

INSTITUTE FOR
RESEARCH ON
POVERTY DISCUSSION
PAPERS

157-73

TRENDS IN THE OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY OF U. S. MEN, 1962-1970

Robert M. Hauser and David L. Featherman

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN ~ MADISON



TRENDS IN THE OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY
OF U. S. MEN, 1962-1970

Robert M. Hauser

David L. Featherman

This research was supported by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. GI-31604X), by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin, Madison, and by funds granted to the Institute for Research on Poverty pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The authors wish to thank Otis Dudley Duncan for suggesting that we, rather than he write this paper and John M. Bregger for supplying unpublished tabulations of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor. Computations were carried out using facilities of the Center for Demography and Ecology by Peter J. Dickinson with the assistance of Hernando Gomez-Buendia and James R. Kluegel. The views expressed herein are those of the authors.

ABSTRACT

This paper tries to obtain a new reading on trends of occupational mobility by adaptation of a procedure used earlier by O. D. Duncan. The authors believe that the present effort has immediate methodological value in demonstrating how a continuous, if limited, monitoring of trends in occupational mobility over several decades may be based on a single baseline survey.

Age-specific shifts in the male occupation distribution of the U. S. from 1962 to 1970 are like those of the past several decades. There were shifts toward the ranks of salaried professionals, salaried managers, and skilled workers and away from the ranks of proprietors, laborers, and farmers. These changes may be described as a shift from manual to nonmanual occupations combined with shifts from lower to higher status occupations within both the manual and nonmanual groups. Changing occupational origins accounts for a modest upgrading of the occupation distribution, while changes in mobility from occupational origins to first jobs have no systematic effect. The largest component of intercohort shifts in the occupation distribution is change in mobility patterns from first to current occupations. The historical trend of upward mobility among U. S. men is neither uniform nor inevitable. There was more change in occupational mobility patterns in 1962-1970 than in 1952-1962, but less than in 1942-1952. The continuation of historical trends of occupational mobility is strictly limited by the depletion of occupation groups--service workers, laborers, and farmers--which have earlier served as sources of recruitment into higher status occupations.

TRENDS IN THE OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY
OF U. S. MEN, 1962-1970

Introduction

It is only in the past decade that satisfactory data on the rate or volume of social mobility in the United States have become available. Sociologists and other observers of the American scene had long engaged in pessimistic speculation about the trend of occupational mobility (Sibley, 1942; Havighurst, 1947; Hertzler, 1952; Hollingshead, 1952) which was later countered by critical discussions (Sjoberg, 1951; Chinoy, 1955; Lenski, 1958) and by a comparison of national surveys carried out between 1945 and 1957 (Jackson and Crockett, 1964). The later evidence suggested "that no striking changes have occurred in mobility patterns and rates since World War II. . . what movement has occurred, however, is in the direction of increasing rates of movement." (Jackson and Crockett, 1964:15).

In 1962 the Current Population Survey (CPS) supplement, "Occupational Changes in a Generation" (OCG) carried out under the direction of Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, yielded the first definitive measurements of patterns and trends in occupational mobility among U. S. males. Analyses of this survey of 20,700 males aged 20-64 established that there had been substantial upward mobility in the occupational hierarchy between generations, and by an ingenious arrangement of OCG, CPS, and Census data it was possible to show that more recent cohorts enjoyed greater opportunities for movement into high status occupations than their predecessors (Blau and Duncan, 1967: 90-111; Duncan, 1965). Further analyses of the 1962 data by means of age-constant intercohort comparisons have suggested that improvements in occupational opportunities in the aggregate have not been accompanied by substantial changes in the rigidity of the occupational structure (Duncan, 1968). That is, there

has been no appreciable tightening or loosening of the regime connecting the occupations of men with those of their fathers.

In the past decade there has probably been as much concern about trends toward "rigidification" in American society as in any earlier period. Thus, efforts to obtain a new reading on trends in occupational mobility are surely in order. Definitive measurements of trend over the decade await the completion of a replication of the OCG survey, which is presently scheduled to be carried out in connection with the March 1973 Current Population Survey (Featherman and Hauser, 1973). However, by adaptation of a procedure used earlier by Duncan (1965), it is possible to obtain indirect evidence of changes in occupational mobility in the past decade.

With a replication of the OCG survey forthcoming one may ask whether an assessment of trend by indirect methods is worthwhile at this time. We think it is. Preliminary runs from the 1973 OCG survey will not be available until late in 1974, but the discussion of recent mobility trends has already begun (Lipset, 1972). We believe it desirable that the inevitable anticipations and conjectures about trends in occupational mobility be given some basis in fact. Moreover, we think our present effort has immediate methodological value in demonstrating how a continuous, if limited, monitoring of trends in occupational mobility over several decades may be based on a single baseline survey.

Method

Following Duncan's notation, we let $P = (p_{ij})$ be the transition matrix of an intergenerational occupational mobility table. Then, its elements

represent the probability of a son's movement from the i^{th} category of father's occupation to a current occupation in the j^{th} category.

Clearly, $\sum_j p_{ij} = 1.0$. Let $A = (a_i)$ be the origin vector of the mobility table, a row vector which gives the proportion of men who originate in the i^{th} occupation class, $\sum_i a_i = 1.0$; and let $C = (c_j)$ be the vector which gives the proportionate distribution of men over destination categories, $\sum_j c_j = 1.0$. Thus, we have the identity, $C = AP$. Likewise, we may also write $C = BQ$, where C is defined as before, while B is the vector of

occupations of men in their first full-time jobs and Q represents the matrix of transition probabilities from first to current jobs.

We use functional notation to identify the vectors and matrices of men in a given cohort observed in a particular year. Thus, $C(r,s)$ is the occupation distribution of men in the r^{th} cohort in the s^{th} year, and so on. For a selected cohort and year, then, the transition from fathers' to current occupation distribution takes the form

$C(r,s) = A(r,s) P(r,s)$. From the OCG survey we have estimates of C , A , P , B , and Q for cohorts within ages 20-64 in 1962. First full-time civilian occupation and father's occupation at son's age 16 were ascertained in the OCG supplement, while current occupation was ascertained in the regular March CPS interview. In order to make inferences about changes over time in P and Q we make the following assumptions: that within the prime working ages, the occupation distributions and mobility patterns of U.S. males are random with respect to mortality, net migration, and movement into and out of the experienced civilian labor force and that the quality of data on current occupation, father's occupation, and first job does not vary with age or time.¹ These assumptions have two pertinent consequences.

First, for men born in year r , $A(r, s+t) = A(r, s)$ and $B(r, s+t) = B(r, s)$, where t may be greater or less than zero. This says that we may use the 1962 survey to estimate the origin vectors (fathers' occupation or first jobs) observed in any year for cohorts covered in the 1962 survey. Second, the assumptions imply that it is legitimate to compare observed destination distributions across years. Thus, we can make the age-constant intercohort comparison, $C(r, s)$ with $C(r+t, s+t)$, or the intracohort comparison $C(r, s)$ with $C(r, s+t)$. Obviously, our assumptions are not perfectly met, either as to population coverage or response quality, and our inferences are subject to substantial risks of measurement error.

Granting our assumptions, it becomes possible to make inferences about intercohort change in a mobility matrix. Consider the null hypothesis $P(r, 1962) = P(r+t, 1962+t)$, where we have observed only $P(r, 1962)$. This says that the mobility matrix for men aged $(1962-r)$ is unchanged t years later (or earlier). Under the null hypothesis we may write

$$\begin{aligned} C(r+t, 1962+t) &= A(r+t, 1962+t) P(r+t, 1962+t) \\ &= A(r+t, 1962+t) P(r, 1962), \end{aligned}$$

which we can estimate by

$$\hat{C}_p(r+t, 1962+t) = A(r+t, 1962) P(r, 1962),$$

since $A(r+t, 1962+t) = A(r+t, 1962)$ by assumption. We denote our estimate of the expected distribution here by $\hat{C}_p(r, s)$ in order to differentiate it from $\hat{C}_q(r, s)$, the estimate based on the first job vector and the transition from first to current occupation. For example, we can estimate the 1972 occupation distribution (at age 35-44) of men born in 1927-1936 (aged 25-34 in 1962) by applying the 1962 intergeneration transition matrix of men born in 1917-1926 (aged 35-44 in 1962) to the origin vector of the younger cohort. The same

logic applies to hypotheses about intercohort change in the intragenerational mobility matrix. Of course, this procedure is simply an application of the common demographic technique of indirect standardization based on the 1962 occupational mobility rates.

Comparisons among expected and observed distribution for recent years permits us to make limited inferences about change in mobility matrices in the past decade. While identity of destination vectors does not imply identity of transition matrices, differences between destination vectors clearly imply rejection of the null hypothesis (subject to the possibility that internal changes in the matrix are due solely to changes in the marginals and not at all to changes in interactions between rows and columns of the matrix).

In his 1965 paper Duncan used this procedure to measure trends from 1932 through 1962. That is, he applied the 1962 matrix for a younger cohort to the origin distribution of a cohort 10, 20, or 30 years older to obtain an expected occupation distribution of the older cohort when it was 10, 20, or 30 years younger. Following Duncan's proposal (1965:493-494) that his procedure also be used projectively, we have applied transition matrices for older cohorts to the origin vectors of younger cohorts to obtain expected destination vectors for them in later years.

Using the destination vectors estimated from inter- and intragenerational mobility, it is possible to partition the net intercohort differences in occupation distributions for men of the same age into components attributable to intercohort changes in occupational origins, in the transition from father's occupation to first job, and in the transition from first job to current occupation. The necessary identity is

$$\begin{aligned}
C(r+t, s+t) - C(r, s) &= [C(r+t, s+t) - \hat{C}_Q(r+t, s+t)] \\
&\quad + [\hat{C}_Q(r+t, s+t) - \hat{C}_P(r+t, s+t)] \\
&\quad + [\hat{C}_P(r+t, s+t) - C(r, s)].
\end{aligned}$$

The two terms in the first bracket on the right differ only because of intercohort differences in the transition matrix from first job to current occupation. That is,

$$C(r+t, s+t) = B(r+t, s+t) Q(r+t, s+t),$$

while

$$\hat{C}_Q(r+t, s+t) = B(r+t, s) Q(r, s).$$

Thus since $B(r+t, s) = B(r+t, s+t)$ by assumption, the difference between $C(r+t, s+t)$ and $\hat{C}_Q(r+t, s+t)$ is the effect of intercohort change in the transition from first job to current occupation on the net intercohort difference. To interpret the difference in the second bracket denote the transition matrix from father's occupation to first job as $M(r, s)$.

Then

$$P(r, s) = M(r, s) Q(r, s),$$

so

$$\hat{C}_P(r+t, s+t) = A(r+t, s) M(r, s) Q(r, s).$$

Also,

$$\hat{C}_Q(r+t, s+t) = A(r+t, s) M(r+t, s+t) Q(r, s)$$

since

$$B(r+t, s) = A(r+t, s) M(r+t, s+t)$$

by assumption. Thus $\hat{C}_P(r+t, s+t)$ and $\hat{C}_Q(r+t, s+t)$ differ only because of intercohort change in the transition from father's occupation to first job, and their difference represents the effect of that change on the net intercohort difference.

Finally, $C(r, s) = A(r, s) P(r, s)$, while $\hat{C}_P(r+t, s+t) = A(r+t, s) P(r, s)$, which differs from the first expression only by virtue of changes between cohorts in the vector of occupational origins. Thus, the difference between the terms in the third bracket is the effect on the net intercohort difference of the intercohort shift in the distribution of sons by their fathers' occupations.

Had we been limited to tabulations by standard 10-year age-breaks, our efforts would have been stymied by the fact that 1972 occupation distributions were not available when these analyses were carried out. However, since we have access to unit record tapes of the OCG survey, we have proceeded to make trend comparisons over a shorter period by varying the age-breaks in our origin vectors. Specifically, we have applied the transition matrices for those aged 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 in 1962 to the origin vectors of those aged 27-36, 37-46, and 47-56 in March 1962 in order to generate expected distributions for men aged 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 in March 1970. We obtained observed distributions in 1970 from the March 1970 Current Population Survey person tape. In passing, we should note that with freedom to vary age-breaks in both the OCG and CPS tabulations it is possible to make annual trend measurements at any desired age.

Net Intercohort Shifts, 1962-1970

The occupational distributions of men 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 in 1962 and 1970 are compared in Table 1. The net intercohort shifts from 1962 to 1970 may be summarized as a fairly smooth continuation of the trends of earlier decades (Duncan, 1966). There were substantial intercohort shifts toward employment as salaried professionals and managers and smaller shifts toward employment as craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers. The former were largest at the two younger ages and the latter at the oldest age. Within the professional category there was no net shift toward self-employment; all of the net change was attributable to increases in salaried professionals. The growth among salaried managers was almost perfectly offset at each age by a substantial decline in the proportion of proprietors.² A similar,

Table 1 about here

but weaker pattern can be ascertained in the net inter- and intragenerational shifts from 1952 to 1962 at younger ages in Duncan's 1965 paper on mobility trends (Table 4, p. 497). Only the decline in the percentage of farmers rivals that among self-employed managers, but the decline in the percentage of nonfarm laborers is also fairly large. The remaining categories show small downward shifts in their share of the occupation distribution. It should be kept in mind that small percentage point shifts in the total occupation distribution imply rapid growth or decline of smaller occupational groups. For example, the decline of 2.5 percentage points in the share of men who are farmers or farm managers at ages 35-44 represents a fall of 50 percent in the proportion of men in that category.

While the March 1970 CPS estimated there were 7,151 men aged 55-64 in the experienced civilian labor force, the number of men 47-56 in March 1962 estimated from the OCG survey was 9,104. The net loss of nearly 22 percent of the cohort, due in about equal measure to retirement and mortality, is an obvious threat to our assumption of closure. Specifically, the validity of our findings for 55-64 year olds is reduced (a) insofar as labor force exits between 1962 and 1970 occurred differentially with to occupational origins (not occupations at the survey date) and (b) insofar as changes from 1962 to 1970 in occupational mobility matrices for men in the labor force at ages 55-64 were affected by changing patterns of occupation-specific exit from the labor force. We do not think that either of these sources of invalidity could be very large, but our findings for men aged 55-64 should be interpreted with caution. In the two younger cohorts there is no prima facie evidence of severe violation of our closure assumption; the 1962 and 1970 estimated population totals differ by only 2.8 and 5.0 percent, respectively, for those aged 27-36 and 37-46 in 1962.

Components of Intercohort Shifts

The components of intercohort change in the occupation distribution between 1962 and 1970 are shown in Table 2. The most striking feature of the table is the fact that virtually all of the net intercohort shifts in the occupation distribution are attributable to changes in the matrix of transition from first jobs to current occupations. In no occupation group at any age is the effect of change in occupational origins or in the transition from origin to first job as large as one percent point.

Table 2 about here

With but one exception intercohort shifts in occupational origins at each age increase the chances that a man will become a professional, salaried manager, salesman, or clerical worker, and they decrease the chances of his becoming a laborer or a farmer. Shifting occupational origins have virtually no impact on the likelihood that a man will become a proprietor or a service worker. Since the occupation categories are listed in an order which approximates the socioeconomic ranking of major occupation groups from top to bottom, it is fair to conclude that the overall effect of intercohort shifts in occupational origins is to produce a slight upgrading of the occupation structure. That is, the historical upgrading of the occupational structure implies a modest intercohort shift of employment from lower to higher status occupations. If recent expectations of mobility between generations are to be met in the future, there will have to be a continuing expansion of opportunities for employment in higher status occupations.

The transition from occupational origins to first jobs takes place over an interval in the life-cycle which is roughly invariant with respect to calendar time. Thus, comparisons across ages of intercohort shifts

due to changes in that transition matrix represent intertemporal change. At ages 35-44 changes in the origin-first job transition matrix place more men in professional and salaried managerial jobs and fewer as salesmen, clerical workers, craftsmen, or operatives, while there are virtually no effects on the proportions of proprietors, service workers, laborers, or farmers. At ages 45-54 changes in the same transition matrix place more men as salaried professionals, proprietors, and craftsmen, and fewer are placed as salaried managers, salesmen, clerical workers, operatives, and farmers, while the remaining groups are virtually unaffected. At age 55-64 shifts in the origin-first job transition matrix lead to the placement of more men as proprietors, craftsmen, and operatives and fewer as salaried professionals, salesmen, clerical workers, and farmers. In light of these observations and the modest size of the observed shifts we conclude that there are no consistent trends in the influence on the occupational structure of change in the transition matrices from occupational origins to first jobs.

Following the pattern of earlier decades (Duncan, 1965:497), net intercohort shifts in the occupation distribution are largely attributable to changes in the transition matrix from first full-time jobs to current occupations. The components due to shifts in this transition matrix are similar across the age groups, and, of course, they are much like the net intercohort shifts described above. There are substantial positive shifts toward employment as salaried professionals, salaried managers, and as craftsmen, and there is a smaller positive shift into the operative category. There is a large shift away from proprietorship, and there are small, but consistent shifts out of the four lowest categories: service workers, farm and nonfarm

laborers, and farmers. Finally, shifts involving self-employed professionals, salesmen, and clerical workers are generally small and form no consistent pattern across the age groups.

Overall, the components of intercohort change in the occupation distribution due to changes in the first job-current occupation transition matrix can be said to have increased opportunities for upward mobility. The seeming exception to this generalization, net movement out of the category of self-employed managers, may not be as much a contradiction as it appears. Proprietors are typically small businessmen, not the heads of large firms or corporations, and they have less education and lower incomes than do salaried managers. If one takes self-employment as a self-evident virtue, then he may be less sanguine about this development. The overall pattern of shifts due to change in the intracohort mobility matrices might be described as an upgrading of the occupational structure within both the manual and nonmanual sectors, accompanied by a smaller shift from manual to nonmanual occupations.

The differences between occupation distributions we have compared to form components of intercohort change are summarized using indexes of dissimilarity in Table 3. The index of dissimilarity is equal to the sum of positive percentage point differences between two distributions. It represents the percentage of cases in one distribution which would have to be shifted to a different category on order to make it identical to a second distribution. The relative sizes of the indexes on the first three lines in each row confirm our earlier observation that changes in occupational opportunities between cohorts are due primarily to changes in the transition matrix from first jobs to current occupations.

Table 3 about here

The indexes for that transition are nearly as large as the indexes for the total intercohort comparisons, shown on the fourth line of Table 3.

By 1970 the groups at the bottom of the occupation hierarchy from which there was net out movement during 1962-1970 contained 13.4, 15.1, and 21.0 percent of the experienced civilian labor force at ages 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64, respectively, compared to 18.1, 20.6, and 25.8 percent in 1962. By 1970 farm occupations included only 3.4 percent, 4.7 percent and 7.6 percent of the labor force at those ages. Thus, the possibilities for continued upward mobility are limited unless there appear new patterns of movement out of occupations in the middle of the hierarchy.

Long-Term Trends

In Table 4 we present our estimates of components of intercohort occupational shifts during 1962-1970 due to changes in intergenerational and intragenerational mobility matrices beside Duncan's (1965) estimates for men aged 35-44 and 45-54 in earlier periods. Note that the intergenerational effects shown here include the effects of changes in both the occupational origin-first job and first job-current occupation transition matrices. Unfortunately, we are unable to separate self-employed from salaried professionals prior to 1952.

Table 4 about here

The indexes of dissimilarity, shown at the base of each column, suggest that net changes in the mobility matrices had a larger effect on the occupational distribution during 1942-1952 than in 1952-1962 or 1962-1970. Because the professional and managerial categories are collapsed we have obviously under-estimated the decline in net

occupational redistribution from 1942-1952 to the present. However the decline, if real, is surely not monotonic; shifts in the occupation distribution due to changing mobility patterns are clearly larger during 1962-1970 than in 1952-1962 both at ages 35-44 and 45-54.

At age 35-44 changing mobility matrices produced more movement into professional employment during 1952-1962 than in either 1942-1952 or 1962-1970. At age 45-54 there was no clear pattern of change between 1952-1962 and 1962-1970. There has been a clear shift away from the category of managers, officials, and proprietors in the past three decades. At age 35-44 there was a net shift of 3.4 percent due to changes in intragenerational mobility during 1942-1952, but no net shift during 1962-1970. The apparent explanation is a continuing net movement into the ranks of salaried managers, compensated by net movement away from proprietorship, where both sorts of changes occurred more rapidly during the 1962-1970 than in the preceding decade. There have been essentially no net movements into or out of sales or clerical occupations during the period covered by Table 4.

At age 35-44 there was substantial net movement into the ranks of craftsmen and operatives in 1942-1952, and there were small net shifts away from and into those categories in 1952-1962 and 1962-1970 respectively. At age 45-54 there were essentially no shifts in the craft and operative categories due to changing mobility regimes between 1952-1962 and 1962-1970. There is a consistent pattern of net movement out of the four lowest manual occupation categories. The net shift away from the two farm categories appears to have declined continuously (along with the relative numbers in those categories) over the three decades. Shifts away from services and nonfarm labor were smaller in 1952-1962 than in the preceding decade, but the net out movement may have increased again from 1962 to 1970.

Summary

Intercohort net shifts in the male occupation distribution between 1962 and 1970 are similar to those observed over the past several decades. There were shifts toward employment as salaried professionals, salaried managers, craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers and shifts away from employment as self-employed managers, laborers, and in farm occupations. In terms of the status hierarchy of occupations, these changes consist of a shift from manual to nonmanual occupations combined with shifts from lower to higher status occupations within both the manual and nonmanual groups.

For men aged 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 we have decomposed the sources of intercohort shifts into three components: (a) changes in the distribution of occupational origins (fathers' occupations) between cohorts, (b) changes in mobility between occupational origins and first full-time occupations, and (c) changes in mobility between first jobs and current occupations. At each age we find that changing occupational origins account for a modest upgrading of the occupation distribution, while changes in mobility from occupational origins to first jobs produce small and unsystematic shifts in the distribution. The largest component of intercohort shifts in the occupation distribution is change in mobility patterns from first to current occupations. While the first two components each account for net shifts of 0.75 to 1.60 percent of the occupation distribution, changed patterns of intragenerational mobility account for net shifts of 8 to 9 percent of the occupation distribution. Thus, the total intercohort shifts in the occupation distribution are essentially reflections of those shifts produced by changing patterns of intragenerational mobility.

While the experience of the period 1962-1970 continues, the historical tendency toward upward mobility among U.S. men, that tendency is neither uniform nor inevitable. For example, there appears to have been more change in occupational mobility patterns in 1962-1970 than in 1952-1962, but less than in 1942-1952. The continuation of historical trends of occupational mobility is strictly limited by the depletion of occupation groups--service workers, laborers, and farmers--which have earlier served as sources of recruitment into higher status occupations.

Although definitive analyses of mobility trends await the outcome of the 1973 survey of "Occupational Changes in a Generation," we do not think that we have yet exhausted the usefulness of the indirect methods employed here. For example, one promising line of inquiry is based on a comparison of black and white mobility trends using the set of components developed here, and a second attempts to identify the ways in which changes in educational attainment have affected mobility patterns.

TABLE 1

Percentage Distribution by Occupation and Net Change, 1962-1970, by Age:
U.S. Men in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, March 1962 and March 1970

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1970	Change	1962	1970	Change	1962	1970	Change
Professional, technical, and kindred workers									
Self-employed	1.91	1.85	-0.06	1.51	1.59	0.08	1.71	1.55	-0.16
Salaried	10.89	14.45	3.56	7.66	10.38	2.72	7.37	8.77	1.40
Managers, officials and proprietors, exc. farm									
Salaried	9.59	13.50	3.91	8.36	13.56	5.20	9.60	11.70	2.10
Self-employed	7.62	4.15	-3.47	9.94	5.42	-4.52	10.05	5.51	-4.54
Sales workers	5.14	4.93	-0.21	5.00	4.87	-0.13	3.99	5.63	1.64
Clerical and kindred workers	6.47	6.06	-0.41	6.66	6.78	0.12	5.92	6.47	0.55
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	21.16	22.77	1.61	22.56	23.45	0.89	19.51	22.53	3.02
Operatives and kindred workers	19.10	18.93	-0.17	17.68	18.84	1.16	16.10	16.82	0.72
Service workers, including private household	4.86	4.69	-0.17	6.28	5.16	-1.12	7.91	7.57	-0.34
Laborers, except farm and mine	6.96	5.25	-1.71	6.53	5.24	-1.29	6.51	5.80	-0.71
Farmers and farm managers	4.92	2.46	-2.46	6.41	3.85	-2.56	9.22	6.05	-3.17
Farm laborers and foremen	1.39	0.96	-0.43	1.41	0.87	-0.54	2.11	1.60	-0.51
Total	100.00	100.00		100.00	100.00		100.00	100.00	
Number (1,000)	11,085	10,513		9,594	10,423		6,563	7,151	

Sources: March 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation Survey and March 1970 Current Population Survey (person tapes).

TABLE 2

U.S. Men in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, March 1962 and March 1970:
 Components of Intercohort Change in Occupation Distributions Due to Social Origins, Transitions From Father's Occupation
 to First Occupation, and Transitions From First Occupation to Current Occupation

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	Father's Origins	First Job Occ. to First Job	First Job to Current Job	Father's Origins	First Job Occ. to First Job	First Job to Current Job	Father's Origins	First Job Occ. to First Job	First Job to Current Job
Professional, technical, and kindred workers									
Self-employed	0.13	0.36	-0.55	0.02	-0.05	0.11	-0.02	-0.05	-0.09
Salaried	0.75	0.56	2.25	0.29	0.46	1.97	0.16	-0.32	1.56
Managers, officials, and proprietors, exc. farm									
Salaried	0.27	0.17	3.47	0.18	-0.16	5.18	0.19	-0.09	2.00
Self-employed	0.01	0.01	-3.49	0.00	0.41	-4.93	0.10	0.28	-4.92
Sales workers	0.21	-0.21	-0.21	0.08	-0.13	-0.08	0.17	-0.15	1.62
Clerical and kindred workers	0.21	-0.30	-0.32	0.12	-0.23	0.23	0.10	-0.23	0.68
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	-0.03	-0.35	1.99	-0.01	0.39	0.50	0.21	0.29	2.52
Operatives and kindred workers	-0.30	-0.28	0.41	-0.04	-0.14	1.33	0.20	0.19	0.33
Service workers, including private household	0.00	0.03	-0.20	0.07	-0.05	-1.14	0.05	0.11	-0.50
Laborers, except farm and mine	-0.28	0.07	-1.50	-0.06	-0.11	-1.12	-0.11	0.11	-0.71
Farmers and farm managers	-0.82	0.03	-1.67	-0.58	-0.27	-1.71	-0.87	-0.18	-2.12
Farm laborers and foremen	-0.17	-0.08	-0.18	-0.08	-0.11	-0.35	-0.18	0.04	-0.37

Sources: March 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation Survey and March 1970 Current Population Survey (person tapes).

TABLE 3

U.S. Men in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, March 1962 and March 1970
 Indexes of Dissimilarity Representing Components of Intercohort
 Change in Occupation Distributions at Selected Ages

Component of intercohort change	Age		
	35-44	45-54	55-64
Occupational origin	1.59	0.76	1.18
Transition from father's occupation to first job	1.22	1.26	1.02
Transition from first job to current occupation	8.12	9.32	8.71
Total intercohort change 1962-1970	9.08	10.16	9.43

Source: Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 4

Differences Between Occupation Distributions for Men of Specified Ages Produced by 1962
Intergeneration and Intrageneration Mobility Matrices and By Matrices
for Earlier and Later Years in Percentage Points

Occupation	Intergeneration mobility					Intrageneration mobility				
	35-44		45-54			35-44		45-54		
	1952 -1942	1962 -1952	1970 -1962	1962 -1952	1970 -1962	1952 -1942	1962 -1952	1970 -1962	1962 -1952	1970 -1962
Professional, technical, and kindred workers										
Self-employed		0.3	-0.2	-0.1	0.1		0.3	-0.6	0.0	0.1
Salaried	0.9	3.5	2.8	1.5	2.4	1.7	2.8	2.2	1.9	2.0
Managers, officials, and proprietors, ex. farm.										
Salaried	3.1	2.4	3.6	0.7	5.0	3.4	2.4	3.5	0.9	5.2
Self-employed		0.0	-3.5	1.0	-4.5		-0.4	-3.5	0.5	-4.9
Sales workers	-1.5	0.1	-0.4	0.3	-0.2	-1.3	0.3	-0.2	0.3	-0.1
Clerical and kindred workers	0.2	0.4	-0.6	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.7	-0.3	0.9	0.2
Craftsmen, formen, and kindred workers	3.7	-0.8	1.6	0.1	0.9	3.3	-1.0	2.0	0.2	0.5
Operatives and kindred workers	3.3	-2.0	0.1	0.0	1.2	2.7	-1.8	0.4	-0.4	1.3
Service workers, including private household	-1.1	-0.3	-0.2	-0.3	-1.2	-1.4	-0.3	-0.2	-0.2	-1.1
Laborers, except farm and mine	-3.1	-0.5	-1.4	-1.0	-1.2	-3.3	-0.4	-1.5	-1.1	-1.1
Farmers and farm managers	-3.5	-2.6	-1.6	-2.3	-2.0	-3.5	-2.3	-1.7	-2.5	-1.7
Farm laborers and foremen	-2.0	-0.5	-0.3	-0.5	-0.5	-2.1	-0.3	-0.2	-0.5	-0.4
Index of dissimilarity	(11.2)	(6.7)	(8.2)	(4.2)	(9.6)	(11.6)	(6.5)	(8.1)	(4.7)	(9.3)

Sources: March 1962 Occupation Change in a Generation Survey, March 1970 Current Population Survey (person tapes), and O. D. Duncan, "The Trend of Occupational Mobility in the United States," American Sociological Review 30 (August 1965): Table 4, p. 497.

FOOTNOTES

¹The assumption of randomness with regard to labor force entry and exit may be relaxed if we change the population referent to all men in the civilian noninstitutional population, rather than men in the experienced civilian labor force. We have replicated our analyses with this change in definition, and it has not affected our results. The present definition permits direct comparison of our results with those of Duncan (1965).

²Friendly critics have suggested to us that the complementary net shifts between salaried and self-employed managers, officials and proprietors may be an artifact of a 1967 procedural change in the Current Population Survey which improved the quality of self-employment reports. We estimate this change of procedure could account for a shift of no more than one percent of the male occupation distribution from self-employed to salaried status within the category of managers, officials, and proprietors. While our conclusions about the pattern of shifts within that category are unaffected, our numerical results probably do overstate the extent of the shifts.

REFERENCES

Blau, Peter M., and Otis Dudley Duncan

- 1967 The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Bregger, John E.

- 1971 "Revisions in Occupational Classifications for 1971." Employment and Earnings (February):5-8. U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Chinoy, Ely

- 1955 "Social Mobility Trends in the United States." American Sociological Review 20 (April):180-186.

Duncan, Otis Dudley

- 1965 "The Trend of Occupational Mobility in the United States." American Sociological Review 30 (August):491-498.
- 1966 "Occupation Trends and Patterns of Net Mobility in the United States." Demography 3 (Number 1):1-18.
- 1968 "Patterns of Occupational Mobility Among Negro Men." Demography 5 (Number 1):11-22.

Featherman, David L., and Robert M. Hauser

- 1973 "Design for a Replicate Study of Social Mobility in the United States." In K. Land and S. Spilerman (eds.) Social Indicator Models. New York: Russell Sage (forthcoming).

Havighurst, Robert J.

- 1947 "The Influence of Recent Social Changes on the Desire For Social Mobility in the United States." In Bryson, Finkelstein, and Maciver (eds.) Conflicts of Power in Modern Culture, Seventh Symposium. New York: Harper and Bros.

Hertzler, J. O.

- 1952 "Some Tendencies Toward a Closed Class System in the United States." Social Forces 30 (March):313-323.

Hollingshead, August B.

- 1952 "Trends in Social Stratification: A Case Study." American Sociological Review 17 (December):679-686.

Jackson, Elton F. and Harry J. Crockett, Jr.

1964 "Occupational Mobility in the United States: A Point Estimate and Trend Comparison." American Sociological Review 29 (February): 5-15.

Lenski, Gerhard E.

1958 "Trends in Inter-Generational Occupational Mobility in the United States." American Sociological Review 23 (October):514-523.

Lipset, Seymour Martin

1972 "Social Mobility and Equal Opportunity." The Public Interest 29 (Fall):90-108.

Sibley, Elbridge

1942 "Some Demographic Clues to Stratification." American Sociological Review 7 (June):322-330.

Sjoberg, Gideon

1951 "Are Social Classes in America Becoming More Rigid?" American Sociological Review 16 (December):775-783.