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Conceptualizing education

- Level: single hierarchy of competencies obtained.
- Duration: time spent in education.
- The two are identical if:
  - Single, comprehensive grade system
  - No grade repetition
- In fact, this never occurs in reality.

Problems with Duration measures

- Not equivalent to level measures in "divided" systems; the correlation varies between systems: in some systems the correlation could even be negative.
- Question formulation: "American interpretation" of "years" actually refers to level.
- Accounting problems:
  - What to do with part-time education
  - What to do with grade repetition
  - What to do with different starting ages
  - What to do with recurrent education
  - Special education

Good things about Duration

- One single, simple (?) question.
- In all systems there is some correlation between duration and level.
- Simple, cross-nationally comparable metric; ratio level, detailed.
- Has a nice interpretation in human capital accounting.

Problems with Level measures

- Hierarchy and metric need to be constructed using (A) judgement or (B) criterion variables.
- Hard to compare between countries (and within countries over time).

Good things about Level measures

- However you construct a level measure, the consistency between judges, or between criterion variables is impressive.
- The predictive power of education is (primarily) in level, not in duration.
Our aims

- Construct a cross-nationally (and historically?) valid and comparable index for level of education.
  - Establish valid singular hierarchies for each country at multiple time points.
  - Construct a comparative metric.
- Assess measurement error of the constructed measure using data in ESS.

ISCED

- International Standard Classification of Education (OECD).
- Comparative measure of level of education
  - Seven levels
  - Documented (in small print) for some 25 OECD countries for their education system in 1997.

ISCED – problems

- Researchers cannot consistently apply ISCED97 to their data.
  - Ambiguity about those currently enrolled.
  - Ambiguity about post-secondary, non-tertiary education (ISCED 4).
  - No differentiation within tertiary (ISCED 5/6).
- Too condensed. In many countries only 3-4 categories are effectively used and some of these are very large (> 50%).
- Not sensitive to divided systems.
- Not sensitive to historical variation.
- ‘Common denominator’ approach.

Education in ESS

- Respondent:
  - Showcard with national categories (except 7 countries).
  - National categories are recoded to ISCED by local researchers; documentation preserved and included in the data (except for Germany).
  - Independent question on duration.
- Father, mother, partner:
  - Showcard with national or ISCED categories.
  - National categories (if applied) are not preserved in the data, only ISCED is provided.

Problems in ESS education

- National categories tend to be replaced by ISCED categories in data collection; some countries have not used more categories or local specialties.
- Different treatment of respondent and the three others, both in data collection and data documentation.
- Researchers obviously have given their own interpretation to the ISCED categories.

Comparing different measures

- Five measures:
  - OPT1: Detailed (local) categories, optimally scaled within countries.
  - OPT2: ISCED categories, optimally scaled within countries.
  - OPT3: ISCED categories optimally scaled within countries, but constrained between father, mother, spouse, respondent.
  - OPT4: ISCED categories optimally scaled between countries, father, mother, spouse, respondent
  - ISCED: linear interpretation (0..6) of ISCED categories.
- Note that the these five measures are nested.
- Alternative measure:
  - DURATION in years, truncated at 23 years of education.
Design

- Develop optimal scores: first approximation is effect-proportional scoring for a composite of criterion variables: father’s and mother’s education, spouse’s education (FISCED, MISCED, PISCED), occupation (ISEI), spouse’s occupation (PISEI).
- Use duration (DUR) as an alternative source of information (independent measurement and measurement error).
- Assess loss of quality of measurement in a multiple indicator status attainment model, estimated as a simultaneous equations model [SEM].

Expectations on measurement relationships

- Criteria
  - Loss of measurement quality is expressed relative to OPT1 (reference measurement relationship).
  - Parallel measurement makes for a true score model.
- Expectations:
  - Quality of measurement will decrease as we allow fewer degrees of freedom.
  - Duration will be a much worse measure of the true score than any the level measures.
  - Duration measure will not work as well in divided systems.

Problems with this approach

- Circularity: we use the optimal scores, generated by the same data.
- Potential solution: estimate optimal scores in ESS02 and apply in ESS04.
- We currently use a primitive method of generating optimal scores.
- Solution: use Princals or LEM.
- Design assumes
  - single hierarchy,
  - hierarchy is the same for father, mother, spouse, respondent,
  - hierarchy is the same for ED/OCC, FED/MED, FED/ED.
- We have not done the SEM models yet.

Data in ESS04

- 24 countries to start with.
- 2 countries dropped because of missing or invalid education data (GB, PT)
- 4 countries do not have a local measure of education (AT, FI, IS, SI) and 2 other have local measure identical to ISCED (IR, UA).
- 18 countries with all relevant data.
- Only men & women with valid occupation codes (whether currently employed or not), N=29057.

Special case: Germany

- Germany claims to have a uniquely complicated education system.
- So they ask two questions: one on academic training and on vocational training.
- Hoffmeyer & Warner (2005) show how these two questions can best be combined in one single hierarchy with 10/12 levels. Not used by ESS researchers.
- Germany is the only country in the ESS that used a many-to-many mapping between local education measure and ISCED (measures are not nested).
- Correlation FED/MED (0.45) is relatively low to other countries (0.65) and other German data. Something went wrong!
Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>0.948</th>
<th>0.744</th>
<th>0.402</th>
<th>0.364</th>
<th>0.575</th>
<th>0.422</th>
<th>0.582</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results on level measures (based on correlations)

- Bias relative to OPT1 (cross-national)
  - OPT1: 1.00
  - OPT2: 0.96
  - ISCED: 0.96

- Conclusions:
  - Comparison OPT1/OPT2 shows bias due to aggregation over local variation: 4% over all countries that used a different local classification.
  - Comparison OPT2/ISCED (linear) shows bias by using cross-national constraints: hardly noticeable.
  - However, these results vary by country (and level of detail used in detailed codes). Large differences between optimal local codes and ISCED scale is found in CZ.
  - There is also evidence that the optimal scaling varies between relationships (ED/OCC, FED/ED, ED/PED).

Results on Duration measure

- Considerably loss occurs in duration measure: OPT1 / DUR = 1.00 / 0.88.
- This loss varies considerably among countries, which may also indicate measurement error in the detailed local classifications. Outliers here: DE.
- However, there is significant independent information in the duration measure in 14 of 18 countries.

Advice

- Researchers should measure all educations in locally valid categories (preferably in one question / showcard), in a much detail as is appropriate in their country.
- ISCED is useful as a cross-national metric, but should be recoded only after collection of the local measure.
- Preserve both local and cross-national information (for all persons involved).
- Duration measure contributes independently to the quality of measurement in many countries. Keep it.

Perspectives

- How can we rescale the optimal scores to a cross-nationally valid measure?
  - Use either Duration or ISCED as the metric of the true score.
  - CILE: Use anchoring points for the local scales and extra/interpolate the other points.