

Table 1. Estimates of Intergenerational Persistence in Education

Citation	Coeff	Relationship examined	Years	Notes
Blau and Duncan (1967)	0.310	F-son, US	1962	pp. 170, 174
Bowles (1972)	0.204	F-son, US	1962	
Hauser and Featherman (1976)	0.251/ 0.254	F-son, US	1962/1973	As low as 0.206
Olneck (1977)	0.45	F-son, MI	1973/73	Odd sample
Behrman and Taubman (1985)	0.31	F-child, US	1980/80	
Case and Katz (1991)	0.095	P-child, Boston	1989	Inner city
Lillard and Willis (1994)	0.19 0.23	F-son, Malaysia F-daughter, Malaysia	1988/88	
Couch and Dunn (1995)	0.27 0.20	F-son, US F-son, Germany	1984/84	
Mulligan (1997)	0.32 0.33	F-son, US F-child, US	1968/84-9	
Behrman and Rosenzweig (2002)	0.133 0.251 0.242 0.327	M-daughter, Minnesota F-daughter, Minnesota M-son, Minnesota F-son, Minnesota	1993	Twins M-child estimates near zero
Chevalier (2004)	0.1	P-child, UK	1994-2002	IV twice as large
Plug (2004)	0.276 0.268	M-child, Wisconsin F-child, Wisconsin	1957/1992	Smaller estimate for adopted children
Sacerdote (2002)	0.299 0.069 0.401 0.277	P-child, Holt biological P-child, Holt adopted P-child, NLSY biological P-child, NLSY adopted	1970-1980 / 2003 1979/2003	Holt adoptees Korean-Americans <i>randomly</i> assigned to families.
Black, Devereux, and Salvanes (2005a)	0.237 0.212 0.264 0.217 0.209 0.226	M-child, Sweden M-son, Sweden M-daughter, Sweden F-child, Sweden F-son, Sweden F-daughter, Sweden	1970/2000	IV estimates near zero except for M-son.

Notes: Mulligan (1997, Table 7.4, p.200) provides five rows of this table. ‘M’ indicates mother, ‘F’ indicates father, ‘P’ indicates parent, IV=instrumental variables.