was the case for the earlier ability test scores.

<sup>10</sup> Full results available on request from the authors.

its own drawbacks. Cross cohort comparisons of the impact of parental income are quite problematic, given that the distribution of income widened considerably during this period (1970s and 1980s). Equally changes in the structure of the work force mean that cross cohort comparisons based on parental social class are equally difficult. Hence although Table 3 shows results using quintiles of the parental income distribution as the primary family background measure, we also estimated our models using social class. In the model in Table 3, the impact of being in the top quintile of the income distribution became markedly greater for the more recent cohort and this trend was observed across all the educational thresholds up to A-level. However, when social class was included the interactions between social class and cohort were generally insignificant. This reflects the problem discussed earlier, of using social class as a family background indicator when there have been structural changes in the composition of the social classes over time (and in particular when there have been aggregate increases in the proportion of the work force in the higher social class categories). We can only conclude therefore that family background, as defined by parental income, appears to have a somewhat more important role in determining educational outcomes for the more recent cohort.

We then investigated whether there were interactions between cognitive ability and family background, and whether these were changing over time. A graphical representation of our findings is perhaps the most effective way of showing the changing relationship between ability and educational outcomes by parental income level. Figure 2 shows, for boys, the relationship between cognitive ability and the probability of attaining higher education, for both the top and bottom quintiles of the income distribution. Figure

3 does the same for females. In both figures, the continuous line shows the relationship for the NCDS 1958 cohort, the broken line shows the relationship for the 1970 BCS cohort.

Our regression models have already shown that ability is a good predictor of educational attainment. Figures 2 and 3 confirm that for both cohorts, more able children have a higher probability of attaining HE, for a given level of parental income. What is also noticeable however is that the income related gap in educational attainment is only observed for the *most able* students in the 1958 cohort. For the 1970 cohort, a gap in achievement between the top and bottom income quintiles emerges at low levels of ability too. Thus for the earlier cohort, if a student is less able they stand a very low chance of attaining higher education, regardless of their income level. This generates a steep ability-educational attainment slope for the 1958 cohort. The steepness of this slope was reduced markedly for the 1970 cohort. In other words, the relationship between ability and educational attainment (measured here at the HE level) weakened. This is partly because the intercept of the 1970 curves shifted upwards in Figures 2 and 3. Thus the educational attainment of the least able increased across the two cohorts, although substantially more so for the better off students. This pattern was observed across all educational thresholds.

[Figures 2 and 3 here]

Table 4 confirms this, showing the educational attainment of different ability/ parental income combinations. Three levels of educational attainment are shown, firstly the

proportion with higher education, secondly the proportion with A levels or above (first year college) and lastly the proportion with O levels or above (high school graduates). Educational attainment has increased across the board for most income / ability combinations and particularly for low ability children. However, it is evident that the attainment of those from wealthier backgrounds has been greatest, regardless of their ability.

For example, whilst around 63% of middle ability –low-income<sup>11</sup> students reached higher education amongst the 1958 cohort, this rose by 5 percentage points to 68% in the 1970 cohort. By contrast, 72% of middle ability students from the top of the income distribution reached higher education in the 1958 cohort, rising 12 percentage points to 84% for the 1970 cohort. Another illustration is the fact that 24% of low ability-low income children achieved O levels or higher (high school graduation) amongst the 1958 cohort. This increased 19 percentage points to 43% in the 1970 cohort. Among low ability-high income children in the 1958 cohort, 33% achieved O levels or above, which increased 27 percentage points to nearly 60% for the 1970 cohort.

[Table 4 here]

These results suggest primarily that ability became a less important determinant of educational attainment over the period spanned by the 1958 and 1970 cohorts. The interpretation of this finding is however, complex. Ability became less important partly because the educational achievement of the least able students increased, as shown in

---

<sup>11</sup> Students whose parents' income level was in the bottom tercile of the distribution and who come from the middle tercile of the cognitive ability distribution as measured at age 10/11.

Figures 2 and 3. An alternative way of interpreting this finding is that attainment became markedly less related to ability. In other words it can be viewed as a good or a bad thing that students from the very bottom of the cognitive ability distribution now have a higher probability of getting a degree. If standards have not fallen, this result is a credit to the improvements made in the UK education system in raising the attainment of less able children. The result may however, equally reflect falling standards and the growing popular belief that “anyone can get a degree these days”. Given the difficulties in interpretation, some analysis of the changes in British educational policy that might have brought about these changes is required.

### **Changes in British Educational Policy**

Our main result is that cognitive ability played a lesser role in determining educational attainment for those born in 1970, as compared to an earlier generation born in 1958. During the period spanned by our two data sets (1960s to 1980s), Britain’s secondary education underwent a radical shift from selective to mixed ability schooling. This may have been important in explaining the declining role of early cognitive ability.

At the beginning of the period a large proportion of students in England and Wales (more than 90%<sup>12</sup>) were being taught within a selective school system. This selective system consisted of two<sup>13</sup> types of schools, grammar schools and secondary moderns. Grammar schools were more academically oriented and catered for the top 10-20% of the ability

---

<sup>12</sup> Less than 5% of schools in 1965 were mixed ability schools.

<sup>13</sup> In fact a third type of school existed, namely technical schools. These were very few in number however.

distribution, as identified by students' performance in an age eleven examination in English, mathematics and general IQ<sup>14</sup>. Secondary modern schools catered for the remaining 80% of the ability distribution and were more practical in orientation. Most students in secondary modern schools did not continue schooling beyond the compulsory school leaving age.

In 1965, legislation enabled local school districts to adopt a comprehensive or mixed ability system, whereby students of differing abilities are taught in the same school. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, selective and non-selective schools co-existed. However, by the end of the period (1980s), most British students were being taught in mixed ability schools. By definition the old selective school system placed great emphasis on a child's early cognitive ability, which directly determined their educational opportunities (i.e. which school they went to) and hence their outcomes. Dismantling this selective system may therefore have reduced the role of cognitive ability in determining educational outcomes.

It is worth noting however, that our data also suggest some diminution of the role of cognitive ability between the ages of 5/7 and 10/11, i.e. during primary school<sup>15</sup>. This might of course stem from changes in educational policy at both the primary and secondary levels, and not necessarily just because of the shift to comprehensive schooling

---

<sup>14</sup> Pupils who lived in an area with a selective school system might have anticipated the need to perform well in this age 11 examination. It is possible that their performance in other tests at this age would also be influenced by the fact that they lived in an area with a selective school system. This potential endogeneity is another reason to test the robustness of our results using the age 5/7 test scores. We are grateful to an anonymous referee for this suggestion.

<sup>15</sup> Results available from the authors on request.

at secondary level. However, since the shift to comprehensive schooling reduced the importance of children's cognitive performance at age 10/11, it might also have impacted on performance incentives in primary school. In other words, students, parents and teachers might have reduced their efforts to improve children's cognitive skills in primary school since they were no longer assessed at age 11<sup>16</sup>.

Certainly it is useful to examine the relationship between an individual's family background (parental income and social class) and their educational outcome before and after such a massive shift in educational policy<sup>17</sup>. There is already a large and controversial literature on the effectiveness of the grammar school system (summarised in Crook et al. (1999)) However, this is a particularly problematic research area. One obviously needs to evaluate the impact of the two different systems as a whole, rather than the impact of a particular school type. We assessed the impact of different schooling systems for children of differing ability and family background using the older (1958) cohort, since selective and non-selective systems co-existed during the period that this cohort went to school. Using the same age 11 ability test for all students, we found that more able students in the selective school system did significantly better than those in the comprehensive system. This confirms that cognitive ability played a greater role in determining outcomes in the selective system and that abolition of selection is likely to reduce the role of cognitive ability. As has been said, this can be viewed as a positive or a

---

<sup>16</sup> A further alternative explanation is that we have measurement error in our cognitive ability measures across the two cohorts. Since our key result (the diminution of the role of cognitive ability across the two cohorts) remains robust when we used age 5/7 cognitive ability measures, we can discount this as the only explanation.

<sup>17</sup> Further radical change came later, with the 1988 Education Act, which introduced quasi-markets into primary and secondary education in the UK.



negative development. During this period there was a significant increase in the attainment of the least able students. This is clearly something to celebrate and it may of course have been brought about at least partially due to the decline in selective schooling in the UK.

## **Conclusions**

The primary purpose of this paper was to investigate changes in the role of cognitive ability in determining educational attainment in Britain. Our results suggest that the impact of cognitive ability on educational attainment actually decreased over this period, whilst some measures of family background become more important in determining a child's educational attainment. More specifically, we found that cognitive ability played a lesser role for the more recent cohort partly because the attainment of the least able students had increased substantially over time. We cannot say whether this is due to 'dumbing down', i.e. less able students getting more qualifications because the content of qualifications has been reduced, or whether this represents a genuine increase in the achievement of the least able. We do however find some evidence that for England and Wales, the reduction of secondary school selection on the basis of age 11 ability is likely to have reduced the role of early cognitive ability in determining a student's eventual outcome.

One can of course argue that initial ability should play a lesser role in determining how well a pupil does in educational terms, since the role of the education system is to provide

all pupils, especially the least able, with an opportunity to progress. However, what the architects of the comprehensive school system failed to predict was that this increase in the attainment of the less able would benefit richer students to a greater extent. For various reasons, richer but less able students were able to take most advantage of the change in policy, and thus the achievement of this group increased the most.


## References

- Barro, R.J. and Lee, J. (2000), 'International Data on Educational Attainment Updates and Implications', NBER working paper.
- Blanden, J., Goodman, A., Gregg, P. and Machin, S. (2002), 'Changes in Intergenerational Mobility in Britain', Centre for Economic Performance Discussion Paper No. 517: London School of Economics.
- Breen, R. and Goldthorpe, J. (1999), 'Class Inequality and Meritocracy: A Critique of Saunders and An Alternative Analysis', *British Journal of Sociology*, 50 (1), pp. 1-27.
- Carneiro, J., Hansen, K. and Heckman, J. (2003 - forthcoming), 'Estimating Distribution of Counterfactuals with an Application to the Returns to Schooling and Measurement of the Effect of Uncertainty on Schooling Choice, *International Economic Review*.
- Cawley, J., Conneely, K., Heckman, J. and Vytlačil, E. (1996), 'Measuring the effects of cognitive ability', NBER Working Paper No. 5645. National Bureau of Economic Research: Cambridge, Ma.

- Chevalier, A. and Lanot, G. (forthcoming), 'Financial Transfer and Educational Achievement', *Education Economics*.
- Crook, D., Power, S. and Whitty, G. (1999) 'The Grammar School Question: A Review of Research on Comprehensive and Selective Education', *Perspectives on Education Policy Series*, London: Institute of Education.
- Currie, J. and Thomas, D. (1999), 'Early Test Scores, Socioeconomic Status and Future Outcomes', NBER Working Paper No. 6943. National Bureau of Economic Research: Cambridge, Ma.
- Dearden, L. (1999) 'The Effects of Families and Ability on Men's Education and Earnings in Britain', *Labour Economics*, 6, pp. 551-567.
- Dearden, L., Machin, S. and Reed, H. (1997), 'Intergenerational Mobility in Britain', *Economic Journal*, 107, pp. 47-64.
- Erickson, R. and Goldthorpe, J. (1985). 'Are American Rates of Social Mobility Exceptionally High? New Evidence on an Old Issue, *European Sociological Review*, May.
- Feinstein, L. and Symons, J. (1997), 'Attainment in Secondary School', Centre for Economic Performance Discussion Paper, no. 341: London School of Economics.
- Harmon, C. and Walker, I. (2000), 'The Returns to Quantity and Quality of Education: Evidence for Men in England and Wales', *Economica*, 67 (265).
- Haveman, R. and Wolfe, B. (1995), 'The Determinants of Children's Attainments: A Review of Methods and Findings', *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33 (4), pp. 1829-1878.


- McCulloch, A. and Joshi, H. (2000), 'Neighbourhood and Family Influences on the Ability of Children in the British National Child Development Study', Institute of Social and Economic Research Working Papers, University of Essex.
- Murnane, R, Willet, J. and Levy, F. (1995), 'The Growing Importance of Cognitive Skills in wage Determination', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 77 (2), pp 251-266.
- Saunders, P. (1997), 'Social Mobility in Britain: An Empirical Evaluation of Two Competing Explanations', *Sociology*, May.
- Schoon, I., Bynner, J., Joshi, H., Parsons, S., Wiggins, RD., and Sacker, A. (2002) 'The influence of context, timing, and duration of risk experiences for the passage from childhood to midadulthood', *Child development*, Sep-Oct 2002, Vol.73, No.5, pp.1486-1504.

Figure 1: Distribution of ability index by cohort.




Notes: Kernel density estimates of cognitive ability index distribution for BCS and NCDS (under 3 alternatives specified in table 1).

Figure 2. Changes in HE attainment, by ability and parental income quintile. (Men)



Notes: Estimated probability of attaining a higher education qualification, by ability, for top and bottom income quintiles. NCDS 58 (BCS70) depicted with a continuous (discontinuous) line. Estimated profile for higher income level always above lower income. Arrows indicate change between cohorts for each income group.

Figure 3. Changes in HE attainment, by ability and parental income quintile. (Women)



Notes: Estimated probability of attaining a higher education qualification, by ability, for top and bottom income quintiles. NCDS 58 (BCS70) depicted with a continuous (discontinuous) line. Estimated profile for higher income level always above lower income. Arrows indicate change between cohorts for each income group.

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics**

	Cohort=1958		Cohort=1970	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
<b>Highest academic level (percentage)</b>				
No qualifications	16.31		16.17	
CSE	18.29		10.60	
O-level	40.25		37.95	
A-level	10.74		7.81	
Higher education	14.41		27.47	
<b>Father's social class (percentage)</b>				
Unskilled	5.88		3.93	
Semi-Skilled	15.91		12.71	
Skilled manual	43.15		44.01	
Skilled non-manual	9.42		9.32	
Intermediate	17.88		22.93	
Professional	5.68		5.80	
Missing	2.07		1.30	
Father's age left schooling	14.74	1.72	15.93	2.22
Father's age at child's birth	30.63	6.15	29.11	5.80
Mother's age left schooling	14.74	1.41	15.72	1.65
Mother's age at child's birth	27.56	5.58	25.99	5.36
Number of siblings	2.07	1.50	1.54	1.13
Observations	9742		8971	
<b>Attrition details:</b>				
Total in cohort	18544		17958	
Total-(Obs with missing ability)	14121		11325	
Total-(Obs miss ability and education)	9742		8971	
Total-(Obs miss ability, edu and income)	5867		6913	



**Table 3: The Determinants of Educational Attainment at the O/A level Threshold**

Generalised ordered logit estimates for academic educational attainment

	Boys		Girls	
	Early ability (7/5)	Ability at 11/10	Early ability (7/5)	Ability at 11/10
Cohort=1970	2.3247 <i>0.9763</i>	2.6000 <i>1.0655</i>	3.6350 <i>0.9369</i>	3.0907 <i>1.0159</i>
Income quintile=2	0.2489 <i>0.1750</i>	0.2915 <i>0.1855</i>	0.0905 <i>0.1737</i>	-0.0482 <i>0.1790</i>
Income quintile=3	0.0690 <i>0.1741</i>	0.1294 <i>0.1858</i>	-0.1826 <i>0.1826</i>	-0.3004 <i>0.1840</i>
Income quintile=4	0.3437 <i>0.1719</i>	0.3420 <i>0.1831</i>	0.3286 <i>0.1714</i>	0.2576 <i>0.1719</i>
Income quintile=5	0.2809 <i>0.1787</i>	0.3799 <i>0.1870</i>	0.5230 <i>0.1746</i>	0.4379 <i>0.1747</i>
Income quintile=2 *Cohort=1970	-0.0612 <i>0.2241</i>	-0.1234 <i>0.2409</i>	0.1148 <i>0.2193</i>	0.3122 <i>0.2268</i>
Income quintile=3 *Cohort=1970	0.1294 <i>0.2258</i>	0.1186 <i>0.2412</i>	0.5323 <i>0.2268</i>	0.6053 <i>0.2308</i>
Income quintile=4 *Cohort=1970	0.1684 <i>0.2206</i>	0.1355 <i>0.2362</i>	0.2913 <i>0.2194</i>	0.2621 <i>0.2231</i>
Income quintile=5 *Cohort=1970	0.6033 <i>0.2375</i>	0.4064 <i>0.2528</i>	0.5009 <i>0.2302</i>	0.3759 <i>0.2338</i>
Ability quintile=2	1.1149 <i>0.2672</i>	1.0764 <i>0.4469</i>	0.9221 <i>0.2749</i>	0.6564 <i>0.4154</i>
Ability quintile=3	1.4719 <i>0.2630</i>	2.1545 <i>0.4040</i>	1.4422 <i>0.2606</i>	1.7582 <i>0.3719</i>
Ability quintile=4	2.0947 <i>0.2513</i>	3.0991 <i>0.3985</i>	1.8323 <i>0.2563</i>	3.0552 <i>0.3629</i>
Ability quintile=5	2.7352 <i>0.2500</i>	4.5177 <i>0.3972</i>	2.4658 <i>0.2555</i>	3.9473 <i>0.3632</i>
Ability quintile=2 *Cohort=1970	-0.7395 <i>0.3040</i>	-0.5102 <i>0.4854</i>	-0.6657 <i>0.3095</i>	-0.2299 <i>0.4483</i>
Ability quintile=3 *Cohort=1970	-0.7644 <i>0.2990</i>	-1.0459 <i>0.4407</i>	-0.8702 <i>0.2937</i>	-0.7887 <i>0.4045</i>
Ability quintile=4 *Cohort=1970	-1.0627 <i>0.2866</i>	-1.4843 <i>0.4349</i>	-0.9730 <i>0.2910</i>	-1.5272 <i>0.3949</i>
Ability quintile=5 *Cohort=1970	-1.3003 <i>0.2864</i>	-1.7804 <i>0.4337</i>	-1.0538 <i>0.2896</i>	-1.5362 <i>0.3987</i>
Intercept	-9.5503 <i>0.7728</i>	-9.3774 <i>0.8923</i>	-11.2448 <i>0.7411</i>	-10.4041 <i>0.8175</i>
Number of observations	6058	6054	6374	6434
Log-likelihood	-7870.8	-7356.6	-8042.7	-7605.8

Notes: Generalised ordered logit estimates reported, with standard errors in italics. Sample of individuals with valid ability and income data for each specification. Other controls include father's and mother's schooling, age and presence in household dummies, as well as number of siblings, all interacted with cohort. Marginal effects=(approx)=beta\*p\*(1-p) [p=0.24 (NCDS58); p=0.35 (BCS70)].

**Table 4: Proportion of each Income/ Ability group attaining each level of education (males and females)**

Educational attainment by ability and income group.

Age 11/10 Ability tercile=	1958 cohort			1970 cohort		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Income tercile=1 - % with higher education	0.004	0.050	0.262	0.073	0.157	0.311
Income tercile=1 - % with A levels or above	0.019	0.105	0.467	0.093	0.217	0.421
Income tercile=1 - % with O levels or above	0.244	0.629	0.920	0.425	0.675	0.842
<b>Sample size</b>	<b>672</b>	<b>641</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>995</b>	<b>791</b>	<b>518</b>
Income tercile=2 - % with higher education	0.008	0.050	0.261	0.105	0.186	0.405
Income tercile=2 - % with A levels or above	0.024	0.120	0.463	0.128	0.249	0.541
Income tercile=2 - % with O levels or above	0.296	0.678	0.947	0.533	0.751	0.916
<b>Sample size</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>683</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>753</b>
Income tercile=3 - % with higher education	0.012	0.091	0.425	0.154	0.325	0.609
Income tercile=3 - % with A levels or above	0.045	0.190	0.645	0.192	0.404	0.730
Income tercile=3 - % with O levels or above	0.325	0.718	0.966	0.590	0.840	0.961
<b>Sample size</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>685</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>1,239</b>