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CHAPTER I

OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY OF AMERICAN FEMALES

Introduction

The study of social mobility from one generation to the next has had a strong and consistent appeal for students of society wishing to describe the dynamics of the stratification system in the United States. The literature is replete with theoretical and empirical analyses of social mobility.\(^1\) Traditionally, the study of patterns of social mobility has been accomplished through analyzing the movement from social origins or father's occupation to occupational destination or respondent's occupation. Despite a large number of studies, they have been limited to the study of males. This research extends such study to females.

The objective of this research is to present a systematic analysis on a national basis of female intergenerational occupational mobility patterns within the American occupational structure. The patterns of occupational mobility will be studied through an analysis of the movement of females among different occupational categories. Comparisons will be made to already

known occupational mobility patterns for males in order to determine whether the occupational mobility patterns of the female labor force differ from these known occupational mobility patterns of the male segment of the labor force.

Studies of occupational mobility have been limited almost exclusively to the study of the male. Statements of limitation, such as the following from perhaps the most comprehensive study of occupational mobility to date, are typical of occupational mobility researches:

The limitation of our inquiry to the fortunes of men, though a legitimate preliminary simplification, reckons without the impact of the influx of women into the labor force on men's chances of mobility. Women do not offer competition to men in all occupations, but the supply of openings can hardly be independent of the number of women ready and trained to work at a variety of skill levels.  

It is evident that this limitation of mobility studies is becoming more serious for an understanding of occupational mobility patterns in view of the growing proportion of women working and the increasingly large segment of the occupational structure occupied by females. In 1940 the percentage of American females fourteen and over who were working was 27.4 per cent; in 1966 this figure had risen to 37.3 per cent. It is interesting to note that among

---


single women the percentage of women working has declined over this
same time period from 48.1 per cent to 40.8 per cent, while among
married women the percentage working has increased dramatically
from 16.7 per cent to 36.5 per cent. The labor force itself is
becoming increasingly female. In 1947, 28.1 per cent of the
civilian labor force was made up of women sixteen and over, but by
1967 this figure had risen to 36.5 per cent. As a result, account
must be taken of the more than one-third of the labor force, fe-
males, who have been excluded from the study of mobility.

Much has been written on the consequences of increased female
participation in the labor force. In the area of the family, for
example, it has been speculated that the increase in working wives
is having consequences for patterns of marriage, child bearing,
child rearing, marital conflict, and the divorce rate. The educa-
tional sphere is also considered to be affected. As traditional
values and beliefs regarding women and work are changing, more young
women are seeking higher education as preparation for more demanding
and status conferring occupations. Studies of female occupational
mobility provide a new perspective for an understanding of the con-
sequences of increased female participation in the labor force.

In addition, studies of male or female American occupational

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., p. 221.
mobility have implications for the more general theoretical approaches to stratification. The theoretical implications of this study are explored below.

The Study of Social Mobility by Occupation

Although this research is specifically a study of occupational mobility, it has implications for the more general process of social mobility. This section briefly defines social mobility and indicates how this process has been characteristically operationalized for study.

If societies are conceptualized as consisting of variously ranked social strata, then the term social mobility may be defined as movement, either upward or downward, between higher and lower social strata. This movement is to be thought of as a process which occurs over time with individuals and their family units moving from one social stratum level to another.¹

Social mobility across generations has been traditionally studied by using ranked occupational categories as indicators of different social status positions. This hierarchical system of ranked occupational categories is here referred to as the occupational structure. A formidable rationale lies behind operationalizing social stratum level and the stratification system in this fashion, but still occupation and social stratum level are not

synonymous.

Occupation as an index of social stratum level has a social reality, especially in an industrial society. It is a real category of social classification that has direct meaning for social status.¹ Occupations are differentially valued by the members of society and studies have shown there is a remarkable agreement as to how they rank in prestige. For example, in a well-known study of ninety occupations,² there was substantial agreement among the rankings from different areas of the U.S., different sizes of home towns and cities, different age groups, different economic levels, and different sexes. It has further been shown by Inkeles and Rossi³ that this agreement among rankings even holds cross-culturally in modern industrialized societies.

In addition to the logic behind using occupation as an index of social status, the mass of available evidence indicates that, in American society, occupation is the single best indicator of social


stratum level.\textsuperscript{1} It is highly related to other criteria of status level such as income, wealth, style of life, power, and quality of residential area. Further, it is more likely to influence these other variables than to be influenced by them. These points have been given strong credence by Kahl and Davis\textsuperscript{2} who subjected 19 different indicators of class position to intensive statistical analysis. Their computations pointed to two variables which appeared to underlie all others: occupation and quality of house and residential area. Occupation, above all, proved most predictive.\textsuperscript{3}

Although occupation and social stratum have much in common, there is not a one-to-one relationship between the two. Social stratum level or social class is a more complex and subtle entity than occupational level.\textsuperscript{4} Too often, complains Hodges, studies which are purportedly investigations of social class fall into the trap of an unqualified equating of occupation and social strata. The error in such instances is not in using occupation as an index


\textsuperscript{3}This conclusion of Kahl and Davis has recently been questioned. It has been suggested that a combination of education and income is a more valid indicator than occupation. See Bogue, Donald J., \textit{Principles of Demography}. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969. Pp. 429-32.

\textsuperscript{4}Hodges, op. cit., p. 96.
of strata, but in using occupation and strata as synonyms.\(^1\)

This research is specifically a study of occupational mobility patterns of American females. As such, occupation and social stratum level are not taken to be synonymous, but rather occupation is considered to be an indicator of social stratum level subject to definite limitations. As a result, any generalization of occupational mobility patterns to social mobility patterns is performed with considerable caution.

**Factors Basic to Occupational Mobility**

A number of variables have been theoretically posited as crucial for an understanding of the amounts, types, and rates of occupational mobility. These variables interact with the values underlying the stratification system which permit and encourage or prohibit and discourage mobility. This section considers these variables which are basic to occupational mobility patterns.

No single element acts alone to produce occupational mobility. The concrete processes of occupational mobility are generally affected by several different but interrelated factors or conditions.\(^2\) These factors can be thought of as affecting mobility by operating

---

\(^1\)For an extended statement of the limitations of occupational measures of stratum level see Barber, op. cit., pp. 108-11; and Reiss, op. cit., pp. 89-108.

\(^2\)Barber, op. cit., p. 357.
on the system or by influencing the mobility of individuals. Hence, two modes of analysis, systemic and individual, have been employed in the study of these factors.\(^1\) An analysis at the systemic level focuses on variables which can be used to explain the system as a whole. An analysis at the individual level is concerned with variables which are analyzed as characteristics of the individual affecting his mobility. In some instances a factor can be so specified as to be analyzable at both levels, for example, the family. The type of family structure in American society can be analyzed at the systemic level, while the results of the socialization process within a given family can be viewed as a characteristic of a given individual.

Major factors which affect occupational mobility to be discussed are: the development of technology and science, differential birth rates, the structure of the family, education, wealth, and the results of the socialization process of the family. The first three of these factors are conceived of as systemic and are discussed as such. The latter three factors are discussed as individual characteristics. However, in some instances they are amenable to analysis for the systemic level.

In the past, these factors basic to occupational mobility have been conceptualized in such a way as to account for male occupation-

\(^1\)Blau and Duncan have made somewhat the same distinction. See op. cit., pp. 9-10.
al mobility. The possibility exists that their use in analysis of
the mobility of females may not be precisely the same as for males.
Consequently, the format for the discussion of each of these factors
is first to present its current use in analyzing male mobility, and
then to indicate the questions of analysis it raises for females.

The development of technology and science is commonly used as
a systemic characteristic to explain partially the occupational
mobility of males. This factor can result in a change in the
absolute number of positions within a given occupational category
over a period of years and so affect mobility. For example,
Porter has written that an increased proportion of highly educated
professionals is presently needed which was not needed fifty years
ago. This change is due to the emergence of larger and more com-
plex organizing and producing units, higher expectations for
distributive justice, the expanding occupational sector in state
and local government, and the recognized increasing need for
scientific research. This situation has required a surge of upward
mobility to fill the now more plentiful higher status professional
positions.

To our knowledge, it is not known whether females and males
from lower ranked occupational categories are equally able to take

\[1\] Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Zetterberg, Hans L., "A Theory of
Social Mobility," In Bendix and Lipset, op. cit., p. 565.

\[2\] Porter, John, "The Future of Upward Mobility." American
advantage of this opportunity for upward mobility since there is a lack of occupational mobility studies for females. However, empirical studies have indicated that in many of the high status professional occupations, the male-dominated normative structures do not permit effective functioning of females in these occupations. Hence, it is doubtful that females are as able to take advantage of this opportunity as are males.

A second variable often used to partially account for the occupational mobility of males in differential birth rates among occupational categories. If fathers in various social strata do not replace themselves, mobility will result. To illustrate, if professional workers do not replace themselves, then in the next generation some professionals will have to be obtained from occupational categories other than the professional category. This is indeed the case in the American occupational structure; men at the top of the occupational structure tend to have small families, smaller than those at lower levels, thus making room at the top. Therefore, differential reproduction results in some mobility.

Replacement has been characteristically conceptualized as replacement of fathers by sons. The literature does not appear to indicate how this factor affects female mobility when replacement is

---


conceptualized as the replacement of fathers by daughters. With a lack of knowledge of the social origins (father's occupation) of females and the degree of occupational inheritance females have, the place of females in replacement and the mobility of females because of the replacement process is not known.

The third systemic factor is the structure of the family. In the United States, a given nuclear family, that is, the basic family unit consisting of the father, mother, and their dependent children, is relatively independent of other family ties. This independence makes less likely the predetermination of mobility characteristics by other kinship ties. An individual may remain in the same strata as his parents, or he may rise or fall from their position, but he has no institutionalized obligation to keep his parents, siblings, or other relatives "equal" with him. As a result, he only has to carry with him the new nuclear family he initiates by marriage. This type of family structure facilitates individual upward mobility more than an extended family system. Hence, the independent nuclear type of family structure affects the process of occupational mobility by not imposing burdens of kinship obligation.

Again, to our knowledge, it is not known whether females and males can equally take advantage of the opportunity for individual occupational achievement which the type of family structure in

---

1Occupational inheritance refers to daughters or sons having the same occupation as their fathers.

2Barber, op. cit., p. 356.
American society provides. However, it is known that females are normatively tied down for a time to child bearing and child rearing and hence do not have as much time for the continuous pursuit of an occupation as do males. In addition, empirical analyses have indicated that females are more dependent than males on the values of their families of origin toward obtaining an occupation, and that such values in the case of females are in many instances both vague and inconsistent. These facts would suggest that females may not be as able as males to take advantage of the opportunity for individual advancement which the type of family structure in American society allows.

Formal education is fast becoming an essential prerequisite for occupational mobility. As American society becomes increasingly modernized, the factor of education becomes more important for occupational advancement. Whereas earlier a boy was taught agrarian techniques or business dealings at the side of his father or as an apprentice, today this function has been largely taken over by the system of formal education. The major part of the production and distribution of goods is handled by large corporations, and ambitious young men are more likely to seek work in corporations.

---


rather than start their own firms. To enter a corporate career, a man begins with a college training often in either a technical field like engineering or business administration. Thus, the combination of complex scientific technology and large bureaucratic organization has made higher education necessary for high positions in most fields of business and government, as well as in the professions. "Only in entertainment, art, and sport can talented individuals make headway without being asked, 'Do you have a bachelor's degree?'"

Education can be analyzed as either a systemic variable or as a characteristic of the individual affecting his mobility. For example, if a researcher were concerned with analyzing the differential impact of education upon mobility in varying social strata, he would be analyzing education as a systemic variable. However, if he were interested in the relationship of education to the mobility (upward and downward) of individuals, he would record the years of education for each individual in his sample. In this instance education would be analyzed as a characteristic of the individual affecting his mobility.

The literature does not indicate whether the effect of education on mobility patterns is different for females as opposed to males. However, on the systemic level, it is known that the values... 

---

1Kahl, op. cit., p. 277.

2Ibid.
and behavior toward obtaining an education differ for females and males; that is, it is generally considered less important for females to get an education that it is for males. This can be illustrated by the fact that only 40 per cent\(^1\) of college degrees, 32 per cent\(^2\) of master's degrees, and 11 per cent\(^3\) of doctoral degrees are awarded to females. On the individual level, the effect of education on mobility may differ for females since females more often than males enter and re-enter the labor force,\(^4\) and since females enter the labor force at lower status occupational levels than do males.\(^5\) In view of these facts, the question arises whether females are as able to hold occupations equivalent to their level of education as readily as are males.

Wealth is another factor which can be utilized to explain individual mobility. Wealth is defined as the sum of the valuable possessions of a person or social unit, for example, the family. The use of "valuable" here means any object capable of being assigned a money value.\(^6\) As a result, wealth is more inclusive than

---

\(^1\)U.S. Bureau of the Census, op. cit., p. 131.


\(^3\)Ibid.

\(^4\)Rossi, Alice S., "Equality Between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal." *Daedalus*, 93 (Spring 1964), 626.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 627.

Wealth is a factor in producing occupational mobility in that it is a most effective means of providing the opportunity to enter into or learn an occupational role, and thereby achieve its associated status. Those parents with the financial resources tend to "buy" their children as superior an education as possible in order to fit them for occupational roles equivalent or superior to those of their own. Wealth can also be used to buy landed property and commercial or manufacturing enterprises which in turn may serve to establish high occupational status for the buyer.

The amount of wealth a person possesses can be a factor affecting mobility. As such, wealth is a characteristic of the individual. Like education, wealth can also be analyzed as a systemic variable. An analysis of the differential use of wealth by social class to promote upward mobility is an analysis treating wealth as a systemic variable.

To our knowledge, the degree to which the indirect use of wealth ("buying" an education) differentially affects the mobility of females and males is not known. Yet, if education is in fact valued more for males than for females, as was suggested earlier, then it might be expected that families would more consistently tend to "buy" their sons an education than their daughters. If such is the case, then the indirect use of wealth would be a more important factor in the case of males.

1 Barber, op. cit., p. 374.
The final factor to be discussed here, which can be used to explain individual mobility, is the results of the type of socialization within a given family. The family is the "keystone" of the American stratification system and hence of crucial importance for an understanding of the process of occupational mobility. The family is the first socializing agent in the life history of the individual and so a prime determining factor in what will happen to him later in the occupational system. The results of the type of socialization within a given family can be analyzed as a characteristic of the individual.

It is well known that in the contemporary United States, different social strata socialize their children in characteristically different fashions, with consequent results for their attitudes to and chances for mobility. A study by Kahl has offered evidence of the family's socializing influence as regards mobility. It showed, for instance, that the lower-middle-class family that did aspire to mobility for its children was more successful in starting them on the educational route to that goal than was the lower-middle-class family which did not have this aspiration. Today, the influence of the family on the child's aspiration for higher education is extremely important because, as noted earlier, education is

---

1loc. cit., p. 371.

2Goode, op. cit., p. 77.

increasingly becoming an indispensible prerequisite for occupational mobility.

In addition to differences in types of socialization among different social strata, there are also systematic differences between the socialization of females and males in all strata. The effects of this different socialization of females for the occupational mobility patterns of females is still unknown.

This section has considered some of the more important factors which affect the amounts and types of occupational mobility. These variables may affect differently mobility for males and females. Thus, the need to understand female mobility stems not only from their numbers in the labor force, but also from the theory used to account for mobility as a social phenomenon.

This research on female intergenerational occupational mobility is not specifically concerned with studying the effect of these factors upon occupational mobility. It is rather concerned with the consequences of the functioning of these variables. These consequences have been termed patterns of mobility. The next section reviews the patterns of mobility indicated by previous research.

Patterns of Occupational Mobility
Indicated by Previous Research

This review of the literature focuses on patterns of American intergenerational occupational mobility of males; that is, patterns of mobility revealed by the movement from fathers' occupations to
sons' occupations. It is of necessity that the focus is limited to males, since to our knowledge, females have not been studied in this context. Only findings concerning patterns of mobility are related; no attempt is made to review the studies dealing with systemic and individual factors considered to affect these patterns. The reason for this is that the present study is primarily a study of American female patterns of mobility, not a study of systemic and individual factors affecting that mobility. The studies to be discussed are divided into four types.¹ The first of these consists of time-comparative studies of a sample of the population in some one locality. The second type of study investigates mobility in a present-day, non-comparative local sample. The third kind of study examines mobility in a present-day, non-comparative national sample. The final of the four types consists of time-comparative studies of a national sample.

There are two reasons behind using this typology of mobility studies. First, this typology emphasizes the type of sample and thus the generalizability of a given study. Consequently, a perspective on discrepancies in findings between locally and nationally based studies can be provided. Second, this typology permits the locating of the present study within a particular tradition of mobility studies. Particular attention is paid to the third of these four types, since it is within this category that the present

¹This classification of intergenerational occupational mobility studies is taken from Barber, op. cit., p. 430.
study falls.

The most often cited comparative study of a local sample was that conducted by Rogoff,\(^1\) in which she investigated two samples of men in metropolitan Indianapolis, one sample from 1910, the other from 1940. Rogoff was able to compare the occupations of all white male applicants for marriage licenses in the two periods 1905-1912 and 1938-1941 with the occupations of their fathers, since both were listed on the marriage license applications. Realizing that some mobility is due to changes from one generation to the next in the "numerical importance" of occupational categories (for example, there were more professionals in 1940 than in 1910), she controlled for these changes by using a statistical technique called the social distance mobility ratio.\(^2\) This allowed her to make a comparison between the amount of mobility experienced by sons in 1910, and that experienced by sons in 1940.

The general findings on the patterns of mobility emerging from Rogoff's study were as follows. First, occupational inheritance occurred more frequently than any single type of occupational change. Put differently, the most likely single occupational destination of all the sons was the occupation of their fathers.

---


\(^{2}\) For a description of this technique, see loc. cit., pp. 29-33.
Second, if upward or downward movement did occur out of the fathers' occupations, it was into occupations similar in status to that of the fathers. As a result, most mobility, upward or downward, was of a small degree. Still, however, there was a definite, though small, amount of mobility of large degree, both upward and downward. For example, there were a few cases of movement in both directions between the high ranking professional category and the low ranking service workers category. All of these patterns held for both time periods.

On the total amounts of mobility in each of the two periods, Rogoff reports the notion that the occupational structure is becoming more "rigid" is false. The likelihood of a son being in an occupational category other than that of his father was about the same in 1910 and in 1940. It is interesting to note, however, that this means that the amount of occupational mobility was the same after changes in the occupational structure were "held constant." Since these changes had resulted in more higher ranking occupations in 1940 than in 1910, there was in reality more occupational mobility in 1940 than in 1910. Viewing it from this perspective, Rogoff contends the occupational structure had become more "open" to mobility in the mid-twentieth century than in the early twentieth century.

A second type of occupational mobility research pertinent to the present study is the non-comparative study of a local sample; that is, data on a single locality from one specific time period. By themselves, such studies can tell us nothing about whether mobil-
ity is increasing or decreasing in the United States. However, their findings can be compared to studies similar in nature which are from different localities.

Although the bulk of occupational mobility research to date falls into this non-comparative local category, only one example of such research is presented here, since our major interest is in non-comparative studies of national samples. The study selected is one of the first American local studies of occupational mobility, that of Davidson and Anderson.¹

Davidson and Anderson conducted their study on a representative sample of the male working population in the medium-sized city of San Jose, California. Using a questionnaire, they obtained information on both sons' occupations and their fathers' occupations. In comparing the occupations of fathers and sons, they found that approximately two-thirds of the sons were in the same occupations as their fathers, or in occupations of nearly equal rank. The movement of the other sons was somewhat farther up or down. Thus, though the amount of mobility in San Jose was considerable, it was generally mobility of small degree.

The findings of Davidson and Anderson coincide quite closely with the comparable findings of Rogoff, i.e., the predominance of occupational inheritance and short-distance mobility. In writing

of Davidson and Anderson's study, Barber\(^1\) states that the San Jose study found a rough pattern of the amount and degree of mobility in the United States which has been substantiated in all subsequent national and local studies.

The third type of occupational mobility studies is the non-comparative national sample type. The first study of this type was conducted by Centers\(^2\) in 1945 and reported on in 1948. Centers obtained a nationally representative sample of the adult white male population of the United States from which he reported the following findings. First, occupational inheritance is a common phenomenon. Centers states there is a "tendency for the occupational level of the son to be substantially more commonly the same as that of his father than to be of any other particular level."\(^3\) Second, of the sons who were mobile, more tended to be upwardly mobile than downwardly mobile. Third, short-distance mobility predominated over long-distance mobility. As Centers put it:

... fewer and fewer fathers of a given stratum have sons going into occupations other than their own as occupations recede in the occupational order from their own. Taking the occupation of the father as the point of reference in each case, it is typical for the son not to have differed in occupational placement very far in either direction.\(^4\)

\(^1\)op. cit., p. 440.


\(^3\)loc. cit., p. 199.

A second intergenerational occupational mobility study conducted on a national basis was a study incidental to the National Opinion Research Center’s investigation of the popular evaluation of ninety different jobs, already mentioned in a previous section. NORC had also asked male respondents for their father's occupation. In comparing fathers' occupations with sons' occupations, these findings emerged: (1) a great deal of occupational inheritance, (2) if there was movement, it was usually to an occupational class nearly equal in rank, and (3) only a small per cent of the total sons had moved very far up or down the occupational structure in this one generation interval.

The third study conducted on a national basis to be discussed here is perhaps the most comprehensive work on intergenerational occupational mobility to date. As one part of the study Blau and Duncan, utilizing more sophisticated techniques, reported findings which support the results of studies already reviewed. Thus, Blau and Duncan state: (1) occupational inheritance is much greater than that expected by "chance", (2) nevertheless, mobility is pervasive, (3) upward mobility is more prevalent than downward mobility, and (4) short-distance mobility occurs more often than long-distance mobility.

---

1 op. cit.

2 op. cit., p. 36. Since this study is constantly referred to and utilized in the ensuing chapters, no description of its sample and techniques of analysis is given here.
The final study to be reported on is an example of both the non-comparative nationally based study and the comparative nationally based study. The researchers first made an analysis of patterns of mobility at one point in time, and then compared the findings from this analysis to the findings from earlier nationally based studies of occupational mobility. Both of these aspects are described below.

In 1957 the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan conducted a national sample survey of American adults. Included in this survey's questionnaire were questions on sons' and fathers' occupations. Jackson and Crockett reported these mobility patterns from their analysis of that data: (1) thirty per cent of the men in the sample "inherited" their fathers' occupational level, (2) when movement did occur, it was usually into an adjacent or near adjacent occupational category, and (3) more men in the sample had experienced upward mobility than had experienced downward mobility.

Besides reporting mobility patterns for American males in 1957, Jackson and Crockett compared their national sample to earlier national samples in order to ascertain whether changes in rates and patterns of occupational mobility had occurred over time. They summarize their findings from these comparisons as

---

Comparisons with earlier national mobility studies yield an impression that no striking changes have occurred in mobility patterns and rates since World War II. The conservative interpretation might be that of essentially no change. What movement has occurred, however, is in the direction of increasing rates of movement and decreasing influence of father’s occupation on that of his son.¹

There are two major points arising out of this review of the mobility literature which should be stressed. First, there is a great deal of consistency in findings among the studies, even though some were conducted on a local basis while others were conducted on a national basis. This consistency was maintained in spite of the differences in classifying occupations. Second, it is of especial interest that all of the studies here reviewed were studies of American males. Not one of these studies even made reference to mobility patterns of females. As indicated, it is this omission in inter-generational occupational mobility research that this study hopes to redress.

Social Roles of the Female and Participation in the Labor Force

The question now arises, what occupational mobility patterns can be expected for females? To answer this question, certain dimensions of the female role in American society must first be taken

¹loc. cit., p. 15.
into account, particularly those aspects of the female role which affect her patterns of participation in the labor force. This section develops this topic as a basis on which to predict patterns of occupational mobility for females.

In spite of the fact that a large number of theorists and empirical researchers have involved themselves in the study of the female role from different perspectives, there has been almost a unanimity of conclusions. Most agree that changes in the economic basis of the social structure since the Industrial Revolution have resulted in differential shifts in the roles of men and women. Although the social roles of men have remained quite clearly defined, those of women are subject to a large measure of ambiguity. This role ambiguity of the female has resulted in a lack of certainty on the part of the female about education and occupational roles. This, in turn, has had a definite impact on the types of occupations in which women generally engage. These points are developed more fully below through a review of the appropriate literature.

Rose\(^1\) hypothesized that social and cultural changes accompanying the Industrial Revolution left the middle class urban woman's roles relatively less specific than those of comparable men, and hence her pre-adult expectations are less adequate. Through a comparison of male and female roles over the past one hundred years, Rose\(^2\) gives

\(^1\)Rose, Arnold, "The Adequacy of Women's Expectations for Adult Roles." *Social Forces*, 30 (October 1951), 69.

\(^2\)loc. cit., pp. 69-72.
credence to his proposition.

Since the Industrial Revolution, males have lost many of their family functions. They no longer assist with food and clothing preparations, and their educational function for their children has decreased drastically. However, they have acquired new civic responsibilities such as voting for governmental officials, joining unions, participating in social welfare activities, and soldiering. Further, and most important, most adult males realize they must have an occupation to support their families. As a result, though there have been changes in the roles of men, there has not been either a decrease of function or a change in their most basic role, that of a provider.

The change in the social role of women after the eighteenth century was much different, according to Rose. In the first place, her change of functions was slower and less complete.\(^1\) Over the past one hundred years, housework for the female has become easier and less time consuming. Modern technology has added labor-saving devices to the household. Fewer children are born to each family and the schools have taken over part of the task of raising and educating the children. Yet these losses of functions came about so slowly that most women did not realize them and therefore did not prepare for alternate functions.

A second difference between the modification of male and female

\(^1\)loc. cit., p. 70.
roles is that there has been considerable opposition to women acquiring new functions. Many interest groups have worked to keep women in the home. Women have been excluded from higher status occupations and from leadership in sexually mixed organization. This opposition has hindered women from acquiring new roles.

A third difference between men's and women's change of roles is that the new roles of women have not become clear and definite. Though the female does not spend as much time at the old economic functions (e.g., clothes making) or at child-rearing after the children begin school, no new demands on her time and interest take their place. She may choose between a "career" or marriage or work out a combination of the two. Because she has this choice, she may eventually question whether the goals she chose are the ones she really wants. A man, in contrast, has no such choice; he must get an occupation. This can be illustrated by the fact that within the economically active years (25-54), over 95 per cent of the males were in the labor force in 1960. The comparable figure for females is 42 per cent.

Parsons has also emphasized a lack of definiteness or ambiguity

1Ibid.
2Ibid.
4Ibid.
in the wife's role. In addition to the patterns of total
domesticity and careerist, the wife has the alternatives of the
"glamor" role with its specific emphasis on a feminine form of at-
tractiveness, and the "common humanistic" role with its emphasis on
either the cultivation of "cultural" interests or humanitarian
obligations in community welfare. But since the domestic and
"common humanistic" roles are not fulfilling to many wives, and since
the careerist and glamor patterns are considered by community opin-
tion to threaten the stability of the family, the proper role of the
wife is not clearly defined and so is unstable. In sum, states
Parsons: "It is quite clear that in the adult feminine role there
is quite sufficient strain and insecurity so that wide-spread man-
ifestations are to be expected in the form of neurotic behavior."1

According to Rodman,2 Parsons3 has more recently placed less
emphasis on the strains involved in choosing a particular role
pattern. With the increase in female participation in the labor
force, attitudes regarding women working are changing. As a result,
states Rodman, the inference Parsons leaves is that it is more
likely and acceptable now for women to combine various patterns such

1Loc. cit., p. 613.

2Rodman, Hyman, "Talcott Parsons' View of the Changing Amer-
ican Family." In Rodman, Hyman (Ed.), Marriage, Family, and So-

3Parsons, Talcott, "The American Family: Its Relation to Per-
sonality and to Social Structure." In Parsons, Talcott and Bales,
Robert F. (Eds.), Family, Socialization and Interaction Process.
as the domestic and the careerist rather than to choose one particular pattern. However, Rodman maintains that the central aspect of the female role still remains the rearing of children and management of the household. Hence, any other pattern combined with the domestic pattern must of necessity be secondary.

In a study of college women seniors, Komarovsky reported two conflicting female roles. The "feminine" role defines the proper attitude toward men, family, work, and love as being "not as dominant or aggressive as men." In contrast, the "modern" role calls on the female to develop in competitive lines of endeavor and attain techniques of adaptation similar to those of the male. In other words, the latter role partly obliterates the differentiation in sex. Now if the female chooses to accept the second role, she becomes penalized for failing to properly fill her feminine role. The result is role conflict and ambiguity about future roles. Komarovsky concludes by stating this problem will persist for the female "until the adult sex roles of women are redefined in greater harmony with the socio-economic and ideological character of modern society."2

Wallin, in replicating the study of Komarovsky, came to essentially like conclusions. The questionnaires yielded similar

1 op. cit.
2 loc. cit., p. 189.
3 op. cit.
results, but Wallin did not find as much conflict between the feminine and modern roles in his interviews as did Komarovsky. However, Wallin explains this inconsistency away by stating that his research dealt mostly with marriage oriented women, while Komarovsky's examined predominantly career oriented women.

The lack of a clearly defined role in the case of the American female has had a profound impact on both the attitudes of young women toward work and on the type of occupations in which women generally engage. Rose reports that among the college women he studied almost 33 per cent planned to retire "permanently" from all paid work before the age of 30, while only one per cent of the men planned to do so. Even the career oriented women in his sample planned to retire from their jobs considerably earlier than the men. In summing up his observations, Rose writes of the college female: "She has not made, or is not able to make, definite plans--to the same extent as men do--regarding her use of her expected occupation." 2

Rossi has also lamented over the attitude of young women toward both education and work. She writes: "To study and to prepare for a future job 'in case I have to work' is just as poor a

1 op. cit., p. 74.
2 ibid.
4 op. cit.
preparation for occupational participation as the postponement of learning domestic skills 'until I have to' is a poor preparation for the homemaker role." This emphasis on the "present", Rossi continues, is characteristic of the American woman throughout her life span. She also notes the curious similarity between occupational attitudes of women and the working class.

The lack of certainty about occupational roles on the part of females has had a definite effect on the type of occupations in which women generally engage. "There has been an apparent selectivity in the sort of positions females have occupied in the labor force." The emphasis throughout the literature on this point has been that females are under-represented in the more challenging and demanding occupations and that "the female's increase in the labor force has primarily occurred in the lower paying, lower prestige, non-professional occupations."²

Cavan³ states that although the time is past when "careers for women" were considered as an alternative to marriage and family, women still do not have a commitment to one occupation by virtue of an investment of time, money, and educational preparation. Rather, they enter those occupations requiring only routine preparation on the job. Such semiprofessional, skilled, and semiskilled occupa-

---

¹Robin, op. cit.
²ibid.
³op. cit., pp. 402-3.
tions can be easily abandoned and resumed, and fitted to full-
time or part-time hours as the demands of a family dictate.

Bell¹ contends that women still enter occupations in which they traditionally have been found. As a result, they are notorious-iously under-represented in the most prestigeful professions such as law and medicine, and most heavily represented in intermediate status occupations such as typists and secretaries. The lower status of women's occupations is reflected in their lower incomes. In 1962, for example, the median income for full-time female workers was only $3,458 as compared to $5,826 for full-time male workers.

A recent study by Gross² lends support to the thesis of Bell. Using the detailed Census classification of occupations, Gross reports there has been only a slight decrease in sexual segregation³ in occupations over the past sixty years. As a result, Gross concludes that the increasing movement of females into the labor force has been into occupations that were already heavily female, newly emerging occupations (for example, the key punch operator) defined as female from the start, and previous male occupations which have been taken over by females. It is interesting to note that Gross


³Sexual segregation is defined as the number of females (or males) that would have to change occupations to have the percentage of females in each occupation correspond to the percentage of females in the labor force as a whole. See loc. cit., p. 201.
attributes the slight decrease in sexual segregation in occupations to men moving into primarily female occupations, rather than females moving into male dominated occupations.

Hunt\(^2\) has summarized the conclusions of the literature about the nature of female participation in the labor force in the following fashion:

... American women have been drawn into the occupational complex of an industrialized society but their participation has been structured toward intermediate status roles. They show only a minor participation in professional, technical and managerial activities and make up a surprisingly small part of the industrial labor force. Similarly they attend higher educational institutions at little more than half the masculine rate and make hardly more than a token contribution to such professions as law and medicine.

In view of the role ambiguity of American females and its effects on the nature of female participation in the labor force, what intergenerational occupational mobility patterns can be expected for females? The final section of this chapter deals with this question.

Mobility Patterns and the Female

In the review of the intergenerational occupational mobility research, these patterns of mobility were indicated for males:

\(^1\)loc. cit., p. 207.

\(^2\)Hunt, Chester L., "Female Occupational Roles and Urban Sex Ratios in the United States, Japan, and the Philippines." Social Forces, 43 (March 1965), 413.
greater than "chance" occupational inheritance, (2) more upward mobility than downward mobility, and (3) more short-distance mobility than long-distance mobility. Now on the basis of the preceding discussion of female role ambiguity and its effects on the nature of female participation in the labor force, can female patterns of mobility be expected to differ from these male patterns of movement, and if so, in what way? It must be realized that since the information applicable to this question is limited, the following answer is no more than a limited educated guess.

On the basis of Gross' findings, it might be expected that the female will exhibit less occupational inheritance than that shown by the male. Gross has reported, for example, that over the past sixty years females have been moving into occupations already heavily female, newly emerging occupations defined as female from the start, and previous male occupations which have been taken over by females. If this is so, it would seem the type or character of the occupation has had more influence on the daughter's choice of occupation than father's occupation, at least to the extent of determining the daughter's occupation. In the case of the male, however, it has been demonstrated that father's occupation does influence the son's choice of occupation. Therefore, less occupational inheritance might be expected for females than that already found for males.

There seems to be no basis on which to predict whether females will or will not exhibit more upward mobility than downward mobility.
However, in comparison to males, it might be expected that females will exhibit less upward mobility than males. As noted, Rose¹ and Rossi² have reported an ambivalence and lack of seriousness among women regarding future adult occupational roles. In addition, Robin,³ Cavan,⁴ and Hunt⁵ have stated females tend to be over-represented in the middle and lower status occupations, while being under-represented in the higher status occupations. Certainly such conditions are not conducive to a great deal of upward mobility, and may even result in much downward mobility.

As regards short-distance mobility versus long-distance mobility, there seems to be no reason to expect females not to exhibit more short-distance movement than long-distance movement. Comparing females to males, however, on the less common cases of long-distance mobility, it might be expected that females will show fewer cases of long-distance upward mobility and more cases of long-distance downward mobility. This prediction is based on the same reasons as given above for expecting females to show less upward mobility and more downward mobility than males. Ambivalence concerning occupational roles, over-representation in the middle and lower status occupations, and interrupted occupational careers are not conducive

¹op. cit., p. 69.
²op. cit.
³op. cit.
⁴op. cit.
⁵op. cit.
to a great deal of upward mobility, long-distance or otherwise.

A limitation of the above predictions for female intergenerational occupational mobility patterns should be noted at this point. The above reasons for prediction are based on the findings from researches which dealt with specific occupations. This research, on the other hand, utilizes a broad classification of occupations in the form of occupational categories. Hence, a "masking" effect may be operative which could reduce the expected differences between female and male patterns of mobility.¹

Before moving on to the next chapter, one final point should be made. In an earlier section, it was indicated that findings from occupational mobility studies were often generalized to be findings concerning social mobility. Such a generalization may be more valid for the male than for the female. The male's social status is usually determined by his occupational status whereas, as Bergel² states, the female's social status is generally taken from her husband, if married, as she shares her husband's status. As a result, the implications of this study for female patterns of social mobility may not be as great as the implications of occupational mobility studies on males were for male patterns of social mobility.

This chapter has presented a theoretical background and

¹This masking effect is discussed in detail as a methodological problem in the next chapter.

rationale for an analysis of patterns of female intergenerational occupational mobility. The first section considered the study of social mobility by using occupational level as an indicator of social stratum level. The second section related systemic and individual factors basic to occupational mobility. Following this, studies utilizing this operational specification of occupational level were reviewed to determine the mobility patterns which have been reported for males.

After reviewing the mobility patterns which have been reported for males, the interest turned to predicting female patterns of mobility. Before making the actual predictions, certain dimensions of the female's social role which affect her patterns of participation in the labor force were considered. Using this discussion as a basis, predictions were made noting the limitations of those predictions.
CHAPTER II
RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter describes the methods used to analyze patterns of mobility of females and males in the occupational structure. The first section identifies the data required for the study, the procedures used to obtain the data, and finally, the sources of the data. The second section presents descriptions of the female sample and the male sample, and an evaluation of the representativeness of these samples. The third section considers the classification and ranking of occupations. The final section is concerned with methodological problems encountered in research on intergenerational occupational mobility.

Data Collection Procedures

In order to study intergenerational occupational mobility of American females, data for the United States for the following variables were necessary: occupation of respondent and occupation of respondent's father. Data on the following eight variables: education of respondent's father, education of respondent's mother, respondent's marital status, respondent's age, respondent's education, respondent's race, respondent's place of residence, and respondent's number of children, were sought for future research on personal characteristics associated with female occupational mobility.
mobility.

Wishing to avoid the limitations of the local sample type of mobility study as described in Chapter I, national sample data were desired. To obtain this national data, a number of data repositories throughout the nation were contacted and asked if they had available national samples containing the variables mentioned above. The following data banks were approached: the Roper Public Opinion Research Center, the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan, the Bureau of Applied Social Research of Columbia University, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, the Institute for Survey Research of Temple University, and the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago.

The National Opinion Research Center had the data most appropriate for this research and were extremely cooperative in making it available. Six nation-wide samples from NORC research were combined for this research.

An additional source of data for male occupational mobility was obtained from the study of Blau and Duncan, The American Occupational Structure. There are three reasons for using these data.

---

1The selection of archives was made from Glaser, William A. (Director), Social Science Data Archives in the United States: 1967. New York: Council of Social Science Data Archives, 1967. This listing contained information indicating the type of data different archives had available.

2op. cit., p. 496.
First, the present study of female patterns of movement in the occupational structure utilizes, in part, Blau and Duncan's methods for analyzing the occupational mobility of males. Second, Blau and Duncan's data, used as an independent sample, allows a check on the reliability of the NORC data. Third, Blau and Duncan provide an analysis of an independent national sample of males which can be compared with the analysis of the females' occupational mobility derived from the NORC data.

The Samples

The female sample

The female sample consists of all females in the six NORC studies who are or have been in the labor force. The NORC study number, the year conducted, and the number of females from each study are listed in Table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORC Study Number</th>
<th>Year Conducted</th>
<th>No. of Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS-857</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS-889A</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Female Sample</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3196</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The population for these six studies was defined consistently. The total non-institutional population, 21 years of age or older, was sampled in each instance.

Although all six studies sampled the same population, the sampling techniques were not identical. Two studies are amalgam samples (SRS-857, SRS-889A), three are national area probability samples (367, 447, 466), and one is a stratified multi-stage probability sample (423).^1

The question about respondent's occupation was not consistent in the six questionnaires. Four of the six questionnaires asked for the respondent's present or latest past occupation rather than simply requesting the respondent's present occupation. As a result, the female sample includes women who are working and have worked. The NORC data indicate that from 1955 to 1966, 59 per cent of women 21 and over are or have been working. The 1960 Census^2 indicates 35.7 per cent of women 21 and over are working. Hence, rather than 35.7 per cent, we are able to use 59 per cent of the females in our

---


^2 op. cit.
sample in analyzing female occupational mobility.

The question about the respondent's father's occupation was more consistent in the six questionnaires. In four of the questionnaires, it asked for the respondent's father's occupation when the respondent was a child. In the other two questionnaires, it requested the father's occupation when the respondent was sixteen years of age.

The male sample

The male sample was obtained from the study by Blau and Duncan. Their data for males were collected as an adjunct to the monthly "Current Population Survey" (CPS) taken by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in March, 1962.¹ The population sampled was males, 20 to 64 years old, in the civilian, non-institutional population of the United States.² The CPS contacted some 35,000 eligible male respondents. Complete questionnaires were obtained from five-sixths of these men; that is, from 20,700 respondents. Blau and Duncan state these 20,700 respondents represent the 45 million men 20 to 64 years old in the civilian, non-institutional population of the United States in March of 1962.³

The instrument used by Blau and Duncan, labelled "Occupational

¹Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 10-3.
²For a statement on the sampling techniques see loc. cit., p. 13.
³Included as "civilians" are some 900,000 Armed Forces members living in the United States.
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Changes in a Generation" (OCG) was left behind with eligible respondents. They were requested to fill out the two page document and mail it to the regional headquarters of the Bureau of the Census.

The OCG questionnaire was designed to obtain supplementary information not available through the regular CPS interview. A copy of the OCG questionnaire is reproduced in Blau and Duncan.¹

Representativeness of samples

It was noted in Chapter I that the bulk of intergenerational occupational mobility studies have been conducted with local samples and thus have limited generalizability. This research uses national samples in order to provide a firmer basis of generalization to the American labor force or to the distribution and mobility of all workers in the various occupational categories. If this type of generalization is to be made, the occupational distributions of the female and male samples should be representative of the national distributions of females and males in the various occupational categories.

More specifically, the following questions should be raised:
(1) Does the female sample represent the national distribution of females in the occupational categories? (2) Does the male sample from Blau and Duncan represent the national distribution of males in the occupational categories?

In order to obtain answers to these questions, the respondents have been classified into ten occupational categories by sex and source of data. In addition to the Blau and Duncan males, NORC males\(^1\) are also classified into occupational categories to assess further the representativeness of the NORC samples. Table 2.2 presents the percentage distributions for males in the ten occupational categories by source of data, while Table 2.3 presents the percentage distributions for females.

In each of these tables, the occupational distribution from the 1960 Census is also presented. The Census distributions serve as a basis of comparison in each table, since they represent the best estimate of the population parameters.

An examination of Tables 2.2 and 2.3 indicates that both the Blau and Duncan sample distribution and the NORC sample distributions are similar to the Census distributions for the labor force in 1960.

In Table 2.2, the largest difference between the Blau and Duncan males and the Census males is a 3.7 percentage difference in the category of

\(^1\)The NORC male sample consists of all males in the six NORC studies who are or have been in the labor force. The NORC study number, the year conducted, and the number of males in each study are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORC Study Number</th>
<th>Year Conducted</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS-857</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS-889A</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.2 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALES IN OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES BY SOURCE OF DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of Males</th>
<th>1960 Census Males</th>
<th>Blau and Duncan Males</th>
<th>NORC Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


managers. The largest difference between the NORC males and the Census males is a 2.3 percentage difference in the category of farmers. Of the possible twenty comparisons with the Census males in Table 2.2, seven show less than a 1 percentage difference and thirteen show less than a 2 percentage difference. In Table 2.3, the largest variation from the Census females is in the largest category, that of clerical workers. A 3.4 percentage discrepancy is shown here. Of the possible ten comparisons with the Census females in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of Females</th>
<th>1960 Census Females</th>
<th>NORC Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.3, seven show less than a 1 percentage difference and nine show less than a 2 percentage difference.

There is another question related to representativeness of samples which should be taken up in the present context: are the social origins of the female and male samples, as represented by the occupational distributions of respondents' fathers, different or consistent across samples? The answer to this question is important because if the occupational distributions of respondents' fathers are not similar for sampled females and males, then any comparison of findings for females to findings for males would be subject to
question. That is, if the occupational distribution of working females' fathers was not similar to the occupational distribution of working males' fathers, any differences exhibited between female patterns of mobility and male patterns of mobility might be due to differences between occupational distributions of females' fathers and males' fathers. The reason that this is so is that in an intergenerational study such as this, the starting point for determining mobility is father's occupation. Consequently, if female patterns of mobility are to be compared to male patterns of mobility, then the starting point for determining mobility, father's occupation, should have similar distributions for females and males so that any differences exhibited in patterns of mobility for females and males cannot be due to differences in the starting point for determining those patterns.

In order to answer this question about the consistency of social origins for females and males, Table 2.4 presents occupational distributions of respondents' fathers by sex and source of data. NORC females have been divided into working and non-working and the occupational distributions of their fathers are presented. This has been done to ascertain whether there are any differences between the social origins of working and non-working females.

An examination of Table 2.4 indicates that there is minimal variation among the percentage distributions. The largest variation occurs in the category of farmers which is the category with the largest percentages. Being a category with large percentages, there is greater tolerance for variation because it comprises a smaller
TABLE 2.4 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FATHERS OF MALES AND FEMALES IN OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES BY SOURCE OF DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of Father</th>
<th>Fathers of Blau and Duncan Males</th>
<th>Fathers of Working NORC Females</th>
<th>Fathers of Non-working NORC Females</th>
<th>Fathers of NORC Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 496.

Relative variation. It is also interesting to note that there is little variation in percentages between fathers of working females and fathers of non-working females. Thus, there is no relationship between social origins and the occupational groups of working females, non-working females, and working males.

Table 2.4 has indicated there is little variation among the occupational distributions of fathers of working females and males. Hence any differences exhibited between findings for females and males indicated by the ensuing analysis, can not be due to differences in the social origins of working females and working males.
This sub-section has dealt with the question of representativeness of samples. First, Tables 2.2 and 2.3 indicated that the male sample and the female sample represent the national distribution of males and females in the occupational categories. Thus, the male and female samples can be generalized to the occupational distributions of all workers. Second, Table 2.4 showed there is little variation between the social origins of the female sample and the male sample. Therefore, any difference exhibited between female and male patterns of movement can not be attributed to differences in their social origins as measured by father's occupation. These tables, then, have shown that the data from the samples on the key variables (respondent's occupation and father's occupation) to be used in this study are both representative and comparable.

Classification and Ranking of Occupations

The NORC data were classified according to the 1950 Census classification of occupations. This classification consists of ten major occupational categories: professionals, farmers, managers, clerical workers, sales workers, craftsmen, operatives, service workers, farm laborers, and laborers (non-farm). These ten occupational categories serve as the classification of occupations throughout this research.

Blau and Duncan's\(^1\) data are classified according to 17 major

\(^1\)op. cit., p. 23.
occupational categories, an extension of the 10 major occupational categories of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. "The seven additional categories represent simple subdivisions of the Census categories." Professionals are divided into self-employed and salaried, managers are separated into self-employed proprietors and salaried managers, and sales workers are subdivided into retail and other salesmen. In addition, craftsmen are divided into three categories by industry: manufacturing, other, and construction. Similarly, operatives and non-farm laborers are separated into manufacturing and other.

In order to compare Blau and Duncan with NORC data, the Blau and Duncan data were combined into the original Census classification of ten occupational categories. This, of course, presented no problem since their seven additional categories are merely "simple subdivisions" of the ten Census categories.

To determine whether movement among occupational categories is upward or downward movement, the ten occupational categories must be ranked. The ranking of the occupational categories is taken from Blau and Duncan. After calculating median scores on the criteria of income and education for each of the occupational categories, Blau and Duncan indicate the following ranking of occupational categories from high status to low status: professionals, managers, clerical workers, sales workers, craftsmen, operatives, service workers, laborers, farmers, and farm laborers. This is the ranking that will

1ibid.
be utilized throughout this research.¹

Methodological Problems

There are three methodological problems which are discussed in this section. The first is what has been termed the "masking effect."² The second is the use of father's occupation as an indicator of social origins. The third is a problem of measurement.

This research utilizes a broad classification of occupations in the form of occupational categories. As Gross³ has indicated, such broad occupational categories can have a "masking" effect. To illustrate, it has been noted in Chapter I that females have not entered the more demanding professional occupations; that is, the higher ranking professional occupations to the degree that men have. However, a great many women have entered the lower ranking professional occupations such as teaching and nursing with the result that there is approximately as great a percentage of female workers classified as professionals as male workers classified as professionals. Yet the use of the single broad occupational category of professionals does not indicate this status discrepancy between female professionals and male professionals. Consequently, the categor-

¹This ranking of occupational categories has raised some questions. For a description of some of the possible problems involved see Bogue, op. cit., pp. 264-5; and Kahl, The American Class Structure, op. cit., pp. 252-3.

²Gross, op. cit., p. 201.

³Ibid.
izing of specific occupations into broad occupational categories can mask differences between male and female patterns of participation in the labor force, and thus reduce the differences between male and female patterns of intergenerational occupational mobility, which were predicted in Chapter I.

In this study, father's occupational category is used as the indicator of social origins for both female and male respondents. This indicator was selected because both females and males receive the social status of their father. Secondly, as indicated above, the social origin distributions for both working females and males are the same. However, this operationalization presents certain limitations. First, the respondent experiences socialization from the time of birth, not at one point in time for which father's occupation is known. During this long period of socialization, the respondent's father's occupational status may have changed. Further, there is interaction between the respondent's socialization process and shifts in father's occupational status over time. This research is unable to study this process. Instead, it substitutes an indication of social origins of the respondent at one point in time, i.e., father's occupation when the respondent was sixteen years old. Thus, though father's occupation is considered to be the best single indicator of social origins, it is nevertheless a limited indicator.¹

The above limitation is compounded by the fact that only one

¹This limitation is shared by every intergenerational study of mobility in the literature.
element among the many comprising the social origins of the respondent has been reported, i.e., father's occupation. Ideally, a composite index of the many variables influencing respondent's occupation should be used.¹ However, father's occupation still is the best single indicator of social origins for the purposes of mobility research.

Intergenerational studies which use father's occupation as an indicator of the respondent's social origins also have been criticized on the following basis. Although the occupational classification of daughters, for instance, represents actual groupings of female workers around 1960 or at some known time, the occupational distribution of fathers is not an actual distribution of men existing at any single earlier period. Many of these fathers still worked in 1960, others have retired, and still others have died.

This criticism is not applicable to this research. By asking the respondents to report their fathers' occupations, the researcher is not seeking a sample of the fathers from some earlier period, but rather an indication of the social origins of the respondents. Consequently, father's occupation is interpreted as a characteristic of the respondent, not as a sample of men from some earlier time.²

¹Kahl, The American Class Structure, op. cit., p. 252.

²One possible manner in which to resolve the problems involved in the relationship of social origins to occupational destination of the respondent is to perform a cohort analysis. The reason this research is not a cohort analysis is that the data will not allow it. For a description and use of cohort analysis see Blau and Duncan, op. cit., pp. 81-113.
The measurement problem involved in doing an intergenerational study, such as this research, is that the mobility being measured is "total mobility", that is, mobility resulting from a variety of variables.\(^1\) Since only total mobility is being measured, there is no way to tell from the data which factors are involved in the mobility. Instead, only the patterns of mobility within the occupational structure can be delineated, realizing that these patterns are due to a composite of all factors which produce mobility.

This chapter has described the methods used to investigate female and male patterns of mobility in the occupational structure. The preceding section considered methodological problems in doing this type of research. Problems involved in using father's occupation as an indicator of social origins were examined, as well as the measurement problem of not being able to describe which variables affect mobility. In preceding sections, the composition of the female and male samples were presented with an analysis of the representativeness of these samples. The first section identified the data required for this study and the procedure used to obtain the data.

\(^1\)See Chapter I, pp. 7-17.
CHAPTER III

PATTERNS OF MOVEMENT FOR FEMALES
IN THE OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE

Introduction

The analysis of patterns of intergenerational occupational mobility has characteristically been performed in two distinct manners. Prior to the work of Rogoff, mobility data were presented in frequency tables which cross-classified father's occupational category by son's occupational category. From these frequency tables, the gross volumes of occupational inheritance and mobility were calculated. Rogoff contends that an analysis of mobility patterns based on frequency matrices is inadequate in that no account is taken of the change in the total number of positions available in each occupational category which has occurred between the generation of fathers and the generation of sons. For example, no account is taken of the fact that the professional category has proportionately doubled over the last generation. Rogoff points out that it is especially important that such structural changes be controlled if

1Rogoff, Recent Trends in Occupational Mobility, op. cit., p. 29.
2For examples of this type of mobility analysis see Davidson and Anderson, op. cit.; and Centers, op. cit.
3op. cit., pp. 29-30.
4loc. cit., p. 31.
meaningful comparisons are to be made. The interest in the comparisons is in whether or not the differences or similarities in the mobility patterns of the groups being compared can be attributed to the differential characteristics of the groups. When structural changes which produce mobility are not controlled, such comparisons are theoretically meaningless and empirically misleading.

In this study, comparisons are to be made between female and male patterns of mobility. Hence, the structural changes between the occupational distributions of fathers and their sons, and the structural changes between fathers and their daughters must be controlled if meaningful comparisons are to be made. These structural changes are controlled by the use of a technique introduced by Rogoff.¹

This chapter focuses on intergenerational mobility patterns of females within the American occupational structure. These patterns will be delineated through an analysis of three major problems. First to be considered is the mobility characteristics of females in the occupational structure. Questions as to presence, direction, and length of distance of mobility will be answered here. For example, is mobility present within the structure, or does occupational inheritance dominate? If mobility is present, is it primarily upward or downward movement? Does long-distance or short-dis-

¹loc. cit., pp. 30-3. See also Jackson and Crockett, op. cit., pp. 6-7; and Blau and Duncan, op. cit., pp. 35-8.
tance mobility predominate? The second problem is concerned with an examination of the processes of occupational supply and recruitment. By supply, the analysis will consider this problem: given a specific occupational origin (i.e., father's occupation), what are the destinations of the females in that occupational category? By recruitment, the opposite perspective will be studied; that is, given an occupational destination, what are the origins of the women in that category? The final problem involves dealing with the question as to whether there are any empirically defined boundaries for movement of females within the occupational structure. Further, if such boundaries exist, are they primarily restrictions on upward movement, downward movement, or both? Hence, this third problem initially requires a specific determination of the direction of mobility.

The Flow of Female Workers

As stated in the introduction, this section will be concerned with determining the mobility characteristics of females in the occupational structure. Questions pertaining to the presence, direction, and length of distance of mobility within the structure are dealt with here. Through an analysis of Table 3.1, which presents the intergenerational matrix of movement between occupational origin (father's occupation) and occupational destination (daughter's occupation) in the form of mobility ratios, answers to the posed questions will be obtained.

The mobility ratio indicates the association between occupa-
TABLE 3.1 MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO DAUGHTER'S OCCUPATION: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCIES TO FREQUENCIES EXPECTED ON THE ASSUMPTION OF INDEPENDENCE (N=2371)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>2.5*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8*</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.6*</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.9*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells

--- Cells whose expected and observed values are both less than five contain a dash since such values are considered too small to yield reliable results.
tional origins and occupational destinations by presenting the relative proportion of women with the same occupational origin who end up in a certain occupational destination. Put differently, the mobility ratio for any given cell in Table 3.1 is the ratio of observed frequencies to the expected frequencies calculated on the assumption of statistical independence. The expected frequency for a given cell is obtained by multiplying the row marginal by the column marginal and then dividing this product by N. This figure, the expected frequency, is then divided into the observed frequency for the designated cell in order to obtain the mobility ratio. This mobility ratio\(^1\) measures the extent to which mobility from one occupational category to another is greater or less than that expected by "chance"; that is, a value of 1.0 indicates that the observed mobility is equal to that expected on the assumption of statistical independence.

A theoretical model of perfect mobility, defined by statistical independence of occupational origins and occupational destinations, provides a baseline for comparison. If perfect mobility were the case for females in the occupational structure, each occupational destination category would have the same distribution of occupational origins as the total population, each occupational origin category would have the same distribution of occupational destin-

\(^1\)loc. cit., p. 35. This mobility ratio has been labelled the "index of association" by Glass, David V. (Ed.), Social Mobility in Britain. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956, p. 177; and the "social distance mobility ratio" by Rogoff, op. cit., p. 30.
tions as the total population, and all indices would be 1.0.

Departures from this model of perfect mobility for females in the occupational structure are shown in the mobility ratios in Table 3.1. In order to note easily the over-all flow of female workers, mobility ratios in excess of 1.0 are underscored.

If occupational inheritance, the opposite of perfect mobility, were the only factor operating for females in the occupational structure, all females would be located in the ten cells on the diagonal. Obviously, this is not the case since 56 of the off-diagonal cells contain female workers. A considerable amount of movement from father's occupational category is thus indicated for females in the occupational structure.

A rough indication of the dominant direction of mobility is the number of underlined mobility ratios lying on either side of the major diagonal. The underscored values to the left of the diagonal, which mark greater than expected upward mobility, exceed by more than two to one (15:7) those to the right, which in turn mark greater than expected downward mobility. Therefore, by this rough indicator, upward mobility is more prevalent for females in the occupational structure than is downward mobility.

Short-distance mobility far surpasses long-distance mobility. Most of the underscored mobility ratios are concentrated around the major diagonal, denoting short-distance mobility. Nevertheless, there are a few areas near the upper right and lower left corners which evidence some longer distance mobility. For instance, the
movement from father's occupational category of farmers to daughter's occupational category of sales workers yields a mobility ratio of 1.2. This is a movement across five ranks, which is considerable mobility. In general, though, the values of mobility ratios tend to be highest in and around the major diagonal and decrease with movement away from it. As a result, the closer two occupational categories are to each other in the ranked hierarchy, the greater is the flow between them.

There are however, three gaps in the general pattern of underscored mobility ratios being directly adjacent to one another. These are: (1) daughters of laborers who are operatives, (2) daughters of farmers who are laborers and (3) daughters of farmers who are craftsmen. The mobility ratio for the first of these gaps is .9. Since this value is so close to that expected on the assumption of independence, it does not seem safe to draw any contrary conclusions about this exception. The mobility ratios for the other two gaps are .8 and .7 respectively. Both of these are found in the social origin category of farmers which is the most heterogeneous and difficult category to rank.\(^1\) Hence, some minor discrepancies might be expected in this category.

In summary, an analysis of Table 3.1 has indicated the following mobility characteristics for the female occupational structure: first, the generally high values along the diagonal of the matrix

\(^1\)Bogue, op. cit., p. 431.
show that in all cases but two occupational inheritance is greater than that expected on chance occupational destinations, i.e., the assumption of statistical independence. Second, the large number of underlined indices off the diagonal reveal a large amount of mobility. Third, the greater number of underlined values to the left of the diagonal denote the prevalence of upward mobility over downward mobility. Last, the adjacency of underlined values to the diagonal illustrates that short-distance mobility occurs more often than long-distance movement.

Intergenerational Supply and Recruitment: Volume and Direction

The questions that will be under consideration in this section are: (1) What is the outflow of female workers supplied by each occupational origin category to the various destination categories? (2) What proportion of daughters does each occupational origin category supply to a given occupational category? (3) What is the inflow of workers recruited from the various occupational origin categories by each occupational category? It will be noted that the first two of these questions deal with supply, while the last is concerned with recruitment.¹

¹Blau and Duncan in their work on the American occupational structure have chosen to deal with only the first and last of these questions. We felt, however, that a more complete treatment of occupational supply and recruitment is given by the addition of the second of the three questions. Further, in their treatment of intergenerational supply and recruitment, Blau and Duncan confine their concept of occupational inheritance to supply from a given occupational origin category to the same occupational destination category, and self-recruitment as recruitment to a given occupational
Table 3.2 presents the transition matrix of intergenerational mobility; that is, the movements between fathers' occupational categories (social origins) and daughters' occupational categories (occupational destinations). The percentages in this table, computed horizontally, designate the outflow from occupational or social origins to occupational destinations. The column totals in this table indicate the per cent of daughters in our sample falling in the various occupational destinations.

The first question to be answered through an analysis of Table 3.2 is, what proportion of its daughters does a given social origin category supply to each of the various occupational destination categories? This involves analyzing the table by row; that is, viewing each origin category separately.

Generally, the percentages in Table 3.2 are highest or nearly highest in and around the major diagonal and decrease with movement away from it. This reflects a tendency for social origin categories to supply their daughters either to the same occupational category in the next generation (self-supply) or to categories similar in status (short-distance movement). To illustrate these two points the percentages on either side of that percentage on the diagonal are added for each origin category. (For the professional category from the same occupational origin category. Since we feel both of these concepts so utilized refer to the different modes of approaching occupational inheritance, we shall refer to the former as self-supply and the latter as self-recruitment. See Blau and Duncan, op. cit., pp. 38-48.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>35.9*</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.0*</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>44.6*</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>6.4*</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.9*</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>28.5*</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.7*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.8*</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>6.7*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in Various Destinations</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells
gory, the two percentages to the right of the diagonal are taken since there is not a percentage to the left of the diagonal in this category. Similarly for farm laborers, the two percentages to the left of the diagonal are taken since there is not a percentage to the right of the diagonal for this category.) The three summed adjacent percentages for each origin category from professionals through farm laborers are 71.8, 69.0, 54.1, 51.3, 28.5, 51.7, 48.4, 39.4, 7.7, and 8.9 respectively. Now, if there were equal supply of workers to each destination category from each origin category, a value of 30.0 per cent would be expected for the three summed adjacent percentages for each origin category. However, it can be seen that every origin category exhibits a value in excess of 30.0 per cent for its three adjacent cells except craftsmen, farmers, and farm laborers. As a result, the general tendencies toward self-supply and short-distance movement are again supported by the outflow percentages in Table 3.2.

Nevertheless, this pattern of smaller outflow percentages with movement away from the diagonal is by no means entirely consistent. For example, the daughters of salesworkers move to higher white-collar occupations in greater proportions than back into sales work. In addition, fewer daughters of craftsmen remain in that occupational category than move into any white-collar occupational category or the immediately adjacent two blue-collar categories. Lastly, the daughters of laborers move to all higher ranking occupational categories in greater proportions than back into the cate-
There seems to be at least two manners in which to deal with these apparent inconsistencies. The first is a consideration of the problem of linearity. That is to say, is the ranking of these ten occupational categories correct for females? This is indeed a possible problem since the ranking was taken from Blau and Duncan who did their study for males. The second possible explanation for these inconsistencies is that not all occupations have a consistent appeal or opportunity for women. As was indicated in Chapter I; "There has been an apparent selectivity in the sort of positions females have occupied in the labor force."¹

The less self-supply there is in a given category the greater is the outflow of daughters from this origin category to other occupational destinations. The five occupational categories with the least self-supply, as Table 3.2 shows, are salesworkers, craftsmen, laborers, farmers, and farm laborers. Fathers in these five categories supply more than 93 per cent of their daughters to other destinations. Note that among these five categories are the lowest white-collar category, the lowest blue-collar category, and the lower of the two farm categories. Daughters of men in occupations near the bottom of one of the three broad occupational groupings seemingly have exceptional opportunities for mobility. In contrast, professionals, second only to clerical workers, reveal a large

¹Robin, op. cit.
degree of self-supply and therefore fathers in this category are less likely to supply daughters to other occupational destinations. The growth and prestige of this occupational category undoubtedly serves to restrict the outflow of its daughters.

As stated in the introduction to this section, there is a second question to be dealt with when considering the process of supply, namely: what proportion of daughters do the various occupational origins supply to a given occupational destination category? Answering this question involves an analysis of Table 3.2 by column; that is, viewing each destination category separately. The concern here is with a comparison of the extent to which each origin supplies daughters to a given destination.

Analyzing Table 3.2 by column indicates that in six out of the ten instances, the factor of self-supply provides the largest percentage in each destination's column. (The exceptions are sales, craftsmen, service, and laborers.) Further, the values in each column (destination category) tend to decrease with movement away from the diagonal, thus showing the largest percentages in the various destination categories belong to occupational origin categories similar in ranking. Both of these findings are again rough indications of the general tendencies toward self-supply and short-distance movement.

Table 3.3 which will be utilized to answer the third question posed at the beginning of this section shows what proportion of the females in each occupational category was recruited from the various
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>15.0x</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>22.7x</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.0x</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.9x</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>19.6x</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>22.2x</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.6x</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19.1*</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>100.0x</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>7.7x</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells
occupational origin categories. These inflow percentages, computed vertically, indicate, for example, that every occupational destination category has recruited more than 17 per cent of its personnel from the daughters of farmers. Blau and Duncan,¹ noting the same finding for males, advance three major reasons for this: (1) the large size of the farm category in the past: in 1940 it still accounted for 14.7 per cent of the total labor force; (2) the rapid decline in the number of farmers in recent decades; and (3) the very high fertility of farmers. These same reasons can be tentatively forwarded in the case of females with the possible addition of a fourth, namely, the lack of appeal of farming as an occupation for females.

The less self-recruitment there is in an occupational category, the more it must rely on the inflow of female workers recruited from other occupational origins. Table 3.3 shows that the three occupational categories with the largest inflow of outsiders, gaining 95 per cent or more of their female personnel from other origins, are clerical workers, sales workers, and service workers. Farmers, conversely, disclose by far the highest rate of self-recruitment, recruiting zero per cent of their female workers from different origins, while no other occupational category recruits less than 77 per cent from other origins.

The five occupational categories characterized by the highest

¹op. cit., p. 38.
rates of inflow of female personnel recruited from other occupa-
tional origins in the last generation are clerical workers, sales-
workers, operatives, laborers, and farm laborers. Note that only
three of these five categories, salesworkers, laborers, and farm
laborers also are characterized by a high rate of outflow. Thus
the lowest ranked occupational categories in the three major occu-
pational groupings of white-collar, blue-collar, and farming may be
considered the distributors of female workers in the occupational
structure. Disproportionate numbers of females move into their
ranks from different origins, as well as disproportionate numbers
moving from their ranks to other destinations. The distributing oc-
cupational categories are channels for upward mobility, into which
successful daughters from lower origins tend to move and from which
successful daughters tend to move to higher destinations. In addi-
tion, they provide a net to catch the downwardly mobile daughters
of higher white-collar and blue-collar origins, so enabling them to
retain their white-collar and blue-collar statuses respectively.

Intergenerational Supply and Recruitment: Concentration

The analysis of intergenerational supply and recruitment, up to
this point, has been concerned with analyzing the "volume" of supply
and recruitment. As a result, Table 3.2 (outflow percentages) and
Table 3.3 (inflow percentages) have been presented in the form of
percentages. A further important aspect of supply and recruit-
ment, however, is "concentration" of supply and recruitment. This
section deals with this phenomenon of "concentration".¹

Whatever the volume of outflow or inflow, it may range from highly concentrated to highly dispersed. The outflow from a particular origin may become concentrated to supply primarily a few occupational categories or disperse to supply many different occupational categories. Similarly, the inflow of female workers into a particular destination may be recruited either from a narrow base of a few origins or from a wide range of different origins. Although the volume of supply and recruitment to any given occupational category depends directly on the number of daughters whose fathers are found in that occupational category, the degree of concentration of supply and recruitment do not. In other words, the concern here is not specifically with how many daughters have left their fathers' occupational categories, or with the number of daughters recruited into occupational categories other than their fathers', but rather with the degree of concentration in supply and the degree of concentration in recruitment. A measure of this phenomenon of concentration has been developed by Blau and Duncan and will be utilized in the following analysis.

To illustrate the construction of this measure, let us consider the outflow from father's occupational category to daughter's occupational category as presented in Table 3.2. Of the daughters of

¹Blau and Duncan chose to approach their data from the opposite perspective, i.e., dispersion. We feel, however, it is less confusing in view of what follows to approach our data from the perspective of concentration.
professionals, 35.9 per cent entered this same occupational category, 6.3 per cent became managers, 29.6 per cent took clerical jobs, and 7.5 per cent went into sales work. The corresponding percentages for all females (bottom row) are 14.3, 5.6, 28.0, and 7.3. Notice that these four occupational categories are the only ones in which females with professional origins are over-represented, that is, constitute a higher proportion than in the total population. Thus the outflow percentage for each of these four categories is larger than its corresponding percentage for all females (bottom row). By simply summing the differences between these corresponding percentages, an index of the degree of concentration of supply is obtained. Therefore, the degree of concentration of supply of daughters of professionals is (35.9 - 14.3) plus (6.3 - 5.6) plus (29.6 - 28.0) plus (7.8 - 7.3) which equals 24.4.

The range of values this measure can take makes its meaning apparent. If father’s occupation exerts no influence and the destination of daughters from a given occupational origin is identical with that of the entire population, the index value is zero. Conversely, if all daughters from a given origin were concentrated in a single destination, the index value would be close to 100.0: specifically, as much short of 100.0 as the per cent of the total population in this destination. This index then, here labelled the index of concentration of supply, indicates how much more concentrated the destinations of females from a particular origin are compared to all females in the sample. A high value indicates high
concentration, while a low value indicates high dispersion. The corresponding index of concentration of recruitment for inflow indicates how concentrated the origins of females in each occupational destination are.

Before actually computing the index, an adjustment has been made. This is to exclude all females in the same category as their fathers. If this were not done, the index would be strongly influenced by occupational inheritance, whereas what is under consideration here is the outflow and inflow into different occupational categories.

The refined measures of concentration of supply and recruitment are presented in Table 3.4. Column 1 of this table gives the indices for concentration of supply, while column 2 relates the indices for concentration of recruitment. For example, the data in column 1 show that daughters of clerical workers are supplied in the most concentrated fashion in the next generation, while daughters of craftsmen are supplied in the most dispersed manner. The data in column 2 indicate that farm laborers are recruited from the most concentrated occupational origins, whereas salesworkers are recruited from the most dispersed occupational origins.

It is obvious that the various cases of concentration of supply and concentration of recruitment are not identical for the same categories. In fact, they are not even related; a Spearman's rho performed on the data in Table 3.4 yielded no relationship.
TABLE 3.4  INDEXES OF CONCENTRATION OF SUPPLY AND RECRUITMENT BETWEEN DESTINATION OF VERTICALLY MOBILE FEMALES AND DISTRIBUTION EXPECTED ON THE MODEL OF QUASI-INDEPENDENCE,* FOR SPECIFIED ORIGIN OR DESTINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occ. of Origin or Destination</th>
<th>Concentration of Supply of Father’s Occ. to Daughter’s Occ.</th>
<th>Concentration of Recruitment of Daughter’s Occ. from Father’s Occ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The use here of the term quasi-independence refers to the fact that non-mobile females have been excluded in the calculation of this index.

reveal an interesting point. If the magnitudes of the indices for white-collar occupational categories (professional through sales) are compared with the magnitudes of the indices for blue-collar occupational categories (craftsmen through laborers), it becomes evident that, overall, the indices for white-collar occupational categories are larger. Thus, the white-collar grouping supplies daughters in a more concentrated fashion than does the blue-collar grouping. This finding has important theoretical implications which
will be discussed in a later chapter.

Column 2 of Table 3.4, however, does not exhibit the same pattern. There does not appear to be an overall difference between white-collar occupational categories and blue-collar occupational categories in terms of the magnitudes of their indices of concentration of recruitment. If anything, the blue-collar grouping is somewhat more concentrated in terms of recruitment than the white-collar grouping.

Mobility and Grouping Boundaries

What is the direction of mobility among occupational categories for females in the occupational structure? Is it primarily upward movement or downward movement or a combination of the two? The answer to this question is an integral element to an understanding of females' patterns of movement within the occupational structure. Therefore, the first part of this section analyzes the specific direction of movement among occupational categories for females. From there, the analysis moves to a consideration of the related question as to whether there are any empirically defined boundaries for upward mobility or downward mobility of females within the occupational structure.

To answer the question of the direction of mobility, only mobility between a given occupational category and any higher one is computed; that is, the supply of females from given origins into any higher destinations, and the supply of females to given destin-
ations from any higher origins. The observed number of females in each of these categories is divided by the number expected on the assumption of independence when the cells for non-mobile females are excluded from the computation. The index obtained, which refers to the excess over expectations in the supply to higher or the supply from higher occupational categories, is presented in Table 3.5. Column 1 presents the index of upward mobility and column 2 the index of downward mobility, because only mobility between given occupational categories and all those above are considered in either case. The values for supply to lower and supply from lower occupational categories are inverse functions of those shown and hence are not considered.

The first pattern exhibited in Table 3.5 is that the values for both supply to and the supply from higher occupational categories generally decrease as the status rank order of occupational categories is descended. The higher the status of an occupational category, the more the flow of female personnel between it and higher categories in both directions exceeds the volume expected on the assumption of quasi-statistical independence. This finding indicates more short-distance than long-distance movement. There are, nevertheless, some definite exceptions to the pattern. Thus, clerical workers experience more upward mobility than managers (column 1). In addition, the supply of females to farm laborers is higher than the supply to the blue-collar categories, which is indicative of more downward mobility. (It should be stated,
TABLE 3.5 SUPPLY TO AND FROM HIGHER RANKING OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCY TO FREQUENCY EXPECTED ON THE MODEL OF QUASI-INDEPENDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Upward Mobility</th>
<th>Downward Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father's Occ. to Daughter's Occ.</td>
<td>Father's Occ. to Daughter's Occ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

however, that the frequencies in the appropriate cells and marginals here are extremely small for this category. As a result, this finding should be viewed with more caution than if the N for the study were larger.)

Of special interest in Table 3.5 is the finding for supply from higher occupational categories (column 2) that all blue-collar occupational categories have values less than 1.0. Yet for supply to higher categories, the same four blue-collar occupational categories have values higher than that expected on the assumption of quasi-independence. This finding indicates that there is substantially more upward mobility from blue-collar origins to white-collar
destinations than downward mobility from white-collar origins to blue-collar destinations.

A surprising aspect of the outflow values (column 1) is that the majority of them reveal an excess of upward mobility. Most of these values are greater than 1.0, the only exception being the higher farm category. The supply of female personnel from various origins is predominately in the upward direction. What is the source of all this upward mobility? Blau and Duncan,¹ who found the same pattern for males, attribute it to a decreasing need for workers in farming and menial labor occupations and an increasing need for workers in the higher status occupations. The resulting pull at the top of the occupational structure has created a chain reaction of short-distance movement throughout the entire occupational structure.

As stated, there is a second question to be considered in this section, namely: are there any empirically derivable boundaries² for upward mobility or downward mobility of females within the three major occupational groupings? To answer this question, the mobility ratios presented in Table 3.1 for the ten cross-classified occupational categories have been recalculated for the three cross-classified major occupational groupings of white-collar, blue-collar, and farm. Therefore, instead of having a matrix of 100

¹op. cit., p. 66.

²Boundary is here defined as movement less than that expected on the assumption of statistical independence.
mobility ratios (Table 3.1), we now have a matrix of nine mobility ratios (see Table 3.6).

The data on intergenerational movement in Table 3.6 initially indicate that the mobility ratios along the major diagonal are disproportionately large (cells A, E, I). Females in farming with farming origins exhibit the largest value, 2.91. They are followed by females in white-collar occupations with white-collar origins who have a mobility ratio of 1.40. Finally, females in blue-collar work with blue-collar origins show the lowest mobility ratio of the three, 1.14. These large values along the major diagonal are again reflections of the tendencies toward occupational inheritance and short-distance movement for females in the occupational structure.

Table 3.6 shows that there are two boundaries for movement of females with white-collar origins. First, a boundary exists between white-collar origins and blue-collar destinations since the flow of female workers between these two groupings yields a mobility ratio of .55 (B), half the expected frequency on the assumption of statistical independence. Second, an even stronger boundary is in evidence between white-collar origins and farming destinations because the flow of female workers between these two exhibits a mobility ratio of only .20 (C). Both of these boundaries for movement of women with white-collar origins are boundaries for downward movement.

Two boundaries again exist for movement of women with blue-collar origins. First, a boundary exists between blue-collar
TABLE 3.6 MOBILITY FROM FATHER’S OCCUPATION TO DAUGHTER’S OCCUPATION IN TERMS OF THE THREE CROSS-CLASSIFIED MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPINGS: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCIES TO FREQUENCIES EXPECTED ON THE ASSUMPTION OF INDEPENDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>1.40*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.91*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells
origins and farming destinations since the mobility ratio for this movement is .35 (F). This is a boundary for downward movement.

Second, a boundary further exists between blue-collar origins and white-collar destinations, because the mobility ratio denoting this flow of female workers is less than that expected under the assumption of statistical independence, that is, .93 (D). This is a boundary for upward movement. It is important to note that the boundary for downward movement here is considerable stronger than the boundary for upward movement. In other words, there is proportionately more upward mobility from blue-collar origins to white-collar destinations than downward mobility from blue-collar origins to farming destinations though neither exceeds chance (1.0).

There is only one boundary in evidence for movement of women with farming origins. The boundary exists for upward movement from farming origins to white-collar destinations since the mobility ratio for this flow of female workers is .79 (G). However, a boundary is not in evidence for movement from farming origins to blue-collar destinations because the mobility ratio for this movement, 1.18, is greater than that expected under the assumption of statistical independence. Thus, farming origins is the only origin grouping which does not show two boundaries for movement of female workers.

In summary, we have reported the following boundaries for movement in the female occupational structure. For white-collar origins, two boundaries exist for downward movement: (1) between white-collar origins and blue-collar destinations, and (2) between...
white-collar origins and farming destinations. For blue-collar origins, one boundary exists for downward movement, and another boundary exists for upward movement: (1) between blue-collar origins and farming destinations, and (2) between blue-collar origins and white-collar destinations. For farming origins, one boundary exists for upward movement, namely, between farming origins and white-collar destinations. If the mobility ratios denoting the relative, not absolute, amount of movement across these boundaries are compared, it becomes evident that in all cases the boundaries for downward movement are stronger than the comparable boundaries for upward movement. Thus the mobility ratio for downward movement between the white-collar origins and blue-collar destinations is only .55 (B), as opposed to .93 (D) for upward movement between the two. Further, the mobility ratio for downward movement between white-collar origins and farming destinations is .20 (C), over against that of .79 (G) for upward movement between the two. Finally, the mobility ratio for downward movement between blue-collar origins and farming destinations is .35 (F), in contrast to 1.18 (H) for upward movement between the two. This finding is a reflection of the finding already reported on earlier in this section; namely, there is more upward mobility than downward mobility for females in the occupational structure.

1It is realized that a boundary does not exist for upward movement between farming origins and blue-collar destinations. The figure is simply utilized for the sake of comparison.
One further point should be made about Table 3.6. If the boundaries for upward and downward movement are combined, two general barriers become evident for movement of females in the occupational structure. The first is a barrier between the white-collar occupations and the occupations of both blue-collar and farming. This is represented by the double line drawn between the destination categories of sales and craftsmen in Table 3.6. Thus, the white-collar occupations as an origin grouping do not show proportionate downward mobility into either blue-collar occupations or farming occupations. Further, the white-collar occupations as a destination grouping do not show proportionate upward mobility from either blue-collar occupations or farming occupations. A second barrier exists between the blue-collar occupations and the farming occupations. This is represented by the double line drawn between cells E and F in Table 3.6. Thus the blue-collar occupations as an origin grouping do not show proportionate downward mobility into farming. However, the blue-collar occupations as a destination grouping do show more than proportionate mobility from the farming occupations. As a result, we might refer to the barrier between blue-collar and farming occupations as one-way restrictive (shows only less than proportionate downward mobility), while the barrier between white-collar occupations and the other two groupings is two-way restrictive (shows both less than proportionate upward mobility and downward mobility).

This section has presented an analysis of the direction of
mobility and further dealt with the question as to whether there are any empirically defined grouping boundaries for movement of females within the occupational structure. It is interesting to note that Table 3.5, used in the analysis of direction of mobility, and Table 3.6, used in the analysis of grouping boundaries essentially support one another, though the former table was calculated excluding the factor of occupational inheritance and the latter table including this factor. Both tables indicate: (1) short-distance mobility exceeds long-distance mobility, (2) there is proportionately more upward mobility than downward mobility, and (3) there is proportionately more upward mobility from blue-collar origins to white-collar destinations than downward mobility from white-collar origins to blue-collar destinations.

This chapter has presented the intergenerational mobility patterns of females within the American occupational structure. Summarized are the findings of this chapter. First, the section dealing with the flow of female workers indicates the following mobility characteristics for females: (1) occupational inheritance is greater than that expected on the assumption of statistical independence, (2) nevertheless, a large amount of mobility is present, (3) upward mobility is more prevalent than downward mobility, and (4) short-distance mobility occurs more often than long-distance mobility. Second, the section concerned with the volume of supply and recruitment initially reiterates the general themes of occupational inheritance and short-distance movement, and then shows that
the lower occupational categories in the three major occupational groupings of white-collar, blue-collar, and farming are the distributors of female workers in the occupational structure. Third, the section examining the concentration of supply and recruitment reports that the white-collar occupational categories are more concentrated in terms of supply than are the blue-collar occupational categories, but this finding does not hold for concentration of recruitment. Lastly, the section presented to deal with the problem of direction of mobility and class boundaries first indicates in a more rigorous fashion that the dominant direction of mobility is upward, and then shows that there is a two-way restrictive barrier between the white-collar grouping and the other two groupings, while there is only a one-way restrictive barrier between the blue-collar grouping and the farming grouping.
CHAPTER IV

PATTERNS OF MOVEMENT FOR MALES IN THE OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE

Introduction

This chapter presents the intergenerational mobility patterns of males within the American occupational structure. These patterns will be examined by an analysis parallel to that of females in Chapter III. The mobility characteristics of males will be considered initially. Following this, the two aspects of intergenerational supply and recruitment will be analyzed for males; namely, volume and concentration. Finally, the question of the existence or non-existence of empirically defined boundaries for movement of males within the occupational structure will be dealt with. Again, this third problem will involve a specific determination of the direction of mobility.

The section format for this chapter will be similar to the immediately preceding chapter with one addition; there will be a concluding section comparing the mobility patterns of females with those of males. The tables presented in this chapter will parallel in form and sequence those for females in Chapter III.

Before moving into the analysis, one point from Chapter II should be reiterated. This is that the data utilized in this chapter to describe male patterns of movement in the occupational structure have been obtained from the study by both Blau and
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Duncan. The choice of this analysis, though others were available, provides the most meaningful comparisons between female and male patterns of movement, since the research of Blau and Duncan was used as the model for the analysis of female workers in the preceding chapter.

The Flow of Male Workers

Is mobility present for males within the occupational structure? If so, it is primarily upward or downward movement? Does long-distance or short-distance mobility predominate? Through an analysis of Table 4.1, which presents the intergenerational matrix of movement from occupational origin (father's occupation) to occupational destination (son's occupation) in the form of mobility ratios, answers to these questions will be obtained.

A theoretical model of perfect mobility, defined by statistical independence of occupational origins and occupational destinations, provides the baseline against which all mobility ratios in Table 4.1 are compared. If perfect mobility were the case for males in the

1op. cit., p. 496. As noted in Chapter II, Blau and Duncan's original 17 occupational categories were collapsed into the 10 Census categories in order to make their data comparable to the NORC data.

2The NORC data for males could have been analyzed in this chapter. However, the use of Blau and Duncan's data allows the analysis of an independent national sample of males which can be compared with the analysis of females' occupational mobility derived from the NORC data. Tables for the NORC males, comparable to those presented in this chapter for Blau and Duncan males, are found in the Appendix.
### TABLE 4.1 MOBILITY FROM FATHER’S OCCUPATION TO SON’S OCCUPATION: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCIES TO FREQUENCIES EXPECTED ON THE ASSUMPTION OF INDEPENDENCE (N=33972)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>1.2*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2*</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.2*</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.4*</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2*</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.0*</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.5*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells

Source: Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 496.
occupational structure, each destination category would have the same distribution of origins as the total population, each origin category would have the same distribution of destinations as the total population, and all indices in Table 4.1 would be 1.0.

If occupational inheritance, the opposite of perfect mobility, were the dominant factor, all males would be located in the ten cells on the major diagonal. Obviously, this is not the case since 89 of the off-diagonal cells contain male workers. A considerable amount of movement from father's occupational category is thus indicated for males in the occupational structure.

A rough indication of the dominant direction of mobility is the number of underscored mobility ratios lying on either side of the major diagonal. The underlined values to the left of the diagonal, which denote disproportionate upward mobility (over 1.0) exceed by more than two to one (21:9) those to the right, which denote disproportionate downward mobility. Thus, by this rough indicator, upward mobility is more prevalent for males in the occupational structure than is downward mobility.

Short-distance movement surpasses long-distance movement. Most of the underscored mobility ratios are concentrated around the major diagonal, marking short-distance mobility. There are a few areas near the upper right and lower left corners which indicate some longer distance mobility. The mobility ratios usually are greatest on the diagonal and decrease with movement away from it. In general then, the closer two occupational categories are in rank, the
greater is the intergenerational flow of male workers between them.

Nevertheless, there are numerous exceptions to this general tendency for the flow of male workers to occur between occupational categories of similar ranking. For example, Blau and Duncan\(^1\) state these exceptions reflect industrial lines which constitute stronger barriers to mobility than do skill levels within an industry.

In summary, the data in Table 4.1 have indicated the following mobility characteristics for males: (1) in all cases occupational inheritance is greater than that expected on chance occupational destinations, i.e., the assumption of statistical independence, (2) however, a large amount of mobility is still present, (3) instances of upward mobility are more prevalent than instances of downward mobility, and (4) short-distance movement is more frequent than long-distance movement.

Intergenerational Supply and Recruitment:
Volume and Direction

The questions which will be under consideration in this section are: (1) what is the outflow of male workers supplied by each occupational origin category to the various destination categories, (2) what proportion of sons does each occupational origin category supply to a given occupational category, and (3) what is the inflow of workers recruited from the various occupational origin categories

\(^{1}\) For further discussion of this point see op. cit., p. 37.
by each occupational category? The first two of these questions deal with supply, while the last is concerned with recruitment.

Table 4.2 presents the matrix of horizontally computed outflow percentages. The first question to be answered through an analysis of this table is: what proportion of its sons does a given social origin category supply to each of the various occupational destination categories? This involves analyzing the table by row; that is, viewing each origin category separately.

Generally, the percentages in Table 4.2 are highest or nearly highest in the major diagonal and decrease with movement away from it. This reflects a tendency for social origin categories to supply their sons to the same occupational category in the next generation (self-supply). It further indicates that if there is movement, it is more likely to be short-distance movement. To illustrate these two points the percentages on either side of that percentage on the diagonal are added for each origin category. (For the professional category, the two percentages to the right of the diagonal are taken, since there is not a percentage to the left of the diagonal for this category. Similarly for farm laborers, the two percentages to the left of the diagonal are taken, since there is not a percentage to the right of the diagonal for this category.) The three summed adjacent percentages for each origin category from professionals through farm laborers are 65.4, 62.8, 35.2, 33.1, 51.6, 38.3, 24.5, 30.6, and 29.8 respectively. Now, if there were equal supply of male workers to each destination category from each
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>41.0*</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>34.1*</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>9.6*</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15.0*</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>29.4*</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>25.9*</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>11.1*</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>14.2*</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>17.8*</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.2*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in Various Destinations</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells

Source: Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 496.
origin category, a value of 30.0 per cent would be expected for the summed adjacent percentages for any three origin categories. However, it can be seen that every origin category and its two adjacent categories exhibit a value in excess of 30.0 per cent, except laborers and farm laborers. As a result, the general tendencies toward self-supply and short-distance movement are again supported by the outflow percentages for males in Table 4.2.¹

The less self-supply there is in a given category the greater is the outflow of sons from this origin category to other occupational destinations. The five occupational categories with the least self-supply, as Table 4.2 indicates, are the two lowest white-collar, the two lowest blue-collar, and the lower of the two farming categories. Fathers in these three categories supply 85 per cent or more of their sons to other destinations. Sons of men in occupations near the bottom of one of the three broad occupational groupings seemingly have exceptional opportunities for mobility. In contrast, professionals reveal the largest degree of self-supply and therefore fathers in this category are less likely to supply sons to other occupational destinations. Blau and Duncan² attribute this restriction on the outflow of sons from this category to its recent growth and high prestige.

As stated in the introduction to this section, there is a

¹Again, there are inconsistencies with these general patterns. For discussion of these inconsistencies and the reasons involved see loc. cit., p. 29.

²loc. cit., p. 40.
second question to be dealt with when considering the process of supply, namely: what proportion of sons do the various occupational origins supply to a given occupational destination category? Answering this question involves an analysis of Table 4.2 by column, that is, viewing each destination category separately. The concern here is with a comparison of the extent to which each origin supplies sons to a given destination.

Analyzing Table 4.2 indicates that in every instance but one, the factor of self-supply provides the largest percentage in each destination’s column. (This exception is operative where the origin category of laborers sends 26.3 per cent of its workers into operatives, whereas the origin category of operatives sends but 25.9 per cent of its workers into operatives.) Further, the values in each column (destination category) tend to decrease with movement away from the diagonal cell, thus showing the largest percentages in the various destination categories belong to occupational origin categories similar in ranking. Both of these findings are again rough reflections of the general tendencies toward self-supply and short-distance movement.

Table 4.3 will be utilized to answer the third question posed at the beginning of this section. This table presents the vertically computed inflow percentages for males, and shows what proportion of males in each occupational destination category was recruited from the various occupational origin categories.

The less self-recruitment there is in an occupational category, the more it must rely on the inflow of male workers recruited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>15.3*</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>24.7*</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.0*</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11.7*</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>26.1*</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.5*</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.7*</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14.1*</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>84.9*</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.7*</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells

Source: Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 496.
from other occupational origins. Table 4.3 shows that the occupational category with the largest inflow of outsiders, gaining 95 per cent of its workers from other origins, is clerical workers. Farmers, conversely, disclose by far the highest rate of self-recruitment, recruiting less than 16 per cent of their male workers from different origins, while no other occupational category recruits less than 73 per cent from other origins.

The five occupational categories characterized by the highest rates of inflow within their respective occupational groupings are the two lowest white-collar, the two lowest blue-collar, and the lower of the two farm categories. These occupational categories, clerical workers, salesworkers, service workers, operatives, and farm laborers correspond to those formerly discussed occupational categories characterized by a high rate of outflow of male workers. Thus, the lower occupational categories in the three major occupational groupings of white-collar, blue-collar, and farming may be considered the distributors of male workers in the occupational structure. Disproportionate numbers move into their ranks from different origins, as well as disproportionate numbers moving from their ranks to other destinations. The distributing occupational categories are channels for upward mobility, into which successful sons from lower origins tend to move and from which successful sons tend to move to higher destinations. In addition, they provide a net to catch the downwardly mobile sons of higher white-collar and blue-collar origins, so enabling them to retain their white-collar and blue-collar statuses respectively.
Intergenerational Supply and Recruitment: Concentration

The analysis of intergenerational supply and recruitment, up to this point, has been concerned with analyzing the volume of supply and recruitment. This section, however, shifts to a consideration of the concentration of supply and recruitment. Whereas the section dealing with volume of supply and recruitment was specifically concerned with how many sons had left their fathers' occupational categories in relation to the number who had remained in their fathers' categories, or with how many sons were recruited into occupational categories other than their fathers' in relation to the number recruited into the same categories as their fathers; this section will disregard self-supply and self-recruitment and focus on the degree of concentration in supply and recruitment of the sons who either have moved out of their fathers' categories or have moved into categories other than their fathers'.

Table 4.4 presents the indices of concentration of supply and recruitment. Column 1 of this table gives the indices for concentration of supply while column 2 relates the indices for concentration of recruitment. Keeping in mind that a high value of the indice is to be interpreted as high concentration, it can be seen that column 1 shows that the outflow of sons of managers is most concentrated in respect to occupational destinations, while the sons of service workers have become the most dispersed as adults. Further,

---

1For construction of this index see Chapter III, pp. 72-3.
TABLE 4.4  INDEXES OF CONCENTRATION OF SUPPLY AND RECRUITMENT BETWEEN DESTINATION OF VERTICALLY MOBILE MALES AND DISTRIBUTION EXPECTED ON THE MODEL OF QUASI-INDEPENDENCE,* FOR SPECIFIED ORIGIN OR DESTINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occ. of Origin or Destination</th>
<th>Concentration of Supply</th>
<th>Concentration of Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Occ. to Son's Occ.</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son's Occ. from Father's Occ.</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The use here of the term quasi-independence refers to the fact that non-mobile males have been excluded in the calculation of this index.

Source: Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 496.

Column 2 indicates that farm laborers are recruited from the most concentrated occupational origins, whereas service workers are recruited from the most dispersed occupational origins.

It is obvious that various cases of concentration of supply and concentration of recruitment are not identical for the same categories. A Spearman's rho performed on the data in Table 4.4 yields no relationship.
The data pertaining to concentration of supply (column 1) reveal an interesting point. If the magnitudes of the indices for white-collar occupational categories are compared with the magnitudes of the indices for blue-collar occupational categories, it becomes evident that, overall, the indices for the white-collar occupational categories are larger. Thus the white-collar grouping is more concentrated in supply than the blue-collar grouping. This finding has some important theoretical implications which will be discussed in the final chapter.

Column 2 of Table 4.4, however, does not exhibit this pattern. There does not appear to be an overall difference between white-collar occupational categories and blue-collar occupational categories in terms of the magnitudes of their indices of concentration. Rather, the farm grouping reveals by far a greater concentration of recruitment than either the white-collar or blue-collar groupings.

Mobility and Grouping Boundaries

This section focuses initially on the specific direction of mobility for males in the occupational structure. From there, the analysis proceeds to a consideration of the related question as to whether there are any empirically defined boundaries for upward mobility or downward mobility of males.

Table 4.5 will be utilized to determine the direction of mobility for males in the occupational structure. It will be remembered from Chapter III that the indices in this table refer to the excess
TABLE 4.5 SUPPLY TO AND FROM HIGHER RANKING OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCY TO FREQUENCY EXPECTED ON THE MODEL OF QUASI-INDEPENDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Upward Mobility</th>
<th>Downward Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father's Occ.</td>
<td>Father's Occ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Son's Occ.</td>
<td>to Son's Occ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 496.

Over expectations in the outflow to higher or the inflow from higher occupational categories for each of the ten occupational categories when non-mobile females are excluded from the computation. The outflow column (1) designates upward mobility and the inflow column (2) denotes downward mobility, because only mobility between given occupational categories and all those above it are considered in either case.

The first pattern evident in Table 4.5 is that the values for both inflow and outflow generally decrease as the status rank order of occupational categories is descended. The higher the status of
an occupational category, the more the flow of male workers between it and higher categories in both directions (upward and downward mobility) exceeds the volume expected on the assumption of quasi-independence. This finding indicates more short-distance than long-distance movement. There are, however, two definite exceptions to this pattern in column 2. The inflow of males into sales is higher than the inflow into either managers or professionals, which is indicative of more downward mobility. Further, the inflow of males into farming is higher than the inflow into the blue-collar categories, again indicative of more downward mobility.

Of special interest in Table 4.5 is the finding for inflow from higher ranking occupational categories (column 2) that all blue-collar occupational categories have values less than 1.0. Yet for outflow into higher ranking categories, the same four blue-collar occupational categories have values higher than that to be expected on the assumption of quasi-independence. This finding indicates that there is substantially more upward mobility from blue-collar origins to white-collar destinations than downward mobility from white-collar origins to blue-collar destinations.

A surprising aspect of the outflow values (column 1) is that all but one (farmers) reveal an excess of upward mobility. What is the source of all this upward mobility? Blau and Duncan\(^1\) attribute it to a decreasing need for workers in farming and menial labor.

\(^1\)op. cit., p. 66.
occupations and an increasing need for workers in the higher status occupations. The resulting pull at the top of the occupational structure has created a chain reaction of short-distance movement throughout the entire occupational structure.

A question related to that of the direction of mobility is: are there any empirically defined boundaries for upward mobility or downward mobility of males within the occupational structure? To answer this question, the mobility ratios presented in Table 4.1 for the ten cross-classified occupational categories have been recalculated for the three cross-classified major occupational groupings of white-collar, blue-collar, and farm. Therefore, we now have a matrix of nine mobility ratios (see Table 4.6), instead of having a matrix of 100 mobility ratios (Table 4.1).

The data on intergenerational movement in Table 4.6 initially indicate that the mobility ratios along the major diagonal are disproportionately large (cells A, E, I). Males in farming with farming origins exhibit the largest value, 2.80. They are followed by males in white-collar occupations with white-collar origins who have a mobility ratio of 1.73. Finally, males in blue-collar work with blue-collar origins show the lowest mobility ratio of the three, 1.12. These large values along the major diagonal are additional reflections of the tendencies toward occupational inheritance and short-distance movement for males in the occupational structure.

Recalling that a boundary refers to movement less than that expected on the assumption of statistical independence (less than 1.0), it is apparent from Table 4.6 that two boundaries for
TABLE 4.6 MOBILITY FROM FATHER’S OCCUPATION TO SON’S OCCUPATION IN TERMS OF THE THREE CROSS-CLASSIFIED MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPINGS: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCIES TO FREQUENCIES EXPECTED ON THE ASSUMPTION OF INDEPENDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1.71*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells

Source: Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 496.
movements of males with white-collar origins are in evidence. First, a boundary exists between white-collar origins and blue-collar destinations since the flow of male workers between these two yields a mobility ratio of .54 (B). Second, an even stronger boundary is in evidence between white-collar origins and farming destinations because the flow of male workers between these two exhibits a mobility ratio of only .20 (C). Both of these boundaries for movement of males with white-collar origins are boundaries for downward movement.

Two boundaries again exist for movement of males with blue-collar origins. First, a boundary exists between blue-collar origins and farming destinations since the mobility ratio denoting this movement is .21 (F). This is a boundary for downward movement. Second, a boundary further exists between blue-collar origins and white-collar destinations because the mobility ratio for this flow of male workers is less than that expected on the assumption of statistical independence, that is, .90 (D). Note that the boundary for downward movement here is considerably stronger than the boundary for upward movement. Thus, there is proportionately more upward mobility from blue-collar origins to white-collar destinations than downward mobility from blue-collar origins to farming destinations, though neither exceeds 1.0.

There is one boundary in evidence for movement of males with farming origins. This boundary exists for upward movement from farming origins to white-collar destinations since the mobility ratio denoting this flow of male workers is .57 (G). A boundary is
not in evidence for movement from farming origins to blue-collar destinations, since the mobility ratio for this movement, $1.07 \text{ (H)}$, is greater than that expected on the assumption of statistical independence. Therefore, farming origins is the only origin grouping which does not show two boundaries for movement of male workers.

In summary, we have reported the following boundaries for movement of males in the occupational structure. For white-collar origins, two boundaries exist for downward movement: (1) between white-collar origins and blue-collar destinations, and (2) between white-collar origins and farming destinations. For blue-collar origins, one boundary exists for downward movement and another boundary for upward movement: (1) between blue-collar origins and farming destinations, and (2) between blue-collar origins and white-collar destinations. For farming origins, one boundary exists for upward movement; namely, between farming origins and white-collar destinations. If the mobility ratios denoting the relative, not the absolute, amount of movement across these boundaries are compared, it becomes evident that in all cases the boundaries for downward movement are stronger than the comparable boundaries for upward movement. Thus the mobility ratio for downward movement between white-collar origins and blue-collar destinations is only $0.54 \text{ (B)}$, as opposed to $0.90 \text{ (D)}$, for upward movement between the two. Further, the mobility ratio for downward movement between white-collar origins and farming destinations is $0.20 \text{ (C)}$ over against that of $0.57 \text{ (G)}$ for upward movement between the two. Finally, the mobility ratio for downward movement between blue-collar origins and farming
destinations is .21 (F), in contrast to 1.07 (H) for upward movement between the two.\(^1\) This finding is a reflection of the finding already reported on earlier in this section, that there is more upward mobility than downward mobility for males in the occupational structure.

One further point should be made about Table 4.6. If the boundaries for upward and downward movement are combined, two general barriers become evident for movement of males in the occupational structure. The first is a barrier between the white-collar grouping and the groupings of both blue-collar and farming. This is represented by the double line drawn between the destination categories of sales and craftsmen in Table 4.6. Thus the white-collar grouping as an origin grouping does not show proportionate downward mobility into either the blue-collar grouping or the farm grouping. Further, the white-collar grouping as a destination grouping does not show proportionate upward mobility from either the blue-collar grouping or the farm grouping. A second barrier exists between the blue-collar grouping and the farm grouping. This is represented by the double line drawn between cells E and F in Table 4.6. Thus the blue-collar grouping as an origin grouping does not show proportionate downward mobility into farming. However, the blue-collar grouping as a destination grouping does show more than proportionate mobility from the farming grouping. As a result, we might refer to

\(^1\)It is realized that a boundary does not exist between farming origins and blue-collar destinations. This figure is simply used for the sake of comparison.
the barrier between the blue-collar and farming groupings as one-way restrictive (shows only less than proportionate downward mobility), while the barrier between the white-collar grouping and the other two groupings, is two-way restrictive (shows both less than proportionate upward mobility and downward mobility).

A Comparison of Female Patterns of Movement with Male Patterns of Movement

The final section of this chapter is devoted to comparing female patterns of movement in the occupational structure as presented in Chapter III with male patterns of movement in the occupational structure as presented in the previous sections of this chapter. The discussion in this section will be organized to parallel the comparable sections in both this chapter and in Chapter III.

It will be remembered from Chapter III that in the section entitled, "The Flow of Female Workers", the mobility characteristics of females were enumerated. Those characteristics: a greater than expected amount of occupational inheritance, a large amount of mobility, the prevalence of upward mobility over downward mobility, and the predominance of short-distance movement over long-distance movement are exactly the same characteristics reported for males in this chapter. Hence, the mobility characteristics of all workers in the occupational structure, that is, both males and females, remain the same as those exhibited by males.

The only difference between female and male mobility characteristics is one of degree. Occupational inheritance has been shown to
be a dominant mobility characteristic for both females and males. Yet, the mobility ratios for males along the major diagonal are in most instances larger than those for females.\(^1\) As a result, although both females and males show a greater than expected amount of occupational inheritance, occupational inheritance is more characteristic of males than females in most occupational categories.

Although there is some variation in the magnitudes in the outflow and inflow tables for males and females, the findings derived from these tables are again consistent across sex lines. Thus the outflow and inflow tables, both for females and males, further substantiate the general tendencies toward occupational inheritance and short-distance movement in the occupational structure. In addition, these tables for both females and males show that the lower occupations in the three major occupational groupings are the distributors of workers in the occupational structure. They are channels for upward mobility, as well as receivers of the downwardly mobile within their respective groupings.

The high degree of consonance between female and male patterns of movement in the occupational structure continues when a comparison of the concentration of supply and recruitment for females and males is brought under consideration. The indices designating concentration of supply for females (Table 3.4, column 1) indicate that white-collar categories are more concentrated in supply than

\(^1\)See Tables 3.1, p. 59; and Table 4.1, p. 89.
are blue-collar occupational categories. When the indices denoting concentration of supply for males (Table 4.4, column 1) are considered, the same pattern presents itself. Moreover, though this pattern is not evident for females when their indices of concentration of recruitment are examined, neither is it indicated for males when their indices of concentration of recruitment are studied. Finally, the indexes of concentration of supply and concentration of recruitment are not related for females or males.

Comparing females and males on the basis of the direction of mobility indicates no major differences between female and male patterns of movement in the occupational structure. As a result, when supply to and recruitment from higher ranking occupational categories are examined for females and males, the following three patterns emerge: (1) there is more short-distance than long-distance mobility, (2) there is more upward mobility from blue-collar occupational categories to white-collar occupational categories than downward mobility from white-collar categories to blue-collar categories, and (3) overall, there is more upward mobility than downward mobility in the occupational structure.

The final area in which to make comparisons is "mobility and grouping boundaries." It will be remembered that five boundaries were reported for the movement of female workers: two boundaries for downward movement of females with white-collar origins, one boundary for downward movement and one boundary for upward movement of females with blue-collar origins, and one boundary for upward movement of females with farming origins. These five boundaries
coincide exactly with the boundaries found to exist for movement of males in the occupational structure. As a result, when the five boundaries are collapsed into two general barriers, a two-way restrictive barrier between the white-collar and the other two groupings and a one-way restrictive barrier for downward movement between the blue-collar and farming groupings, the barriers for female movement coincide with the barriers for male movement. In fact, the resemblance of these barriers for female and male movement extends even to the magnitude of their values which indicate their presence. Thus if the cells in Table 3.6 and the cells in Table 4.6 were put in rank order on the basis of the values of their mobility ratios, it would be seen that the rank orderings are practically the same for the females as for the males. (The only exception would be that cells E and H would be reversed for the two tables.)

The above comparison of female and male patterns of movement has utilized the NORC data for females and the Blau and Duncan data for males. The high degree of consonance between female and male patterns of movement would remain, however, if the NORC data on females were compared to the NORC data on males. The Appendix supports this point by illustrating there are no major differences in male patterns of movement between the Blau and Duncan data and the NORC data on males.

The strict comparability of female and male patterns of movement in the occupational structure is evident from the foregoing analysis. The similarities of the complex patterns call forth a statement
concerning the theoretical areas discussed in Chapter I. This statement will be presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS
FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The objective of this research was to present a systematic analysis on a national basis of female intergenerational occupational mobility patterns within the American occupational structure. The patterns of mobility were studied through an analysis of the movement of females among different occupational categories. Comparisons were then made with the already known occupational mobility patterns for males.

This objective was accomplished through an analysis of national sample data obtained from NORC and Blau and Duncan. The variables used in the analysis were father's occupation and respondent's occupation (female and male). In large part, the analysis paralleled that used by Blau and Duncan in their work, *The American Occupational Structure*.

This chapter considers the findings of this research in relation to the theoretical considerations in Chapter I, general theories of stratification, and future research. The first section briefly summarizes the findings of this research. The second section considers the implications of the relevant findings for the analysis of the female role in American society. Subsequent to this, the implications of the findings for the study of factors basic to occupational mobility are examined. A fourth section
presents the implications of a mobility study such as this for general stratification theories. Finally, suggestions for future research and a closing statement are set down.

Summary of Findings

The following mobility characteristics were discovered for females: (1) occupational inheritance is greater than that expected on the assumption of statistical independence, (2) nevertheless, a high degree of mobility is characteristic of female workers, (3) upward mobility is more prevalent than downward mobility, and (4) short-distance mobility occurs more often than long-distance mobility.

The section of the analysis dealing with the volume of supply and recruitment reaffirmed the findings of occupational inheritance and short-distance movement, and then showed that the lower occupational categories in the three major occupational groupings of white-collar, blue-collar, and farming are the distributors of female workers in the occupational structure. The analysis of the concentration of supply and recruitment indicated that the white-collar occupational categories are more concentrated in terms of supply than are the blue-collar occupational categories, but also that this finding does not hold for concentration of recruitment.

The part of Chapter III dealing with the problem of empirically defined boundaries first indicated in a more rigorous fashion that the dominant direction of mobility for females is upward. It then showed that there is a two-way restrictive barrier between
the white-collar grouping and the groupings of blue-collar and farming, while there is only a one-way restrictive barrier for downward movement between the blue-collar grouping and the farming grouping.

The analysis of male patterns of mobility paralleled that conducted for females. The mobility characteristics of males were first described. These are as follows: (1) occupational inheritance is greater than that expected on the assumption of statistical independence, (2) nevertheless, a large amount of mobility is present, (3) instances of upward mobility are more prevalent than instances of downward mobility, and (4) short-distance movement is more frequent than long-distance movement.

The analysis of the volume of supply and recruitment for males gave additional support to the findings toward occupational inheritance and short-distance movement. It then indicated that the lower occupational categories in the three major occupational groupings are the distributors of male workers in the occupational structure. The analysis of concentration of supply and recruitment showed that the white-collar occupational categories are more concentrated in terms of supply than are the blue-collar occupational categories, but that this finding does not hold for recruitment.

Finally, the last part of the analysis for males demonstrated in a more rigorous fashion that the dominant direction of mobility for males is upward. It then indicated that there is a two-way restrictive barrier between the white-collar grouping and the groupings of blue-collar and farming, while there is only a one-way
restrictive barrier for downward movement between the blue-collar grouping and the farming grouping.

In the last section of Chapter IV female patterns of mobility were compared with male patterns of mobility. The mobility characteristics for the two sexes are almost identical. The differences between female and male mobility characteristics are very slight. For example, occupational inheritance is a dominant mobility characteristic for females and males except for minor variations in two of the cells.¹

A comparison of females with males on the volume of supply and recruitment also revealed similar findings. The analysis of both females and males in this context again pointed to the general tendencies toward occupational inheritance and short-distance movement in the occupational structure. In addition, the data for both sexes showed that the lower occupations in the three major occupational groupings are the distributors of workers in the occupational structure. Concentration of supply for both females and males indicates that the white-collar categories are more concentrated in supply than are the blue-collar occupational categories. Further, the data showed that this finding does not hold for either sex when the concentration of recruitment is considered.

A comparison of females and males in the third part of the analysis—the direction of mobility and grouping boundaries—again revealed no major differences. The analysis shows that the

¹See Table 3.1, p. 59.
dominant direction of mobility in the occupational structure is upward. Further, there are two general barriers for movement in the occupational structure for both sexes: (1) a two-way restrictive barrier between the white-collar and the other two groupings, and (2) a one-way restrictive barrier for downward movement between the blue-collar grouping and the farming grouping.

This analysis indicates that there are no major differences between female patterns of movement and male patterns of movement in the occupational structure. This rather startling finding has implications for the theoretical statements and predictions made in Chapter I. The subsequent sections explore these implications.

Implications of the Research for the Analysis of the Female Role

In Chapter I a general theoretical analysis of the female role in American society was developed as a basis on which to predict female patterns of mobility in the occupational structure. It was suggested that changes in the economic basis of the social structure since the Industrial Revolution have resulted in differential shifts in the roles of men and women. While the social roles of men have remained quite clearly defined, those of women have become subject to a large measure of ambiguity. This role ambiguity of the female has engendered a lack of certainty on the part of the female concerning education and occupational roles. As a result, there has been an apparent selectivity in the occupations in which women generally engage. Females are moving into occupations already heavily
female, newly emerging occupations defined as female from the start, and previous male occupations which have been taken over by females. In addition, females are under-represented in the most prestigious occupations, while being over-represented in the intermediate status occupations.

On the basis of these theoretical statements, the following predictions about female patterns of mobility in comparison to the already known male patterns were made: (1) that females would show less occupational inheritance than males, (2) that females would exhibit less upward mobility than males, and (3) that females would indicate less long-distance upward mobility and more long-distance downward mobility than males. Interpretation of the data collected to test these predictions follows.

Although occupational inheritance is somewhat more characteristic of males, females as well as males show considerable occupational inheritance in excess of that expected on the basis of statistical independence. Second, the prediction that females would indicate less upward mobility than males proved to be unfounded. Females, like males, showed a preponderance of upward mobility over downward mobility. Finally, the data did not indicate any discernable differences between the sexes regarding long-distance versus short-distance mobility. Females did not show less long-distance upward mobility than males. In sum, the predictions based on the literature concerning the female role did not materialize in any appreciable manner.

The highly articulated literature concerning the female role in
American society, therefore, did not prove to be an adequate basis from which to predict female patterns of mobility in the occupational structure. Although female role ambiguity and its supposed consequence of over-representation in the intermediate status occupations would lead to an expectation of differences between female and male patterns of mobility, such an expectation is highly suspect in view of the findings. In fact, the high degree of convergence between female and male patterns of mobility seems to call into question this literature on female role ambiguity and its supposed effect on female participation in the labor force. Perhaps females are no longer experiencing role ambiguity to the extent to which this literature leads one to expect. Perhaps female role ambiguity does not affect female mobility patterns in the manner in which the literature leads one to expect. At any rate, one point is obvious: the literature concerning the female role in American society and its supposed consequent effect on female participation in the labor force is not an adequate theoretical base from which to predict female mobility patterns.

An alternative interpretation of the findings in this context is that the "masking effect" mentioned in an earlier chapter was in fact operative. This masking effect can occur where broad occupational categories are used rather than specific occupations. To illustrate, it was noted that females have not entered the higher status professional occupations to the degree males have. Yet, a great many females are engaged in lower status professional occupations such as nursing and teaching, with the result that there is
approximately as great a percentage of female workers classified as professionals as male workers classified as professionals. Thus, the use of the broad category of professionals masks the status discrepancy between female professionals and male professionals.

The "masking effect" might then be forwarded as an alternative interpretation of the high degree of convergence between female and male mobility patterns. In other words, the use of broad occupational categories in this study has masked the "real" differences between female and male occupational mobility patterns. Yet, this interpretation can hardly be considered adequate. To be sure, the masking effect could easily be operative in the case of professionals, but it is doubtful whether it would hold for all the other occupational categories. But the convergence of findings for females and males holds when all occupational categories are brought under consideration, whether they be high or low ranked occupational categories. Therefore, it seems unlikely that the masking effect can account for the congruence of female and male mobility patterns.

This section has considered the findings of this research in terms of the predictions put forth in Chapter I. These predictions, based on the literature dealing with the female role in American society, proved to be unsupported. In view of this, the literature concerned with female role ambiguity is called into question. An alternative interpretation, the masking effect, was also considered. This latter interpretation, however, was shown to be unlikely as an explanation of findings of female and male mobility patterns.
Implications of this Research for the Study of Factors Basic to Occupational Mobility

In Chapter I a rather lengthy section was devoted to discussing the factors basic to occupational mobility. These factors can be thought of as affecting mobility by operating on the occupational system or by influencing the mobility of individuals. Hence, two modes of analysis, system and individual, have been employed in the study of these factors. The development of technology and science, differential birth rates, and the structure of the family were discussed as systemic factors. Education, wealth, and the results of the socialization process were discussed as individual characteristics affecting mobility, but these factors can also be used for analysis at the system level.

The discussion of these factors took the form of initially presenting their extant conceptualization, i.e., for males, and then indicating the analysis or questions of analysis they raise for females. This section considers the findings of this research in relation to these questions of analysis raised for females in Chapter I.

Over the past fifty years, the development of technology and science has resulted in a greater proportion of higher level professional positions. This situation has required a surge of upward mobility to fill the now more plentiful higher status professional positions.

It was suggested in Chapter I that males and females may not be equally able to take advantage of this opportunity for upward
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mobility. Since in many of the high status professional occupations the male dominated normative structures do not permit effective functioning of females, it might be expected that females would not be as able to take the same advantage of this opportunity for upward mobility as males.

The findings of this research throw such a suggestion into question. Females, as well as males, are moving in considerable numbers into the professional occupations. Both females and males recruit approximately 85 per cent of their professional workers from occupations other than professional. Moreover, the percentage of all female workers and the percentage of all male workers engaged in professional occupations is approximately the same, about 12 per cent. Hence, both females and males are taking advantage of the opportunity for upward mobility provided by the development of technology and science.

One qualification should be noted in relation to the foregoing statements. Although females and males are equally represented in the professional category in terms of proportions, females, more than males, have tended to enter lower status professional occupations such as teaching and nursing. Thus, there is a status discrepancy between female professionals and male professionals which is not directly indicated in this study due to the masking effect.

A second systemic variable discussed in Chapter I is

1 See Table 3.3, p. 69; and Table 4.3, p. 96.
2 See Table 2.2, p. 46; and Table 2.3, p. 47.
differential birth rates among occupational categories. In the American occupational structure men at the top of the structure tend to have smaller families than those at lower levels, thus making room at the top.

In conjunction with the discussion of this factor, it was indicated that it is not known how this variable of replacement affects the mobility of females since replacement has been characteristically conceptualized as the replacement of fathers by sons. In this study, however, replacement has been conceptualized as the replacement of fathers by daughters. Consequently, some statements can be made about the place of females in replacement and the mobility of females because of replacement.

First, it was shown in Chapter II that working females, non-working females, and working males have similar social origins, that is, the distribution of fathers' occupations for each of these groups is essentially the same. Hence, the starting point for the consideration of replacement (father's occupation) is similar for females and males. Moreover, the kind and degree of occupational inheritance, as well as other mobility characteristics, are similar for females and males. As a result, one is led to conclude that replacement is affecting the mobility of females and males in a similar fashion.

The third systemic factor discussed in Chapter I is the structure of the family. In American society, a given nuclear family is relatively independent of other family ties. This independence affects the process of occupational mobility by not imposing
burdens of kinship obligation and may facilitate individual achievement.

It was suggested that females may not be as able to take advantage of this opportunity for individual achievement as males for two reasons. First, females are normatively and physically tied down for a time to child bearing and child rearing and hence do not have as much time for an occupation as do males. Second, females are more dependent than males on the values of their families of origin toward obtaining an occupation, and such values in the case of females are in many instances both vague and inconsistent. Yet in view of the convergence of female and male patterns of mobility, one is forced to dismiss these reasons as important for explaining female mobility. Females appear to be taking advantage of the opportunity for individual achievement which the independent type of family structure allows to the same extent as males.

Education is fast becoming an indispensable prerequisite for occupational mobility. The question was raised in Chapter I as to whether education may differentially affect the mobility of females and males since, on the systemic level, it is known that it is generally considered less important for females to get an education than it is for males. Further, on the individual level, education may differentially affect females and males because females more often than males enter and re-enter the labor force. However, the lack of difference between female and male patterns of mobility would suggest that females are able to be mobile in relation to their level of education to the same extent as males.
The indirect use of wealth (buying an education) was considered as an individual characteristic affecting mobility. In relation to this factor, it was indicated that the indirect use of wealth may be a more important factor in the case of males since education is more valued for males than for females. That is, education being more valued for males, it might be expected that families would more consistently tend to buy their sons an education than their daughters.

The findings of this research, however, throw such a suggestion into question. First, if families were more consistently buying their sons an education than their daughters, it would be expected that patterns of male and female occupational inheritance would be different, since occupational inheritance generally requires an education be bought at the same level as the father's education. Second, if sons were being purchased an education more consistently than daughters, it would further be expected that males would indicate more upward mobility than females. Yet, the patterns of occupational inheritance and upward mobility for males and females are the same. As a result, it appears that either sons and daughters are being bought similar educations, or if they are being bought dis-similar educations, the difference is only great enough to have but a negligible effect on their mobility patterns.

The final factor basic to mobility which was considered in Chapter I is the type of socialization within the family. It was indicated that though systematic differences exist between socialization of females and males, it is not known how these differences
will affect the mobility patterns of females as opposed to those of males. The convergence of female and male patterns of occupational inheritance and upward mobility discovered in this research, suggest that the differences in socialization between females and males which could result in different patterns of occupational inheritance and upward mobility do not affect the similarities in socialization which resulted in similar patterns of occupational inheritance and upward mobility.

This section has considered the findings of this research in relation to the factors basic to occupational mobility discussed in Chapter I. Although these factors seemingly admitted to differing mobility patterns for males and females, such differences did not materialize. Consequently, it seems that females and males are affected by these factors in a similar fashion.

It should be reiterated before leaving this section that this research was not designed to specifically study these factors basic to occupational mobility. Only the consequences of the functioning of these factors, patterns of mobility, have been researched. As a result, any direct specification as to how these factors affect mobility patterns, female or male, must be left to further research.

This Research and General Theories of Stratification

General theories of stratification date back to the last century. Marx's theory of social change by class conflict and

---
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Durkheim's\(^1\) theory of the division of labor are noteworthy examples of such theories. It is interesting to note that the theories of Marx and Durkheim, like many other general theories of social class and stratification, seemingly have had little influence on contemporary systematic research of mobility.

A number of major problems are involved in drawing implications from a specific mobility research for general theories of stratification. First, these theories require comparative mobility studies, either cross-cultural or historical, to test their propositions. Second, these theories emphasize strata or social interaction as essential for the development of stratification, a variable on which mobility researches rarely gather information. Finally, these theories point up the multi-dimensionality of social stratification, whereas mobility researches usually operationalize stratification as unidimensional.

According to Blau and Duncan,\(^2\) the reason for this omission of stratification theory in mobility research is not simply the often reiterated accusation that the grand theories are not formulated in terms that make them amenable to empirical investigation. It is more than that. These stratification theories of the last century seek to explain social stratification on the basis of the historical conditions which have produced them. This type of explanation implies a comparative framework in which differences in institutional


\(^2\)op. cit., p. 3.
conditions between historical periods or societies are related to consequent differences in stratification systems. Hence, to explain the conditions that have produced the distinctive features of a particular stratification system, it is necessary to compare it with at least one other historical period or one other stratification system. This and most other empirical studies of social mobility, however, have been limited to the investigation of a single historical period or society.

An additional problem with these general theories of Marx and Durkheim is that they emphasize either strata or social interaction as an explanation and necessary condition for the development of social stratification. More specifically, Marx emphasizes both within and between strata interaction as essential for the formation of class consciousness, which in turn is a necessary condition for the development of stratification. Durkheim, on the other hand, emphasizes the extent of social interaction as essential for the formation of the division of labor, which in turn is a necessary condition for the development of stratification. Yet mobility research, and this one included, rarely gathers information on the type of strata interaction or the extent of social interaction. As a result, mobility research as presently designed is not geared for the study of problems posed by these general theories of stratification of the last century.

A third major problem in linking general stratification theory

\footnote{ibid.}
and mobility research is illustrated by the work of Weber\(^1\) and Warner.\(^2\) Weber's distinction of class, status, and party points to the existence of different dimensions of social stratification. Warner, through his community studies, was led to the same conclusion: there are more dimensions than simply the economic along which societies are stratified. Hence, both Weber and Warner emphasized the multi-dimensionality of social stratification. This emphasis makes problematic the relating of mobility research utilizing only a single dimension of stratification (such as occupation) to general stratification theory.

The remainder of this section is devoted to a consideration of the functional theory of stratification. Subsequent to enumerating the theory as proposed by Davis and Moore, some specific implications of this research for the functional theory of stratification will be set down.

The functional theory of stratification as proposed by Davis and Moore\(^3\) rests on the assumption that no society is without some form of stratification. The theory attempts to explain, in

---


functional terms, the universal necessity for stratification in any social system. Since societies differ in the degree and kind of stratification, the theory also considers types of "social inequality" and the factors which produce them.

As indicated previously in this section, a comparative analysis is required to make reliable statements regarding these factors which vary between stratification systems. Hence, in the following discussion particular attention is paid to general principles of stratification which are intended to apply to all societies.

The functional necessity of stratification is explained on the basis that as a functioning mechanism a society must in some manner distribute its members in social positions and induce them to perform the duties of these positions. Thus, the society must concern itself with motivation at two different levels: to motivate the proper individuals to fill certain positions, and once in these positions, to motivate them to perform the duties attached to them. Whether a "positional system" is competitive or non-competitive, both types of motivation are required. The major difference between these two systems is that in the competitive system more emphasis is

---

placed on the motivation to achieve positions, whereas in the non-competitive system greater importance is attached to the motivation to perform the duties of the positions.

Some positions are regarded as functionally more important for the survival of society than are others. Also, it is essential that the duties of all positions be performed with the diligence that their importance requires. Inevitable, then, a society must have some kind of rewards it can use as inducements and some way of distributing these rewards differentially according to positions. These rewards include things that contribute to "sustenance and comfort", "humor and diversion", and "self-respect and ego expansion." The greatest rewards and highest rank are accorded to those occupying positions which have the greatest functional importance for society and require the greatest training.

Davis and Moore conclude that part of their theory dealing with the functional necessity of stratification with this statement:

If the rights and perquisites of different positions in a society must be unequal, then the society must be stratified, because that is precisely what stratification means. Social inequality is thus an unconsciously evolved device by which societies insure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons. Hence every society, no matter how simple or complex, must differentiate persons in terms of both prestige and esteem, and must therefore possess a certain

---

1Parsons makes somewhat the same point, see Parsons, Talcott, "A Revised Analytical Approach to the Theory of Stratification." In Bendix and Lipset, op. cit., 1953, pp. 104-5.

2For an explanation of these rewards see Davis and Moore, op. cit., p. 243.
amount of institutionalized inequality.¹

It should be evident from the aforegoing that, as explained by Davis and Moore, the functional theory of stratification only seeks to set down the universal system variables which are necessary for explaining stratification systems. No consideration is given by the theory to the systematic societal differences between males and females, and the effects of these differences on male and female patterns of mobility. Rather, the theory has been set down implicitly for males. Because this theory has been written with males in mind implicitly, any distinction and comparison between males and females within the framework of this theory first requires that a logical application or extension of the theory be made. That is, before male and female patterns of mobility can be compared within the context of the functional theory of stratification, a logical application of this theory must be made to females in order to determine what patterns of mobility would be expected within the functional framework for females as opposed to males.

The necessary logical application of the functional theory of stratification can most clearly be seen by utilizing the appropriate work of Parsons written with the functional framework. Parsons,² like Davis and Moore, explains social stratification in terms of varying degrees of functional necessity of different positions and

¹Ibid.

the differential rewards attached to them. However, instead of using the more limited term "position" as do Davis and Moore, Parsons uses the broader term "role". Thus, Parsons explains social stratification in terms of differentially evaluated social roles and the differential rewards attached to them.

But Parsons has also written about social roles in another context, namely, the social roles of males and females in American society. ¹ Parsons, consonant with the other theorists and researchers dealing with the roles of males and females in American society, states that the basic aspect of the male role is holding an occupation. In contrast, he writes of the female: "The woman's fundamental status is that of her husband's wife, the mother of his children, and traditionally the person responsible for a complex of activities in connection with the management of the household, care

¹It is interesting to note that although Parsons has used the concept of social roles in the explanation of both social stratification and the different societal expectations for male and female behaviors, he has never brought the two theoretical areas together. It might be argued that Parsons has never linked these two theoretical areas because he is using the concept of social roles differently in each case. It has been pointed out that Parsons uses the concept to refer to either expectations for behavior or the behavior itself. However, considering the level at which Parsons is operating in both of these theoretical areas, this relatively specific distinction would not enter to prohibit the linking of Parson's theory of social stratification and his theory of differential roles of males and females. For a discussion of Parsons' usage of the concept of social roles see Gross, Neal, Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W., Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958. Pp. 13-6.

²Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States," op. cit., p. 608.
of children, etc. However, states Parsons, in addition to the pattern of total domesticity, the female has the alternatives of the careerist role, the glamor role with its specific emphasis on a feminine form of attractiveness, and the common humanistic role with its emphasis on either the cultivation of cultural interests or humanitarian obligations in community welfare. But since the domestic and common humanistic roles are not fulfilling to many women, and since the careerist and glamor patterns are considered by community opinion to threaten the stability of the family, the proper role of the female is not clearly defined and hence ambiguous. This role ambiguity in turn supposedly results in working females being found in the less prestigious or intermediate status occupations.

Parsons, then, is in agreement with the other theorists and researchers discussed in Chapter 1 who dealt with the female role in American society. It was shown in Chapter 1 that when the work of these theorists and researchers concerning the female role is brought under consideration, one is led to expect different patterns of mobility for females as opposed to males. Thus, this literature seems to indicate that females as opposed to males would show less occupational inheritance, less upward mobility, and less long-
distance upward mobility.

The literature on the female role, although written with a functional emphasis, has not been set down in the context of social stratification or mobility patterns. Hence, there still remains a gap between the functional theory of stratification and the literature of the female role. The linkage to fill this gap can be found in the work of Zelditch.¹

Zelditch, using Parson's framework, theorized that a certain amount of differentiation is necessary for the existence of any social system. A social system which is stable over time will differentiate roles such that instrumental leadership, focused on the achievement of tasks, and expressive leadership, focused on emotionally supportive behaviors, are discriminated within that system. Now, the nuclear family can be considered as a special case of the more general class of social systems. As a result, in order to remain stable over time, the nuclear family must also differentiate roles such that the instrumental and expressive functions are fulfilled.

Working from this theoretical basis Zelditch² hypothesized:

If the nuclear family constitutes a social system stable over time, it will differentiate roles such that instrumental leadership and expressive leadership of the system are discriminated.

²loc. cit., pp. 314-5.
Further, because the nuclear family has peculiar features not common to all systems (age and sex differences), Zelditch\(^1\) was able to state an hypothesis about the "allocation" of these roles to system members.

If the nuclear family consists in a defined "normal" complement of the male adult, female adult and their immediate children, the male adult will play the role of instrumental leader and the female adult will play the role of expressive leader.

Zelditch tested these hypotheses on a cross-cultural sample of 56 societies. Although there were a few special cases, his hypotheses were supported.

Of particular interest here is the status of his hypotheses in regard to American society. Zelditch concludes that the male plays the instrumental role and the female the expressive role. Zelditch\(^2\) describes these roles as follows:

... the American male, by definition, must "provide" for his family. He is responsible for the support of his wife and children. His primary area of performance is the occupational role, in which his status fundamental-
tally inheres; and his primary function in the family is to supply an "income," to be the "breadwinner." ... American women, on the other hand, tend to hold jobs before they are married and to quit when "the day" comes; or to continue in jobs of a lower status than their husbands. And not only is the mother the focus of emotional support ..., but much more exclusively so than in most societies .... The cult of the warm, giving "Mom" stands in contrast to the "capable," "competent," "go-getting" male.

Zelditch and Parsons then, have provided the necessary link between the functional theory of stratification and the different roles of males and females. They have done so by stating that differentiation of roles into instrumental and expressive leadership must occur if a social system is going to be stable. This differentiation must also occur in the nuclear family since it is a social system in miniature. Because of age and sex differentials in American society, the male is the instrumental leader and the female the expressive leader. Central to being the instrumental leader in American society is obtaining an occupation; central to being the expressive leader in American society is offering emotionally supportive behavior in the role of "housewife." The warm, giving "Mom" stands in contrast to the "go-getting," occupationally oriented male.

Given this difference in the central aspects of the roles of males and females, one would expect that females would not be able to effectively compete with males in the occupational sphere. Thus Zelditch and Parsons emphasize that the female's occupation is usually one of intermediate status. Further, if this is the case, one would also expect females to show less upward mobility and more
downward mobility than males. At the very least, one would expect different patterns of occupational mobility for females and males.

The functional theory of stratification or differentiation then, when applied and linked to a consideration of the differential roles of females and males in American society, leads to an expectation of different patterns of mobility for females and males. Yet this research has indicated a congruence of female and male patterns of mobility. This apparent inconsistency between the findings of this research and the functional theory of stratification, as proposed by Davis and Moore, and Parsons, raises some interesting questions. Discussion of these follows.

Prior to enumerating any criticism of the functional theory of stratification on the basis of the findings of this research, the following question should be posed. Are the ranked occupations used in this research valid indicators of what Davis and Moore have called differentially rewarded positions and what Parsons has labelled differentially evaluated social roles? The answer to this question is yes. In fact, the functional theory of stratification has been heavily criticized for its near equation of social positions or social roles with occupational roles,¹ since such an equation relegates the concept of social stratification to a hierarchy of occupations. As a result, a consideration of the functional theory

¹See Wrong, op. cit., p. 774. Buckley makes somewhat the same point stating that this limited usage of the concept of social stratification ignores the historical development involved in each particular stratification system. See Buckley, op. cit., p. 373.
of stratification within the context of this research, which utilizes ranked occupations, seems appropriate.

As stated, when the functional theory of stratification is applied and linked to a consideration of the differential role or females and males, one is led to expect different patterns of mobility for females and males. Yet, the findings of this research indicate a congruence in female and male patterns of mobility. Consequently, one might simply conclude that the general principles of stratification set down by Davis and Moore, and Parsons are inadequate in that when applied and linked to a consideration of the different roles of females and males in order to explain the mobility within the American stratification system, they cannot account for the mobility of that more than one-third of the labor force which is female.

It might be argued that the above conclusion is unwarranted in that it is not the functional theory of stratification which is inadequate, but rather its logical application to females. As suggested earlier,¹ perhaps females are no longer experiencing role ambiguity to the extent to which the literature leads one to expect, or perhaps female role ambiguity does not affect female mobility patterns in the manner in which the literature leads one to expect. This is a possible alternative conclusion. However, simply because the literature on the female role is incorrect or dated does not mean, necessarily, that the functional theory of stratification is adequate. As previously illustrated, the literature on the female role

¹See Chapter V, p. 119.
role and the functional theory of stratification are closely linked.

Regardless of which of the above conclusions one accepts about the functional theory of stratification, it seems that, in view of the findings of this research, the theory and its logical application must be reworked so as to be able to explain how those females now in the labor force have been motivated toward occupational achievement and obtaining the education necessary for the occupational achievement they exhibit. As implied above, this would involve either explaining the manner in which these females have been able to resolve the role conflicts and ambiguities so heavily emphasized in the existing literature, or explaining why these role conflicts and ambiguities have dissipated over the past few decades. In any case, as it now stands, the functional theory of stratification and its linked logical application provide an inadequate theoretical framework on which to base an explanation of the mobility patterns characteristic of the American occupational structure.

The relationship of this mobility research to general theories of stratification has been considered in this section. Initially, it was indicated that, in view of the nature of most general stratification theories, there is a need for comparative, interactional, and multi-dimensional mobility studies if the gap between theory and research in this area is going to be lessened. Subsequent to this discussion, some specific implications of this research were drawn for the functional theory of stratification. The findings of this research seemingly indicate that the functional theory of stratifi-
cation, as presently proposed, and its logical application provide an inadequate theoretical basis for the explanation of mobility patterns within the American occupational structure.

Suggestions for Future Research

Based on the previous discussions relating the findings of this research to various areas of theory, the following suggestions for further research are made:

1. To perform longitudinal studies concerned with female role ambiguity in American society, specifically as it relates to female occupational choice. This research should not be conducted on single occupations only, as it has been in the past, but on a wide range of occupations simultaneously.

2. To conduct research directed at discovering the individual factors associated with different types of female occupational mobility, and in what ways they are similar and dissimilar to those factors associated with different types of male occupational mobility.

3. To perform comparative mobility studies, both cross-cultural and historical, with the specific intention of relating their findings to general theories of stratification.

4. To conduct mobility studies aimed at the investigation of types of strata interaction and extent of social interaction in relation to the development of stratification and resulting mobility patterns.

5. To perform multi-dimensional mobility studies for the purpose
of comparing the findings to the findings derived from occupational mobility studies.

A Closing Statement

Within our societies vertical circulation of individuals is going on permanently. But how is it taking place? ... what are the characteristics of this process about which very little is known? Individuals have been speculating too much and studying the facts too little. It is high time to abandon speculation for the somewhat saner method of collecting the facts and studying them patiently.

Sorokin's challenge, set down over forty years ago, has only partially been met. Since World War II there have been a number of mobility studies, but they have been limited largely to males. It is evident that this limitation of mobility studies is becoming more serious in view of the increasingly large segment of the occupational structure occupied by females. To broaden the scope of mobility research, this investigation has extended the study of intergenerational occupational mobility to females.

The analysis performed here is only an initial step to an understanding of female mobility. It is important that the individual characteristics associated with different types of female mobility be analyzed. This seems the next logical step to a fuller understanding of female intergenerational occupational mobility.

---

APPENDIX

FREQUENCIES FOR NORC FEMALES, BLAU AND DUNCAN MALES, AND NORC MALES; AND TABLES FOR NORC MALES

TABLE 1 MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO DAUGHTER'S OCCUPATION: FREQUENCIES FOR NORC FEMALES

TABLE 2 MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO SON'S OCCUPATION: FREQUENCIES IN THOUSANDS FOR BLAU AND DUNCAN MALES

TABLE 3 MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO SON'S OCCUPATION: FREQUENCIES FOR NORC MALES

TABLE 4 MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO SON'S OCCUPATION: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCIES TO FREQUENCIES EXPECTED ON THE ASSUMPTION OF INDEPENDENCE FOR NORC MALES (N=3320)

TABLE 5 MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO SON'S OCCUPATION: OUTFLOW PERCENTAGES FOR NORC MALES (N=3320)

TABLE 6 MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO SON'S OCCUPATION: INFLOW PERCENTAGES FOR NORC MALES (N=3320)

TABLE 7 INDEXES OF CONCENTRATION OF SUPPLY AND RECRUITMENT BETWEEN DESTINATION OF VERTICALLY MOBILE NORC MALES AND DISTRIBUTION EXPECTED ON THE MODEL OF QUASI-INDEPENDENCE, FOR SPECIFIED ORIGIN OR DESTINATION

TABLE 8 SUPPLY TO AND FROM HIGHER RANKING OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCY TO FREQUENCY EXPECTED ON THE MODEL OF QUASI-INDEPENDENCE FOR NORC MALES

TABLE 9 MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO SON'S OCCUPATION IN TERMS OF THE THREE CROSS-CLASSIFIED MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPINGS: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCIES TO FREQUENCIES EXPECTED ON THE ASSUMPTION OF INDEPENDENCE FOR NORC MALES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2  MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO SON'S OCCUPATION: FREQUENCIES IN THOUSANDS FOR BLAU AND DUNCAN MALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operatives</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>9508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4370</td>
<td>5517</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>7055</td>
<td>6331</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>33972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 496. Blau and Duncan inflated their original sample figures to represent the 45 million men 20 to 64 years old in the civilian, noninstitutional population of the United States in March, 1962; hence, the large figures in this table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4 MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO SON'S OCCUPATION: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCIES TO FREQUENCIES EXPECTED ON THE ASSUMPTION OF INDEPENDENCE FOR NORC MALES (N=3320)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4*</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2*</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.4*</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.2*</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3*</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6*</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>8.4*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells

--- Cells whose expected and observed values are both less than five contain a dash since such values are considered too small to yield reliable results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>32.7*</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>26.1*</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>12.4*</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17.0*</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>31.1*</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>31.5*</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>11.3*</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14.6*</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>22.8*</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15.4*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage in Various Destinations

11.2  13.6  5.1  5.3  21.6  20.2  5.9  6.3  8.9  1.8  100.0

* Diagonal Cells
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>14.0*</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.3*</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.9*</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10.7*</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>27.0*</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21.8*</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.6*</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.5*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>83.8*</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>16.4*</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occ. of Origin or Destination</th>
<th>Concentration of Supply</th>
<th>Concentration of Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8 SUPPLY TO AND FROM HIGHER RANKING OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCY TO FREQUENCY EXPECTED ON THE MODEL OF QUASI-INDEPENDENCE FOR NORC MALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Upward Mobility 1</th>
<th>Downward Mobility 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father's Occ.</td>
<td>to Son's Occ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9 MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO SON'S OCCUPATION IN TERMS OF THE THREE CROSS-CLASSIFIED MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPINGS: RATIO OF OBSERVED FREQUENCIES TO FREQUENCIES EXPECTED ON THE ASSUMPTION OF INDEPENDENCE FOR NORC MALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>1.72*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.20*</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Lab.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diagonal Cells
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Periodicals


Miller, S. M., "Comparative Social Mobility." Current Sociology, 10 (January 1960), 1-89.


Parsons, Talcott, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States." American Sociological Review, 7 (October 1942), 604-16.


Bulletins and Monographs


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.