

Income Inequality, Equality of Opportunity, and Intergenerational Mobility

Miles Corak

The “American Dream” is a very broad concept with many meanings and certainly broader than any single statistic can measure. However, when the Economic Mobility Project (2009), supported by the Pew Charitable Trusts, conducted a nationally representative poll that asked Americans what they understood this phrase to mean, some typical answers included: “Being free to say or do what you want”; “Being free to accomplish almost anything you want with hard work”; and “Being able to succeed regardless of the economic circumstances in which you were born.” These meanings have historically not only made the American Dream a defining metaphor of the country, they are also likely a reason why Americans have been willing to tolerate a good deal more inequality of outcomes than citizens of many other rich countries. Bénabou and Ok (2001) have called this the “prospect of upward mobility” hypothesis, the idea that those with lower incomes are not especially strong advocates of redistributive policies because of the belief that they, or in the least their children, are likely to climb the income ladder.

However, an emerging body of evidence suggests that more inequality of incomes in the present is likely to make family background play a stronger role in determining the adult outcomes of young people, with their own hard work playing a commensurately weaker role. The OECD (2011a, p. 40) has gone so far as to state that rising income inequality “can stifle upward social mobility, making it harder for talented and hard-working people to get the rewards they deserve.

■ *Miles Corak is Professor of Economics, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada, and Research Fellow, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn, Germany. He can be reached at <http://mileskorak.com> or through Twitter @MilesCorak.*

Intergenerational earnings mobility is low in countries with high inequality such as Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and much higher in the Nordic countries, where income is distributed more evenly.”

This suggestion that higher inequality skews opportunity and lowers intergenerational mobility is the starting point of this paper. In particular, my focus is on the degree to which increasing inequality in the high-income countries, particularly in the United States, is likely to limit economic mobility for the next generation of young adults.

The paper offers a descriptive, yet structured, discussion of the underlying drivers of opportunity that generate the relationship between inequality and intergenerational mobility. The goal is to explain why America differs from other countries, how intergenerational mobility will change in an era of higher inequality, and how the process is different for the top 1 percent. To lay the foundation, I begin by presenting evidence that countries with more inequality at one point in time also experience less earnings mobility across the generations, a relationship that has been called “The Great Gatsby Curve.” I also outline how to interpret the common statistic measuring intergenerational earnings mobility and its relationship to the broader concept of equality of opportunity. My overview of the causal factors determining intergenerational mobility is based upon a framework drawn from some influential economic models often used to examine the intergenerational transmission of inequality. This framework focuses attention on the investments made in the human capital of children influencing their adult earnings and socioeconomic status.

The interaction between families, labor markets, and public policies all structure a child’s opportunities and determine the extent to which adult earnings are related to family background—but they do so in different ways across national contexts. Both cross-country comparisons and the underlying trends suggest that these drivers are all configured most likely to lower, or at least not raise, the degree of intergenerational earnings mobility for the next generation of Americans coming of age in a more polarized labor market. This trend will likely continue unless there are changes in public policy that promote the human capital of children in a way that offers relatively greater benefits to the relatively disadvantaged. At the same time, the substantial rise in the income shares of the top 1 percent, their access to sources of high-quality human capital investment for their children, and the intergenerational transmission of employers and wealth will imply a much higher rate of transmission of economic advantage at the very top, in a way that many will perceive as evidence of inequality in opportunity.

The Great Gatsby Curve

Countries with greater inequality of incomes also tend to be countries in which a greater fraction of economic advantage and disadvantage is passed on between parents and their children. It is now common to represent this relationship with

what Alan Krueger has referred to as “The Great Gatsby Curve.”¹ Figure 1 depicts an example.

The figure ranks countries along two dimensions. The horizontal axis shows income inequality in a country as measured by the Gini coefficient from about a generation ago. During the early to mid 1980s, Finland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark were the most equal; the United Kingdom and the United States, the least. The vertical axis is a measure of intergenerational economic mobility: specifically, the elasticity between paternal earnings and a son’s adult earnings using data on a cohort of children born, roughly speaking, during the early to mid 1960s and measuring adult outcomes in the mid to late 1990s. In countries like Finland, Norway, and Denmark, the tie between parental economic status and the adult earnings of children is weakest: less than one-fifth of any economic advantage or disadvantage that a father may have had in his time is passed on to a son in adulthood. In Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States, roughly 50 percent of any advantage or disadvantage is passed on.

The “intergenerational earnings elasticity,” is derived from a regression-to-the-mean model, usually as the least-squares estimate of the coefficient β in the equation


$$\ln Y_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta \ln Y_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_i,$$

with Y representing “permanent earnings” for individuals from a particular family indexed by i , across two generations, t and $t - 1$. In much of the literature, Y refers to the earnings of fathers and sons to avoid the more complicated analyses needed to address the changing role of women in the labor force. It is not that studies of mothers, daughters, and the marriage market do not exist, only that father–son analyses are more common and permit a broader set of cross-country comparisons. In this equation, ε represents all other influences on the child’s adult earnings not correlated with parental income. The constant term α captures the trend in average incomes across generations, due, for example, to changes in productivity, international trade, technology, or labor market institutions. The coefficient β indicates the degree to which earnings are “sticky” across generations within the same family, the percentage difference in child earnings for each percentage point difference in parental earnings. The higher the value of β , the more that knowing a parent’s place in the earnings distribution will tell us about where we can expect the child’s place to be; the lower the value, the less stickiness so that a parent’s relative earnings are a weak predictor of the child’s rung on the earnings ladder of the next generation. Mulligan (1997) offers a more detailed description of how this model should be interpreted.

¹ Krueger used this label for the first time in a speech, “The Rise and Consequences of Inequality,” to the Center for American Progress on January 12, 2012, in his capacity as the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors. The curve has been drawn in different varieties by, to the best of my knowledge, Andrews and Leigh (2009), Björklund and Jäntti (2009), Blanden (2013), and myself (Corak 2006, 2013), Ermisch, Jäntti, Smeeding, and Wilson (2012) in addition to appearing in Krueger’s speech and the 2012 *Economic Report of the President*, which stress the relevance of measuring inequality when the children are growing up.

Figure 1

The Great Gatsby Curve: More Inequality is Associated with Less Mobility across the Generations



Source: Corak (2013) and OECD.

Notes: Income inequality is measured as the Gini coefficient, using disposable household income for about 1985 as provided by the OECD. Intergenerational economic mobility is measured as the elasticity between paternal earnings and a son's adult earnings, using data on a cohort of children born, roughly speaking, during the early to mid 1960s and measuring their adult outcomes in the mid to late 1990s. The estimates of the intergenerational earnings elasticity are derived from published studies, adjusted for methodological comparability in a way that I describe in the appendix to Corak (2006), updated with a more recent literature review reported in Corak (2013), where I also offer estimates for a total of 22 countries. I only use estimates derived from data that are nationally representative of the population and which are rich enough to make comparisons across generations within the same family. In addition, I only use studies that correct for the type of measurement errors described by Atkinson, Maynard, and Trinder (1983), Solon (1992), and Zimmerman (1992), which means deriving permanent earnings by either averaging annual data over several years or by using instrumental variables.

Figure 1, showing the relationship between income inequality and intergenerational economic mobility, uses estimates of the intergenerational earnings elasticity derived from published studies that I adjust for differences in methodological approach (see notes to the figure for details). So these estimates are offered, not as the best available estimates for any particular country, but rather as the appropriate estimates for comparisons across countries. (Analyzing a broader group of countries, I find that many of the lower-income countries occupy an even higher place on the Great Gatsby Curve than depicted for the OECD countries in Figure 1, but this is likely due to structural factors not as relevant to a discussion of the high-income countries.)

There are certainly many other ways of measuring intergenerational mobility that focus attention upon particular aspects of the process. The intergenerational elasticity, for example, offers an overall average measure of the degree of mobility without saying anything about the direction of change. The cross-country differences illustrated in the Great Gatsby Curve could reflect differences in the degree of upward mobility for those born to low-income fathers, or differences in the stickiness of intergenerational status for those born to top income parents. Figures 2 and 3 contrast, by way of illustration, mobility in the United States and Canada for sons raised by fathers with incomes in the top 10 percent, and for those raised by fathers in the bottom 10 percent. In Corak (2010), I argue that the comparison of these two countries is particularly apt in part because of similarities in the underlying data used, but also because they share many other things in common, an issue to which I return below.


It turns out that the American intergenerational earnings elasticity, at about 0.5, is twice as high as the Canadian, and this has little to do with the degree of mobility of children raised by families in broad swaths of the middle part of the distribution. Indeed, a comparison of the full decile transition matrices reveals a good deal of mobility in both countries, to the point that there is little relationship between family background and child outcomes (Corak and Heisz 1999; Mazumder 2005). It is at the extremes of the distribution that the two countries differ, as illustrated in Figures 2 and 3. In the United States, sons raised by top and bottom decile fathers are more likely to occupy the same position as their fathers than they are in Canada. More than half of sons raised by top decile American fathers fall no further than the 8th decile, and about half of those raised by bottom decile fathers rise no further than the third decile. In Canada, there is less stickiness at the top, and a much higher proportion of bottom decile sons also rise to the top half of the earnings distribution.

All this said, if one number is to summarize the degree to which inequality is transmitted across the generations, just as sometimes one number, like a Gini coefficient, is used to summarize the degree of inequality at a point in time, then the intergenerational elasticity is an appropriate statistic to use. But this does not mean that it measures “equality of opportunity” or the even-more-elusive “American Dream.” Roemer (2004, 2012) and Jencks and Tach (2006), among others, are clear on this point, emphasizing that in no sense is an intergenerational elasticity of zero an optimum and noting that in order to make an inference about equality of opportunity from the degree of intergenerational earnings mobility we must draw a line between differences in *circumstances*—for which individuals should in some sense be compensated—and *personal choices*, for which they should be responsible.

Another branch of the empirical literature seeks to draw this line by deriving indices of equality of opportunity that remove the influence of factors over which individuals have no control: for example, race, mother and father’s schooling, region of birth, and father’s occupation (Ferreira and Gignoux 2011; Lefranc, Pistolesi, and Trannoy 2008; Paes de Barros, Ferreira, Molinas Vega, and Saavedra Chanduvi 2009). Brunori, Ferreira, and Peragine (2013) offer a particularly clear

Figure 2


Earnings Deciles of Sons Born to Top Decile Fathers: United States and Canada



Source: Corak and Heisz (1999, table 6); Mazumder (2005, table 2.2).

Figure 3

Earnings Deciles of Sons Born to Bottom Decile Fathers: United States and Canada



Source: Corak and Heisz (1999, table 6); Mazumder (2005, table 2.2).

overview and find that indices of inequality of opportunity are in fact strongly correlated with indicators of intergenerational mobility, be it in earnings or in education. It is in this sense that the Great Gatsby Curve can be understood to be signaling—rather than directly measuring—a negative relationship between inequality and equality of opportunity. As these authors put it (p. 17): “[I]nequality of opportunity is the missing link between the concepts of income inequality and social mobility; if higher inequality makes intergenerational mobility more difficult, it is likely because opportunities for economic advancement are more unequally distributed among children.”

A Framework for Comparisons across Space and Time

The Great Gatsby Curve is not a causal relationship, but it is too glib to dismiss it by saying “correlation does not imply causation.” Theories of child development and economic mobility suggest it is reasonable to juxtapose measures of inequality and mobility as a starting point for understanding the causal process and its policy implications.

The adult outcomes of children reflect a series of gradients between their attainments at specific points in their lives and the prevailing socioeconomic inequalities to which they are exposed. Knudsen, Heckman, Cameron, and Shonkoff (2006), to cite only one example, summarize the literature on child development—and in particular some of the work by James Heckman—in a way that relates child development to adult social and labor market outcomes through a recursive process. Socioeconomic status influences a child’s health and aptitudes in the early years—indeed even in utero—which in turn influences early cognitive and social development, and readiness to learn. These outcomes and the family circumstances of children, as well as the quality of neighborhoods and schools, influence success in primary school, which feeds into success in high school and college. Family resources and connections affect access to good schools and jobs, and the degree of inequality in labor markets determines both the resources parents have and ultimately the return to the education children receive. This entire process then shapes earnings in adulthood. The Great Gatsby Curve is a summary of all of these underlying gradients, reflecting the outcome of a host of ways that inequality of incomes affects children.

The usual starting points for discussions of causality are the models developed by Becker and Tomes (1986, 1979). Solon (2004) has adapted their research in a way appropriate for making comparisons across countries and over time. Very broadly speaking, the reasons for the differences in the intergenerational elasticity across countries have to do with the different balances struck between the influence of families, the labor market, and public policy in determining the life chances of children. These institutions determine the degree to which traits valuable in the labor market are passed on between parents and children, the efficacy of private and public investments in generating human capital, and the labor market returns

to human capital, all of which are important drivers of the degree of intergenerational income mobility.


One perspective on the Great Gatsby Curve focuses on the heritability of traits between parents and their children. Becker and Tomes (1979, p. 1158) refer to these as “endowments of capital that are determined by the reputation and ‘connections’ of their families, the contribution to the ability, race, and other characteristics of children from the genetic constitutions of their families, and the learning, skills, goals, and other ‘family commodities’ acquired through belonging to a particular family culture.” If these traits are strongly transmitted across generations, and if they are valued by labor markets over time, then there will also be an intergenerational association of incomes. At the same time, if there is significant demographic diversity across countries then we should not be surprised that there is an upward slope to the Great Gatsby Curve even if all societies are equally meritocratic. Becker (2013) and Roemer (2012) clearly articulate this interpretation. For this reason we should not think of the Great Gatsby Curve as a recipe for changing outcomes. Rather, it invites us to look at the differences between countries to appreciate the underlying drivers, assess the extent to which they are relevant for public policy, and in this sense recognize that some comparisons are more appropriate than others. Denmark, with a small relatively homogenous population, may not be a template for a large demographically diverse country like the United States; but a comparison of the United States with Canada, a diverse country sharing many fundamental values and institutions with America, may indeed be more appropriate.

Another perspective on the Great Gatsby Curve derives from the focus Solon (2004) places on the returns to education. He takes the rate of return to schooling as an indicator of the degree of inequality in the labor market and shows that societies with labor markets characterized by more cross-sectional inequality—reflecting in part a higher return to education—will be less generationally mobile. Parents with more human capital not only have a higher capacity to invest in the education of their children by virtue of their higher incomes, but also the incentives to do so are greater.

Furthermore, Solon (2004) also suggests that public policy can either accentuate or dampen the influence of labor market inequality, showing that intergenerational mobility is promoted by “progressive” public programs that are of relatively more benefit to the relatively less well-off. Two countries may spend the same fraction of their gross domestic product on education, but if this spending is directed to high-quality early childhood education and to primary and secondary schooling accessible for all, then it is likely to be of relatively more benefit to families lower in the socioeconomic scale than if it were directed to high-quality private tertiary education accessible to only a few. Indeed, this perspective should be applied to all aspects of public actions that influence the relationship between families and the labor market, which in addition to expenditures on schooling include other sources of human capital like health care, taxes and transfers, as well as regulations and policies helping parents to balance work and family life.

Figure 4

Higher Returns to Schooling are Associated with Lower Intergenerational Earnings Mobility



Source: Author using data from OECD (2011b, table A8.1), and Corak (2013).

Notes: The earnings premium refers to the ratio of average earnings of men 25 to 34 years of age with a college degree to the average earnings of those with a high school diploma. This is measured as the average employment income in 2009 of men 25 to 34 years of age with a college degree relative to the average income of their counterparts with a high school diploma (OECD 2011b, table A8.1). Intergenerational economic mobility is measured as the elasticity between paternal earnings and a son's adult earnings, using data on a cohort of children born, roughly speaking, during the early to mid 1960s and measuring adult outcomes in the mid to late 1990s (see notes to Figure 1).

Labor Market Inequalities and the Returns to Human Capital

Labor market outcomes have become more unequal in the United States and many other high-income countries since the late 1970s and early 1980s. This pattern is now very well-documented, as have been many of the underlying causes associated with skill biases in technical change, its interaction with globalization, and the capacity of the supply of skilled workers to keep up with demand. But institutional differences have also implied that changes in inequality and the returns to skills have varied across countries.

Figure 4 is inspired by the main hypothesis put forward by Solon (2004), and it relates the intergenerational earnings elasticity to the earnings premium a college graduate has over a high school graduate. The earnings premium is measured as the average employment income in 2009 of men 25 to 34 years of age with a college degree relative to the average income of their counterparts with a high school diploma (OECD 2011b, table A8.1). As the figure illustrates, in countries where the

return to college education is higher, intergenerational mobility tends to be lower. Clearly, this is a tendency, and there are notable outliers—particularly Italy and to a degree also Finland—suggesting that other forces dominate in those countries. But the premium is higher in the United States than any other country included in the figure: a college graduate earns about 70 percent more than a high school graduate, compared to about 30 percent in Canada.

This correlation between a higher skill premium and lower intergenerational mobility of earnings also holds over time. Aaronson and Mazumder (2008) derive estimates of the intergenerational elasticity of earnings for the United States from about 1940 to about 2000 and compare them with the evolution of the return to education documented by Goldin and Katz (1999). Figure 5, adapted from Mazumder (2012), shows that the father-son earnings elasticity moves over the decades in tandem with the return to education—the changes after 1980 being the most notable. The increase in the returns to college from 9 percent in 1980 to about 13 percent two decades later was matched by a significant increase in the intergenerational earnings elasticity, from 0.38 to about 0.55.²

Of course, the average premium for higher education isn't informative about the distribution of that premium. As Lemieux (2006) points out, relative wages among the highly educated have become much more dispersed since the mid 1970s. He suggests this is the result of a strong heterogeneity in the returns to higher education. Much of the increase in labor market inequality is the result of this heterogeneity and reflects higher wages at the very top of the distribution. Wage growth has been higher for those with a college education in the United States but higher still for those among the college educated with graduate and professional credentials.

This pattern is consistent with the significant increase in the share of total earnings and incomes accruing to the very top of the distribution. Rising top shares are an important component of rising inequality, and while they have been particularly notable in English-speaking countries, they have increased more in the United States than most anywhere else, though the United Kingdom and Canada also experienced large increases (OECD 2011a, p. 39).


These patterns are likely to strengthen the tie between the economic outcomes of parents and children at the top. The intergenerational earnings elasticity is a measure of the average degree of relative mobility, but the underlying issue here is whether it is stronger (that is, nonlinear) for high levels of parental income. In some countries this was already evident for the generation that came of age just as top income shares started increasing.

Bratsberg et al. (2007) find that the intergenerational elasticity of income for Denmark, Finland, and Norway is flat across the lower parts of the parental distribution, and then rises at the higher end: that is, being raised by a low-income

² It should be noted that some other researchers have not found statistically significant changes in the intergenerational elasticity of earnings for the United States over the postwar period. For example, see Mayer and Lopoo (2004) and Lee and Solon (2009). However, the Aaronson and Mazumder paper is distinguished by its use of Census-based information that offers much larger samples sizes.

Figure 5

The Higher the Return to College, the Lower the Degree of Intergenerational Mobility: United States, 1940 to 2000



Source: Adapted by the author from Mazumder (2012, Figure 1).

Notes: Information on the returns to college and the intergenerational earnings elasticity were provided to the author by Bhashkar Mazumder. As reported in Mazumder (2012), these are respectively from Goldin and Katz (1999) and Aaronson and Mazumder (2008, table 1 column 2). The 1940 estimate of the elasticity is a projection using Aaronson and Mazumder (2008, table 2 column 2).

father confers no disadvantage, but being raised by a high-income father confers an advantage. Björklund, Roine, and Waldenström (2012) and my colleagues and I (Corak and Heisz 1999; Corak and Piraino 2010, 2011) document roughly similar patterns in Swedish and Canadian data with the intergenerational elasticity for top earners being two to three times greater than the overall average. However, Bratsberg et al. (2007) reject this convex pattern for the United Kingdom and United States, suggesting that a linear specification is a better fit. These differences may be substantive, or they may also reflect limitations in the size of the sample available from survey-based data used in the United Kingdom and United States. This is a major limitation in the American literature. In the other countries, the analyses are based upon administrative data with substantially larger sample sizes, and likely better representation at the extremes of the distribution.

Families and Investment in Human Capital

On the one hand, the impact of the returns to education on the degree of intergenerational mobility can be interpreted as reflecting an important role for the

transmission of innate ability between parents and children. If endowments of this sort are strongly inherited, then their impact on earnings is heightened if returns to schooling are higher: when returns are higher, mobility is as a result lower. But this interpretation also has to account for nonlinear patterns both in the returns to schooling, and the transmission of incomes across the generations. Nonlinearities would seem to imply that top earners are either particularly talented and have, in some sense, more of the characteristics valuable in the labor market to pass on to their children, or that these characteristics are more strongly transmitted between top-earning parents and their children than in middle- or lower-income families.


On the other hand, endowments should not be thought of as fixed traits transmitted mechanically across generations. Anything that boosts inequality reduces mobility because it differentially changes both opportunities and incentives for families to invest in their children. Families with more human capital invest more in their children. These investments are surely influenced by money: high-income parents having more scope to develop their children's skills and attitudes and to enrich their day-to-day experiences particularly during the early years. But the relevant investments are also nonmonetary, reflecting the development of behavior, motivation, and aspirations, as well as the possibility that high-income families can offer their children connections to selective schools and even to particular employers.

A college education is increasingly a gateway to higher incomes, but in the United States this effect is especially strong for a higher-level education from a selective college. The gap in college completion between children from low- and high-income families has increased significantly during the last two to three decades of increasing income inequality. Bailey and Dynarski (2011) show that the rate of college graduation increased by about 4 percentage points among a cohort of young people born in the early 1980s to low-income parents compared to their counterparts born in the early 1960s. However, among the cohorts born to relatively high-income parents, the rate of college graduation increased by almost 20 percentage points. Certainly the children of high-income families will find it easier to afford college. Belley and Lochner (2007) examine the relationship between family income and education outcomes in more detail and find that, even when controlling for cognitive skills, the strength of the relationship between family income and college attendance increased significantly over this period, about doubling in its impact. This pattern also holds when looking instead at the quality of the college attended. They suggest that the families of children coming of age during an era of increasing inequality, those born in the 1980s, are more likely to be borrowing-constrained than those raising children born during the 1960s and 1970s.

While family income matters, and while in the United States it increasingly matters, it is not everything. Belley, Frenette, and Lochner (2011) illustrate the importance of differences in financial aid in determining postsecondary attendance in the United States and Canada. While the strength of the tie between family income and postsecondary attendance is much weaker in Canada, even when controlling for cognitive skills, their analysis suggests that, at least in the case of public tuition

Figure 6

Money Matters: Higher-Income Families in the United States Have Higher Enrichment Expenditures on Their Children



Source: Duncan, Greg J. and Richard J. Murnane. Figure 1.6 “Enrichment Expenditures on Children, 1972–2006.” In *Whither Opportunity*, edited by Greg J. Duncan and Richard J. Murnane, © 2011 Russell Sage Foundation, 112 East 64th Street, New York, NY 10065. Reprinted with permission.

Note: “Enrichment expenditures” refers to the amount of money families spend per child on books, computers, high-quality child care, summer camps, private schooling, and other things that promote the capabilities of their children.

fees and associated financial aid packages, the United States is more generous in its support to children from low-income families than Canada.

One way to explain all this is that the children of low-income families, especially in the United States, may not have the guidance and culture from their families that encourages college attendance, so that the offer of financial aid in and of itself is not enough. A field experiment conducted by Bettinger, Long, Oreopoulos, and Sanbonmatsu (2009) points out that a relatively small amount of help given to low-income families in completing a Free Application for Federal Student Aid, or FAFSA, form substantially raises the chances that high school seniors attend college. In other words, the patterns in the United States reflect—to a degree that they don’t in Canada—more than the financial capacity of capable high school seniors.

The development of these capabilities during the years before high school graduation has also become more unequal in the way predicted by Solon (2004). Monetary investments outside of formal schooling help promote a child’s human capital in the primary school years, and likely raise the odds of having both the skills and also the aptitudes, to successfully apply to a college when the time comes. These investments have been increasingly unequally distributed over time. Figure 6, adapted from Duncan and Murnane (2011), contrasts the evolution of “enrichment

expenditures” by families in the top 20 percent of the US income distribution with those in the bottom 20 percent. These expenditures refer to money spent on books, computers, high-quality child care, summer camps, and private schooling, among other things that promote the capabilities of children. Annual expenditures rose significantly for families in the bottom 20 percent, from about \$835 dollars per child during the early 1970s to over \$1,300 per child in the mid 2000s. But this pales in comparison to the increase among households in the top 20 percent: the significant gap between the two groups already present in the early 1970s ballooned over these decades as spending by those at the top went from \$3,500 to almost \$9,000 per child.

The nonmonetary capacities of families are also likely to be more limited for low-income families, and this may be especially apparent in America. In Corak, Curtis, and Phipps (2011), we find that along a host of dimensions—the age of the mother, the education of the mother, the incidence of living with both biological parents, as well as the incidence of living in a single parent household—Canadian children, particularly relatively disadvantaged children, live on average in a more enriching family environment than American children. McLanahan (2004) offers a clear presentation of the US trends in similarly defined family resources. She finds that there is a growing divergence in the parental resources available to children according to the education levels of their mothers. The evolution of mothers’ age, mothers’ employment, single motherhood, and fathers’ involvement since the 1970s all indicate as much. Children born to the relatively more educated mothers are increasingly likely to be raised by an older, more mature mother who is working in a better paying job and more likely to be in a stable union. These children are also likely to be spending more time with their fathers. Children born to relatively less-educated mothers are increasingly likely over time to be making less-significant gains, indeed to be experiencing losses, in the parental resources available to them.

The upshot of all this is that increasing divergence in both monetary and nonmonetary investments in children during an era of increasing inequality may well lead to an increasing divergence in cognitive attainments and achievements that are the necessary prerequisites for college success. Reardon (2011) gathers information on math and reading test scores from a variety of sources for birth cohorts from about 1940 to the 2000s and charts the standardized gap between children raised in families with incomes at the 90th percentile and those raised in families at the 10th. Though some of the early trends are not conclusive, they seem to suggest that the 90/10 test score gap did not change that much from the 1950s to about the mid 1970s. For subsequent birth cohorts, however, there is a substantial increase amounting to about 30 to 40 percent between the mid to late 1970s and 2001. Even when the most able children of low-income families go to college, they tend not to apply to more selective colleges when compared to children of equal ability from high-income families. Hoxby and Avery (2012) document this tendency and suggest that it occurs in spite of the fact that when the more generous financial aid of selective colleges is considered, the eventual costs of these colleges would often be lower than for nonselective schools.

Finally, the traits relevant for success extend well beyond cognitive development before and during the school years. Families support their children through all the transitions they must make on the way to adulthood, including the transition to active and full-time engagement in the labor market. A more polarized and unequal labor market makes this more of a challenge for some than for others and also implies that family connections will matter all the more.


In Corak and Piraino (2010, 2011) and Bingley, Corak, and Westergård-Nielson (2012), the evidence suggests a strong tendency for labor market connections, in some sense, to matter for child outcomes. We document a very strong transmission of economic status at the top even in relatively mobile countries like Canada and Denmark. In particular, we show that the intergenerational transmission of earnings at the very top is associated with the intergenerational transmission of employers. Sons of top-earning fathers are more likely to fall from the top strata if they did not work for the very same employer for which their father had also worked. Figure 7 documents the intergenerational transmission of employers across the percentiles of the paternal earnings distribution for the two countries we analyze in Bingley, Corak, and Westergård-Nielson (2012). This is also based upon the broadest of the definitions we use: for sons in their early 30s, the incidence of ever having worked for an employer that had ever employed their fathers. The patterns in these two relatively mobile countries are remarkably alike: the overall levels differ, but there is a distinct tendency for the proportion to be much higher at the upper tail. Overall, about four out of every ten young Canadian men at some point held a job with an employer who in the past also employed their fathers. The intergenerational transmission of employers rises for those born to fathers in the top 10 percent of the income distribution, and sharply so for those born to fathers at the very top. Almost seven out of ten Canadian sons born to top 1 percent fathers had a job with an employer for which they had also worked, and in Denmark a little over half of sons of fathers at this level did so.

There is no direct evidence that these patterns also characterize the American labor market, though Datcher Loury (2006) suggests that in the United States up to half of jobs are found through family, friends, or acquaintances. She also shows that the highest wages are paid to those who find jobs through “prior generation male” relatives who actually knew the potential employer or served as a reference. While this information does not appear to be available across the US earnings distribution, the literature on the succession of chief executive officers in family firms hints at the possibility that the incidence could be higher at the very top. Pérez-González (2006) examines just over 300 CEO transitions and finds that in more than one-third, the new CEO had a family connection. In addition, these transitions were associated with a decline in firm performance, particularly so when the newly appointed family member did not attend a select college. Bennedsen, Nielson, Pérez-González, and Wolfenzon (2007) offer a similar, but more detailed analysis with Danish data, and using instrumental variables, more firmly document a causal impact of family succession on declining performance.

While these patterns may reflect simple nepotism, and the historical review by Bellow (2003) suggests that possibility, other interpretations are also possible. If

Figure 7

Proportion of Sons Currently Employed or Employed at Some Point with an Employer their Father Had Worked for in the Past: Canada and Denmark
(by father's earnings percentile)



Source: Bingley, Paul, Miles Corak, and Niels Westergaard-Nielson. Figure 18.2 “Sons Employed at Some Point with Employer Fathers Worked for, by Fathers’ Earnings.” In *From Parents to Children: The Intergenerational Transmission of Advantage*, edited by John Ermisch, Markus Jantti, and Timothy Smeeding. © 2012 Russell Sage Foundation, 112 East 64th Street, New York, NY 10065. Reprinted with permission.

there is intergenerational transmission of firm-specific skills, then children inherit human capital that has a higher return when they are employed by the family firm. In this sense, the intergenerational transmission of employers might be interpreted as another reflection of the transmission of skills and traits valuable for labor market outcomes. But the decline of firm performance upon the succession of a family member would seem to suggest that family members do not on average have a distinctly more valuable set of skills or managerial talent.

In Corak and Piraino (2010, 2011) and Bingley, Corak, and Westergaard-Nielson (2012), my coauthors and I show that the intergenerational transmission of employers is higher when fathers report self-employment income, and presumably have control over a firm and its hiring decisions. But we also show that the patterns are much broader and not due simply to firm ownership. Other factors, like information about the labor market or “connections” (in the sense used by Becker and

Tomes) help to structure a child's job search and play a role in generating the intergenerational transmission of employers across the entire parental income distribution, but particularly at the top.

My own sense is that in the United States, and also the United Kingdom, this channel between parent and child economic status due to connections probably works more strongly for top earners through college choice, and particularly through the select colleges. Anecdotal evidence is often used to suggest that access to unpaid internships, which permit the development of on-the-job training and firm-specific human capital, is also tilted toward children of the relatively well-to-do, whose families have the resources to finance them.

Public Policy as Leveling or Tilting the Playing Field

Public policy can affect the investments made in children across the entire income distribution. It can also affect how families interact with labor markets. The United States stands out in the degree to which government programs are of relatively more benefit to the advantaged. As such, they are more likely to exacerbate rather than blunt the degree to which labor market inequalities are passed on across generations.

When the Pew Charitable Trusts asked Canadians what they understood the good and successful life to be—the dimensions of what might thought of as the “Canadian Dream”—the responses were uncannily similar to how Americans defined the “American Dream.” In Corak (2010), I report that the citizens of both countries value the ideal of equality of opportunity and define it—almost exactly to the same degree—in terms of individual freedoms. They also recognize the importance of individual responsibilities and have an equal aversion to “equality of outcomes” as a desirable end. The biggest difference in this comparative analysis of similarly worded public opinion polls concerned the view of government and public policy. Americans were more inclined to view government as doing more harm than good in their pursuit of the American Dream; at the same time, they viewed a whole host of possible public policy interventions as effective in promoting economic mobility. From this, I surmise that they had less confidence that their federal, state, and local government could implement and manage effective policy changes.

As a result, there are significant differences in the broader social circumstances under which children in the United States and Canada are being raised. Carasso, Reynolds, and Steuerle (2008) attempt to estimate the global incidence of US federal government spending on programs, like education, that promote mobility, placing them into a broader context of total government spending. They find that the US government spends considerable amounts in this way, up to 1.6 percent of GDP in 2006, but that only about one-quarter of these expenditures are to the benefit of lower- to moderate-income individuals.

A notable example is the education system. At almost \$15,000 per student, America spends more on the schooling of its children than almost any other

high-income country (OECD 2011b). But the American education system does not promote mobility to the extent that it could because its educational spending is more likely to benefit the relatively well-to-do. The OECD suggests that the higher levels of spending in the United States—both private and public—are driven by much higher spending on tertiary education. For every \$1 spent on primary education, \$3 are spent on tertiary education, the highest ratio of all high-income countries. Further, tertiary spending is dominated by private sources of financing, which makes up over 60 percent of all spending on this level of education. Education spending, in other words, is allocated to make higher education relatively more of a priority, and in a way that is of relatively more benefit to the relatively advantaged.

The demand for high-quality college education among the relatively well off expresses itself in a demand for high-quality primary and secondary schooling that offers a gateway to a good college education. While America also spends more on primary education per pupil than many other countries, significant inequalities in parental resources express themselves in the structure of the system, leading to variations in financing, quality, and access in a way that does little to level the playing field. The OECD (2012, p. 30) summarizes its research on this issue in this way: “Currently the United States is one of only three OECD countries that on average spend less on students from disadvantaged backgrounds than on other students. . . . Moreover, the most able teachers rarely work in disadvantaged schools in the United States, the opposite of what occurs in countries with high-performing education systems.”

At the same time, socioeconomic differences in readiness to learn among children just starting school are larger in the United States than in other countries, making the challenge faced by the schooling system all the greater. In Bradbury, Corak, Waldfogel, and Washbrook (2012), we study vocabulary development and behavioral problems among children who were 4–5 year-olds in 2000 in Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States. We find inequalities according to family income and mother’s education in all four countries. But in general, these inequalities are notably greater in the United States and most muted in Canada.

In Corak, Curtis, and Phipps (2011), my coauthors and I look at a wider cohort of children from newborns to about 13 years of age during the late 1990s—that is, those who were among the first to be raised in an era of rising inequality and who will in the coming years be the subject of the next generation of intergenerational mobility studies—and find that they are much more affluent in the United States than in Canada, having on average almost one-third more income. Though children in both countries are distributed across their countrywide income distributions in the same way, the gap between bottom and top children differs in the two countries. In the United States it is much greater: a child in the top decile of the income distribution has 14 times as much as a bottom decile child. In Canada a top decile child has only 7.5 times as much economic resources as a bottom decile child. When we placed Canadian children in the American income distribution, adjusting their incomes using an index of Purchasing Power Parity, they tended to be lower-middle income in status. However, while Canadian children are much less likely to be in

the top half of the American income distribution, they are also less likely to be in the bottom 10 percent, so their low-income, in this absolute sense, is not as great.

Public regulations and provision of goods associated with human capital likely do more to level this playing field in Canada than in the United States. In Corak, Curtis, and Phipps (2011), we show that mental and physical health, school readiness, and some education outcomes are on average higher in Canada and less tied to family circumstance. It is not a simple task to attribute these outcomes to the public provision of goods in a causal sense. However, we suggest that universal provision of health care is associated with more preventative care for children that reduces the number and severity of health shocks that could have longer-term consequences. In addition, parents have more flexibility in making childcare and work arrangements in Canada. For the study period we consider, the late 1990s, there seemed to be more part-time employment in Canada, and a significant policy change in the mid 1990s extended paid parental leave for up to almost one year after a child's birth and gave parents the right to return to their job. Income support to families was also reformed at around the same time, delivered through the income tax system, and was more targeted and generous for lower-income families. The program is substantially more generous than its American counterpart and is more likely to reach all families with children because tax-filing rates are nearly universal. In fact, more recently some provincial governments have introduced full-time kindergarten for four year-olds.

In contrast, total hours of household labor supplied by household members were higher in the United States during this period, but also polarized across families. This pattern is associated with a more limited system of parental leave. While relatively well-off households are able to afford high-quality child-care or have one partner, usually the mother, withdraw from the labor market, lone parents have fewer child-care options and are likely to continue working. The methods in Corak, Curtis, and Phipps (2011) certainly fall short of establishing a causal impact on child attainments, whether in the long-run nor in the short-run, but our study does demonstrate that public policy is contributing to parents balancing the demands of work and family in different ways between the United States and Canada.

Conclusion

Relatively less upward mobility of the least advantaged is one reason why intergenerational mobility is lower in the United States than in other countries to which Americans are often compared. But it is not the only reason. Intergenerational mobility is also lower because children of top-earning parents are more likely to become top earners in their turn. An era of rising inequality will be more likely to heighten these differences than diminish them. The cohort of American children raised since the 1980s, who will reach their prime working years in the coming decade, is likely to experience an average degree of intergenerational income mobility as low—if not lower—than previous cohorts who were raised in an era of less inequality.

Inequality lowers mobility because it shapes opportunity. It heightens the income consequences of innate differences between individuals; it also changes opportunities, incentives, and institutions that form, develop, and transmit characteristics and skills valued in the labor market; and it shifts the balance of power so that some groups are in a position to structure policies or otherwise support their children's achievement independent of talent.

Thus, those who are concerned about equality of opportunity should also care about inequality of outcomes, but only to the extent that these differences in outcomes are due, in the words of John Roemer (2004), to "differential circumstances." Roemer considers three categories of circumstances through which parents may give their children an advantage. First, parents may transmit economic advantages through social connections facilitating access to jobs, admission to particular schools or colleges, or access to other sources of human capital. Second, parents may influence life chances through the genetic transmission of characteristics like innate ability, personality, and some aspects of health that are valued in the labor market. Third, parents may influence the lifetime earnings prospects of their children in subtle ways, like through a family culture and other monetary and nonmonetary investments that shape skills, aptitudes, beliefs, and behavior. When it comes to "equal opportunity," a common pattern is that people tend to support policies that would assure a level playing field in access to jobs and education, less willing to take steps to offset genetic advantages, and conflicted about what steps might be appropriate in counterbalancing within-family investments. But my main point here is that deciding which circumstances should be offset by policy steps of some kind, and as a result the fraction of parental income advantage passed on to children that is consistent with "equality of opportunity," is a value judgment that different societies may well make differently.

The demographic diversity between the high-income countries, and their underlying values, imply that it may be impossible, and indeed not even desirable, to change the degree of mobility in countries like the United Kingdom or the United States into the rates observed in Denmark. Rather, the cross-country comparison of intergenerational mobility of the sort offered by the Great Gatsby Curve invites us to reflect on what makes one country different than another so we may clarify the underlying drivers and determine whether these are forces that can change and whether we want them to change. This is one reason why parts of this overview have focused on the differences between the United States and Canada, and more importantly on changes within the United States over time.

The inequality literature has paid little attention to the intergenerational consequences of the increasing top income shares that it has so carefully documented. Freeland (2012) graphically documents the degree to which the top 1 percent, by virtue of the magnitude of their income, are divorced from the rest of the population in their work arrangements, consumption behavior, and beliefs. I have argued here that the top 1 percent are also different in the way advantages are passed on to the next generation, which certainly involves much higher-quality schooling and other investments of human capital from the early years onward, but may well also

involve nepotism in the allocation of jobs. Children of top earners are more likely to grow up to be top earners. Indeed, at some point the high levels of earnings accrued by the top 1 percent will be reflected in capital accumulation, and eventually lead to stronger intergenerational transmission of wealth, a topic not addressed at all in this paper. This dynamic at the top, and its underlying drivers, are likely very different from the configuration of forces determining intergenerational mobility for those in the lower half of the income distribution. Even so, some countries are likely to combine a good deal of intergenerational mobility with higher top shares because the balance in the lower parts of the income distribution between labor market inequalities, the health and vitality of the family as an institution, and broad, high-quality, and accessible public investments in human capital will not be (much) skewed by top earners. This pattern may well be the case in Sweden and Canada: Björklund, Roine, and Waldenström (2012) and my coauthor and I in Corak and Piraino (2010) suggest that, for these two countries, high mobility for most coexists with a “dynasty” for the top 1 percent.

A similar dynamic seems unlikely to unfold in the United States. While the imagined prospect of upward mobility for those in the lower part of the income distribution shares little in common with the generational dynamics of the top 1 percent, the latter may continue to be an important touchstone for those in, say, the top fifth of the US income distribution. After all, this group too has experienced significant growth in its relative standing, which partly reflects an increasing return to the graduate and other higher degrees for which they exerted considerable effort but is also linked to a background of nurturing families and select colleges. This group has both the resources and incentives to turn more intensely to promoting the capacities of their children. With effort and a bit of luck, it is not unreasonable for them to believe they may yet cross the threshold into the top 1 percent, and they can certainly imagine that their children stand just as good a chance, if not better. For them, the “American Dream” lives on, and as a result they are likely not predisposed, with their considerable political and cultural influence, to support the recasting of American public policy to meet its most pressing need, the upward mobility of those at the bottom.

■ *I gratefully acknowledge very helpful comments from Chang-Tai Hsieh, Ulrike Malmendier, and especially David Autor and Timothy Taylor. I would also note that this paper is a revised version of a discussion paper originally circulated under the title “How to Slide Down the Great Gatsby Curve” by the Center for American Progress (available at <http://www.americanprogress.org>), which itself grew out of a presentation I made to the “Social Mobility Summit” in London, United Kingdom, in May 2012, which was organized by the Sutton Trust and the Carnegie Foundation. The support and comments of Heather Boushey, Lee Elliot Major, and Eric Wanner are also appreciated as is the opportunity to make presentations at a meeting of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, the Prentice Institute of the University of Lethbridge, and the conference in honor of Thomas J. Courchene held at Queen’s University in October 2012.*

References

- Aaronson, Daniel, and Bhashkar Mazumder. 2008. "Intergenerational Economic Mobility in the United States, 1940 to 2000." *Journal of Human Resources* 43(1): 139–72.
- Andrews, Dan, and Andrew Keith Leigh. 2009. "More Inequality, Less Social Mobility." *Applied Economics Letters* 16(15): 1489–92.
- Atkinson, Anthony Barnes, Alan K. Maynard, and Chris G. Trinder. 1983. *Parents and Children: Incomes in Two Generations*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Bailey, Martha J., and Susan M. Dynarski. 2011. "Inequality in Postsecondary Education." In Chap. 6 in *Whither Opportunity? Rising Inequality, Schools, and Children's Life Chances*, edited by Greg J. Duncan and Richard J. Murnane. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Becker, Gary. 2013. "Meritocracies and Intergeneration Mobility." The Becker-Posner Blog, January 1. <http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/2013/01/meritocracies-and-intergeneration-mobility-becker.html>.
- Becker, Gary S., and Nigel Tomes. 1979. "An Equilibrium Theory of the Distribution of Income and Intergenerational Mobility." *Journal of Political Economy* 87(6): 1153–89.
- Becker, Gary S., and Nigel Tomes. 1986. "Human Capital and the Rise and Fall of Families." *Journal of Labor Economics* 4(3, Part 2): S1–S39.
- Belley, Philippe, Marc Frenette, and Lance Lochner. 2011. "Post-Secondary Attendance by Parental Income in the U.S. and Canada: What Role for Financial Aid Policy?" NBER Working Paper 17218.
- Belley, Philippe, and Lance Lochner. 2007. "The Changing Role of Family Income and Ability in Determining Educational Attainment." NBER Working Paper 13527.
- Bellow, Adam. 2003. *In Praise of Nepotism: A Natural History*. New York: Random House.
- Bénabou, Roland, and Efe A. Ok. 2001. "Social Mobility and the Demand for Redistribution: The Poup Hypothesis." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116(2): 447–87.
- Bennedsen, Morten, Kasper Meisner Nielson, Francisco Pérez-González, and Daniel Wolfenzon. 2007. "Inside the Family Firm: The Role of Families in Succession Decisions and Performance." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122(2): 647–49.
- Bettinger, Eric P., Bridget Terry Long, Philip Oreopoulos, and Lisa Sanbonmatsu. 2009. "The Role of Simplification and Information in College Decisions: Results from the H&R Block FAFSA Experiment." NBER Working Paper 15361.
- Bingley, Paul, Miles Corak, and Niels C. Westergård-Nielson. 2012. "Equality of Opportunity and Intergenerational Transmission of Employers." Chap. 18 in *From Parents to Children: The Intergenerational Transmission of Advantage*, edited by John Ermisch, Markus Jäntti, and Timothy Smeeding. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Björklund, Anders, and Markus Jäntti. 2009. "Intergenerational Income Mobility and the Role of Family Background." Chap. 20 in *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Inequality*, edited by Wiemer Salverda, Brian Nolan, and Timothy M. Smeeding. Oxford University Press.
- Björklund, Anders, Jesper Roine, and Daniel Waldenström. 2012. "Intergenerational Top Income Mobility in Sweden: Capitalist Dynasties in the Land of Equal Opportunity?" *Journal of Public Economics* 96(5): 474–84.
- Blanden, Jo. 2013. "Cross-Country Rankings in Intergenerational Mobility: A Comparison of Approaches from Economics and Sociology." *Journal of Economic Surveys* 27(1): 38–73.
- Bradbury, Bruce, Miles Corak, Jane Waldfogel, and Elizabeth Washbrook. 2012. "Inequality in Early Child Outcomes." Chap. 4 in *From Parents to Children: The Intergenerational Transmission of Advantage*, edited by John Ermisch, Markus Jäntti, and Timothy M. Smeeding. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bratsberg, Bernt, Knut Røed, Oddbjørn Raaum, Robin Naylor, Markus Jäntti, Tor Eriksson, and Eva Österbacka. 2007. "Nonlinearities in Intergenerational Earnings Mobility: Consequences for Cross-Country Comparisons." *Economic Journal* 117(519): C72–C92.
- Brunori, Paolo, Francisco H. G. Ferreira, and Vito Peragine. 2013. "Inequality of Opportunity, Income Inequality and Economic Mobility: Some International Comparisons." Policy Research Working Paper 6304, World Bank, Development Research Group.
- Carasso, Adam, Gillian Reynolds, and C. Eugene Steuerle. 2008. "How Much Does the Federal Government Spend to Promote Economic Mobility and for Whom?" Washington DC: Economic Mobility Project, Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Corak, Miles. 2006. "Do Poor Children Become Poor Adults? Lessons for Public Policy from a Cross-Country Comparison of Generational Earnings Mobility." *Research on Economic Inequality*, Vol. 13: *Dynamics of Inequality and Poverty*, edited by John Creedy and Guyonne Kalb, 143–88. The Netherlands: Elsevier Press. (Available in an unabridged

form as IZA Discussion Paper 1993, <http://ftp.iza.org/dp1993.pdf>.)

Corak, Miles. 2010. "Chasing the Same Dream, Climbing Different Ladders: Economic Mobility in the United States and Canada." Washington DC: Economic Mobility Project, Pew Charitable Trusts.

Corak, Miles. 2013. "Inequality from Generation to Generation: The United States in Comparison." Chap. 6 in *The Economics of Inequality, Poverty, and Discrimination in the 21st Century*, edited by Robert S. Rycroft. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Corak, Miles, Lori Curtis, and Shelley Phipps. 2011. "Economic Mobility, Family Background, and the Well-being of Children in the United States and Canada." In *Persistence, Privilege and Parenting: The Comparative Study of Intergenerational Mobility*, edited by Timothy Smeeding, Markus Jäntti, and Robert Erickson. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Corak, Miles, and Andrew Heisz. 1999. "The Intergenerational Earnings and Income Mobility of Canadian Men: Evidence from Longitudinal Income Tax Data." *Journal of Human Resources* 34(3): 504–33.

Corak, Miles, and Patrizio Piraino. 2010. "Intergenerational Earnings Mobility and the Inheritance of Employers." IZA Discussion Paper 4876.

Corak, Miles, and Patrizio Piraino. 2011. "The Intergenerational Transmission of Employers." *Journal of Labor Economics* 29(1): 37–68.

Council of Economic Advisors. 2012. *Economic Report of the President*. Washington DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Datcher Loury, Linda. 2006. "Some Contacts are More Equal than Others: Informal Networks, Job Tenure, and Wages." *Journal of Labor Economics* 24(2): 299–318.

Duncan, Greg J., and Richard J. Murnane. 2011. "Introduction: The American Dream, Then and Now." Chap. 1 in *Whither Opportunity? Rising Inequality, Schools, and Children's Life Chances*, edited by Greg J. Duncan and Richard J. Murnane. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Economic Mobility Project. 2009. "Opinion Poll on Economic Mobility and the American Dream." Washington DC: Pew Charitable Trusts. <http://www.pewstates.org/research/analysis/opinion-poll-on-economic-mobility-and-the-american-dream-85899378651>.

Ermisch, John, Markus Jäntti, Timothy M. Smeeding, and James A. Wilson. 2012. "Advantage in Comparative Perspective." Chap. 1 in *From Parents to Children: The Intergenerational Transmission of Advantage*, edited by John Ermisch, Markus Jäntti, and Timothy M. Smeeding. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Ferreira, Francisco H. G., and Jérémie Gignoux. 2011. "The Measurement of Inequality of Opportunity: Theory and an Application to Latin America." *Review of Income and Wealth* 57(4): 622–57.

Freeland, Chrystia. 2012. *Plutocrats: The Rise of the New Global Super-Rich and the Fall of Everyone Else*. Toronto: Doubleday.

Goldin, Claudia, and Lawrence F. Katz. 1999. "The Returns to Skill in the United States across the Twentieth Century." NBER Working Paper 7126.

Hoxby, Caroline M., and Christopher Avery. 2012. "The Missing 'One-Offs': The Hidden Supply of High-Achieving, Low Income Students." NBER Working Paper 18586.

Jencks, Christopher, and Laura Tach. 2006. "Would Equal Opportunity Mean More Mobility?" In *Mobility and Inequality: Frontiers of Research from Sociology and Economics*, edited by Stephen B. Morgan, David L. Grusky, and Gary S. Fields. Stanford University Press.

Knudsen, Eric I., James J. Heckman, Judy L. Cameron, and Jack P. Shonkoff. 2006. "Economic, Neurobiological, and Behavioral Perspectives on Building America's Future Workforce." *PNAS*, July, 103(27): 10155–62.

Krueger, Alan. 2012. "The Rise and Consequences of Inequality." Presentation made to the Center for American Progress, January 12th. <http://www.americanprogress.org/events/2012/01/12/17181/the-rise-and-consequences-of-inequality/>.

Lee, Chul-In, and Gary Solon. 2009. "Trends in Intergenerational Income Mobility." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 91(4): 766–772.

Lefranc, Arnaud, Nicolas Pistolesi, and Alain Trannoy. 2008. "Inequality of Opportunities vs. Inequality of Outcomes: Are Western Societies All Alike." *Review of Income and Wealth* 54(4): 513–46.

Lemieux, Thomas. 2006. "Post-secondary Education and Increasing Wage Inequality." NBER Working Paper 12077.

Mayer, Susan E., and Leonard M. Lopoo. 2004. "What Do Trends in the Intergenerational Economic Mobility of Sons and Daughters in the United States Mean?" Chap. 5 in *Generational Income Mobility in North America and Europe*, edited by Miles Corak. Cambridge University Press.

Mazumder, Bhashkar. 2005. "The Apple Falls Even Closer to the Tree than We Thought: New and Revised Estimates of the Intergenerational Inheritance of Earnings." In *Unequal Chances: Family Background and Economic Success*, edited by Samuel Bowles, Herbert Gintis, and Melissa Osborne Groves. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Mazumder, Bhashkar. 2012. "Is Intergenerational Economic Mobility Lower Now than in the Past?" Chicago Fed Letter 297, April.

McLanahan, Sara. 2004. "Diverging Destinies: How Children Are Faring under the Second Demographic Transition." *Demography* 41 (4): 607–627.

Mulligan, Casey B. 1997. *Parental Priorities and Economic Inequality*. University of Chicago Press.

OECD. 2011a. *Divided We Stand: Why Inequality Keeps Rising*. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

OECD. 2011b. *Education at a Glance 2011: OECD Indicators*. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

OECD. 2012. *OECD Economic Surveys: United States*. June 2012. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Paes de Barros, Ricardo, Francisco H. G. Ferreira, José R. Molinas Vega, and Jaime Saavedra Chanduvi. 2009. *Measuring Inequality of Opportunities in Latin America and the Caribbean*. World Bank.

Pérez-González, Francisco. 2006. "Inherited Control and Firm Performance." *American Economic Review* 96(5): 1559–88.

Reardon, Sean F. 2011. "The Widening Academic Achievement Gap Between the Rich and the Poor: New Evidence and Possible Explanations." Chap. 5 in *Whither Opportunity? Rising*

Inequality, Schools, and Children's Life Chances, edited by Greg J. Duncan and Richard J. Murnane. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Roemer, John E. 2004. "Equal Opportunity and Intergenerational Mobility: Going Beyond Intergenerational Income Transition Matrices." Chap. 3 in *Generational Income Mobility in North America and Europe*, edited by Miles Corak. Cambridge University Press.

Roemer, John E. 2012. "What is the Justification of Studying Intergenerational Mobility of Socioeconomic Status?" Chap. 20 in *From Parents to Children: The Intergenerational Transmission of Advantage*, edited by John Ermisch, Markus Jäntti, and Timothy M. Smeeding. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Solon, Gary. 1992. "Intergenerational Income Mobility in the United States." *American Economic Review* 82(3): 393–408.

Solon, Gary. 2004. "A Model of Intergenerational Mobility Variation over Time and Place." Chap. 2 in *Generational Income Mobility in North America and Europe*, edited by Miles Corak. Cambridge University Press.

Zimmerman, David J. 1992. "Regression Toward Mediocrity in Economic Stature." *American Economic Review* 82(3): 409–29.

This article has been cited by:

1. Thom Malone. 2020. There goes the neighborhood does tipping exist amongst income groups?. *Journal of Housing Economics* **48**, 101667. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Daniel Auguste. 2020. Who Becomes a Business Owner in High-inequality Regimes? The Conditioning Effect of Economic Inequality on the Impact of Individual Educational and Financial Endowment on Entrepreneurship. *Social Currents* **7**:2, 131-154. [[Crossref](#)]
3. RICHARD J. AREND, PANKAJ C. PATEL. 2020. THE AMERICAN DREAM, MELTING POT AND REGIONAL KNOWLEDGE STOCK AS DRIVERS OF ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITY. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* **1**, 2050001. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Tom S Vogl. 2020. Intergenerational Associations and the Fertility Transition. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **24**. . [[Crossref](#)]
5. Rob Clark. 2020. Income inequality in the post-2000 era: Development, globalization, and the state. *International Sociology* **43**, 026858092090546. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Michael J. Donnelly. 2020. Material Interests, Identity and Linked Fate in Three Countries. *British Journal of Political Science* **73**, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Karl-Friedrich Israel, Sophia Latsos. 2020. The impact of (un)conventional expansionary monetary policy on income inequality – lessons from Japan. *Applied Economics* **8**, 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
8. James M Raymo, Hao Dong. 2020. Parental resources and child well-being in East Asia: An overview. *Chinese Journal of Sociology* **12**, 2057150X2090809. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Orhan Torul. 2020. Education in a Heterogeneous-Agent Economy: Revisiting Transatlantic Differences. *Journal of Human Capital* . [[Crossref](#)]
10. Thang Dang. 2020. Intergenerational Earnings and Income Mobility in Vietnam. *LABOUR* **34**:1, 113-136. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Atheendar Venkataramani, Sebastian Daza, Ezekiel Emanuel. 2020. Association of Social Mobility With the Income-Related Longevity Gap in the United States. *JAMA Internal Medicine* **180**:3, 429. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Emilie Le Caous, Fenghueih Huarng. 2020. Economic Complexity and the Mediating Effects of Income Inequality: Reaching Sustainable Development in Developing Countries. *Sustainability* **12**:5, 2089. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Gregory Clark, Andrew Leigh, Mike Pottenger. 2020. Frontiers of mobility: Was Australia 1870–2017 a more socially mobile society than England?. *Explorations in Economic History* 101327. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Daniel Deimel, Bryony Hoskins, Hermann J. Abs. 2020. How do schools affect inequalities in political participation: compensation of social disadvantage or provision of differential access?. *Educational Psychology* **40**:2, 146-166. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Marianne Cooper, Allison J. Pugh. 2020. Families Across the Income Spectrum: A Decade in Review. *Journal of Marriage and Family* **82**:1, 272-299. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Alexi Gugushvili, Caspar Kaiser. 2020. Equality of opportunity is linked to lower mortality in Europe. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* **74**:2, 151-157. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Anders Björklund, Markus Jäntti. 2020. Intergenerational mobility, intergenerational effects, sibling correlations, and equality of opportunity: A comparison of four approaches. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 100455. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Jaewon Lee, Fei Sun. 2020. Intergenerational Economic Mobility Between Mothers and Children: Racial and Ethnic Disparities. *Family Relations* **126**. . [[Crossref](#)]

19. Pablo A. Mitnik. 2020. Intergenerational Income Elasticities, Instrumental Variable Estimation, and Bracketing Strategies. *Sociological Methodology* **26**, 008117501988799. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Xi Song, Catherine G. Massey, Karen A. Rolf, Joseph P. Ferrie, Jonathan L. Rothbaum, Yu Xie. 2020. Long-term decline in intergenerational mobility in the United States since the 1850s. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**:1, 251-258. [[Crossref](#)]
21. David Loschiavo. 2020. Household debt and income inequality: Evidence from Italian survey data. *Review of Income and Wealth* **75**. . [[Crossref](#)]
22. Pablo A. Mitnik, David B. Grusky. 2020. The Intergenerational Elasticity of What? The Case for Redefining the Workhorse Measure of Economic Mobility. *Sociological Methodology* **87**, 008117501988661. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Rebecca Simson, Mike Savage. 2020. The global significance of national inequality decline. *Third World Quarterly* **41**:1, 20-41. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Songtao Tian, Zhirong Liu. 2020. Emergence of income inequality: Origin, distribution and possible policies. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **537**, 122767. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Gyorgy Andor. Contrasting Theories and Evidence About Income Inequality of Post-socialist Central and Eastern European Countries in the European Union 39-52. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Michelle M. Miller, Frank McIntyre. 2020. Does Money Matter for Intergenerational Income Transmission?. *Southern Economic Journal* **86**:3, 941-970. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Jo Blanden. Education and inequality 119-131. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Lixing Sun, Dong-Po Xia, Jin-Hua Li. Size Matters in Primate Societies: How Social Mobility Relates to Social Stability in Tibetan and Japanese Macaques 47-59. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Christoph Deutschmann. Piketty und die Zukunft des Kapitalismus 179-198. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Paolo Brunori, Flaviana Palmisano, Vitorocco Peragine. 2019. Inequality of opportunity in sub-Saharan Africa. *Applied Economics* **51**:60, 6428-6458. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Sabino Kornrich, Leah Ruppanner, Trude Lappegård. 2019. Spending on Children across Four Countries: Variation in the Role of Income and Women's Labor Force Participation. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* **42**. . [[Crossref](#)]
32. Mina Sami, Randa El Bedawy. 2019. Assessing the impact of knowledge management on total factor productivity. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies* **11**:1, 134-146. [[Crossref](#)]
33. Rainer Andergassen, Franco Nardini. 2019. INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY AND SOCIAL STATUS IN A MODEL WITH HUMAN CAPITAL INVESTMENTS AND TRAIT INHERITANCE. *Macroeconomic Dynamics* **82**, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Alix J. Jansen, Linda A. White, Elizabeth Dhuey, Daniel Foster, Michal Perlman. 2019. Training and Skills Development Policy Options for the Changing World of Work. *Canadian Public Policy* **45**:4, 460-482. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Deirdre Bloome, Jane Furey. 2019. Lifetime inequality: Income and occupational differences and dynamics in the US. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 100470. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Suzanne Duryea, Luísa Baptista de Freitas, Luana Marques-Garcia Ozemela, Breno Sampaio, Gustavo R. Sampaio, Giuseppe Trevisan. 2019. Universities and Intergenerational Social Mobility in Brazil: Examining Patterns by Race and Gender. *Journal of Economics, Race, and Policy* **2**:4, 240-256. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Jon Horgen Friberg. 2019. Does selective acculturation work? Cultural orientations, educational aspirations and school effort among children of immigrants in Norway. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* **45**:15, 2844-2863. [[Crossref](#)]

38. Siwei Cheng, Xi Song. 2019. Linked Lives, Linked Trajectories: Intergenerational Association of Intragenerational Income Mobility. *American Sociological Review* **67**, 000312241988449. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Marlena Creusere, Hengxia Zhao, Stephanie Bond Huie, David R. Troutman. 2019. Postsecondary Education Impact on Intergenerational Income Mobility: Differences by Completion Status, Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Type of Major. *The Journal of Higher Education* **90**:6, 915-939. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Robert Rogers, Doan Hai Ma, Tra Nguyen, Ngoc Anh Nguyen. 2019. Early childhood education and cognitive outcomes in adolescence: a longitudinal study from Vietnam. *Education Economics* **27**:6, 658-669. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Aroop Chatterjee. 2019. Measuring wealth inequality in South Africa: An agenda. *Development Southern Africa* **36**:6, 839-859. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Zheng Chang, Jiayu Chen, Weifeng Li, Xin Li. 2019. Public transportation and the spatial inequality of urban park accessibility: New evidence from Hong Kong. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* **76**, 111-122. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Cuong Viet Nguyen, Lam Tran Nguyen. 2019. Intra-generational and Intergenerational Social Mobility: Evidence from Vietnam. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* **56**, 002190961987632. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Zhongda Li, Lu Liu. 2019. Preference or endowment? Intergenerational transmission of women's work behavior and the underlying mechanisms. *Journal of Population Economics* **32**:4, 1401-1435. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Chao Wu, Fu Ren, Xinyue Ye, Xiaojin Liang, Qingyun Du. 2019. Spatiotemporal analysis of multiscale income mobility in China. *Applied Geography* **111**, 102060. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Ling Liu, Qian Wan. 2019. The effect of education expansion on intergenerational transmission of education: Evidence from China. *China Economic Review* **57**, 101327. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Patricia Justino, Bruno Martorano. 2019. Redistributive Preferences and Protests in Latin America. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* **63**:9, 2128-2154. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Diego Daruich, Julian Kozlowski. 2019. Explaining intergenerational mobility: The role of fertility and family transfers. *Review of Economic Dynamics* . [[Crossref](#)]
49. Bastian A. Betthäuser. 2019. Left behind? Over-time change in the social mobility of children from unskilled working-class backgrounds in Germany. *Acta Sociologica* **58**, 000169931986852. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Monique Borgerhoff Mulder, Mary C. Towner, Ryan Baldini, Bret A. Beheim, Samuel Bowles, Heidi Colleran, Michael Gurven, Karen L. Kramer, Siobhán M. Mattison, David A. Nolin, Brooke A. Scelza, Eric Schniter, Rebecca Sear, Mary K. Shenk, Eckart Voland, John Ziker. 2019. Differences between sons and daughters in the intergenerational transmission of wealth. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **374**:1780, 20180076. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Anning Hu, Xiaozhao Yousef Yang. 2019. Is college education an equalizer for social disparities in health literacy? A case study in Shanghai, China. *Global Health Promotion* **26**:3, 62-70. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Madhu Sehrawat, Sanjay Kumar Singh. 2019. Human capital and income inequality in India: is there a non-linear and asymmetric relationship?. *Applied Economics* **51**:39, 4325-4336. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Sima Siami-Namini, Darren Hudson. 2019. Inflation and income inequality in developed and developing countries. *Journal of Economic Studies* **46**:3, 611-632. [[Crossref](#)]
54. David J Harding, Martin D Munk. 2019. The Decline of Intergenerational Income Mobility in Denmark: Returns to Education, Demographic Change, and Labor Market Experience#. *Social Forces* **107**. . [[Crossref](#)]
55. Andrew Q. Philips, Flávio D. S. Souza, Guy D. Whitten. 2019. Globalization and comparative compositional inequality. *Political Science Research and Methods* **27**, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]

56. Marianne Nordli Hansen, Øyvind Nicolay Wiborg. 2019. The Accumulation and Transfers of Wealth: Variations by Social Class. *European Sociological Review* **128**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
57. Alla SOKOLOVSKA. 2019. Income and wealth inequality and tax instruments of its decrease. *Finansi Ukraïni* **2019**:283, 23-41. [\[Crossref\]](#)
58. Roman KOPYCH. 2019. Austerity policies of Eurozone countries. *Finansi Ukraïni* **2019**:283, 42-54. [\[Crossref\]](#)
59. Claudia Lumpe. 2019. Public beliefs in social mobility and high-skilled migration. *Journal of Population Economics* **32**:3, 981-1008. [\[Crossref\]](#)
60. Marisa Hidalgo-Hidalgo. 2019. Childhood-Related Policies and Adult Poverty: Evidence from Some European Countries. *Social Indicators Research* **144**:1, 191-217. [\[Crossref\]](#)
61. Abdurrahman B. Aydemir, Hakki Yazici. 2019. Intergenerational education mobility and the level of development. *European Economic Review* **116**, 160-185. [\[Crossref\]](#)
62. Yasaman Gorji, Michael Carney, Rajshree Prakash. 2019. Indirect nepotism: Network sponsorship, social capital and career performance in show business families. *Journal of Family Business Strategy* 100285. [\[Crossref\]](#)
63. Nate Breznau, Carola Hommerich. 2019. No generalizable effect of income inequality on public support for governmental redistribution among rich democracies 1987–2010. *Social Science Research* **81**, 170-191. [\[Crossref\]](#)
64. Marie Connolly, Miles Corak, Catherine Haeck. 2019. Intergenerational Mobility Between and Within Canada and the United States. *Journal of Labor Economics* **37**:S2, S595-S641. [\[Crossref\]](#)
65. Ravi Kanbur, Andy Snell. 2019. Inequality Indices as Tests of Fairness. *The Economic Journal* **129**:621, 2216-2239. [\[Crossref\]](#)
66. Frank F. Furstenberg. 2019. Family Change in Global Perspective: How and Why Family Systems Change. *Family Relations* **68**:3, 326-341. [\[Crossref\]](#)
67. Mario D. Molina, Mauricio Bucca, Michael W. Macy. 2019. It's not just how the game is played, it's whether you win or lose. *Science Advances* **5**:7, eaau1156. [\[Crossref\]](#)
68. Torben M. Andersen. 2019. SOCIAL BACKGROUND, EDUCATION, AND INEQUALITY. *Economic Inquiry* **57**:3, 1441-1459. [\[Crossref\]](#)
69. David G. Blanchflower, Andrew J. Oswald. 2019. Unhappiness and Pain in Modern America: A Review Essay, and Further Evidence, on Carol Graham's Happiness for All?. *Journal of Economic Literature* **57**:2, 385-402. [\[Abstract\]](#) [\[View PDF article\]](#) [\[PDF with links\]](#)
70. Yumei Guo, Yang Song, Qianmiao Chen. 2019. Impacts of education policies on intergenerational education mobility in China. *China Economic Review* **55**, 124-142. [\[Crossref\]](#)
71. Guido Neidhöfer, Maximilian Stockhausen. 2019. Dynastic Inequality Compared: Multigenerational Mobility in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Germany. *Review of Income and Wealth* **65**:2, 383-414. [\[Crossref\]](#)
72. Richard N. Pitt, Lin Zhu. 2019. The Relationship between College Major Prestige/Status and Post-baccalaureate Outcomes. *Sociological Perspectives* **62**:3, 325-345. [\[Crossref\]](#)
73. Patrick Sachweh, Evelyn Sthamer. 2019. Why Do the Affluent Find Inequality Increasingly Unjust? Changing Inequality and Justice Perceptions in Germany, 1994–2014. *European Sociological Review* **80**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
74. Miles Corak. 2019. The Canadian Geography of Intergenerational Income Mobility. *The Economic Journal* **126**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
75. Guido Neidhöfer. 2019. Intergenerational mobility and the rise and fall of inequality: Lessons from Latin America. *The Journal of Economic Inequality* **60**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)

76. Teresa Barbieri, Francesco Bloise, Michele Raitano. 2019. Intergenerational Earnings Inequality: New Evidence From Italy. *Review of Income and Wealth* **87**. . [[Crossref](#)]
77. Jaehyun Nam. 2019. Government spending during childhood and intergenerational income mobility in the United States. *Children and Youth Services Review* **100**, 332-343. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Himanshu Shekhar, Alexander J. Schmidt, Hans-Werner Wehling. 2019. Exploring wellbeing in human settlements - A spatial planning perspective. *Habitat International* **87**, 66-74. [[Crossref](#)]
79. N. M. Novak, M. Rabiee, A M. Tjoa. ICTs for Education: An Inclusive Approach to Addressing Challenges Faced by Roma Communities in Europe 1355-1361. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Erzsébet Bukodi, Marii Paskov, Brian Nolan. 2019. Intergenerational Class Mobility in Europe: A New Account. *Social Forces* **29**. . [[Crossref](#)]
81. . Bibliography 521-564. [[Crossref](#)]
82. Gregory S. Paul. Happiness 396-420. [[Crossref](#)]
83. Kirill O. Telin. 2019. Divergence in mind: Why inequality devil is as black as he is painted. *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :4, 107-123. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Djeneba Doumbia. 2019. The quest for pro-poor and inclusive growth: the role of governance. *Applied Economics* **51**:16, 1762-1783. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Gina A. N. Chowa, Rainier D. Masa. 2019. Asset Ownership and Academic Achievement Among Youth in Ghana: Examining Associations Based on Asset Type and Academic Subject. *The Educational Forum* **83**:2, 181-198. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Paul Gregg, Lindsey Macmillan, Claudia Vittori. 2019. Intergenerational income mobility: access to top jobs, the low-pay no-pay cycle and the role of education in a common framework. *Journal of Population Economics* **32**:2, 501-528. [[Crossref](#)]
87. KEIKO FUJISAWA, HIDEO AKABAYASHI, MAKIKO NAKAMURO, MASUMI SUGAWARA. 2019. Future Direction of Collaboration Between Economics of Education and Educational Psychology. *The Annual Report of Educational Psychology in Japan* **58**:0, 258-262. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Thor Berger, Per Engzell. 2019. American geography of opportunity reveals European origins. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**:13, 6045-6050. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Alari Paulus, Holly Sutherland, Iva Tasseva. 2019. Indexing Out of Poverty? Fiscal Drag and Benefit Erosion in Cross-National Perspective. *Review of Income and Wealth* **107**. . [[Crossref](#)]
90. Mengjie Jin, Xuemei Bai, Kevin X Li, Wenming Shi. 2019. Are we born equal: a study of intergenerational income mobility in China. *Journal of Demographic Economics* **85**:1, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Roberto Iacono. 2019. The Norwegian Oil Bonanza and the Scandinavian Model in Comparative Perspective. *Comparative Economic Studies* **61**:1, 63-82. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Jérôme Bourdieu, Lionel Kesztenbaum, Gilles Postel-Vinay, Akiko Suwa-Eisenmann. 2019. Intergenerational Wealth Mobility in France, 19th and 20th Century. *Review of Income and Wealth* **65**:1, 21-47. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Joshua Pearce, Emily Prehoda. 2019. Could 79 People Solarize the U.S. Electric Grid?. *Societies* **9**:1, 26. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Samuel L. Swift, Zinzi Bailey, Adina Zeki Al Hazzouri. 2019. Improving the Epidemiological Understanding of the Dynamic Relationship Between Life Course Financial Well-Being and Health. *Current Epidemiology Reports* **6**:1, 28-33. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Åsbjørn Melkevik. 2019. A tax dead on arrival: classical liberalism, inheritance, and social mobility. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* **22**:2, 200-220. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Yu-Wei Luke Chu, Ming-Jen Lin. 2019. Intergenerational earnings mobility in Taiwan: 1990-2010. *Empirical Economics* **43**. . [[Crossref](#)]

97. I-Chan Huang, Nickhill Bhakta, Tara M Brinkman, James L Klosky, Kevin R Krull, DeoKumar Srivastava, Melissa M Hudson, Leslie L Robison. 2019. Determinants and Consequences of Financial Hardship Among Adult Survivors of Childhood Cancer: A Report From the St. Jude Lifetime Cohort Study. *JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute* **111**:2, 189-200. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Kit-Chun Lam, Pak-Wai Liu. 2019. Intergenerational Educational Mobility in Hong Kong: Are Immigrants More Mobile than Natives?. *Pacific Economic Review* **24**:1, 137-157. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Bruce Bradbury, Jane Waldfogel, Elizabeth Washbrook. 2019. Income-Related Gaps in Early Child Cognitive Development: Why Are They Larger in the United States Than in the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada?. *Demography* **56**:1, 367-390. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Arthur Sakamoto, Daniel A. Powers. 17 The Demography of Social Stratification 457-480. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Vincent T. Law. Intergenerational and Sustainable Development 1006-1013. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Susan T. Fiske, Federica Durante. Mutual Status Stereotypes Maintain Inequality 335-348. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Vincent T. Law. Intergenerational and Sustainable Development 1-8. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Bart H. H. Golsteyn, Stefa Hirsch. 2019. Are estimates of intergenerational mobility biased by non-response? Evidence from the Netherlands. *Social Choice and Welfare* **52**:1, 29-63. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Fatos Selita, Yulia Kovas. 2019. GENES AND GINI: WHAT INEQUALITY MEANS FOR HERITABILITY. *Journal of Biosocial Science* **51**:1, 18-47. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Anthony Marcus, Popy Begum, Laila Alsbahi, Ric Curtis. 2019. Between Choice and Obligation: An Exploratory Assessment of Forced Marriage Problems and Policies among Migrants in the United States. *Social Policy and Society* **18**:1, 19-36. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Naureen Karachiwalla. 2019. A Teacher Unlike Me: Social Distance, Learning, and Intergenerational Mobility in Developing Countries. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* **67**:2, 225-271. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Ernesto F. L. Amaral, Shih-Keng Yen, Sharron Xuanren Wang-Goodman. 2019. A Meta-Analysis of the Association between Income Inequality and Intergenerational Mobility. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* **5**, 237802311988128. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Pablo Mitnik, Victoria Bryant, Michael Weber. 2019. The Intergenerational Transmission of Family-Income Advantages in the United States. *Sociological Science* **6**, 380-415. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Thomas Fischer. 2019. Determinants of Wealth Inequality and Mobility in General Equilibrium. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
111. Maurizio Franzini. 2019. Disuguaglianza economica, immobilità sociale e crescita stagnante: possibili legami tra i "malesseri" italiani. *ITALIA CONTEMPORANEA* :288, 115-131. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Alessandro Vercelli. Normative Foundations 1-27. [[Crossref](#)]
113. James R. Repetti. 2019. The Appropriate Roles for Equity and Efficiency in a Progressive Income Tax. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
114. José Luis Iparraguirre. Poverty, Deprivation, and Social Class 175-254. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Lily L. Batchelder, David Kamin. 2019. Taxing the Rich: Issues and Options. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
116. Ahmed Tritah. 2019. Inégalité et mobilité sociale : le rôle du financement de l'éducation. *Revue économique* **n°5**:5, 819. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Axel Murswieck. Sozialstruktur der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Huiting Liu, Qinying He. 2019. The effect of basic public service on urban-rural income inequality: a sys-GMM approach. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja* **32**:1, 3211-3229. [[Crossref](#)]
119. David Altman. Citizenship and Contemporary Direct Democracy **27**, . [[Crossref](#)]

120. Maria A. Davia, Nuria Legazpe. Chapter 8 Macro-Economic Determinants of Cross-Country Differences in Intergenerational Transmission of Economic Disadvantage in Europe 197-217. [[Crossref](#)]
121. John A. Bishop, Haiyong Liu, Juan Gabriel Rodríguez. Chapter 9 Long-Run Factors Influencing Intergenerational Perceived Job Status Mobility 219-246. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Teodora Boneva, Christopher Rauh. 2018. Parental Beliefs about Returns to Educational Investments —The Later the Better?. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **16**:6, 1669-1711. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Chelsea Murray, Robert Graham Clark, Silvia Mendolia, Peter Siminski. 2018. Direct Measures of Intergenerational Income Mobility for Australia. *Economic Record* **94**:307, 445-468. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Raitano Michele, Vona Francesco. 2018. From the Cradle to the Grave: The Influence of Family Background on the Career Path of Italian Men. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **80**:6, 1062-1088. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Deirdre Bloome, Shauna Dyer, Xiang Zhou. 2018. Educational Inequality, Educational Expansion, and Intergenerational Income Persistence in the United States. *American Sociological Review* **83**:6, 1215-1253. [[Crossref](#)]
126. Devdatta Ray, Mikael Linden. 2018. Health, inequality and income: a global study using simultaneous model. *Journal of Economic Structures* **7**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
127. Roy Boyd, Maria Eugenia Ibararán, Roberto Vélez-Grajales. Social Mobility: The Result of Standing Inequalities 79-89. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Seonaigh MacPherson. 2018. Ethno-cultural diversity education in Canada, the USA and India: the experience of the Tibetan diaspora. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* **48**:6, 844-860. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Getinet Astatike Haile. 2018. Intergenerational Mobility in Socio-economic Status in Ethiopia. *Journal of International Development* **30**:8, 1392-1413. [[Crossref](#)]
130. Shai Davidai. 2018. Why do Americans believe in economic mobility? Economic inequality, external attributions of wealth and poverty, and the belief in economic mobility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* **79**, 138-148. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Bhashkar Mazumder. 2018. Intergenerational Mobility in the United States: What We Have Learned from the PSID. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* **680**:1, 213-234. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Timothy M. Smeeding. 2018. The PSID in Research and Policy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* **680**:1, 29-47. [[Crossref](#)]
133. Julie Szendrey, Laci Fiala. 2018. "I Think I Can Get Ahead!" Perceived Economic Mobility, Income, and Financial Behaviors of Young Adults. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning* **29**:2, 290-303. [[Crossref](#)]
134. Steven Higgins. Improving Learning **42**, . [[Crossref](#)]
135. Gary S. Becker, Scott Duke Kominers, Kevin M. Murphy, Jörg L. Spenkuch. 2018. A Theory of Intergenerational Mobility. *Journal of Political Economy* **126**:S1, S7-S25. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Arnaud Lefranc. 2018. Intergenerational Earnings Persistence and Economic Inequality in the Long Run: Evidence from French Cohorts, 1931-75. *Economica* **85**:340, 808-845. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Michael Hout. 2018. Americans' occupational status reflects the status of both of their parents. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**:38, 9527-9532. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Binkai Chen, Dan Liu, Ming Lu. 2018. Opportunity equality and development: Rural income mobility and city size in China. *The World Economy* **95**. . [[Crossref](#)]

139. Tim Hazledine, Max Rashbrooke. 2018. The New Zealand rich list twenty years on. *New Zealand Economic Papers* 52:3, 289-303. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Rosalind Dixon. 2018. On law and economic inequality: a response to Philip Alston. *Australian Journal of Human Rights* 24:3, 276-280. [[Crossref](#)]
141. Adriana Lleras-Muney. 2018. Mind the Gap: A Review of The Health Gap: The Challenge of an Unequal World by Sir Michael Marmot. *Journal of Economic Literature* 56:3, 1080-1101. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
142. Raymundo M. Campos-Vazquez. 2018. Intergenerational Persistence of Skills and Socioeconomic Status. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 39:3, 509-523. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Adam Okulicz-Kozaryn, Rubia da Rocha Valente. 2018. Life Satisfaction of Career Women and Housewives. *Applied Research in Quality of Life* 13:3, 603-632. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Guido Neidhöfer, Joaquín Serrano, Leonardo Gasparini. 2018. Educational inequality and intergenerational mobility in Latin America: A new database. *Journal of Development Economics* 134, 329-349. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Rainald Borck, Matthias Wrede. 2018. Spatial and social mobility. *Journal of Regional Science* 58:4, 688-704. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Gregory R. Thorson, Sera M. Gearhart. 2018. The Adverse Effects of Economic Inequality on Educational Outcomes: An Examination of PISA Scores, 2000–2015. *World Affairs* 181:3, 286-306. [[Crossref](#)]
147. Marc Fleurbaey, Olivier Bouin, Marie-Laure Salles-Djelic, Ravi Kanbur, Helga Nowotny, Elisa Reis, Amartya Sen. A Manifesto for Social Progress 2, . [[Crossref](#)]
148. Eyal Bar-Haim. 2018. Still Great: Subjective Intergenerational Mobility and Income Inequality. *Comparative Sociology* 17:5, 496-518. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Fabio D'Orlando, Francesco Ferrante. 2018. Macroeconomic priorities revisited: the behavioural foundations of stabilization policies. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 42:5, 1255-1275. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Arndis Vilhjálmsdóttir, Jon Gunnar Bernburg, Ragna B. Gardarsdóttir, Inga Dora Sigfusdóttir. 2018. Community income inequality and adolescent emotional problems: A population-based study. *Journal of Community Psychology* 46:6, 715-733. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Thor Berger. 2018. Places of Persistence: Slavery and the Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States. *Demography* 55:4, 1547-1565. [[Crossref](#)]
152. Andreu Arenas, Clément Malgouyres. 2018. Countercyclical school attainment and intergenerational mobility. *Labour Economics* 53, 97-111. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Øyvind N. Wiborg, Marianne N. Hansen. 2018. The Scandinavian model during increasing inequality: Recent trends in educational attainment, earnings and wealth among Norwegian siblings. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 56, 53-63. [[Crossref](#)]
154. Raj Chetty, Nathaniel Hendren. 2018. The Impacts of Neighborhoods on Intergenerational Mobility II: County-Level Estimates*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133:3, 1163-1228. [[Crossref](#)]
155. ###. 2018. A Study of Changes in School-to-Work ransition - Comparison in South Korean 1970-80 birth cohort -. *Korean Journal of Social Welfare* 70:3, 113-137. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Natasha Warikoo. 2018. What Meritocracy Means to its Winners: Admissions, Race, and Inequality at Elite Universities in the United States and Britain. *Social Sciences* 7:8, 131. [[Crossref](#)]
157. Robert Moosbrugger, Johann Bacher. 2018. The End of Educational Mobility: Toward a Two-Class Structure in Austria's Educational System?. *International Journal of Sociology* 48:3, 274-293. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Robert J. Gordon. 2018. Declining American economic growth despite ongoing innovation. *Explorations in Economic History* 69, 1-12. [[Crossref](#)]

159. Sang Yoon (Tim) Lee, Ananth Seshadri. 2018. Economic Policy and Equality of Opportunity. *The Economic Journal* **128**:612, F114-F151. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Maia Güell, Michele Pellizzari, Giovanni Pica, José V. Rodríguez Mora. 2018. Correlating Social Mobility and Economic Outcomes. *The Economic Journal* **128**:612, F353-F403. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Saurav Pathak, Etayankara Muralidharan. 2018. Economic Inequality and Social Entrepreneurship. *Business & Society* **57**:6, 1150-1190. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Andrew Lister. 2018. The Difference Principle, Capitalism, and Property-Owning Democracy. *Moral Philosophy and Politics* **5**:1, 151-172. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Laura Ravazzini, Florian Chávez-Juárez. 2018. Which Inequality Makes People Dissatisfied with Their Lives? Evidence of the Link Between Life Satisfaction and Inequalities. *Social Indicators Research* **137**:3, 1119-1143. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Sofia Tano, Robert Nakosteen, Olle Westerlund, Michael Zimmer. 2018. Youth-age characteristics as precursors of power couple formation and location choice. *Labour Economics* **52**, 98-111. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Annalisa Russino. 2018. Financial development and intergenerational education mobility. *Review of Development Finance* **8**:1, 25-37. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Christian Hofer, Raja Kali, Fabio Mendez. 2018. Socio-economic mobility and air passenger demand in the U.S. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **112**, 85-94. [[Crossref](#)]
167. Raymundo M. Campos-Vazquez, Emmanuel Chavez, Gerardo Esquivel. 2018. Estimating Top Income Shares Without Tax Return Data: Mexico Since the 1990s. *Latin American Policy* **9**:1, 139-163. [[Crossref](#)]
168. Bruce Weber, J. Matthew Fannin, Kathleen Miller, Stephan Goetz. 2018. Intergenerational mobility of low-income youth in metropolitan and non-metropolitan America: A spatial analysis. *Regional Science Policy & Practice* **10**:2, 87-101. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Daniel Schneider, Orestes P. Hastings, Joe LaBriola. 2018. Income Inequality and Class Divides in Parental Investments. *American Sociological Review* **83**:3, 475-507. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Michèle Lamont. 2018. Addressing Recognition Gaps: Destigmatization and the Reduction of Inequality. *American Sociological Review* **83**:3, 419-444. [[Crossref](#)]
171. ###, Do-Hyeon Kim. 2018. Inequality and Entrepreneurial Activity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Venturing and Entrepreneurship* **13**:3, 1-12. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Johannes Idsø, Torbjørn Årethun, Bharat Bhatta. 2018. The Income Equalization System among Municipalities in Norway: Strengths and Implications. *Economies* **6**:2, 34. [[Crossref](#)]
173. David Coady, Allan Dizioli. 2018. Income inequality and education revisited: persistence, endogeneity and heterogeneity. *Applied Economics* **50**:25, 2747-2761. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Hanen Ragoubi, Sana El Harbi. 2018. Entrepreneurship and income inequality: a spatial panel data analysis. *International Review of Applied Economics* **32**:3, 374-422. [[Crossref](#)]
175. Raufhon Salahodjaev, Satoshi Kanazawa. 2018. WHY DO SOCIETIES WITH HIGHER AVERAGE COGNITIVE ABILITY HAVE LOWER INCOME INEQUALITY? THE ROLE OF REDISTRIBUTIVE POLICIES. *Journal of Biosocial Science* **50**:3, 347-364. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Shervin Assari. 2018. Diminished Economic Return of Socioeconomic Status at Birth among Black than White Youth. *Social Sciences* **7**:5, 74. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Rosalia Castellano, Gennaro Punzo, Antonella Rocca. 2018. The generational perspective of gender gap in wages and education in southern Europe. *Review of Social Economy* **76**:2, 227-258. [[Crossref](#)]
178. Prashant Gupta, Sushanta Mallick, Tapas Mishra. 2018. Does social identity matter in individual alienation? Household-level evidence in post-reform India. *World Development* **104**, 154-172. [[Crossref](#)]

179. Steven N. Durlauf, Ananth Seshadri. 2018. Understanding the Great Gatsby Curve. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual* 32:1, 333-393. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Roland Bénabou. 2018. Comment. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual* 32:1, 394-406. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Jaehyun Nam. 2018. Intergenerational income mobility and inequality in South Korea. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 27:2, 132-145. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Elizabeth A. Wahler, Amanda Adhami. 2018. Barriers to program completion of a voluntary capacity-building group intervention for individuals living in poverty. *Journal of Poverty* 22:2, 179-190. [[Crossref](#)]
183. Elise S. Brezis, Joël Hellier. 2018. Social mobility at the top and the higher education system. *European Journal of Political Economy* 52, 36-54. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Tak Wing Chan. 2018. Social mobility and the well-being of individuals. *The British Journal of Sociology* 69:1, 183-206. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Sebastian Till Braun, Jan Stuhler. 2018. The Transmission of Inequality Across Multiple Generations: Testing Recent Theories With Evidence From Germany. *The Economic Journal* 128:609, 576-611. [[Crossref](#)]
186. Claudia Geist, Leah Ruppner. 2018. Mission Impossible? New Housework Theories for Changing Families. *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 10:1, 242-262. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Maria Bertotti, Amit Chattopadhyay, Giovanni Modanese. 2018. Statistics of Correlations and Fluctuations in a Stochastic Model of Wealth Exchange. *Entropy* 20:3, 166. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Wasim Qazi, Syed Ali Raza, Syed Tehseen Jawaid, Mohd Zaini Abd Karim. 2018. Does expanding higher education reduce income inequality in emerging economy? Evidence from Pakistan. *Studies in Higher Education* 43:2, 338-358. [[Crossref](#)]
189. Sunyee Yoon, Hyeongmin Christian Kim. 2018. Feeling Economically Stuck: The Effect of Perceived Economic Mobility and Socioeconomic Status on Variety Seeking. *Journal of Consumer Research* 44:5, 1141-1156. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Kevin J. Lansing, Agnieszka Markiewicz. 2018. Top Incomes, Rising Inequality and Welfare. *The Economic Journal* 128:608, 262-297. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Timm Bönke, Guido Neidhöfer. 2018. Parental Background Matters: Intergenerational Mobility and Assimilation of Italian Immigrants in Germany. *German Economic Review* 19:1, 1-31. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Minghao Li, Stephan J. Goetz, Bruce Weber. 2018. Human Capital and Intergenerational Mobility in U.S. Counties. *Economic Development Quarterly* 32:1, 18-28. [[Crossref](#)]
193. Taylor Jaworski, Gregory T. Niemesh. 2018. Revisiting the Great Compression: Wage inequality in the United States, 1940-1960. *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History* 51:1, 39-48. [[Crossref](#)]
194. Maksym Ivanyna, Alex Mourmouras, Peter Rangazas. The Political Economy of Fiscal Reforms 227-265. [[Crossref](#)]
195. Monica M. Taylor. Rural Health Disparities: The Economic Argument 9-17. [[Crossref](#)]
196. Mikayla Novak. Explaining Inequality in an Entangled Political Economy 55-82. [[Crossref](#)]
197. Seung Jin Baek. Bringing the Developmental State Back in the Age of Exponentiality 273-304. [[Crossref](#)]
198. Danny M. Leipziger. Globalization and National Income Inequality: Observations and Lessons from the U.S. Experience 159-173. [[Crossref](#)]
199. Guillaume Allègre. Mitigating the Inequality Crisis 133-149. [[Crossref](#)]
200. Paul Wakeling. Social Class 439-453. [[Crossref](#)]

201. Hansung Kim, Sooyeon Huh, Sangmi Choi, Yushin Lee. 2018. Perceptions of inequality and attitudes towards redistribution in four East Asian welfare states. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 27:1, 28-39. [[Crossref](#)]
202. Robert Chernomas, Ian Hudson, Gregory Chernomas. 2018. Can Neoliberal Capitalism Affect Human Evolution?. *International Journal of Health Services* 48:1, 166-188. [[Crossref](#)]
203. Stefan Andrade, Jens-Peter Thomsen. 2018. Intergenerational Educational Mobility in Denmark and the United States. *Sociological Science* 5, 93-113. [[Crossref](#)]
204. Bhashkar Mazumder. 2018. Intergenerational Mobility in the US: What We Have Learned from the PSID. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
205. Andreu Arenas, Clément Malgouyres. 2018. Countercyclical School Attainment and Intergenerational Mobility. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
206. Ramesh Bhardwaj. 2018. Explaining Income Inequalities: A Cross Sectional-Study of OECD Countries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
207. Ramesh Bhardwaj. 2018. Legalization of Marijuana in Canada –Youth at Risk. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
208. Guido Neidhöfer. 2018. Intergenerational Mobility and the Rise and Fall of Inequality: Lessons from Latin America. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
209. Thomas Kopp, Franziska Dorn. 2018. Social Equity and Ecological Sustainability - Can the Two Be Achieved Together?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
210. Heesuk Yun. 2018. What Do We Really Know About Income Mobility in Korea?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
211. Luigi Cannari, Giovanni D'Alessio. 2018. Istruzione, reddito e ricchezza: la persistenza tra generazioni in Italia (Education, Income and Wealth: Persistence Across Generations in Italy). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
212. 2018. South Africa: Selected Issues. *IMF Staff Country Reports* 18:247, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
213. Matthew Lawrence. 2018. Visualizing Income Inequality and Mobility Together. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 4, 237802311880564. [[Crossref](#)]
214. Danai Kasambira Fannin. 2017. Reporting of Underrepresented Populations in Autism Treatment Studies Across 25 Years. *Clinical Archives of Communication Disorders* 2:3, 250-263. [[Crossref](#)]
215. Jeremy Greenwood, Nezih Guner, Guillaume Vandenbroucke. 2017. Family Economics Writ Large. *Journal of Economic Literature* 55:4, 1346-1434. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
216. Shlomo Getz, Lilach Lev-Ari. 2017. "Sense of place" and college placement. *Higher Education* 74:6, 933-948. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Tommaso Agasisti, Sergio Longobardi. 2017. Equality of Educational Opportunities, Schools' Characteristics and Resilient Students: An Empirical Study of EU-15 Countries Using OECD-PISA 2009 Data. *Social Indicators Research* 134:3, 917-953. [[Crossref](#)]
218. Joep H.M. Evers, David Iron, Theodore Kolokolnikov, John Rumsey. 2017. Agent-based model of the effect of globalization on inequality and class mobility. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 361, 35-41. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Arturo Martinez, Tina Rampino, Mark Western, Wojtek Tomaszewski, Jude David Roque. 2017. Estimating the Contribution of Circumstances that Reflect Inequality of Opportunities. *Economic Papers: A journal of applied economics and policy* 36:4, 380-400. [[Crossref](#)]
220. Shelly Lundberg, Aloysius Siow. 2017. Canadian contributions to family economics. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* 50:5, 1304-1323. [[Crossref](#)]

221. Raymundo M. Campos-Vazquez, Emmanuel Chavez, Gerardo Esquivel. 2017. Growth is (really) good for the (really) rich. *The World Economy* 40:12, 2639-2675. [[Crossref](#)]
222. Anirudh Krishna, Swapnil Agarwal. 2017. Promoting Social Mobility in India. *Journal of South Asian Development* 12:3, 236-258. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Reshad N. Ahsan, Arpita Chatterjee. 2017. Trade liberalization and intergenerational occupational mobility in urban India. *Journal of International Economics* 109, 138-152. [[Crossref](#)]
224. Sangyong Joo. 2017. Income-led Growth for Korea: Conditions and Policy Discussions. *Journal of Budget and Policy* 6:2, 117-149. [[Crossref](#)]
225. Elizabeth A. Wahler. 2017. A Group-Based Intervention for Persons Living in Poverty: Psychosocial Improvements Noted among Participants of "Getting Ahead in a Just-Gettin'-by World". *Social Work with Groups* 40:4, 281-295. [[Crossref](#)]
226. Stefanie Heidrich. 2017. Intergenerational mobility in Sweden: a regional perspective. *Journal of Population Economics* 30:4, 1241-1280. [[Crossref](#)]
227. Joseph S. Kay, Jacob Shane, Jutta Heckhausen. 2017. Youth's Causal Beliefs About Success: Socioeconomic Differences and Prediction of Early Career Development. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 46:10, 2169-2180. [[Crossref](#)]
228. Anders Björklund, Markus Jäntti, Martin Nybom. 2017. The Contribution of Early-life Versus Labour Market Factors to Intergenerational Income Persistence: A Comparison of the UK and Sweden. *The Economic Journal* 127:605, F71-F94. [[Crossref](#)]
229. Gwen van Eijk. 2017. Socioeconomic marginality in sentencing: The built-in bias in risk assessment tools and the reproduction of social inequality. *Punishment & Society* 19:4, 463-481. [[Crossref](#)]
230. Leslie McCall, Derek Burk, Marie Laperrière, Jennifer A. Richeson. 2017. Exposure to rising inequality shapes Americans' opportunity beliefs and policy support. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114:36, 9593-9598. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Nadir Altinok, Abdurrahman Aydemir. 2017. Does one size fit all? The impact of cognitive skills on economic growth. *Journal of Macroeconomics* 53, 176-190. [[Crossref](#)]
232. Weizeng Sun, Yuming Fu, Siqi Zheng. 2017. LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICE PROVISION AND SPATIAL INEQUALITY IN CHINESE CITIES: THE ROLE OF RESIDENTIAL INCOME SORTING AND LAND-USE CONDITIONS. *Journal of Regional Science* 57:4, 547-567. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Eric J. Connolly, Richard H. Lewis, Danielle L. Boisvert. 2017. The Effect of Socioeconomic Status on Delinquency Across Urban and Rural Contexts. *Criminal Justice Review* 42:3, 237-253. [[Crossref](#)]
234. Silvia Mendolia, Peter Siminski. 2017. Is education the mechanism through which family background affects economic outcomes? A generalised approach to mediation analysis. *Economics of Education Review* 59, 1-12. [[Crossref](#)]
235. Bruce A. Weber, J. Matthew Fannin, Sam M. Cordes, Thomas G. Johnson. 2017. Upward Mobility of Low-Income Youth in Metropolitan, Micropolitan, and Rural America. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 672:1, 103-122. [[Crossref](#)]
236. Joshua Preiss. 2017. Libertarian personal responsibility. *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 43:6, 621-645. [[Crossref](#)]
237. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina, Raquel Ortega. 2017. Like my parents at home? Gender differences in children's housework in Germany and Spain. *Empirical Economics* 52:4, 1143-1179. [[Crossref](#)]
238. Dirk Witteveen, Paul Attewell. 2017. Family Background and Earnings Inequality among College Graduates. *Social Forces* 95:4, 1539-1576. [[Crossref](#)]
239. Benjamin F. Jarvis, Xi Song. 2017. Rising Intragenerational Occupational Mobility in the United States, 1969 to 2011. *American Sociological Review* 82:3, 568-599. [[Crossref](#)]

240. Tommaso Agasisti, Sergio Longobardi, Andrea Regoli. 2017. A cross-country panel approach to exploring the determinants of educational equity through PISA data. *Quality & Quantity* 51:3, 1243-1260. [[Crossref](#)]
241. Charilaos Mertzanis. 2017. Family ties and access to finance in an Islamic environment. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money* 48, 1-24. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Erin M. Baumgartner. 2017. Making gains or falling behind? Changes and stability in school readiness. *Social Science Research* 64, 277-298. [[Crossref](#)]
243. Tiziana Dearing. 2017. Social Services, Social Justice, and Social Innovations: Lessons for Addressing Income Inequality. *Religions* 8:5, 89. [[Crossref](#)]
244. Kay Schlozman, Henry Brady, Sidney Verba. 2017. Growing Economic Inequality and Its (Partially) Political Roots. *Religions* 8:5, 97. [[Crossref](#)]
245. Silke Anger, Daniel D. Schnitzlein. 2017. Cognitive skills, non-cognitive skills, and family background: evidence from sibling correlations. *Journal of Population Economics* 30:2, 591-620. [[Crossref](#)]
246. T. Gries, R. Grundmann, I. Palnau, M. Redlin. 2017. Innovations, growth and participation in advanced economies - a review of major concepts and findings. *International Economics and Economic Policy* 14:2, 293-351. [[Crossref](#)]
247. Mónica Hernández-Alava, Gurleen Popli. 2017. Children's Development and Parental Input: Evidence From the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Demography* 54:2, 485-511. [[Crossref](#)]
248. M.L. Bertotti, A.K. Chattopadhyay, G. Modanese. 2017. Stochastic effects in a discretized kinetic model of economic exchange. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 471, 724-732. [[Crossref](#)]
249. Brant Abbott, Giovanni Gallipoli. 2017. Human capital spill-overs and the geography of intergenerational mobility. *Review of Economic Dynamics* 25, 208-233. [[Crossref](#)]
250. Tomoaki Kotera, Ananth Seshadri. 2017. Educational policy and intergenerational mobility. *Review of Economic Dynamics* 25, 187-207. [[Crossref](#)]
251. Christina Starmans, Mark Sheskin, Paul Bloom. 2017. Why people prefer unequal societies. *Nature Human Behaviour* 1:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
252. John E. Roemer, Burak Ünveren. 2017. Dynamic Equality of Opportunity. *Economica* 84:334, 322-343. [[Crossref](#)]
253. Christiane Gross, Kerstin Lorek, Friedemann Richter. 2017. Attitudes towards inheritance taxation – results from a survey experiment. *The Journal of Economic Inequality* 15:1, 93-112. [[Crossref](#)]
254. Prashant Loyalka, James Chu, Jianguo Wei, Natalie Johnson, Joel Reniker. 2017. Inequalities in the Pathway to College in China: When Do Students from Poor Areas Fall Behind?. *The China Quarterly* 229, 172-194. [[Crossref](#)]
255. Jessi Streib. 2017. The unbalanced theoretical toolkit: Problems and partial solutions to studying culture and reproduction but not culture and mobility. *American Journal of Cultural Sociology* 5:1-2, 127-153. [[Crossref](#)]
256. Tony Ward. 2017. Inequality and Growth: Reviewing the Economic and Social Impacts. *Australian Economic Review* 50:1, 32-51. [[Crossref](#)]
257. Lucie Holmgreen, Vanessa Tirone, James Gerhart, Stevan E. Hobfoll. Conservation of Resources Theory 443-457. [[Crossref](#)]
258. Francis Green, Golo Henseke, Anna Vignoles. 2017. Private schooling and labour market outcomes. *British Educational Research Journal* 43:1, 7-28. [[Crossref](#)]

259. Richard G. Wilkinson, Kate E. Pickett. 2017. The enemy between us: The psychological and social costs of inequality. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 47:1, 11-24. [[Crossref](#)]
260. Jacob Shane, Jutta Heckhausen. 2017. It's only a dream if you wake up: Young adults' achievement expectations, opportunities, and meritocratic beliefs. *International Journal of Psychology* 52:1, 40-48. [[Crossref](#)]
261. Andrew Lister. 2017. Fact-Sensitivity and the 'Defining-Down' Objection. *Res Publica* 23:1, 117-135. [[Crossref](#)]
262. Christopher Rauh. 2017. Voting, education, and the Great Gatsby Curve. *Journal of Public Economics* 146, 1-14. [[Crossref](#)]
263. Paul Gregg, Lindsey Macmillan, Claudia Vittori. 2017. Moving Towards Estimating Sons' Lifetime Intergenerational Economic Mobility in the UK. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 79:1, 79-100. [[Crossref](#)]
264. Christopher Ellis. 2017. Social Class, Meritocracy, and the Geography of the "American Dream". *The Forum* 15:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
265. Marii Paskov, Klarita Gërkhani, Herman G. van de Werfhorst. 2017. Giving Up on the Joneses? The Relationship between Income Inequality and Status-seeking. *European Sociological Review* 115, jcw052. [[Crossref](#)]
266. Michael Wolfson, Steve Gribble, Reed Beall. Exploring Contingent Inequalities: Building the Theoretical Health Inequality Model 487-513. [[Crossref](#)]
267. Wen-Hao Chen, Yuri Ostrovsky, Patrizio Piraino. 2017. Lifecycle variation, errors-in-variables bias and nonlinearities in intergenerational income transmission: new evidence from Canada. *Labour Economics* 44, 1-12. [[Crossref](#)]
268. Maria Letizia Bertotti, Amit K. Chattopadhyay, Giovanni Modanese. 2017. Correlation between Gini index and mobility in a stochastic kinetic model of economic exchange. *Results in Physics* 7, 2081-2084. [[Crossref](#)]
269. Frank J. Lechner. "People of Plenty": The American Economic Exception 1-60. [[Crossref](#)]
270. Jørgen Modalsli. 2017. Intergenerational Mobility in Norway, 1865–2011. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 119:1, 34-71. [[Crossref](#)]
271. Tuomas Pekkarinen, Kjell G. Salvanes, Matti Sarvimäki. 2017. The Evolution of Social Mobility: Norway during the Twentieth Century. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 119:1, 5-33. [[Crossref](#)]
272. Rasmus Landersø, James J. Heckman. 2017. The Scandinavian Fantasy: The Sources of Intergenerational Mobility in Denmark and the US. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 119:1, 178-230. [[Crossref](#)]
273. Yonatan Berman, Ole Peters, Alexander Adamou. 2017. An Empirical Test of the Ergodic Hypothesis: Wealth Distributions in the United States. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
274. Yonatan Berman. 2017. Understanding the Mechanical Relationship between Inequality and Intergenerational Mobility. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
275. M. Shahe Emran, Forhad Shilpi. 2017. Estimating Intergenerational Mobility with Incomplete Data: Coresidency and Truncation Bias in Rank-Based Relative and Absolute Mobility Measures. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
276. Weina Zhou. 2017. Resilience in Youth: Evidence From a Forced Migration in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
277. Anuj Kapoor, Catherine E. Tucker. 2017. Income Inequality and Digital Advertising Strategies: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

278. Deborah A. Cobb-Clark, Sarah Dahmann, Nicolas Salamanca, Anna Zhu. 2017. Intergenerational Disadvantage: Learning about Equal Opportunity from Social Assistance Receipt. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
279. William R Doyle, Benjamin Skinner. 2017. Predicting Postsecondary Attendance by Income in the American States Using Multilevel Regression with Poststratification. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
280. Vincent Geloso. 2017. Government and the Economic History of American Income Inequality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
281. Thomas Fischer. 2017. Modeling Inequality and Mobility with Stochastic Processes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
282. . Emerging Shifts in the Relationships Between Providers of Labour and Users of Labour 167-190. [\[Crossref\]](#)
283. David Coady, Allan Dizioli. 2017. Income Inequality and Education Revisited: Persistence, Endogeneity, and Heterogeneity. *IMF Working Papers* 17:126, 1. [\[Crossref\]](#)
284. Ravi Kanbur, Joseph E. Stiglitz. 2016. Dynastic inequality, mobility and equality of opportunity. *The Journal of Economic Inequality* 14:4, 419-434. [\[Crossref\]](#)
285. O. D. Marcenaro-Gutierrez, M. Luque, L. A. Lopez-Agudo. 2016. Balancing Teachers' Math Satisfaction and Other Indicators of the Education System's Performance. *Social Indicators Research* 129:3, 1319-1348. [\[Crossref\]](#)
286. Kang-Rae Ma. 2016. Intergenerational Transmission of Wealth and Life Satisfaction. *Applied Research in Quality of Life* 11:4, 1287-1308. [\[Crossref\]](#)
287. Ricardo T. Fernholz. 2016. A Model of economic mobility and the distribution of wealth. *Journal of Macroeconomics* 50, 168-192. [\[Crossref\]](#)
288. Martin Dribe, Jonas Helgertz. 2016. The Lasting Impact of Grandfathers: Class, Occupational Status, and Earnings over Three Generations in Sweden 1815-2011. *The Journal of Economic History* 76:4, 969-1000. [\[Crossref\]](#)
289. Jeff Borland, Michael Coelli. 2016. Labour Market Inequality in Australia. *Economic Record* 92:299, 517-547. [\[Crossref\]](#)
290. Daniel D. Schnitzlein. 2016. A New Look at Intergenerational Mobility in Germany Compared to the U.S. *Review of Income and Wealth* 62:4, 650-667. [\[Crossref\]](#)
291. Richard Sturn. 2016. Hayek, Rawls, and Schmolter Reconciled? Justice, Institutions and the Invisible Hand. *Schmollers Jahrbuch* 136:4, 377-399. [\[Crossref\]](#)
292. Jutta Heckhausen. Social Inequality Across the Life Course: Societal Unfolding and Individual Agency 1-18. [\[Crossref\]](#)
293. Atheendar S Venkataramani, Rachel Brigell, Rourke O'Brien, Paula Chatterjee, Ichiro Kawachi, Alexander C Tsai. 2016. Economic opportunity, health behaviours, and health outcomes in the USA: a population-based cross-sectional study. *The Lancet Public Health* 1:1, e18-e25. [\[Crossref\]](#)
294. Charles M. Beach. 2016. Changing income inequality: A distributional paradigm for Canada. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* 49:4, 1229-1292. [\[Crossref\]](#)
295. Michele Raitano, Claudia Vittori, Francesco Vona. 2016. The effect of parental background along the sons' earnings distribution: does one pattern fit for all?. *Applied Economics Letters* 23:15, 1073-1078. [\[Crossref\]](#)
296. . Inequality 69-99. [\[Crossref\]](#)
297. Yangtao Huang, Francisco Perales, Mark Western. 2016. A land of the 'fair go'? Intergenerational earnings elasticity in Australia. *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 51:3, 361-381. [\[Crossref\]](#)

298. Dalton Conley. 2016. Swapping and the social psychology of disadvantaged American populations. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 26:4, 594-598. [[Crossref](#)]
299. Maria Letizia Bertotti, Giovanni Modanese. 2016. Economic inequality and mobility in kinetic models for social sciences. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics* 225:10, 1945-1958. [[Crossref](#)]
300. Sunyee Yoon, Hyeongmin Christian Kim. 2016. Keeping the American Dream Alive: The Interactive Effect of Perceived Economic Mobility and Materialism on Impulsive Spending. *Journal of Marketing Research* 53:5, 759-772. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Mehtabul Azam. 2016. Intergenerational Educational Persistence among Daughters: Evidence from India. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* 16:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
302. Rosalia Castellano, Rosalba Manna, Gennaro Punzo. 2016. Income inequality between overlapping and stratification: a longitudinal analysis of personal earnings in France and Italy. *International Review of Applied Economics* 30:5, 567-590. [[Crossref](#)]
303. Cynthia S. Levine, Alexandra Halleen Atkins, Hannah Benner Waldfoegel, Edith Chen. 2016. Views of a good life and allostatic load: Physiological correlates of theories of a good life depend on the socioeconomic context. *Self and Identity* 15:5, 536-547. [[Crossref](#)]
304. Silvia Mendolia, Peter Siminski. 2016. New Estimates of Intergenerational Mobility in Australia. *Economic Record* 92:298, 361-373. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Bev Wilson, Andrew J. Greenlee. 2016. The geography of opportunity: an exploratory spatial data analysis of U.S. counties. *GeoJournal* 81:4, 625-640. [[Crossref](#)]
306. Maria Letizia Bertotti, Giovanni Modanese. 2016. Microscopic models for welfare measures addressing a reduction of economic inequality. *Complexity* 21:6, 89-98. [[Crossref](#)]
307. Sam Portnow, Saida Hussain. 2016. Income and Cognitive Stimulation: A Reanalysis of the Minnesota Family Investment Program. *Prevention Science* 17:5, 565-571. [[Crossref](#)]
308. Peter A. Diamond. 2016. ADDRESSING THE FORCES DRIVING INEQUALITY IN THE UNITED STATES. *Contemporary Economic Policy* 34:3, 403-411. [[Crossref](#)]
309. Lars P. Feld, Christoph M. Schmidt. 2016. Jenseits der schrillen Töne. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* 17:2, 188-205. [[Crossref](#)]
310. Nandini Krishnan, Gabriel Lara Ibarra, Ambar Narayan, Sailesh Tiwari, Tara Vishwanath. Inequality, Mobility, and Opportunity: Setting the Context 1-25. [[Crossref](#)]
311. Nandini Krishnan, Gabriel Lara Ibarra, Ambar Narayan, Sailesh Tiwari, Tara Vishwanath. Inequality in the Labor Market 85-120. [[Crossref](#)]
312. Daniel R. Carroll, Anne Chen. 2016. Income Inequality Matters, but Mobility Is Just as Important. *Economic Commentary (Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland)* 1-6. [[Crossref](#)]
313. Richard Alba, Guillermo Yrizar Barbosa. 2016. Room at the top? Minority mobility and the transition to demographic diversity in the USA. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39:6, 917-938. [[Crossref](#)]
314. Sara Goldrick-Rab, Robert Kelchen, Douglas N. Harris, James Benson. 2016. Reducing Income Inequality in Educational Attainment: Experimental Evidence on the Impact of Financial Aid on College Completion. *American Journal of Sociology* 121:6, 1762-1817. [[Crossref](#)]
315. Dan Cloney, Gordon Cleveland, John Hattie, Collette Tayler. 2016. Variations in the Availability and Quality of Early Childhood Education and Care by Socioeconomic Status of Neighborhoods. *Early Education and Development* 27:3, 384-401. [[Crossref](#)]
316. Arup Mitra, Yuko Tsujita. 2016. Issues in upward mobility: Study based on longitudinal data from Delhi slums. *Habitat International* 53, 320-330. [[Crossref](#)]
317. Regina T. Riphahn, Daniel D. Schnitzlein. 2016. Wage mobility in East and West Germany. *Labour Economics* 39, 11-34. [[Crossref](#)]

318. Reid Ewing, Shima Hamidi, James B. Grace, Yehua Dennis Wei. 2016. Does urban sprawl hold down upward mobility?. *Landscape and Urban Planning* **148**, 80-88. [[Crossref](#)]
319. Tommaso Agasisti, Mara Soncin, Riccardo Valenti. 2016. School factors helping disadvantaged students to succeed: empirical evidence from four Italian cities. *Policy Studies* **37**:2, 147-177. [[Crossref](#)]
320. Jaime C. Slaughter-Acey, Claudia Holzman, Danuelle Calloway, Yan Tian. 2016. Movin' on Up: Socioeconomic Mobility and the Risk of Delivering a Small-for-Gestational Age Infant. *Maternal and Child Health Journal* **20**:3, 613-622. [[Crossref](#)]
321. Pallab Kumar Ghosh, Jae Yoon Lee. 2016. Decomposition of Changes in Korean Wage Inequality, 1998–2007. *Journal of Labor Research* **37**:1, 1-28. [[Crossref](#)]
322. Thomas A. Knapp, Nancy E. White. 2016. THE EFFECT OF YOUTH POVERTY RATES AND MIGRATION ON ADULT WAGES. *Journal of Regional Science* **56**:2, 239-256. [[Crossref](#)]
323. Atheendar S. Venkataramani, Paula Chatterjee, Ichiro Kawachi, Alexander C. Tsai. 2016. Economic Opportunity, Health Behaviors, and Mortality in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health* **106**:3, 478-484. [[Crossref](#)]
324. Daniele Checchi, Vito Peragine, Laura Serlenga. Inequality of Opportunity in Europe: Is There a Role for Institutions? 1-44. [[Crossref](#)]
325. Richard Alba, Nancy Foner. 2016. Integration's challenges and opportunities in the Wealthy West. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* **42**:1, 3-22. [[Crossref](#)]
326. Chrystia Freeland. Epilogue: Can Capitalists Reform Themselves? 467-474. [[Crossref](#)]
327. Henry Braun. The Dynamics of Opportunity in America: A Working Framework 137-164. [[Crossref](#)]
328. Maurizio Franzini, Elena Granaglia, Michele Raitano. The Planet of the Rich: An Exploration 1-31. [[Crossref](#)]
329. Maurizio Franzini, Elena Granaglia, Michele Raitano. The Super-Rich: A Matter of Desert? 55-83. [[Crossref](#)]
330. Maurizio Franzini, Elena Granaglia, Michele Raitano. Extreme Inequality, Well-Being, Freedom 85-111. [[Crossref](#)]
331. Robert D. Lieberthal. Group Purchasing 175-200. [[Crossref](#)]
332. Axel Murswieck. Sozialstruktur der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika 93-112. [[Crossref](#)]
333. Amanda Machin, Nico Stehr. Inequality in Modern Societies: Causes, Consequences and Challenges 3-34. [[Crossref](#)]
334. Andros Kourtellos, Christa Marr, Chih Ming Tan. 2016. Robust determinants of intergenerational mobility in the land of opportunity. *European Economic Review* **81**, 132-147. [[Crossref](#)]
335. Sauro Mocetti. 2016. Dynasties in professions and the role of rents and regulation: Evidence from Italian pharmacies. *Journal of Public Economics* **133**, 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
336. Olaf Groh-Samberg. Persistent Social and Rising Economic Inequalities: Evidence and Challenges 41-63. [[Crossref](#)]
337. Mohammad Reza Farzanegan, Pooya Alaedini. Introduction 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
338. Claire Crawford, Paul Gregg, Lindsey Macmillan, Anna Vignoles, Gill Wyness. 2016. Higher education, career opportunities, and intergenerational inequality. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* **32**:4, 553-575. [[Crossref](#)]
339. Diego Daruich, Julian Kozlowski. 2016. Explaining Income Inequality and Intergenerational Mobility: The Role of Fertility and Family Transfers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
340. Bassel Tarbush, Francis Dennig. 2016. Fertility Choice, Intergenerational Transmission, and the Distribution of Capital. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

341. Ricardo T. Fernholz. 2016. A Model of Economic Mobility and the Distribution of Wealth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
342. Guido Neidhoefer. 2016. Intergenerational Mobility and the Rise and Fall of Inequality: Lessons from Latin America. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
343. Laura Ansala, Ulla Hamalainen, Matti Sarvimki. 2016. Slipping through the Cracks of a Welfare State: Children of Immigrants in Finland. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
344. Ron Diris, Frank Vandenbroucke. 2016. How Does Early Deprivation Relate to Later-Life Outcomes? A Longitudinal Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
345. David Loschiavo. 2016. Household Debt and Income Inequality: Evidence from Italian Survey Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
346. International Monetary Fund. 2016. Côte d'Ivoire: Selected Issues. *IMF Staff Country Reports* **16**:148, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
347. Dalia Hakura, Mumtaz Hussain, Monique Newiak, Vimal Thakoor, Fan Yang. 2016. Inequality, Gender Gaps and Economic Growth: Comparative Evidence for Sub-Saharan Africa. *IMF Working Papers* **16**:111, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
348. Hideo AKABAYASHI, Ryosuke NAKAMURA, Michio NAOI, Chizuru SHIKISHIMA. 2016. Toward an International Comparison of Economic and Educational Mobility: Recent Findings from the Japan Child Panel Survey. *Educational Studies in Japan* **10**:0, 49-66. [[Crossref](#)]
349. Christian Daude, Virginia Robano. 2015. On intergenerational (im)mobility in Latin America. *Latin American Economic Review* **24**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
350. Sebastian Böhm, Volker Grossmann, Thomas M. Steger. 2015. Does expansion of higher education lead to trickle-down growth?. *Journal of Public Economics* **132**, 79-94. [[Crossref](#)]
351. A. Bheemeshwar Reddy. 2015. Changes in Intergenerational Occupational Mobility in India: Evidence from National Sample Surveys, 1983-2012. *World Development* **76**, 329-343. [[Crossref](#)]
352. John Jerrim, Lindsey Macmillan. 2015. Income Inequality, Intergenerational Mobility, and the Great Gatsby Curve: Is Education the Key?. *Social Forces* **94**:2, 505-533. [[Crossref](#)]
353. Irina Murtazashvili, Di Liu, Artem Prokhorov. 2015. Two-sample nonparametric estimation of intergenerational income mobility in the United States and Sweden. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie* **48**:5, 1733-1761. [[Crossref](#)]
354. ###, ###, Seo Hwan-Joo. 2015. Inequality of Opportunity in Korea Since 2000. *KUKJE KYUNGJE YONGU* **21**:4, 83-108. [[Crossref](#)]
355. Cheon Gie Kim. 2015. Limitations of the mainstream fairness model of allocation of the college opportunity in the context of socioeconomic inequality and exploration of alternative fairness model. *Korean journal of sociology of education* **25**:4, 1-24. [[Crossref](#)]
356. Claire Crawford, Laura Erve. 2015. Does Higher Education Level the Playing Field? Socio-Economic Differences in Graduate Earnings. *Education Sciences* **5**:4, 380-412. [[Crossref](#)]
357. Isabelle Laurin, Angèle Bilodeau, Nadia Giguère, Louise Potvin. 2015. Intersectoral Mobilization in Child Development: An Outcome Assessment of the Survey of the School Readiness of Montreal Children. *Social Sciences* **4**:4, 1316-1334. [[Crossref](#)]
358. Gianpiero Petriglieri, Jennifer Louise Petriglieri. 2015. Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* **14**:4, 625-647. [[Crossref](#)]
359. Nancy Birdsall, Christian J. Meyer. 2015. The Median is the Message: A Good Enough Measure of Material Wellbeing and Shared Development Progress. *Global Policy* **6**:4, 343-357. [[Crossref](#)]
360. Yuyu Chen, Suresh Naidu, Tinghua Yu, Noam Yuchtman. 2015. Intergenerational mobility and institutional change in 20th century China. *Explorations in Economic History* **58**, 44-73. [[Crossref](#)]

361. ChangHwan Kim, Christopher R. Tamborini, Arthur Sakamoto. 2015. Field of Study in College and Lifetime Earnings in the United States. *Sociology of Education* **88**:4, 320-339. [[Crossref](#)]
362. Allan H. Meltzer, Scott F. Richard. 2015. A positive theory of economic growth and the distribution of income. *Research in Economics* **69**:3, 265-290. [[Crossref](#)]
363. Fabian T. Pfeffer, Florian R. Hertel. 2015. How Has Educational Expansion Shaped Social Mobility Trends in the United States?. *Social Forces* **94**:1, 143-180. [[Crossref](#)]
364. Young Back Choi. 2015. Is the American dream dead? Inequality, mobility and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy* **4**:2, 234-256. [[Crossref](#)]
365. Howard Karger. 2015. Curbing the Financial Exploitation of the Poor: Financial Literacy and Social Work Education. *Journal of Social Work Education* **51**:3, 425-438. [[Crossref](#)]
366. Pablo Celhay, Sebastián Gallegos. 2015. Persistence in the Transmission of Education: Evidence across Three Generations for Chile. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* **16**:3, 420-451. [[Crossref](#)]
367. LINDSEY MACMILLAN, CLAIRE TYLER, ANNA VIGNOLES. 2015. Who Gets the Top Jobs? The Role of Family Background and Networks in Recent Graduates' Access to High-status Professions. *Journal of Social Policy* **44**:3, 487-515. [[Crossref](#)]
368. Emanuel Xavier-Oliveira, André O Laplume, Saurav Pathak. 2015. What motivates entrepreneurial entry under economic inequality? The role of human and financial capital. *Human Relations* **68**:7, 1183-1207. [[Crossref](#)]
369. Didi Kuo, Nolan McCarty. 2015. Democracy in America, 2015. *Global Policy* **6**, 49-55. [[Crossref](#)]
370. Jacob M. Grumbach. 2015. Does the American Dream Matter for Members of Congress?. *Political Research Quarterly* **68**:2, 306-323. [[Crossref](#)]
371. Steve N. Durlauf, Irina Shaorshadze. Intergenerational Mobility 1-14. [[Crossref](#)]
372. Markus Gangl. Stratification in Hard Times 1-14. [[Crossref](#)]
373. Robert S. Erikson. 2015. Income Inequality and Policy Responsiveness. *Annual Review of Political Science* **18**:1, 11-29. [[Crossref](#)]
374. Alyssa Schneebaum, Bernhard Rimplmaier, Wilfried Altinger. 2015. Gender in intergenerational educational persistence across time and place. *Empirica* **42**:2, 413-445. [[Crossref](#)]
375. Lars Lefgren, Frank McIntyre, David P. Sims. 2015. BEYOND EDUCATION AND FAIRNESS: A LABOR MARKET TAXATION MODEL FOR THE GREAT GATSBY CURVE. *Economic Inquiry* **53**:2, 962-978. [[Crossref](#)]
376. Vladimir Mau, Alexey Ulyukaev. 2015. Global crisis and challenges for Russian economic development. *Russian Journal of Economics* **1**:1, 4-29. [[Crossref](#)]
377. Patrizio Piraino. 2015. Intergenerational Earnings Mobility and Equality of Opportunity in South Africa. *World Development* **67**, 396-405. [[Crossref](#)]
378. Nezih Guner. 2015. GARY BECKER'S LEGACY ON INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY. *Journal of Demographic Economics* **81**:1, 33-43. [[Crossref](#)]
379. Frederic L Pryor. 2015. Recent Fracturing in the US Economy and Society. *Eastern Economic Journal* **41**:2, 230-250. [[Crossref](#)]
380. Deirdre Bloome. 2015. Income Inequality and Intergenerational Income Mobility in the United States. *Social Forces* **93**:3, 1047-1080. [[Crossref](#)]
381. Shamus Rahman Khan. The Counter-Cyclical Character of the Elite 81-103. [[Crossref](#)]
382. Yoram Amiel, Michele Bernasconi, Frank Cowell, Valentino Dardanoni. 2015. Do we value mobility?. *Social Choice and Welfare* **44**:2, 231-255. [[Crossref](#)]

383. David J. Maume, George Wilson. 2015. Determinants of Declining Wage Mobility in the New Economy. *Work and Occupations* 42:1, 35-72. [[Crossref](#)]
384. Janet Morrison. Conclusions: Business Ethics and Global Challenges 345-368. [[Crossref](#)]
385. Janet Morrison. The Global Economy from an Ethical Perspective 50-84. [[Crossref](#)]
386. Jing Jian Xiao. Consumer Income 129-149. [[Crossref](#)]
387. John E. Roemer, Alain Trannoy. Equality of Opportunity 217-300. [[Crossref](#)]
388. Markus Jääntti, Stephen P. Jenkins. Income Mobility 807-935. [[Crossref](#)]
389. Peter Abell, Ofer Engel, Henry P. Wynn. Corporate Social Responsibility, Inequality and Corporate Governance 163-174. [[Crossref](#)]
390. Carrie R. Leana, Jirs Meuris. 2015. Living to Work and Working to Live: Income as a Driver of Organizational Behavior. *The Academy of Management Annals* 9:1, 55-95. [[Crossref](#)]
391. Herbert Grubel. 2015. Income Mobility or Income Equality?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
392. Lonnie Golden, Adam Okulicz-Kozaryn. 2015. Work Hours and Worker Happiness in the US: Weekly Hours, Hours Preferences and Schedule Flexibility. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
393. Naureen Karachiwalla. 2015. A Teacher Unlike Me: Social Distance, Learning, and Intergenerational Mobility in Developing Countries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
394. Thang Dang. 2015. Intergenerational Mobility of Earnings and Income Among Sons and Daughters in Vietnam. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
395. Eric Reed Nielsen. 2015. The Income-Achievement Gap and Adult Outcome Inequality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
396. Mehtabul Azam. 2015. Intergenerational Educational Persistence among Daughters: Evidence from India. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
397. Paolo Brunori, Flaviana Palmisano, Vito Peragine. 2015. Inequality of Opportunity in Sub-Saharan Africa. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
398. Roberto Iacono. 2015. The Nordic Model and the Oil Nation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
399. Era Dabla-Norris, Kalpana Kochhar, Nujin Suphaphiphat, Frantisek Ricka, Evridiki Tsounta. 2015. Causes and Consequences of Income Inequality: A Global Perspective. *Staff Discussion Notes* 15:13, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
400. Mario Mansour, Pritha Mitra, Carlo Sdravovich, Andrew Jewell. 2015. Fair Taxation in the Middle East and North Africa. *Staff Discussion Notes* 15:16, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
401. Carrie R. Leana, Jirs Meuris. 2015. Living to Work and Working to Live: Income as a Driver of Organizational Behavior. *Academy of Management Annals* 9:1, 55-95. [[Crossref](#)]
402. Richard Reeves. 2015. The Measure of a Nation. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 657:1, 22-26. [[Crossref](#)]
403. Viviana Velez-Grajales, Roberto Velez-Grajales. 2014. Is entrepreneurship inherited? A study of intergenerational social mobility in Mexico. *Latin American Journal of Economics* 51:2, 247-278. [[Crossref](#)]
404. Boris Nikolaev, Ainslee Burns. 2014. Intergenerational mobility and subjective well-being—Evidence from the general social survey. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 53, 82-96. [[Crossref](#)]
405. M. N. Hansen. 2014. Self-Made Wealth or Family Wealth? Changes in Intergenerational Wealth Mobility. *Social Forces* 93:2, 457-481. [[Crossref](#)]
406. David A. Green. 2014. What Is a Minimum Wage For? Empirical Results and Theories of Justice. *Canadian Public Policy* 40:4, 293-314. [[Crossref](#)]

407. V. Mau, A. Ulyukaev. 2014. Global Crisis And Trends Of Economic Development. *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :11, 4-24. [[Crossref](#)]
408. Arthur Sakamoto, Jason Rarick, Hyeyoung Woo, Sharron X. Wang. 2014. What underlies the Great Gatsby Curve? Psychological micro-foundations of the "vicious circle" of poverty. *Mind & Society* 13:2, 195-211. [[Crossref](#)]
409. Raj Chetty, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, Emmanuel Saez. 2014. Where is the land of Opportunity? The Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129:4, 1553-1623. [[Crossref](#)]
410. John A. Bishop, Haiyong Liu, Juan Gabriel Rodríguez. Cross-Country Intergenerational Status Mobility: Is there a Great Gatsby Curve? 237-249. [[Crossref](#)]
411. Richard Alba, Nancy Foner. 2014. Comparing Immigrant Integration in North America and Western Europe: How much do the Grand Narratives Tell Us?. *International Migration Review* 48:1_suppl, 263-291. [[Crossref](#)]
412. Florencia Torche. 2014. Intergenerational Mobility and Inequality: The Latin American Case. *Annual Review of Sociology* 40:1, 619-642. [[Crossref](#)]
413. Anna García-Altés, Vicente Ortún. 2014. Funcionamiento del ascensor social en España y posibles mejoras. Informe SESPAS 2014. *Gaceta Sanitaria* 28, 31-36. [[Crossref](#)]
414. CHRISTOPHER J. BOUDREAUX. 2014. Jumping off of the Great Gatsby curve: how institutions facilitate entrepreneurship and intergenerational mobility. *Journal of Institutional Economics* 10:2, 231-255. [[Crossref](#)]
415. A. Aizer. 2014. Rising Inequality and Intergenerational Mobility: The Role of Public Investments in Human Capital. *CEStfo Economic Studies* 60:2, 280-311. [[Crossref](#)]
416. D. H. Autor. 2014. Skills, education, and the rise of earnings inequality among the "other 99 percent". *Science* 344:6186, 843-851. [[Crossref](#)]
417. Thomas Gift, Erik Wibbels. 2014. Reading, Writing, and the Regrettable Status of Education Research in Comparative Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 17:1, 291-312. [[Crossref](#)]
418. Raj Chetty, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, Emmanuel Saez, Nicholas Turner. 2014. Is the United States Still a Land of Opportunity? Recent Trends in Intergenerational Mobility. *American Economic Review* 104:5, 141-147. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
419. Axel Murswieck. Sozialstruktur der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
420. Michael W. Doyle, Joseph E. Stiglitz. 2014. Eliminating Extreme Inequality: A Sustainable Development Goal, 2015–2030. *Ethics & International Affairs* 28:1, 5-13. [[Crossref](#)]
421. John Lambie. History of Open and Closed Societies 131-160. [[Crossref](#)]
422. Mohammad Ashraf. Formal Social Safety Nets, Income Distribution, and the Society 105-138. [[Crossref](#)]
423. Nancy Birdsall, Christian Johannes Meyer. 2014. The Median is the Message: A Good-Enough Measure of Material Well-Being and Shared Development Progress. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
424. Chih Ming Tan, Tan Zhibo, Xiaobo Zhang. 2014. Sins of the Father: The Intergenerational Legacy of the 1959–61 Great Chinese Famine on Children's Cognitive Development. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
425. Sean Higgins, Nora Lustig, Whitney Ruble, Timothy M. Smeeding. 2014. Comparing the Incidence of Taxes and Social Spending in Brazil and the United States. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
426. Andros Kourtellos, Christa Marr, Chih Ming Tan. 2014. Local Measures of Intergenerational Mobility of Income, Cognitive, and Noncognitive Skills. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

427. Daniel Schnitzlein. 2014. A New Look at Intergenerational Mobility in Germany Compared to the US. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
428. Nikolai Hoberg, Stefan Baumgärtner. 2014. Value Pluralism, Trade-Offs and Efficiencies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
429. Sauro Mocetti. 2014. Dynasties in Professions: The Role of Rents. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
430. Christopher Handy. 2014. Assortative Mating and Intergenerational Persistence of Schooling and Earnings. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
431. Markus Jantti, Stephen P. Jenkins. 2013. Income Mobility. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
432. Moshe Justman, Anna Krush. 2013. Less Equal and Less Mobile: Evidence of a Decline in Intergenerational Income Mobility in the United States. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
433. Brandon Lehr. 2013. Optimal Income Taxation with Social Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
434. Kevin J. Lansing, Agnieszka Markiewicz. 2012. Top Incomes, Rising Inequality, and Welfare. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]