239-74

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON POVERTY DISCUSSION PAPERS

TRENDS IN OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY BY RACE AND SEX IN THE UNITED STATES, 1962-1972

David L. Featherman
and
Robert M. Hauser

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON

TRENDS IN OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY BY RACE AND SEX IN THE UNITED STATES, 1962-1972

David L. Featherman

Robert M. Hauser

November 1974

Presented at the MSSB seminar, "Measurement and Models in Stratification and Mobility Research," Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 14-16 August 1974. The research was supported by NSF Grant GI-31604 NICHD Grant HD-05876 institutional support from the University of Wisconsin-Madison College of Agricultural and Life Sciences; and by funds granted to the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison by the Office of Economic Opportunity pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The opinions expressed are those of the authors. They acknowledge the assistance of Michael Sobel and Peter Dickinson in the preparation of statistical materials. This paper becomes a chapter in their forthcoming volume, Occupational Stratification: The Analysis of Trends (New York: Academic Press).

ABSTRACT

Employed black and white women have not enjoyed the same intercohort improvements in occupational status as have men between 1962 and 1972. While employed men of both races experienced net shifts into higher status white- and blue-collar jobs, with noticeable redistribution into salaried professions and managerial ranks and exits from self-employment in these occupation groups, employed women have made more localized shifts from private household service and into other services, clerical work, and the salaried professions. Marked intercohort increases in white female labor force participation is duplicated by younger but not older blacks. Relative to men of the same race, white females have gained employment in those occupations vacated by men and solidified their concentration in clerical jobs. Black females appear more able to compete with black men for occupations, as sexual inequality is lower among blacks than whites. While both racial and sexual inequalities have decreased between 1962 and 1972, sexual inequality is greater at each period and arises largely from different mobility matrices which allocate substantial percentages of women from every origin category to roles outside the regular labor force and to restricted employment locations within it. Occupational inequality between the races is lower among women than among men, although racial differences in intergenerational mobility and not social origin handicap black women from gaining higher status employment, while transferring larger proportions of white women out of the regular labor force.

Despite substantial popular commentary on role differentiation and socioeconomic inequalities between the sexes in the United States, it is only recently that empirical research has documented their extent and details (Suter and Miller, 1973; Carter, 1972; DeJong et al., 1971, Tyree and Treas, 1974). This lacuna between speculation and fact arose from a lack of reliable data for broad cross-sections of men and women in comparable social circumstances (e.g. marital status, age, color), coupled with a probable lack of interest in the socioeconomic plight of females. For whatever reasons, far more is known about the process of social stratification and the conditions of unequal opportunities for men than for women.

As part of the 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation (OCG) Survey, married male respondents reported on the occupations of their fathers-in-law. Together with reports of the present-spouses' current (last week) occupations to the March Current Population Survey (CPS), these OCG proxy reports on paternal origins provide the bivariate data for a comparison of occupational stratification (or occupational mobility) for the sexes. Given recent analyses (Tyree and Treas, 1974) of these intergenerational data for the 1962 period, we inquire here about trends in the sexual patterns of mobility in the decade 1962-1972.

To accomplish this exercise we employ the same techniques of indirect standardization which we borrowed from Duncan (1965) and which we applied to the analysis of male trends by age and by color (Hauser and Featherman, 1973, 1974b and Chapter 6 of this volume). In brief, we apply the March 1962 rates (i.e., matrices of outflow probabilities) for older cohorts of men and women to the 1962 compositions (i.e., origin vectors, paternal

occupation) of younger cohorts to calculate the expected distribution of current occupations for the younger cohort ten years later, March 1972. By comparing the observed vectors of current occupation from the March 1972 CPS with those vectors expected on the null hypothesis (viz. no inter-cohort change in age-specific mobility matrices, 1962-1972), we gain indirect evidence about the presence or absence of age-specific shifts in mobility patterns (in the absence of our new OCG data for 1973). These techniques can be employed with color and/or sex controls, which we have done below.

Furthermore, we take advantage of our ability to decompose each age-constant intercohort comparison (by color and/or sex) of observed occupation distributions into two components of net shift. The first component indicates the shifts stemming from intercohort differences in paternal occupation; a second reflects changes derivative from intercohort differentials in intergenerational mobility (i.e. outflow probabilities from paternal to current occupation). [Earlier work among men identified a significant third component--mobility from first job to current job--which comprised the largest source of total shifts between 1962 and 1972. Since no first job was reported by or for the females covered in the OCG-CPS overlap, we cannot speak to this component here.]

As with our prior analyses, the validity of this one rests upon several assumptions: namely, that within the prime working ages, mortality and net migration are random with respect to occupational mobility and that the quality of data on current occupation and father's occupation does not vary with age or time. In order to maintain coverage of the male and female elements of the civilian noninstitutional population, we introduce "no

occupation reported" and "unmarried" as categories in the origin vectors, and "unemployed" and "not in the labor force" as classes in the destination vectors. Hence each destination vector contains categories of occupation for employed men and women, a combined category of experienced and inexperienced unemployed, and a category for those neither at work nor looking for work. Problems in reconciling the 1960- and 1970-basis U.S. Census classifications of occupations are reported and resolved in earlier work (cf. Hauser and Featherman, 1974b).

In the month of March, the CPS adds to its sample of the civilian noninstitutional population those households containing members of the Armed Forces living in families on military posts or off posts in civilian quarters. For our analysis here we have eliminated all Armed Forces personnel from the 1962 and 1972 data, leaving only elements of the civilian non-institutional populations in those years. Table 1 reports the frequencies of men and women by color and age, as given in the March 1972 CPS and as expected from the projection of the 1962 (younger) cohorts into 1972. If our assumptions (above) are valid, then the signed values in the third line of each color-sex panel bespeak real intercohort changes in the size of each subpopulation. Our methods of projection come closest to approximating the non-black (hereafter, white) subpopulation of women, with a small net gain in size over the decade for women aged 35-44 and small, increasing losses at the two oldest ages. Differences as small as 2% may reflect sampling and rounding errors, while larger positive values likely indicate gains between 1962 and 1972 in the civilian population at the expense of elements of a cohort within the Armed Forces. Larger negative values probably denote the

invalidity of our assumption of randomness between mortality, age, and time. That the negative percent changes reflect mortality is suggested by larger (age-constant) values for men than for women, for blacks than for whites, and for older ages within each sex-color panel. Clearly, our results are less secure for blacks than for whites and are least valid for the oldest age category.

[Table 1 about here]

Table 2 presents the age-constant 1962 and 1972 occupational distributions for men and women by color. As reported elsewhere (Hauser and Featherman, 1974 b and Chapter 6) there are four major net shifts, or intercohort shifts, for men of both races (although the black shifts are somewhat attenuated). First, we observe a shift from self-employment to salaried status within both of the highest white-collar classes. [We have arranged the occupation categories in rank order based on Duncan's (1961) socioeconomic index; no order is implied, however, in the positioning of "unemployed" and "not in the labor force."] Whether these net shifts are connected, such that entrepreneurs and self-employed professionals become salaried managers and professionals, respectively, we cannot say without our new 1973 data. We can concede, however, that such shifts are consistent with declines in self-employment and the growth in the consolidation of business and professional enterprises over several decades (Lebergott, 1968). Moreover, such trends incorporate the second major shift in our male data, namely, the movement out of farming.

[Table 2 about here]

Third, the period 1962-1972 marks a net shift upward in the percentages of white and black men holding higher (vs. lower) status white-collar and

blue-collar jobs. Fourth, among the oldest white men and, to a lesser extent, among the oldest black men, there appears to be a recent shift out of the labor force. Whether such changes signify the greater availability of social security benefits or other means toward earlier retirement is not clear from our data. However, the removal of larger percentages of young black men from the 1972 labor force vis-a-vis the prior decade cannot foster a sanguine interpretation, despite intercohort gains in status among the employed. Finally, there is a minor shift toward greater employment among blacks.

Among women, the intercohort shifts in Table 2 are more striking for blacks than for whites. Black women of all ages have experienced substantial declines in service work in private households, with concomitant gains in other service occupations. [Again, the connectedness of these net shifts are obscure here, although the growth of enterprises offering contractual maid and janitorial services to businesses and homes may provide such a connection.] Second, black women have enlarged their share of non-secretarial/stenographic jobs as clerks in recent years. Third, higher percentages of black females now work as salaried professionals, especially at ages 35-44, although we note no decrease in self-employment (except in proprietorships, especially for the oldest women). Fourth, young black women in 1972 are more liekly to be at work, despite the slight opposing tendency at the older ages.

White women in 1972 undertake clerical employment (both categories) to a greater extent than in 1962; this is the dominant shift at all ages among the employed. Like blacks, white females are less likely to be in private household service and somewhat more likely to be employed in other service,

although these shifts are less distinctive than among blacks. Here, too, we observe small increases in salaried professions. But the most noticeable shift for white females is into the labor force as employed workers, especially at the youngest ages.

We conclude from these intercohort shifts that female changes in occupation are more localized than for males, probably associated with the longstanding allocation of women to clerical and service work and to positions outside the ordinary labor force (e.g. housewifery). While there is evidence for a decline in private household service employment for blacks, these may be offset by gains in other service jobs. Certainly there is no apparent decline in the recruitment of women, especially whites, to clerical work, although the gain in this category for black females might be interpreted as a net upward status shift (see below). Table 2 foreshadows comparisons which follow: Namely, females have experienced quite similar intercohort shifts over the decade, and they are more alike in this regard than are white men and women, on the one hand, or black men and women, on the other. In addition, color differences in female shifts reveal lingering historical patterns (by race) in labor force participation, fertility and marital status, and employment.

Net shifts as revealed in Table 2 are decomposed into the two orthogonal components of intercohort change in Table 3. Without dwelling on the impact of these components, we conclude for men (both white and black) that intercohort improvements in social origins [e.g., the average SEI score for father's occupation has risen at each son's age over the period 1962-1972 (Hauser and Featherman, 1974a)] stimulate but modest alterations (also, status upgrading) in the occupational destinations of same-aged men in the two periods.

Changes in component (1) for females (black and white) imply few systematic shifts in women's current occupations. Component (2), intercohort changes in age-specific mobility patterns, in all four sex-color subgroups marks the occupation destinations more distinctly, with effects by race and sex as described from Table 2. In summary of these components of net change between 1962-1972, Table 4 gives indexes of dissimilarity which underscore the small impact of intercohort changes in occupational origin and the larger bearing of changing intergenerational transition probabilities. If there is a sexual pattern in the coefficients for component (1), it suggests that older cohorts of women benefit from shifting occupational origins to a greater degree than younger women; among men, perhaps the reverse relationship with age obtains, especially for whites. Component (2) clearly accounts for substantial intercohort change in current occupation, and in some comparisons is equivalent to or larger than the total net intercohort differences. In all subgroups the oldest cohorts experience the greatest inefficiency in effecting the total intercohort changes (1962-1972), since the sums of their components exceed these total changes.

[Tables 3 and 4 about here]

We obtain our first direct comparison of male-female trends by color in Table 5 by subtracting the female columns of Table 2 from the same-color, same-age male columns. Hence, positive values represent excesses of male vis-a-vis female percentages. For whites in both years, employed females are disproportionately clustered in clerical and service work, and relative to males they are less likely to be in the labor force. White men tend to dominate the crafts and salaried managerial categories.

[Table 5 about here]

Between 1962-1972 white women have enlarged their concentration in both types of clerical work and young women experience a modest increase in percentages employed in other services. Outside these traditional roles, white females have gained in employment in proprietorships, as manufacturing operatives (among the two youngest cohorts) and in farming. While white women have increased their chances of being in the labor force, relative to men, they also suffer a greater vulnerability to unemployment vis-a-vis men over this period. On the other hand, white men gain in percentages allocated into salaried positions as both professionals and managers (especially among the two youngest cohorts). Among whites, therefore, males may be "preferred workers" to females in that they have shifted into the "growth" occupations (salaried, high status white-collar categories), while females either enlarge their allocations to "traditional" work as clerks and service employees or experience gains in those "decline" occupations which males are abandoning--farming, manufacturing operatives, and proprietorships. This interpretation (rather speculative in the absence of corroborating intracohort comparisons) of the relationship between white men and women is consistent with that advanced earlier with respect to white and black men (Hauser and Featherman, 1974b).

Within the black subpopulation, men dominate the other crafts and nonfarm labor, relative to women, in both years. Black females cluster in private household service, although in relation to men they enjoy a somewhat larger percentage employed as salaried professionals; women are less liekly to be in the labor force than men in both years.

In the years between 1962 and 1972, black women have increased their percentages employed in nonfarm labor (especially among the youngest cohort),

as nonmanufacturing operatives (among the oldest cohort), and they have supplanted males in proportions working in non-secretarial/stenographic clerking (mainly for the youngest cohort); they are recently more vulnerable to unemployment vis-a-vis men. Yet in addition to these trends toward incursion into occupational roles commonly held by black men (e.g. other clerical, nonfarm labor), black females have consolidated their prominence in service work outside private households. At the same time black males generally strengthen their high percentages as craftsmen (other) and as operatives, as which black men rather than women have typically gained employment, while experiencing increases in percentages working in the "female" category of private household work and in roles outside the regular labor force.

We venture the speculation, based on Tables 5 and 2, that job competition between the sexes is somewhat more prevalent among blacks than among whites. Age-constant intercohort changes in Table 5 portray an erosion of black female employment, vis-a-vis black men, although this may have more to do with increases in female (vs. male) percentages looking for work rather than with displacements of employed women by men; we cannot tell from these data. In the salaried profession, especially among older cohorts, black men are gaining in an area where the percentages of employed black women have been larger than for employed men; while the reverse pattern is observed for nonfarm labor and the other clerical category (youngest cohort only). As black women reallocate percentages employed in private households and other services, the percentages of black men engaged in private household service increase.

For whites we advanced the notion that men constitute "preferred" workers over women, relative to the "growth" occupation categories. Among black men

and women, a similar but lesser pattern might be observed. Black men have strengthened their percentages in high status blue-collar jobs (e.g. crafts), or "growth" categories and have experienced increases in salaried professions. Some "decline" categories (e.g. nonfarm labor) show decreases among employed men, but increases among women. Thus, subject to larger errors of interpretation stemming from greater sampling errors in the black data, we find a dual relationship between black male and female roles: first, a slight "preference" for men over women, and second, greater competition (than for whites) between the sexes for jobs to which blacks are recruited.

Additional evidence for the competition interpretation lies in the coefficients of dissimilarity in Table 5. Generally, blacks display more sexual equality (i.e. lower coefficients of dissimilarity) in role allocation and experience more recent intercohort changes toward equality at each age than do whites. For both races, sexual inequality has declined over the decade, at all ages. However, we do not want to miss the importance of the magnitude of sexual inequality within both races; pertinent coefficients of sexual dissimilarity range from 0.5 to 0.6. From Table 2 we compute the racial dissimilarity coefficients to range between 0.3 and 0.4 for men and between 0.2 to 0.3 for women.

Of course, the major source of dissimilarity in sexual patterns of role allocation is the differential probability of being in the regular labor force. While larger percentages of women are at work or seeking employment outside the home than in recent decades, and even though women constitute a larger proportion of the labor force than in the recent past (Sweet, 1973), being out of the labor force typifies a central role-set for large minorities

or small majorities of black and white women in the economically active ages of the last decade. Housewifery, mothering, and unpaid public service are activities not included in the regular labor force, although undoubtedly these roles constitute the occupations of large percentages of women, and surely they still differentiate the life cycles of mature women of both races from those of men.

We cannot fathom here the basis for this role differentiation--be it social, biological, psychological, or whatever. Neither do we here speak fully to the bearing of this differentiation on sexual inequality of status or on inequalities of socioeconomic opportunity. What little we can say is found in Tables 6 through 8. Tables 6 and 7 imply that the intercohort, age-specific shifts in the proportions of females vs. males allocated to occupation roles in and out of the labor force cannot be attributed to factors associated directly with intercohort changes in the sex composition of social origins [component (1)] in either race. (This is a somewhat trivial observation, since no one would argue that sex and origin occupation should be related systematically in either 1962 or 1972.) However, changes between 1962 and 1972 in sex differences involving origin statuses have affected (modestly) the probabilities of men vs. women being out of the labor force at ages 45-64 for whites and 55-64 for blacks. This has occurred as improvements in the socioeconomic origins of older white and black women have encouraged them to withdraw from the labor force and as similar changes or improvements in origins redistribute the oldest black men into the labor force (cf. Table 3).

[Tables 6 and 7 about here]

Aside from these rather minor sources of age-constant intercohort shifts in sexual role differentiation, which stem from component (1), the more major source of sexual shifts derives from intercohort changes in intergenerational mobility [component (2)]. The most striking feature of component (2) in Table 6 is the reallocation of same-aged black and white women into the labor force of 1972 (vis-a-vis men), relative to the 1962 period; these changes more than offset any counter effects arising from changes in component (1) at all ages and in each race. Otherwise, the impact of altered mobility matrices for females vs. males on the occupation distributions of whites and blacks follows the discussion of the intercohort shifts by color and age in Table 5.

We hasten to add this caveat. Although in both Table 4 and Table 7 we find that changes in mobility matrices comprise the larger component of age-constant intercohort shifts over occupational roles, one should not assume that the origin-to-current mobility relationships themselves have changed, apart from changes in outflow probabilities in these matrices which follow from "structural" (i.e., the margins of mobility tables) shifts in (1) the labor force of 1962 to that of 1972 and in (2) the origin statuses of the 1962 and 1972 age cohorts (Hauser et al., 1974; also Chapter 11 of this volume).

Table 8 underscores much of the analysis of male-female trends in mobility contained in Tables 6 and 7. We collapse our data over race to compare men with women, and we apply the 1962 male mobility rates to the origin distributions of appropriately aged women. In doing so we inquire about the hypothetical occupational consequences in 1972 of permitting cohorts of women

to experience the outflow probabilities of men which obtained ten years earlier.

At each age, the intercohort shifts in the social origins of women, coupled with the male mobility patterns, would have entered massive percentages of women into the labor force; they would have reallocated employed women into crafts, managerial posts, operative jobs and the professions and out of clerical, service, and retail sales. The substantial redistributional impact of the male matrices, relative to the force of changing female origins, is apparent in the comparison of Table 3 [black and white female component (1)] and Table 4 [coefficient of dissimilarity for black and white female component (1)] with corresponding values in Table 8.

[Table 8 about here]

Hypothetical consequences on female roles in 1972 of changing male mobility between 1962 and 1972 [component (2)] would have stimulated, at all ages, parallel redistributions of women as just discussed for component (1); the coefficients of dissimilarity for the two components are nearly identical as well. The results of this hypothetical exercise are clear. If females had experienced the outflow relationships of men circa 1962, their 1972 occupational roles (including the role-set encompassed by "out of the labor force") would have more closely approximated those of men in the same cohorts. In addition the ensuing hypothetical redistribution would have yielded a far more equivalent sexual division of labor than has emerged as a result either of the relative improvements for females (vs. males) in social origins or (more importantly) of the actual relative shifts in women's (vs. men's) intergenerational mobility (cf. Table 5). Therefore,

we can document the presence of sexual inequality of opportunity (viz., sex-specific outflow probabilities), even if we cannot explain it with our data. [Were we able to decompose net intercohort changes into three components, using information on women's first jobs to differentiate intergenerational from career mobility, we would have a better grasp on explanations. For example, one might be able to examine the relative merits of sex socialization vs. sex discrimination (including, here, differential life cycle patterns) arguments.]

We turn from sex differences in mobility trends to racial trends among females, an analysis which complements that for males in Chapter 6. Table 9 depicts a racial differentiation of the occupation structure among women which is quite different from the racial differentiation for men (cf. Hauser and Featherman 1974b), despite the obvious prevalence, among females as well as males, of socioeconomic inequality by race. At all ages and in both 1962 and 1972, black women are more likely than whites to hold service jobs in private households and outside households. At the youngest ages in both years, blacks suffer higher unemployment. Although lower percentages of white women participate in the labor force than among blacks, employed whites more frequently take up clerical work (especially other clerical) and the salaried professions (at older ages).

[Table 9 about here]

The pattern of signs in the years columns of Table 9 (at all ages, positive values indicate surplus of whites relative to blacks) clarify the dominance of white women in white-collar, higher status occupations. However the overall differences by race are few, save for the prevalence

of blacks in service work and the advantage of white women in clerking and in roles outside the labor force. Coefficients of dissimilarity decline between 1962 and 1972 at all ages, and at each age the role differentiation and socioeconomic inequality by race are less among women than among men (compare Table 9 with Hauser and Featherman, 1974b:Table 5).

Between 1962 and 1972, black women enlarged the percentage working in service outside private households (relative to whites), but they also have increased their relative percentages in roles heretofore largely dominated by white women--namely other clerical work and roles outside the regular labor force. The major shift, however, has involved the substantial exit of black women of all ages from private household service, increasing thereby the relative percentage of whites in this category.

The foregoing intercohort shifts of blacks and whites are decomposed in Table 10 and summarized in Table 11 by coefficients of dissimilarity. Changing racial patterns of the social origins of women account for quite small proportions of total intercohort changes over the decade; this reproduces the findings for men by race. Table 10 provides little insight into the impact of these reallocations arising from component (1), as the values are small and unsystematic. On the other hand, racial differences in changing mobility matrices [component (2)] have had a considerable bearing on intercohort shifts. For example, among the women aged 35-44, blacks gain in the salaried professions, other clerical work, and other service. In addition to this modest upgrading of the socioeconomic profile of black employees (vis-a-vis whites) over the decade, black women of all ages are more likely (relative to whites) to be occupied outside the

1972 labor force than a decade earlier. Again, this result parallels that for men, although absence from the regular labor force may have different significance within the ordinary role-sets of women and those of men. For white women, changes in the racial occupation distribution stemming from component (2) follow the pattern described in Table 9.

[Tables 10 and 11 about here]

Although the patterns are a bit irregular by age, we find a modest socioeconomic upgrading for employed black females vis-a-vis whites, together with increasing relative percentages outside the labor force, even among the young. Intercohort shifts for employed black women, especially the youngest ages, indicate their ability to compete successfully for jobs in those occupations which recruit women and which have expanded in size over the decade (e.g. salaried professionals, clerical). This pattern, albeit weak, is consistent with our assessment that the female labor force may be less sensitive to racial characteristics than the male labor force. We are loathe to advance a firm interpretation of rising black withdrawals from the labor force (relative to changing white percentages between 1962 and 1972). Whether or not white women constitute "preferred" workers for "female" jobs such that an increasing supply of white women for the labor force displaces black women we cannot say. However, the data on unemployment are not consistent with this interpretation; neither is the intercohort increase in labor force participation for young black women. Interpretations having to do with "discouraged workers," evolution toward a white female role-set, and withdrawals contingent upon improvements in employment opportunities for black men remain as some unanalyzed possibilities.

While racial differences in role allocation are fewer for women than for men, despite modest intercohort advances on the socioeconomic dimension, we might inquire about the hypothetical consequences of applying the 1962 white mobility matrices to black female origins. Table 12 displays the occupational redistribution which would ensue, had such relationships obtained; it can be compared to actual components in black intercohort shifts in Table 3.

[Table 12 about here]

Both components (1) and (2) would have stimulated a massive socioeconomic upgrading of black females between 1962 and 1972, had they experienced the white 1962 mobility regime. Relative to actual intercohort shifts, there would be large exits from service employment (especially in private households) and substantial entrances into clerical work (especially other clerical) and into salaried professions and managerial posts; at the older ages, percentages in non-manufacturing operatives would increase. Overall, these hypothetical reallocations would provide status upgrading for black females within both the blue- and white-collar sectors in excess of actual changes. White matrices would decrease percentages of unemployed blacks, especially among the younger women, but they also would transfer larger percentages out of the labor force.

Coefficients of dissimilarity in Table 12, when compared to corresponding values in Table 3, emphasize that any intercohort reductions in unequal role allocation by race among women are most modest when compared to the reorganizations of black female occupation distributions which would result from equal intergenerational opportunities for both races of women.

In that sense, racial discrimination is a clear burden on both black sexes, despite the unique manifestations of that discrimination within the different sexual role-sets of black men and women.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carter, N.

1972 The effects of sex and marital status on a social-psychological model of occupational status attainment. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

DeJong, P., M. Brawer, and S. Robin

1971 "Patterns of female intergenerational mobility: a comparison with male patterns of intergenerational mobility." American Sociological Review 36(December):1033-42.

Duncan, O. D.

1965 "The trend of occupational mobility in the United States." American Sociological Review 30(August):491-498.

1973 "Trends in the occupational mobility of U.S. men, 1962-1970." American Sociological Review 38(June):302-310.

Hauser, R. M. and D. L. Featherman

1974a "Socioeconomic achievements of U.S. men, 1962-1972," Science 185(July):325-331.

1974b "White-nonwhite differentials in occupational mobility among men in the United States, 1962-1972" Demography 11(May):247-265.

Lebergott, S.

1968 "Labor force and employment trends." Pp. 97-144 in E. B. Sheldon and W. E. Moore (eds.) Indicators of Social Change. New York: Russell Sage.

Suter, L. and H. Miller

1973 "Income differences between men and women." American Journal of Sociology 78(January):962-974.

Sweet, J.

1973 Women in the Labor Force. New York: Seminar.

Tyree, A. and J. Treas

1974 "The occupational and marital mobility of women." American Sociological Review 39(June):293-302.

TABLE 1

Estimated Number (1,000s) of Men and Women in Selected Cohorts by Color: U.S. Persons in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, March 1962 and March 1972

Date	Age in 1972 35-44	45-54	55-64
	Non-black Men		
March 1962	9,217	10,374	9,227
March 1972	9,710	10,170	8,121
Percent change, 1962-1972	+5.1	-2.0	-12.0
	Non-black Women		
March 1962	10,059	11,137	9,643
March 1972	10,303	10,964	9,106
Percent change, 1962-1972	+2.4	-1.6	-5.6
	Black Men		
March 1962	968	1,030	881
March 1972	1,023	975	719
Percent change, 1962-1972	+5.4	-5.3	-18.4
	Black Women		
March 1962	1,241	1,230	981
March 1972	1,304	1,166	868
Percent change, 1962-1972	+4.8	-5.2	-11.5

Sources: March 1962 and 1972 Current Population Surveys and Occupational Changes in a Generation survey (person tapes).

TABLE 2

Percentage Distribution of Employed Persons by Occupation and Net Change, 1962-1972, by Age, Sex, and Color: U.S. Persons in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, March 1962 and March 1972

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
				Non-black Men					
Professional, technical and kindred workers									
Self-employed	1.9	1.9	0.0	1.6	1.9	0.3	1.7	1.8	0.1
Salaried	11.3	15.0	3.7	7.4	10.9	3.5	7.0	7.2	0.2
Managers, officials, proprietors									
Salaried	9.9	12.7	2.8	8.7	11.9	3.2	8.4	9.5	1.1
Self-employed	7.1	3.4	-3.7	9.8	3.2	-6.6	8.9	3.7	-5.2
Sales, other	4.0	4.8	0.8	3.3	4.3	1.0	2.4	3.2	0.8
Clerical and kindred									
Stenog and secretaries	0.3	0.1	-0.2	0.2	0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Other	6.0	5.3	-0.7	6.1	5.8	-0.3	5.1	5.1	0.0
Sales, retail	1.5	1.3	-0.2	1.7	1.8	0.1	1.5	2.0	0.5
Craftsmen									
Foremen	3.0	3.2	0.2	3.7	3.9	0.2	2.6	2.7	0.1
Other	17.2	18.2	1.0	17.0	19.0	2.0	13.4	14.9	1.5
Operatives									
Other	9.2	9.2	0.0	7.8	9.0	1.2	7.7	7.6	-0.1
Mfg.	8.3	6.6	-1.7	7.8	6.5	-1.3	5.6	5.1	-0.5
Service									
Other	4.0	4.7	0.7	5.0	5.4	0.4	5.6	6.4	0.8
Private household	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-0.1	0.2	0.1	-0.1

TABLE 2 continued

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
Laborers, except farm	3.9	3.6	-0.3	4.0	3.9	-0.1	4.0	3.7	-0.3
Farmers, farm mgrs.	4.8	2.7	-2.1	6.3	3.5	-2.8	7.7	4.5	-3.2
Farm labor	1.2	0.8	-0.4	1.2	0.6	-0.6	1.5	1.1	-0.4
Unemployed	3.9	3.3	-0.6	4.3	2.9	-1.4	4.0	3.4	-0.6
Not in labor force	2.4	3.1	0.7	4.3	5.4	1.1	12.7	18.1	5.4
Total	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	
Number (1,000)	10,374	9,710		9,227	10,170		6,939	8,120	
	Non-black Women								
Prof., tech., kindred									
Self-employed	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.4	3.8	3.4	0.6	0.5	-0.1
Salaried	5.6	7.6	2.0	6.5	7.4	0.9	5.2	5.5	0.3
Managers, officials, proprietors									
Salaried	1.4	1.9	0.5	2.1	2.4	0.3	1.6	2.3	0.7
Self-employed	0.8	0.5	-0.3	1.7	0.8	-0.9	1.7	0.8	-0.9
Sales, Other	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.3
Clerical and kindred									
Stenog and secretaries	4.5	6.2	1.7	4.0	6.2	2.2	2.3	3.8	1.5
Other	9.8	11.3	1.5	9.4	11.4	2.0	6.3	7.5	1.2
Sales, retail	2.9	2.8	-0.1	4.5	3.5	-1.0	3.0	3.0	0.0
Craftsmen									
Foremen	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0
Other	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.1

TABLE 2 continued

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
Operatives									
Other	5.7	6.3	0.6	6.0	6.6	0.6	3.6	5.0	1.4
Mfg.	1.1	1.6	0.5	1.3	1.3	0.0	1.5	1.2	-0.3
Service									
Other	5.1	7.4	2.3	6.6	7.9	1.3	5.5	7.0	1.5
Private household	0.9	0.7	-0.2	2.0	1.0	-1.0	2.9	1.7	-1.2
Laborers, except farm	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.1
Farmers, farm mgr.	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2	-0.1	0.7	0.3	-0.4
Farm labor	0.9	0.7	-0.2	0.8	0.8	0.0	1.1	0.5	-0.6
Unemployed	2.0	2.5	0.5	2.0	2.2	0.2	1.3	1.4	0.1
Not in labor force	57.4	48.1	-9.3	51.0	46.0	-5.0	61.9	58.1	-3.8
Total	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	
Number (1,000)	11,137	10,303		9,642	10,964		7,500	9,106	
	Black Men								
Prof., tech., kindred									
Self-employed	0.4	1.0	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.8	0.2	-0.6
Salaried	2.5	5.9	3.4	1.5	3.9	2.4	1.2	3.2	2.0
Managers, officials, proprietors									
Salaried	1.2	1.9	0.7	1.2	1.7	0.5	1.1	1.0	-0.1
Self-employed	1.8	1.6	-0.2	2.2	1.2	-1.0	1.1	1.0	-0.1
Sales, Other	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.3	-0.3	0.0	0.2	0.2

TABLE 2 continued

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
Clerical and kindred									
Stenog and secretaries	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	5.9	6.3	0.4	4.7	6.6	1.9	1.1	4.2	3.1
Sales, retail	0.7	0.5	-0.2	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.7
Craftsmen									
Foremen	0.3	1.2	0.9	0.9	1.5	0.6	0.2	0.7	0.5
Other	10.3	12.8	2.5	7.6	11.0	3.4	6.6	10.0	3.4
Operatives									
Other	11.9	14.9	3.0	7.4	13.6	6.2	9.1	7.5	-1.6
Mfg.	9.0	12.8	3.8	13.1	10.3	-2.8	8.3	8.3	0.0
Service									
Other	9.7	11.4	1.7	13.6	12.9	-0.7	16.7	16.0	-0.7
Private household	0.2	0.0	-0.2	1.4	0.3	-1.1	0.5	0.0	-0.5
Laborers, except farm	21.3	12.1	-9.2	19.8	15.3	-4.5	16.9	14.6	-2.3
Farmers, farm mgr.	3.2	0.0	-3.2	3.7	0.5	-3.2	2.8	2.0	-0.8
Farm labor	3.7	2.1	-1.6	4.4	2.6	-1.8	4.6	2.8	-1.8
Unemployed	12.2	6.8	-5.4	10.3	4.0	-6.3	11.2	4.4	-6.8
Not in labor force	5.5	8.4	2.9	7.7	13.6	5.9	17.9	23.3	5.4
Total	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	
Number (1,000)	1,030	1,023		881	975		627	719	
			Black Women						
Prof., tech., kindred									
Self-employed	0.3	0.1	-0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.4	-0.1
Salaried	4.5	7.6	3.1	4.1	5.1	1.0	2.1	3.0	0.9

TABLE 2 continued

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
Managers, officials proprietors									
Salaried	0.3	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.3	0.5	1.3	0.8
Self-employed	0.5	0.4	-0.1	0.7	0.1	-0.6	1.3	0.0	-1.3
Sales, Other	0.3	0.1	-0.2	0.2	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.3	0.3
Clerical and kindred									
Stenog and secretaries	1.2	2.1	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.3	0.2	-0.1
Other	2.7	6.5	3.8	2.9	3.9	1.0	0.8	3.3	2.5
Sales, retail	0.6	1.1	0.5	0.4	1.4	1.0	0.6	0.2	-0.4
Craftsmen									
Foremen	0.2	0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	-0.1
Operatives									
Other	5.8	6.7	0.9	3.9	6.0	2.1	1.5	2.1	0.6
Mfg.	2.9	2.3	-0.6	2.2	2.7	0.5	2.6	3.0	0.4
Service									
Other	12.1	18.9	6.8	14.5	20.3	5.8	9.0	12.2	3.2
Private household	19.9	8.7	-11.2	23.5	12.9	-10.6	24.2	16.2	-8.0
Labor, except farm	0.1	0.7	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.3
Farmers, farm mgr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.7	0.0	-0.7
Farm labor	1.1	0.1	-1.0	1.0	0.3	-0.7	0.7	0.4	-0.3
Unemployed	5.3	4.9	-0.4	4.7	3.0	-1.7	1.8	1.9	0.1
Not in labor force	42.3	38.6	-3.7	40.7	41.0	0.3	53.1	55.0	1.9
Total	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	
Number (1,000)	1,230	1,304		908	1,166		691	868	

Sources: March 1962 Current Population Survey and March 1962 and March 1972 Current Population Surveys (person tapes).

TABLE 3

Components[a] of Intercohort Change in Occupation Distribution by Age, Sex, and Color: U.S. Persons in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, March 1962 and March 1972

Occupation	35-44		45-54		55-64	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Non-black Men						
Prof., tech., and kindred						
Self-employed	0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.3	-0.1	0.2
Salaried	0.6	3.1	0.2	3.3	0.2	-0.1
Managers, officials, proprietors						
Salaried	-0.1	2.9	0.4	2.8	0.3	0.8
Self-employed	-0.4	-3.4	0.0	-6.6	0.0	-5.2
Sales, other	0.0	0.8	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.7
Clerical and kindred						
Stenog and secretaries	0.0	-0.2	0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.1
Other	0.3	-1.0	0.1	-0.4	0.1	-0.1
Sales, retail	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.5
Craftsmen and kindred						
Foremen	-0.1	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0
Other	-0.6	1.6	0.1	1.9	0.2	1.3
Operatives						
Other	-0.1	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.1	-0.2
Mfg.	-0.3	-1.4	-0.1	-1.2	0.1	-0.6
Service						
Other	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.8
Private household	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.1
Laborers, except farm	0.3	-0.6	-0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.3
Farmers, farm mgrs.	-0.7	-1.4	-0.6	-2.2	-0.8	-2.4
Farm laborers	0.3	-0.7	-0.1	-0.5	-0.1	-0.3
Unemployed	0.0	-0.6	-0.2	-1.2	-0.1	-0.5
Not in labor force	0.5	0.2	-0.3	1.4	-0.2	5.7
Non-black Women						
Prof., tech., and kindred						
Self-employed	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0
Salaried	0.2	1.7	-0.6	1.5	-0.1	0.4
Managers, officials, proprietors						
Salaried	0.0	0.5	-0.1	0.4	-0.1	0.8
Self-employed	0.0	-0.3	-0.1	-0.8	-0.2	-0.7
Sales, other	0.1	0.0	-0.1	0.3	-0.1	0.4
Clerical and kindred						
Stenog and secretaries	0.3	1.4	-0.3	2.5	-0.3	1.8
Other	0.2	1.3	-0.4	2.4	-0.5	1.7

TABLE 3 continued

Occupation	35-44 (1)	35-44 (2)	45-54 (1)	45-54 (2)	55-64 (1)	55-64 (2)
Sales, retail	-0.1	0.0	0.0	-1.0	-0.1	0.1
Craftsmen and kindred						
Foremen	-0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1
Operatives						
Other	-0.1	0.9	-0.3	0.9	-0.3	1.7
Mfg.	0.1	0.4	-0.1	0.1	-0.1	-0.3
Service						
Other	-0.1	2.4	-0.4	1.7	-0.7	2.3
Private household	0.0	-0.2	-0.3	-0.7	-0.5	-0.7
Laborers, except farm	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Farmers, farm mgrs.	0.0	0.1	-0.1	0.0	-0.2	-0.2
Farm laborers	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.1	-0.7
Unemployed	0.0	0.5	-0.1	0.3	0.0	0.1
Not in labor force	-0.4	-8.9	2.9	-7.9	3.0	-6.9
	Black Men					
Prof., tech., and kindred						
Self-employed	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.0	-0.6
Salaried	0.4	3.0	0.1	2.3	-0.1	2.1
Managers, officials, proprietors						
Salaried	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.2	-0.3
Self-employed	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	-1.0	0.1	-0.2
Sales, other	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.3	0.0	0.2
Clerical and kindred						
Stenog and secretaries	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0
Other	0.1	0.3	0.3	1.6	-0.1	3.3
Sales, retail	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.7
Craftsmen and kindred						
Foremen	0.0	0.9	-0.1	0.7	0.0	0.5
Other	0.5	2.0	-0.5	3.9	0.2	3.2
Operatives						
Other	0.1	2.9	-0.1	6.3	0.8	-2.4
Mfg.	-0.4	4.2	-0.3	-2.5	0.3	-0.3
Service						
Other	-0.2	1.9	0.7	-1.4	0.4	-1.1
Private household	0.0	-0.2	0.1	-1.2	-0.1	-0.4
Laborers, except farm	-0.7	-8.5	-0.1	-4.4	-0.3	-2.1
Farmers, farm mgrs.	-0.8	-2.4	-0.4	-2.8	-0.1	-0.7
Farm laborers	-0.1	-1.5	-0.3	-1.5	-0.1	-1.7
Unemployed	0.6	-6.0	0.3	-6.6	0.1	-6.9
Not in labor force	0.3	2.6	0.3	5.6	-1.3	6.7

TABLE 3 continued

Occupation	35-44 (1)	35-44 (2)	45-54 (1)	45-54 (2)	55-64 (1)	55-64 (2)
	Black Women					
Prof., tech., and kindred						
Self-employed	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.2	-0.1	0.0
Salaried	0.1	3.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.9
Managers, officials, proprietors						
Salaried	0.0	0.5	-0.1	0.4	-0.2	1.0
Self-employed	0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.6	0.2	-1.4
Sales, other	0.0	-0.2	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.3
Clerical and kindred						
Stenog and secretaries	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1
Other	0.1	3.7	0.7	0.3	-0.2	2.7
Sales, retail	-0.1	0.6	0.3	0.7	-0.1	-0.3
Craftsmen and kindred						
Foremen	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Operatives						
Other	0.3	0.6	-0.3	2.4	-0.3	0.9
Mfg.	-0.3	-0.3	-0.1	0.6	-0.6	0.9
Service						
Other	0.1	6.7	0.2	5.6	-0.1	3.3
Private household	0.2	-11.4	-1.0	-9.6	-1.1	-7.0
Laborers, except farm	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.5	-0.1	0.4
Farmers, farm mgrs.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	-0.1	-0.6
Farm laborers	-0.1	-0.9	0.0	-0.7	-0.3	0.0
Unemployed	-0.3	-0.1	-0.4	-1.3	-0.4	0.6
Not in labor force	0.0	-3.7	0.5	-0.2	3.3	-1.4

[a]Components are (1) net intercohort changes in occupational origins, and (2) net intercohort changes in the transition from father's occupation to current occupation.

Sources: March 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation Survey and the March 1962 and March 1972 Current Population Surveys (person tapes).

TABLE 4

Indexes of Dissimilarity Representing Components of Intercohort Change in Occupation Distributions by Age, Sex, and Color: U.S. Persons in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, March 1962 and March 1972

Component of Intercohort Change	35-44	45-54	55-64
Non-black Men			
Occupational origin	2.3	1.4	1.3
Transition from father's occupation to current occupation	9.5	12.3	9.9
Sum of components	11.8	13.7	11.2
Total intercohort changes, 1962-1972	9.9	13.3	10.4
Non-black Women			
Occupational origin	0.8	3.0	3.1
Transition from father's occupation to current occupation	9.5	10.4	9.5
Sum of components	10.3	13.4	12.6
Total intercohort change, 1962-1972	9.9	8.0	7.3
Black Men			
Occupational origin	2.3	1.8	2.0
Transition from father's occupation to current occupation	18.9	21.7	16.7
Sum of components	21.2	23.5	18.7
Total intercohort change, 1962-1972	20.0	21.7	15.3
Black Women			
Occupational origin	1.0	1.9	3.6
Transition from father's occupation to current occupation	16.6	12.7	11.0
Sum of components	17.6	14.6	14.6
Total intercohort change, 1962-1972	17.3	13.8	11.0

Sources: Tables 2 and 3.

TABLE 5

Percentage-Point Differences between Male and Female Occupation Distributions by Age and Color: U.S. Persons in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, March 1962 and March 1972

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
				Non-blacks					
Professional, tech., and kindred workers									
Self-employed	1.5	1.4	-0.1	1.2	-1.9	-3.1	1.1	1.3	0.2
Salaried	5.7	7.4	1.7	0.9	3.5	2.6	1.8	1.7	-0.1
Managers, officials, proprietors									
Salaried	8.5	10.8	2.3	6.6	9.5	2.9	6.8	7.2	0.4
Self-employed	6.3	2.9	-3.4	8.1	2.4	-5.7	7.2	2.9	-4.3
Sales, Other	3.6	4.3	0.7	2.7	3.5	0.8	2.1	2.6	0.5
Clerical and kindred									
Stenog. and secretaries	-4.2	-6.1	-1.9	-3.8	-6.1	-2.3	-2.2	-3.7	-1.5
Other	-3.8	-6.0	-2.2	-3.3	-5.6	-2.3	-1.2	-2.4	-1.2
Sales, retail	-1.4	-1.5	-0.1	-2.8	-1.7	1.1	-1.5	-1.0	0.5
Craftsmen									
Foremen	2.8	2.8	0.0	3.4	3.6	0.2	2.4	2.5	0.1
Other	16.8	17.7	0.9	16.7	18.5	1.8	13.1	14.5	1.4
Operatives									
Other	3.5	2.9	-0.6	1.8	2.4	0.6	4.1	2.6	-1.5
Mfg.	7.2	5.0	-2.2	6.5	5.2	-1.3	4.1	3.9	-0.2
Service									
Other	-1.1	-2.7	-1.6	-1.6	-2.5	-0.9	0.1	-0.6	-0.7
Private household	-0.9	-0.7	0.2	-1.9	-1.0	0.9	-2.7	-1.6	1.1

TABLE 5 continued

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
Laborers, except farm	3.8	3.3	-0.5	3.7	3.6	-0.1	3.8	3.4	-0.4
Farmers, farm mgrs.	4.7	2.6	-2.1	6.0	3.3	-2.7	7.0	4.2	-2.8
Farm labor	0.3	0.1	-0.2	0.4	-0.2	-0.6	0.4	0.6	0.2
Unemployed	1.9	0.8	-1.1	2.3	0.7	-1.6	2.7	2.0	-0.7
Not in labor force	-55.0	-45.0	10.0	-46.7	-40.6	6.1	-49.2	-40.0	9.2
Index of Dissimilarity	66.4	62.0	16.0	60.1	59.6	17.0	56.8	49.3	13.4
	Blacks								
Professional, tech., and kindred workers									
Self-employed	0.1	0.9	0.8	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	0.3	-0.2	-0.5
Salaried	-2.0	-1.7	0.3	-2.6	-1.2	1.4	-0.9	0.2	1.1
Managers, officials, proprietors									
Salaried	0.9	1.1	0.2	0.7	0.9	0.2	0.6	-0.3	-0.9
Self-employed	1.3	1.2	-0.1	1.5	1.1	-0.4	-0.2	1.0	1.2
Sales, Other	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	-0.1	0.0	-0.1	-0.1
Clerical and kindred									
Stenog. and secretaries	-1.2	-2.1	-0.9	-0.7	-0.3	0.4	-0.3	-0.2	0.1
Other	3.2	-0.2	-3.4	1.8	2.7	0.9	0.3	0.9	0.6
Sales, retail	0.1	-0.6	-0.7	-0.4	-1.1	-0.7	-0.6	0.5	1.1
Craftsmen									
Foremen	0.1	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.2	0.7	0.5
Other	10.3	12.6	2.3	7.6	10.7	3.1	6.3	9.8	3.5

TABLE 5

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
Operatives									
Other	6.1	8.2	2.1	3.5	7.6	4.1	7.6	5.4	-2.2
Mfg.	6.1	10.5	4.4	10.9	7.6	-3.3	5.7	5.3	-0.4
Service									
Other	-2.4	-7.5	-5.1	-0.9	-7.4	-6.5	7.7	3.8	-3.9
Private household	-19.7	-8.7	11.0	-22.1	-12.6	9.5	-23.7	-16.2	7.5
Laborers, except farm	21.2	11.4	-9.8	19.8	14.8	-5.0	16.7	14.1	-2.6
Farmers, farm mgr.	3.2	0.0	-3.2	3.5	0.2	-3.3	2.1	2.0	-0.1
Farm labor	2.6	2.0	-0.6	3.4	2.3	-1.1	3.9	2.4	-1.5
Unemployed	6.9	1.9	-5.0	5.6	1.0	-4.6	9.4	2.5	-6.9
Not in labor force	-36.8	-30.2	6.6	-33.0	-27.4	5.6	-35.2	-31.7	3.5
Index of Dissimilarity	62.1	51.0	28.9	59.7	50.1	25.1	60.9	48.7	19.1

Source: Table 2.

TABLE 6

Percentage-Point Differences between Male and Female Components[a] *of Intercohort Change in Occupation Distributions by Age and Color: U.S. Persons in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, March 1962 and March 1972*

Occupation	35-44		45-54		55-64	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
	Non-blacks					
Prof., tech., and kindred						
Self-employed	0.1	-0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2
Salaried	0.4	1.4	0.8	1.8	0.3	-0.5
Managers, officials, proprietors						
Salaried	-0.1	2.4	0.5	2.4	0.4	0.0
Self-employed	-0.4	-3.1	0.1	-5.8	0.2	-4.5
Sales, other	-0.1	0.8	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.3
Clerical and kindred						
Stenog and secretaries	-0.3	-1.6	0.3	-2.6	0.3	-1.9
Other	0.1	-2.3	0.5	-2.8	0.6	-1.8
Sales, retail	0.1	-0.2	0.0	1.1	0.1	0.4
Craftsmen and kindred						
Foremen	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0
Other	-0.6	1.5	0.1	1.7	0.2	1.2
Operatives						
Other	0.0	-0.8	0.4	0.2	0.4	-1.9
Mfg.	-0.4	1.5	0.0	-1.3	0.2	-0.3
Service						
Other	0.3	-1.9	0.4	-1.3	0.7	-1.5
Private household	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.6
Laborers, except farm	0.3	-0.8	-0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.4
Farmers, farm mgrs.	-0.7	-1.5	0.5	-2.2	-0.6	-2.2
Farm laborers	0.3	-0.6	0.0	-0.6	-0.2	0.4
Unemployed	0.0	-1.1	-0.1	-1.5	-0.1	-0.6
Not in labor force	0.9	9.1	-3.2	9.3	-3.2	12.6
	Blacks					
Prof., tech., and kindred						
Self-employed	0.0	0.8	0.0	-0.1	0.1	-0.6
Salaried	0.3	0.0	0.1	1.3	-0.1	1.2
Managers, officials, proprietors						
Salaried	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.4	-1.3
Self-employed	-0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.4	-0.1	1.2
Sales, other	0.0	0.2	0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.1
Clerical and kindred						
Stenog and secretaries	-0.2	-0.7	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.1
Other	0.0	-3.4	-0.4	1.3	0.1	0.6

TABLE 6 continued

Occupation	35-44		45-54		55-64	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Sales, retail	0.1	-0.8	-0.3	-0.4	0.1	1.0
Craftsmen and kindred						
Foremen	2.0	0.9	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.5
Other	0.5	1.8	-0.5	3.6	0.2	3.2
Operatives						
Other	-0.2	2.3	0.2	3.9	1.1	-3.3
Mfg.	-0.1	4.5	-0.2	-3.1	0.9	-1.2
Service						
Other	-0.3	-4.8	0.5	-7.0	0.5	-4.4
Private household	-0.2	11.3	1.1	8.4	1.0	6.6
Laborers, except farm	-0.7	-9.1	-0.1	-4.9	-0.2	-1.5
Farmers, farm mgrs.	-0.8	-2.4	-0.4	-2.9	0.0	-0.1
Farm laborers	0.0	-0.6	-0.3	-0.8	0.2	-1.7
Unemployed	0.9	-5.9	0.7	-5.3	0.5	-7.5
Not in labor force	0.3	6.3	-0.2	5.8	-4.6	8.1

[a]Components are (1) net intercohort changes in occupational origins of men and women; (2) net intercohort changes in transitions of men and women from their respective paternal occupation origins to their own respective current occupations.

Source: Table 3.

TABLE 7

Sums of Positive Percentage-Point Differences between Male and Female Components of Change in Occupation Distributions by Age and Color: U.S. Persons in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, March 1962 and March 1972

Component of Intercohort Change	35-44	45-54	55-64
Non-blacks			
Occupational origin	2.6	3.4	4.1
Transition from father's occupation to current occupation	15.5	18.1	15.6
Sum of components	18.1	21.5	19.7
Total intercohort changes, 1962-1972	16.2	17.0	13.4
Blacks			
Occupational origin	2.4	2.7	5.1
Transition from father's occupation to current occupation	28.1	24.9	22.5
Sum of components	33.1	27.6	27.6
Total intercohort change, 1962-1972	28.8	25.1	19.1

Sources: Tables 5 and 6.

TABLE 8

Hypothetical Components[a] of Change, 1962-1972 in the Female Occupation Distribution by Age, Based on Transition Matrices of Males in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population in March 1962

Occupation	35-44		45-54		55-64	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Prof., tech., and kindred						
Self-employed	1.5	-1.4	1.4	-1.4	1.1	-1.2
Salaried	5.3	-3.2	4.1	-3.2	5.3	-5.0
Managers, officials, proprietors						
Salaried	8.0	-7.4	6.9	-6.6	7.0	-6.3
Self-employed	5.8	-6.0	4.9	-5.8	4.8	-5.6
Sales, other	3.3	-3.2	3.0	-2.7	3.2	-2.8
Clerical and kindred						
Stenog and secretaries	-3.9	5.4	-3.4	5.3	-1.8	3.2
Other	-3.0	4.7	-2.8	4.7	0.0	1.2
Sales, retail	-1.1	1.1	-2.7	1.9	-1.4	1.3
Craftsmen and kindred						
Foremen	2.5	-2.3	2.4	-2.3	2.3	-2.3
Other	15.7	-15.6	16.1	-15.9	15.6	-15.5
Operatives						
Other	3.7	-3.1	3.8	-3.1	6.1	-4.7
Mfg.	6.9	-6.5	7.1	-6.9	6.7	-7.0
Service						
Other	-1.1	3.9	-2.6	4.3	-1.1	3.0
Private household	-2.8	1.6	-4.0	2.2	-4.7	2.9
Laborers, except farm	5.6	-5.4	5.5	-5.4	6.0	-5.9
Farmers, farm mgrs.	3.8	-3.8	4.1	-4.2	4.2	-4.6
Farm laborers	0.6	-0.8	0.7	-0.8	0.8	-1.3
Unemployed	2.5	-2.0	2.6	-2.6	3.5	-3.3
Not in labor force	-52.8	43.9	-47.1	42.6	-57.6	54.3
Index of dissimilarity	64.6	60.7	62.6	60.9	66.6	65.9

[a]Components are (1) changes in occupation origin; (2) changes in the transition from father's occupation to current occupation.

Sources: March 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation survey and March 1972 Current Population Survey (person tape).

TABLE 9

Percentage-Point Differences between the Black and Non-black Occupation Distributions by Age: U.S. Women in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, March 1962 and March 1972

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
Professional, technical and kindred									
Self-employed	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.4	3.6	3.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
Salaried	1.1	0.0	-1.1	2.4	2.3	-0.1	3.1	2.5	-0.6
Managers, officials, and proprietors									
Salaried	1.1	1.1	0.0	1.6	1.6	0.0	1.1	1.0	-0.1
Self-employed	0.3	0.1	-0.2	1.0	0.7	-0.3	0.4	0.8	0.4
Sales, Other	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.0
Clerical and kindred									
Stenog. and secretaries	3.3	4.1	0.8	3.3	5.5	2.2	2.0	3.6	1.6
Other	7.1	4.8	-2.3	6.5	7.5	-1.0	5.5	4.2	-1.3
Sales, retail	2.3	1.7	-0.6	4.1	2.1	-2.0	2.4	2.8	0.4
Craftsmen and foremen									
Foremen	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	-0.3	-0.6	0.2	0.2	0.0
Other	0.4	0.3	-0.1	0.3	0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2
Operatives									
Other	-0.1	-0.4	-0.3	2.1	0.6	-1.5	2.1	2.9	0.8
Mfg.	-1.8	-0.7	1.1	-0.9	-1.4	-0.5	-1.1	-1.8	-0.7
Services									
Other	-7.0	-11.5	-4.5	-7.9	-12.4	-4.5	-3.5	-5.2	-1.7
Private household	-19.0	-8.0	11.0	-21.5	-11.9	9.6	-21.3	-14.5	6.8
Laborers, except farm	0.0	-0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.2	-0.5	0.0	-0.2	-0.2
Farmers and farm mgrs.	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	-0.1	-0.2	0.0	0.3	0.3
Farm laborers	-0.2	0.6	0.8	-0.2	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.1	-0.3
Unemployed	-3.3	-2.4	0.9	-2.7	-0.8	1.9	-0.5	-0.5	0.0
Not in labor force	15.1	9.5	-5.6	10.3	5.0	-5.3	8.8	3.1	-5.7
Index of Dissimilarity	31.4	23.4	15.1	33.2	27.1	15.6	26.4	22.2	10.6

Source: Table 2.

TABLE 10

Percentage-Point Differences between Black and Non-black Components[a] of Intercohort Change in Occupation Distributions by Age: U.S. Women in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, March 1962 and March 1972

Occupation	35-44		45-54		55-64	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Prof., tech., and kindred						
Self-employed	0.0	0.4	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.0
Salaried	0.1	-1.3	-0.6	0.5	-0.1	-0.5
Managers, officials, proprietors						
Salaried	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	-0.2
Self-employed	0.0	-0.2	-0.1	-0.2	-0.4	0.7
Sales, other	0.1	0.2	-0.1	0.5	-0.1	0.1
Clerical and kindred						
Stenog and secretaries	0.1	0.7	-0.3	2.5	-0.3	1.9
Other	0.1	-2.4	-1.1	2.1	-0.3	-1.0
Sales, retail	0.0	-0.6	-0.3	-1.7	0.0	0.4
Craftsmen and kindred						
Foremen	0.0	0.2	0.0	-0.6	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.1
Operatives						
Other	-0.4	0.3	0.0	-1.5	0.0	0.8
Mfg.	0.4	0.7	0.0	-0.5	0.5	-1.2
Service						
Other	0.0	-4.3	-0.6	-3.9	-0.6	-1.0
Private household	-0.2	11.2	0.7	8.9	0.6	6.3
Laborers, except farm	0.0	-0.4	0.0	-0.5	-0.1	-0.3
Farmers, farm mgrs.	0.0	0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.4
Farm laborers	0.1	0.8	-0.1	0.8	0.4	-0.7
Unemployed	0.3	0.6	0.3	1.6	0.4	-0.5
Not in labor force	-0.4	-5.2	2.4	-7.7	-0.3	-5.5

[a]Components are net intercohort changes in occupational origins of blacks and non-blacks; (2) net intercohort changes in transitions of blacks and non-blacks from their respective paternal origins to their own respective current occupations.

Source: Table 3.

TABLE 11

Sums of Positive Percentage-Point Differences between Black and Non-black Components of Change in Occupation Distributions by Age: U.S. Women in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, March 1962 and March 1972

Components of Intercohort Change	35-44	45-54	55-64
Occupational origin	1.2	3.3	2.3
Transition from father's occupation to current occupation	15.2	17.0	10.7
Sum of components	16.4	20.3	13.0
Total intercohort change, 1962-1972	15.1	15.6	10.6

Sources: Tables 9 and 10.

TABLE 12

Hypothetical Components[a] of Change, 1962-1972, in the Black and Non-black Female Occupation Distributions by Age, Based on Transition Matrices of Non-black Women in the Civilian Non-institutional Population in March 1962

Occupation	35-44		45-54		55-64	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Prof., tech., and kindred						
Self-employed	0.1	-0.3	0.4	-0.2	-0.1	0.0
Salaried	1.9	-1.2	2.4	-1.4	4.7	-3.8
Managers, officials, proprietors						
Salaried	1.4	-0.9	1.2	-0.9	1.3	-0.5
Self-employed	0.6	-0.7	0.4	-1.0	-0.1	-1.1
Sales, other	0.3	-0.5	0.4	-0.6	0.6	-0.3
Clerical and kindred						
Stenog and secretaries	4.9	-4.0	5.3	-5.3	5.9	-6.0
Other	8.8	-5.0	8.7	-7.7	11.1	-8.6
Sales, retail	2.3	-1.8	2.5	-1.5	2.4	-2.8
Craftsmen and kindred						
Foremen	0.1	-0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	-0.3
Other	0.5	-0.3	0.5	-0.2	0.3	-0.3
Operatives						
Other	1.3	-0.4	3.1	-1.1	5.8	-5.2
Mfg.	-1.3	0.7	-0.6	1.1	-1.0	1.4
Service						
Other	-6.0	12.8	-8.4	14.2	-2.8	6.0
Private household	-18.4	7.2	-22.1	11.4	-22.7	14.7
Laborers, except farm	0.0	0.6	0.1	0.4	-0.1	0.3
Farmers, farm mgrs.	0.3	-0.3	0.0	0.1	-0.4	-0.3
Farm laborers	-0.2	-0.8	-0.1	-0.6	0.3	-0.6
Unemployed	-2.4	2.0	-1.8	0.0	1.2	-1.1
Not in labor force	5.9	-10.2	7.3	-7.0	-6.8	8.7
Index of dissimilarity	28.4	25.4	32.6	27.5	33.9	31.1

[a]Components are (1) changes in occupational origin; (2) changes in the transition from father's occupation to current occupation.

Sources: March 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation survey and March 1972 Current Population Survey (person tape).