国立社会保障・人口問題研究所

Working Paper Series （E）

No.1

The Pattern of Intergenerational Mobility Among Men and Woman

Sawako Shirahase

July 1997

No.1

The Pattern of Intergenerational Mobility Among Men and Woman

Sawako Shirahase

July 1997

THE PATTERN OF INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY AMONG MEN AND WOMEN

Sawako Shirahase

1   INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we would like to develop our discussion on sex differences in the labour market by focusing on intergenerational mobility among men and women. We will examine how individuals change their positions in the labour market between generations and compare the mobility patterns of men and women. The data set which will be analysed in this study is derived from the 1985 Social Stratification and Social mobility Survey (1985 SSM).

Sex segregation can be found within occupations primarily in the form of the difference in employment status and in access to managerial status (Shirahase and Ishida 1994). In fact, men are more likely to be self-employed (18.0 per cent) than women (12.5 per cent). Japanese women, mainly in the agricultural sector, are far more likely to be family workers (20.1 per cent) than men (2.8 per cent).[1] These sex differences in employment status would not be captured if we focused only on the occupational distribution of men and women. Similarly, managerial status within occupations is unequally distributed among men and women. For example, we already know that male clerical workers are much more likely to hold managerial positions than their female counterparts.

Therefore, we would like to use a classification of men's and women's positions in the labour market that would take account of this sex differentiation in employment status and managerial status as well as in occupation.

---

1. The number in the parenthesis is from the 1985 SSM survey.

In measuring positions in the labour market, we will use the class schema developed by Goldthorpe and his colleagues (1987). This class schema was originally developed for examining class mobility among men, but it may also be applied in investigating sex differences in the labour market, especially after a finer distinction was made for the routine non-manual class (see below and Goldthorpe and Payne 1986a). Goldthorpe's class schema uses detailed occupational classification as one of the main criteria for constructing class categories, but it also takes into account employment and managerial status and size of the firm. Respondents are assigned to one of the class categories on the basis of similarity in market and work situations (Lockwood 1958) determined by the combination of variables available in the social survey data: occupation, employment status, firm size, and managerial status. Therefore, these categories are a more sophisticated classification for analysing social structure than occupational categories and will be used in the analysis of intergenerational mobility.

The class schema consists of seven class categories: (1) higher and lower professional and administrative employees and large proprietors, or often called the service class; (2) routine non-manual workers; (3) the self-employed with or without employees, or the petty bourgeoisie; (4) farmers; (5) supervisors and skilled manual workers; (6) semi- and non-skilled manual workers; and (7) farm workers. We further divided the routine non-manual category into higher and lower groups. The reason for splitting this routine non-manual class is that women are more likely to be concentrated in lower routine non-manual work and that the work situation of women in this category is close to that of men in semi- and non-skilled manual work. Therefore, in comparing men with women, this category is divided into lower and higher

routine non-manual and the former is combined with semi- and non-skilled manual work (for details, see Goldthorpe and Payne 1986a).

We will begin by analysing social mobility through employment using the class schema but we do not intend to discuss the issue of class mobility which involves the unit of class analysis. Therefore, labels such as 'the service class' are used to indicate <u>individual</u> positions in the labour market, rather than <u>class</u> positions. Here we are simply going to take categories of class schema as referring to different types of employment because the discussion of class position and class mobility requires the determination of the unit of class analysis, that is, whether the unit should be an individual or a family.

The purpose of this study is to examine sex differences in various types of intergenerational mobility, focusing upon individual positions in the labour market. If origin is measured by fathers' main employment for both men and women, the comparison of men's and women's intergenerational mobility through employment can address the issue of the sex-segregated labour market. The difference in the pattern of absolute rates of intergenerational mobility between men and women may be ascribed to sex segregation in the labour market.[2] The sex-segregated labour market reflected in the difference in destination distributions between men and women will have a major impact on the total rate of mobility and on outflow and inflow patterns of mobility. Therefore, the examination of sex differences in intergenerational mobility will build on the findings on sex segregation in the labour market.

This study will be divided into the three parts; (1) the comparison of male and female intergenerational mobility through employment; (2) the

---

2. This is, of course, to assume that there is no significant difference in social fluidity between men and women.

comparison of male intergenerational mobility through employment and female mobility through marriage; and (3) the comparison of female intergenerational mobility through employment and through marriage. The following section will discuss various hypotheses concerning comparisons of different types of intergenerational mobility.

2 HYPOTHESES OF INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY

Comparison of Mobility through Employment between Men and Women

The first comparison corresponds to the individual approach to class analysis, mainly advocated by feminist sociologists (Acker 1973; Delphy 1981; Llewellyn 1981; Stanworth 1984), in which the individual is the unit of class analysis. Because we focus on individual positions in the labour market, women's current employment is treated as equal to men's current employment even if some of the women currently at work have experienced career interruptions or have part-time jobs due to their family responsibilities.[3] The individual approach in class analysis makes possible the comparison of patterns of male and female intergenerational mobility through employment.

The first hypothesis which we will examine in comparing male and female intergenerational mobility through employment is that women are more mobile intergenerationally than men (Portocarero 1983a; Chase 1975; Havens and Tully 1972; Tyree and Treas 1974; Erikson 1976; Erikson and Pontinen 1985; Heath 1981; Roos 1985). Most previous studies which addressed this hypothesis were concerned with the investigation of occupational mobility, but they consistently found a higher extent of intergenerational mobility between

---

3. The proportion of women who are not currently in the labour force is 40 per cent in the 1985 SSM survey and they are excluded from this analysis. These women could be included by assigning their last employment to them if they worked before. We have not adopted this alternative here.

fathers and daughters than between fathers and sons. This hypothesis can be explained by sex segregation in the labour market; because women's employment opportunities are restricted, the difference in distributions of fathers' and daughters' employment, that is, the difference in origin and destination, will be larger than the difference between fathers and sons. In other words, women's mobility through employment will be affected not only by structural change in occupation and employment status between the two generations but also by sex segregation in the labour market because fathers and daughters - obviously - are not the same sex.

The second hypothesis which will be examined is that the effect of women's origin on their present position in employment is less than that of men's. This second hypothesis is also related to the sex-segregated labour market. If the labour market is highly segregated by sex, women's current positions will probably be found in the female segment, independently of their origin. Women will almost always engage in women's work (or types of employment available for women) regardless of their social origins. In this extreme case, women's intergenerational mobility has no association with their origins. Therefore, we can hypothesize that the more sex-segregated the labour market, the less the effect of origin on the current position of the women in the labour market. The effect of origin probably would be negligible under the highly sex-segregated labour market.

This second hypothesis has implications for the previous studies of mobility in Japan which concentrated on men (Ishida 1993; Kojima 1986; Tominaga 1979; Ishida et al. 1991). If the association between origin and destination is weaker among women than among men in contemporary Japan, then the social fluidity or the openness of Japanese society was underestimated in these studies. Focusing upon the intergenerational mobility pattern among men

may be seriously misleading in understanding the extent of social fluidity present in the society as a whole. Incorporating women's pattern of social fluidity, therefore, may alter drastically the picture of social fluidity in contemporary Japan.

It is important to distinguish the first hypothesis from the second one. The first hypothesis refers to absolute terms of mobility, while the second hypothesis is about relative chances of mobility. This difference is crucial in assessing intergenerational mobility. Absolute rates of intergenerational mobility are affected by structural changes occurring between fathers' generation and sons' or daughters' generation, while relative rates of mobility refer to intergenerational mobility chances considered <u>net of</u> marginal distributions. For instance, the agricultural sector has declined over the last few decades and consequently the inflow mobility rate from farm origins is influenced by this decline. However, relative chances to move out of, or to stay on, the farm given different social origins cannot be influenced by a change in class structure. Odds ratios, one of the popular tools to examine the relative rate of mobility (Goodman 1972), will be used in this analysis.[4] Odds ratios show whether women's present position in employment is less associated with their origins than men's present position in employment.

Comparison of Men's Mobility through Employment and Women's Marital Mobility

This second comparison corresponds to the conventional approach to class analysis; the unit of class analysis is considered to be the family, not

---

4. Suppose we have a simple two by two table. The odds ratio indicates that the chance that a person originating from position A stays in A is either the same or different from the chance that a person originating from position B moves to A. If the odds ratio is one, it implies that the two chances are identical, thereby the origin does not affect the destination.

the individual (Goldthorpe 1983; 1984b; 1986b; Lockwood 1986). According to this conventional view, married women's class position is derived from their husbands' positions in the labour market regardless of women's work situation. Therefore, using the conventional approach, women's intergenerational mobility means mobility between their fathers' main employment and their husbands' current employment.

The first hypothesis which will be examined in the comparison of male intergenerational mobility through employment and female mobility through marriage is that women are more mobile intergenerationally through marriage than men through employment (Heath 1981; Chase 1975; Portocarero 1985). This hypothesis would be explained by the sex difference in the inheritance pattern, especially in the petty bourgeoisie and the farm class (Goldthorpe and Payne 1986b; Portocarero 1985). Sons of the petty bourgeoisie and the farm class show a fairly high tendency to inherit their father's class not only in Japan (Tominaga 1979; Yasuda 1971; Ishida 1993) but also in other industrial societies (Goldthorpe 1987; Goldthorpe and Payne 1986b; Erikson and Goldthorpe 1988). Even if they may not inherit their fathers' capital immediately after their entry into the labour market, sons of the petty bourgeoisie and of farmers eventually inherit it later in their career (See Ishida, Goldthorpe, and Erikson 1991 for delayed inheritance in Japan). On the other hand, daughters of the petty bourgeoisie and farmers tend to be excluded from inheriting fathers' capital and land through their own employment. Even through marriage they are less likely to get married to the petty bourgeoisie and farmers than are the sons of the petty bourgeoisie and farmers to inherit their positions (Goldthorpe and Payne 1986b; Portocarero 1985). Therefore, the extent of the inheritance of self-employment through employment by sons and that of the inheritance through marriage by daughters are expected to be

different, and the lower extent of inheritance by the daughters is probably the major explanation of the first hypothesis that women are more likely to be intergenerationally mobile through marriage than men through employment.

The second hypothesis which will be investigated in the comparison of men's intergenerational mobility through employment and women's mobility through marriage is that, in absolute terms, women have more favourable chances of upward mobility through marriage than have men through employment. This hypothesis can be derived from the popular conception of hypergamy, that is, that women tend to marry up rather than down (Parkin 1971). Goldthorpe and Payne (1986b, p. 536) reported that in Britain women experienced more upward mobility into the service class from other class origins through marriage than did men through employment. However, they also found evidence contrary to the popular impression of favourable opportunities for women to marry up. For daughters of lower technical and manual supervisory workers (Class V) and semi- and non-skilled manual workers (Class VII) origins, the tendency towards marrying up into the service class was no greater than the tendency of sons from the same origins towards moving into the service class (p. 537). We will use the Japanese data set to evaluate empirically the idea of hypergamy in Japanese society.

The third hypothesis concerning the comparison of men's mobility through employment and women's marital mobility is that women's marital mobility is less affected by origins than men's mobility through employment (cf. Heath 1981). Glenn, Ross, and Tully (1974) claimed that physical and personality characteristics which make women attractive to men as marriage partners are less closely associated with social origin than are individual characteristics of men which influence their current position in the labour market. Women's beauty and attractiveness do not depend on whether their

fathers are industrial workers or professionals, but they are innate characteristics of women. If women are attractive enough to get married to promising men, they would be able to move up to the service class via marriage regardless of their social origins. Compared with the restricted chances for men to move up into the service class due to their family resources, as far as women are attractive and beautiful, they would have better chances to move up through marriage. Again, the third hypothesis investigates different aspects of mobility to the first and second hypotheses; the first and second hypotheses refer to absolute mobility rates while the third hypothesis refers to relative mobility rates - the pattern of the association between origin and destination net of marginal distributions.

Comparison of Women's Mobility through Employment and Marital Mobility

Finally, the last comparison deals with two different channels of intergenerational mobility for women: marriage and employment. The pattern of mobility through marriage will be compared with the pattern of mobility through employment. By this comparison, we can find whether marriage offers better chances for achieving advantageous social positions than work and thus, examine differentiation in the mobility process among women across different channels, that is, marriage and work. Three related hypotheses, two regarding absolute rates and a third regarding relative rates, can be derived.

The first hypothesis is that women are more mobile intergenerationally through employment than through marriage (Portocarero 1985). The second hypothesis is that on the absolute level, women's mobility through marriage offers better chances of intergenerational upward mobility - mobility into the service class - than women's mobility through their own employment. As in the case of comparison of women's mobility through employment and men's mobility

through employment, the dissimilarity index between fathers' and women's own employment would be greater than that between fathers' and husbands' employment, since women's employment is restricted in types of occupation. Consequently more mobility is produced in absolute terms through women's own employment than through marriage due to greater differences in the two marginal distributions. Furthermore, husbands are more likely to be found in the service class than wives. Therefore, outflows to the service class will be expected to be greater in marital mobility than in mobility through employment.

As far as the relative chances of mobility are concerned, access to advantageous positions (such as professional-managerial positions) through women's work careers appears to be more influenced by social origin than similar access through marriage. The reason is similar to that found in the comparison of women's mobility through marriage and men's mobility through employment; the factors which affect the selection of marriage partners are less closely related to social origin than the factors which affect women's work career. Therefore, relative access to the service class (upward mobility) will be less influenced by social origins in marital mobility than in mobility through employment, and consequently women's marital mobility provides better relative chances of upward mobility than women's mobility through employment. This third hypothesis may be thought of as a revision of the hypergamy thesis in that marriage offers better relative opportunities for women than employment.

We now begin our analysis of intergenerational mobility. The first question we have to consider is the appropriate measurement of social origin for women's mobility.

Measurement of Social Origin for Women's Mobility

In the previous mobility studies focusing on men, men's social origin is measured by their father's work[5] and men's destination is measured by male respondents' current employment. In this case, the respondent and his father are the same sex. However, in the case of determining the women's origin, is it reasonable that their origin should be measured by their father's work? Fathers and daughters are different sexes, and, therefore, in assessing the difference between the distribution of origin and destination, the effect of sex segregation in the labour market would be confounded with the effect of structural change between generations (Rosenfeld 1978; Stevens and Boyd 1980). In examining women's intergenerational social mobility, it is not unreasonable to measure women's origins by their mothers' employment, and not by their fathers'. However, the most serious problem involved in using mothers' work in this way is that there are mothers who have never worked and, furthermore, even if mothers have ever worked, it does not necessarily mean that they have worked continuously since they entered the job market.[6]

---

5. The origin of the respondent is usually measured by father's employment at the age of 15 of respondents. However, in the 1985 SSM survey, for the female data set, the only source of information on father's work is his main work. Therefore, in order to make men and women comparable, we use the father's main work both for men and women.

6. The percentage of mothers who have never worked is 35.5 and the percentage of those who have worked both before and after their marriage is 41.4 per cent in the 1985 SSM survey. Nonetheless, we are not sure whether a mother

Let us first compare two different mobility tables; the father-daughter table and the mother-daughter table (Table 1). The total mobility in the mother-daughter table is lower than that in the father-daughter table: 71.9 per cent and 83.8 per cent, respectively. This is primarily due to the fact that the father-daughter table shows a greater dissimilarity in the marginal distribution than the mother-daughter table. By looking at the outflow rates, large differences in the two tables can be seen in the proportion of stayers in farm and skilled manual work; a higher tendency towards staying in these two categories is shown in the mother-daughter table than in the father-daughter table. Another large difference between the two tables is that daughters of higher routine non-manual mothers are far more likely to move up to the service class than those of the corresponding fathers: 32.6 per cent and 5.3 per cent respectively. Daughters of higher routine non-manual fathers are more likely to occupy supervisory and skilled manual work positions. Other than that, these two tables show a similar pattern of intergenerational mobility.

Let us move to log-linear analysis in order to examine the relative chances of intergenerational mobility between the mother-daughter and father-daughter tables. Looking at the results in Table 2, we can see that the common social fluidity model fits very well; G2 is 44.3 with 36 degrees of freedom. This means that the pattern of relative chances of mobility is very similar both where origin is measured by the mother's work and where it is measured by the father's work. In other words, there is no significant difference in the relative pattern of intergenerational mobility between the two tables. Which table shall we then choose? It would be more reasonable to

---

who worked both before and after marriage worked without any interruption during the working period.

choose the father-daughter table mainly because the usable sample size becomes
larger and, furthermore, because fathers' employment would be more stable and
continuous than mothers'. We will, therefore, examine the distribution of the
origin measured by the fathers' main job and of the destination measured by
the respondents' current employment regardless of sex.

**Comparison of Mobility through Employment between Men and Women: Absolute
Rates**

We present in Table 3 the distributions of the fathers' main position
in the labour market (origin) and the respondents' current position in the
labour market (destination) for men and women. Two important findings are
derived from Table 5.3: (1) a higher degree of dissimilarity between origin
and current position of employment is found among women than among men, and
(2) the degree of dissimilarity in the distribution of the current position
between men and women is as large as the degree of dissimilarity between
origin and destination among men.

Dissimilarities between origin and destination are mainly produced by
the overrepresentation in origin of the petty bourgeoisie and of the farm
group for both men and women.[7] The structural changes followed by
industrialisation must have affected not only men's but also women's
intergenerational mobility. In addition, the sex-segregated labour market

---

7. We already know that the degree of dissimilarity between origin and
   destination among sons in 1970's is relatively higher in Japan than other
   European societies (Ishida, Goldthorpe and Erikson 1991). Our figure
   (36.4) in 1985 is smaller than that (41) in 1975 for men, but the figure in
   1985 is probably still higher than most European societies. The main
   reason for the higher degree of dissimilarity between origin and
   destination in Japan is due to the Japan's experience of late but rapid
   industrialisation.

must have contributed to the degree of dissimilarity between origin and destination for women.

Evidence of the sex-segregated labour market can be found in the comparison of men's and women's current positions in the labour market. The degree of dissimilarity in the distribution of current employment between men and women is 37.2, while dissimilarity in the origin distribution between men and women is only 3.3. The dissimilarity index implies that in order to make identical the destination distributions for men and women, more than one-third of women, or men, have to change their present positions in employment. The extent of dissimilarity in destinations between men and women is as large as that between origin and destination among men (36.4). Therefore, the high degree of dissimilarity (61.3) between origin and destination among women reflects both the effect of structural change between the fathers' and daughters' generations and the effect of the sex-segregated labour market in the current employment.

Men are more likely to be found in higher professional and administrative work than women. Even after groups I and II are collapsed together into the service class which enjoys the most desirable market position in modern society (Goldthorpe 1982), men are more than twice as likely as women to occupy a service class position. On the other hand, women are more likely to be found than men in routine non-manual work and semi- and non-skilled manual work. Because sex differences in the origin distribution are very small (3.3), these differences in current employment between men and women are not derived from sex differences in origin distributions, but from the sex-segregated labour market in the 1980s.

In examining mobility tables in absolute terms, we have to distinguish the outflow mobility matrix from the inflow mobility matrix. In outflow

tables, we can see the flow of occupants given their class origin and we can find out where the individuals move and to what extent they stay in the category of origin. On the other hand, in inflow mobility tables, we can see origin compositions given the current employment. We can look at a pattern of recruitment into a certain current position: which group has a high degree of self-recruitment and which has a high degree of heterogeneity in origin composition.

Let us first examine the inflow mobility table. We present an inflow mobility matrix in Table 4. Dissimilarity indices between men and women are not remarkably high, but the relatively large degree of dissimilarity can be seen in the origin composition of the petty bourgeoisie and the farm groups. These sex differences in the origin composition within the petty bourgeoisie and the farm groups can be explained partly by the conventional form of the inheritance of capital and land. Men originating from the petty bourgeoisie and the farm are more likely to inherit the capital from their fathers than women. Usually the oldest sons are most likely to obtain the benefit from this capital inheritance, and women are less likely to be candidates for inheritance than men (Yasuda 1971). Consequently, men whose fathers are either petty bourgeoisie or farmers are more likely to be self-recruited intergenerationally than women. In particular, the degree of self-recruitment in the farm group among men is far higher than that among women. Almost 90 per cent of sons who are farmers had farm fathers and 66.7 per cent of daughters who are farmers had farm fathers. Therefore, the extent of intergenerational stability among male farmers must be very high. These results suggest that the inheritance of self-employment involving the direct transmission of capital shows sex differences.

In the service class, self-recruitment among women is higher than that among men (39.2 per cent among women and 32.4 per cent among men). Origin composition of the service class is more heterogeneous among men than women: about a half of men in the service class came from petty bourgeois and farm origins whereas about 40 per cent of women did. Possibly, these people move into the service class by using their economic benefits in self-employed work.

The sex difference can also be found in the origin composition of the higher routine non-manual class; about 30 per cent of men originated from the service class, while the corresponding figure for women is only 20 per cent. Women are more likely to come from the petty bourgeoisie (28.3 per cent) than men (16.9 per cent). The higher proportion of men from the service class origin than of women can be explained in part by the fact that some men who are in the relatively early stages of their career enter the higher routine non-manual class but eventually move into the service class later in their career (Cole and Tominaga 1976). The inflow pattern in the higher non-manual class among the older male sample (aged 35 and over) confirms that only 22 per cent of men came from the service class.

Among skilled manual workers (V/VI), origin compositions of men and women show a considerable similarity: more than half of skilled manual workers came from petty bourgeois and farm origins for both men (62.0 per cent) and women (56.6 per cent). Similarly, among non-skilled manual workers (VIIa), the majority of them came from petty bourgeois and farm origins for both men (60.4 per cent) and women (66.6 per cent). However, non-skilled men are more likely than women to be self-recruited (18.2 per cent and 7.4 per cent, respectively).

We show the outflow mobility matrix in Table 5. In this table, we can see intergenerational movement to different positions of employment given a

certain origin. Furthermore, we can examine the first hypothesis which states that women are more likely to be mobile intergenerationally than men.

The main diagonals present the proportion of intergenerational stayers given social origin. The proportion of stayers among men is higher than among women in five out of seven categories: the service class, the petty bourgeoisie, the farm, the skilled manual workers and non-skilled manual workers. These figures support the first hypothesis, i.e. that women are more mobile intergenerationally than men.

The two distinct categories in which men show a far higher tendency to stay than women are the service class and the petty bourgeoisie. In particular, more than 50 per cent of the sons of service class fathers stayed in the service class, whereas only 30 per cent of the daughters of the service class did. As far as employment is concerned, sons appear to enjoy the cultural and probably economic advantages of the service class origin more than daughters. Parents in the service class probably try to pass on their privileged positions to their sons while the same parents are probably concerned to preserve their positions through marriage for their daughters (see below on marital mobility). In examining the inflow table, we already found heterogeneity in the origin composition of the service class which has grown rapidly in the process of rapid industrialisation. However, once sons grow up in the service class family, we know from the outflow pattern that the majority stay in this privileged position.

Among the women originating from the service class, only 30 per cent stayed in the same position, and one-fourth of these women moved to higher routine non-manual work. Furthermore, women in the service class are more likely to be in lower professional work rather than in higher professional or administrative work (90 per cent of all service class women are in Class II,

lower professional and administrative work). Women originating from the service class have some advantage in maintaining the father's position probably through better chances of education, but they tend to be concentrated in lower levels of professional work such as nurses and primary school teachers. In other words, daughters of the service class, unlike sons, are unable to convert their advantaged background fully into the most advantageous positions in the labour market because of sex segregation within the service class.

The other category which shows a higher tendency for men to stay in their fathers' position is the petty bourgeoisie. About one-third of sons of the petty bourgeoisie inherit their fathers' capital while only nine per cent of daughters do. About one-fourth of sons of the petty bourgeoisie move up to the service class. On the other hand, women who originate from the petty bourgeoisie are more likely to move into non-skilled manual and lower routine non-manual work (36.8 per cent) or to higher routine non-manual work (23.3 per cent) than to stay in the petty bourgeoisie. In Japan like other nations (Great Britain, Sweden, France, West Germany), it appears that daughters of the petty bourgeoisie tend to be excluded from being the inheritance of their fathers' capital (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1988).

Finally, higher routine non-manual work presents an important sex difference in outflow mobility patterns. Men originating from higher non-manual work are far more likely to move up to the service class (42.0 per cent) than women (5.3 per cent) The majority of women from higher routine non-manual work background (57.9 per cent) experienced intergenerational moves to manual work. The destiny of men and women from higher routine non-manual work shows a remarkable contrast.

In summary, patterns of outflow mobility for men and women reveal significant sex differences, especially concerning intergenerational stayers of service class and of petty bourgeois origin. Furthermore, the proportions of stayers given different origins among men are in general higher than among women. These findings support the first hypothesis that women are more likely to be mobile than men. The total mobility rate, that is, the number of people on the main diagonal in proportion to the total number of people in the sample, also supports the first hypothesis. The total mobility rate for women is 84 per cent while the rate for men is 70 per cent. However, these absolute rates of mobility - inflow, outflow, and total mobility - are highly influenced by marginal distributions. As we already found in Table 3, the dissimilarity index for marginal distributions of the present positions of males and females in the labour market was 37.2. More than half of the women (53.3 per cent) who are currently in employment are in either routine non-manual (IIIa + IIIb) or non-skilled manual work (VIIa), while more men are found in the service class and the petty bourgeoisie. Because the origin distribution is determined by fathers' main positions in the labour market, the sex-segregated labour market must lead to a higher amount of intergenerational mobility between fathers and daughters than between fathers and sons.

Next, we would like to examine the sex difference in mobility, net of the marginal distributions. After the sex difference in marginal distributions is controlled for, does the sex difference in mobility remain at the same level or disappear?

Comparison of Mobility through Employment between Men and Women: Relative Rates

In this section, we would like to examine sex differences in mobility, net of marginal distributions. The main query is to what extent sex differences in mobility can be explained by sex differences in the marginal distributions. The focus of our attention is on relative chances of mobility and immobility between men and women. The analysis is also aimed at empirically testing the second hypothesis about men's and women's mobility: origin is less associated with destination for women than for men. We will now set up the standard model of log-linear analysis. The model is described, in multiplicative form, as

$$F_{ijk} = n \; t^O_i \; t^D_j \; t^S_k \; t^{OS}_{ik} \; t^{DS}_{ik} \; t^{OD}_{ij}$$

$$i = 1, 2, \ldots\ldots I, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots\ldots J, \quad k = 1, 2$$

where F_{ijk} is the expected frequency in cell ijk. A three-way mobility table is comprised by the social origin (respondents' father) (O) with I categories, the destination (respondents' current employment) (D) with J categories and sex (S) with K (2) categories. The multiplicative model shown above is called the 'common social fluidity' (CSF) model. This model implies that marginal distributions of both origin and destination are associated with sex, and origin is related to destination but there is no interaction among origin, destination, and sex. In other words, the association between origin and destination does not differ between men and women. Sex differences in the intergenerational mobility are almost entirely attributable to the difference in the marginal distributions, and there is no sex difference in the relative rates of mobility.

The results of applying the above model to our data are given in Table 5.6. In this comparison, we use the new 7 category version of the class schema which divides class III into IIIa and IIIb and combines the latter with

class VIIa. This new 7 category schema is specially constructed for analysing women's labour market because women are more likely to be found in lower routine non-manual work than men (see Table 5.3). Furthermore, lower routine non-manual work resembles semi- and non-skilled manual work in its market and work situation. In order to solve the heterogeneity found in routine non-manual work, we split the III category into IIIa and IIIb and collapsed IIIb with VIIa, as suggested by Goldthorpe and Payne (for details, see Goldthorpe and Payne 1986ab).

When we apply the common social fluidity model to data, G^2 is 58.8 which is significant at the conventional standard of .05 level. However, the p-value is .01 and the percentage reduction of G^2 from the independence model is good, that is, 90.7 per cent. Over 90 per cent of the association in the table is captured by the common social fluidity model. This model misclassifies only four per cent of all cases.

When we look at residuals under the common social fluidity model in order to investigate the source of the lack of fit, we find that one cell, that is, the inheritance of semi- and non-skilled manual and of lower routine non-manual groups (VIIa + IIIb), is mainly responsible for the lack of common fluidity pattern. When this cell is blocked, the common social fluidity model fits very well; G^2 is 45.8 and the p-value is .10. Therefore, the sex difference in relative patterns of mobility is found only in the inheritance of VIIa + IIIb class. Women are less likely to inherit in this category than men. With this exception, relative chances in intergenerational mobility between men and women are remarkably similar.[8] This peculiarity in the

---

8. This common social fluidity model can be fitted to four European nations (France, Hungary, Poland, and Sweden) when the sample size is standardised to 3,500, but not to the Federal Republic of Germany (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1988; cf. Roos 1986; Potocarero 1985). Similarly, Goldthorpe and

VIIa+IIIb -VIIa+IIIb cell may be interpreted as follows. The large portion of women who engage in semi- and non-skilled work are 'temporary' in nature. The proportion of part-time work and homework in the VIIa category among women is far larger (53 per cent) than in the other class categories. In contrast, all men in this category are full-time workers and, they are, therefore, the 'genuine' working class. Because of the temporary nature of non-skilled women workers, the propensity towards immobility in non-skilled work is lower among women than among men. In other words, semi- and non-skilled work tends to attract women not only from the non-skilled class background but also from other class origins.

The results of log-linear analysis do not support the second hypothesis which claims that the origin is associated less with the destination for women than for men. On the contrary, employment for women is in general associated with origin measured by father's main work as much as employment for men. The higher tendency towards moving intergenerationally among women than among men is thus largely explained by the sex segregated labour market, and the relative chances of intergenerational mobility and immobility are not different between men and women.

4   COMPARISON OF WOMEN'S MARITAL MOBILITY WITH MEN'S MOBILITY

    THROUGH EMPLOYMENT

So far our analysis has focused on the comparison of men's and women's mobility through employment. This section will concentrate on marital mobility and compare women's marital mobility with men's mobility through employment. Women who were currently in the labour force were examined,

---

Payne (1986b) show that common social fluidity model fits the 1983 Britain data with a few modifications.

regardless of their marital status for the last comparison, but in this section our attention will be given to married women irrespective of their employment status. In order to make marital status comparable between the female sample and the male sample, we will select only married men for the second comparison of women's marital mobility with men's mobility through employment.[9]

Marital mobility for women is measured by mobility between the father's main position in the labour market and the husband's current position in the labour market. Three hypotheses will be examined in this section: (1) women are more mobile intergenerationally through marriage than men through employment, (2) women have better chances to move up into the service class through marriage than men through employment, and (3) origin and destination are less associated in women's marital mobility than in men's mobility through employment.

The outflow marital mobility matrix for women and the outflow mobility for men through employment are presented in Table 7. Looking at the overall dissimilarity index, the degree of dissimilarity between men's employment mobility and women's marital mobility is much smaller than that between men's and women's mobility through employment (Table 5); 5.1 and 35.1 per cent, respectively. This suggests that women's marital mobility is very similar to men's mobility through employment, unlike women's mobility through employment. Nonetheless, differences do exist. We can find in Table 7 three categories which show differences in the inheritance pattern between men's mobility through employment and women's marital mobility; that is, the service class,

---

9. Married men are more likely to be found in the service class than men in general, because married men are more likely to be in the mature stage of their career than single men. In fact, the average age among husbands is 48 and the corresponding figure among all male respondents is 43.

the petty bourgeoisie and the semi- and non-skilled manual groups. In these three categories, men are more likely to stay intergenerationally via their own position than women via marriage.

In the service class origin, the tendency to inherit social origin is higher for men through employment (61 per cent) than for women through marriage (54 per cent). Men are more likely to convert the cultural and economic resources of their service class origin into the inheritance of a favourable position through employment than are women through marriage. Even through marriage - let alone through employment - women do not appear to benefit from their service class origin as much as men can do through employment.

Women of petty bourgeois origin show a higher tendency to move up to the service class (38.1 per cent) than to stay at their fathers' position (22.5 per cent). This tendency has been found in other European societies - England, Sweden, France, West Germany - (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1988; Portocarero 1985). Women originating in the petty bourgeoisie take advantage of their economically better family background and marry up into the service class. In contrast, men are more likely to inherit their father's capital in their career.

In the non- and semi-skilled manual origin, men are more likely to stay in their fathers' positions than women through marriage. In contrast, women originating in non- and semi-skilled manual families have a better opportunity to move up to the service class than men.

In sum, the differences between men's mobility through employment and women's marital mobility can be attributed to different patterns of inheritance, especially in the petty bourgeoisie. This difference in the inheritance pattern will consequently lead to a difference in the total

mobility rate. The total mobility rate for men's mobility through employment is lower than that for women's marital mobility: 69.8 per cent and 73.3 per cent, respectively. This result has implications for the first hypothesis which claims that women are more likely to move intergenerationally via marriage than men via their own employment. There is a modest support for this first hypothesis in absolute terms; women are more mobile through marriage than men through employment.

Let us examine the second hypothesis which states that women have more favourable chances of upward mobility in absolute terms through marriage than men have through employment.[10] Focusing upon the service class destination in Table 7, we find that women, in general, have a better chance to move into the service class through marriage than men through employment; the differences in percentage for movement into the service class are positive (that is, a higher proportion for marital mobility than for men's mobility through employment) from petty bourgeois, skilled manual, non-skilled manual, and farm worker origins. Differences from petty bourgeois and non-skilled manual origins are particularly large: 11.8 and 15.1, respectively. However, when daughters of routine non-manual and farm fathers are concerned, their chances of marrying up into the service class are no better in absolute terms than the sons' chances of movement into the service class through employment. In particular, sons of routine non-manual origin have a far better chance to move up into the service class through employment (44 per cent) than do daughters through marriage (32 per cent). Therefore, although the second hypothesis cannot be entirely supported by outflow analysis, daughters of manual class fathers seem

---

10. Although classes are not ranked hierarchically, classes differ in terms of their 'relative desirability', and the service class appears to occupy the most desirable and advantageous positions (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1987ab). Therefore, mobility into the service class from non-service class origins is considered to be upward mobility.

to have better chances of upward mobility into the service class through marriage than sons through employment.

The third hypothesis concerning the comparison of men's mobility through employment and women's mobility through marriage focused on relative chances of mobility - association between origin and destination. This hypothesis states that women's marital mobility is less affected by social origins than men's mobility through employment. The association between origin and destination is expected to be weaker in women's marital mobility than in men's mobility through employment. Let us move to log-linear analysis to focus on relative chances of mobility. We present the results in Table 8.[11] According to Table 8, the common social fluidity model does not fit at the .05 level of significance (G^2=58.37), but once a particular cell, that is, the inheritance of the petty bourgeois class, is blocked, the common social fluidity model becomes acceptable at the conventional .05 level of significance (G^2=44.40, p=.130). The results suggest that we can find common features between men's intergenerational mobility through employment and marital mobility among women <u>except</u> for one peculiarity in the inheritance of the petty bourgeoisie. The propensity towards inheritance for men within the petty bourgeoisie is much stronger than the propensity towards marriage to those of similar background for daughters of the petty bourgeoisie.

This deviation in the common social fluidity model in Japan involving the inheritance of petty bourgeoisie is also found in England (Goldthorpe and Payne 1986b). However, the English data set requires many more modifications

---

11. In this comparison, we use the old seven category version which does not split routine non-manual category because women are not included in this comparison. We compare different channels of intergenerational mobility; mobility through employment for men and mobility through marriage for women. Therefore, we compare men's current positions in the labour market with the husbands' current positions, and they are the same sex.

than the Japanese data set before it shows a satisfactory fit with the common social fluidity model. The result suggests that as far as the comparison of men's intergenerational mobility through employment and women's marital mobility is concerned, features of social fluidity appear to be more common in Japan than in England.[12]

Similarity in relative chances of mobility between women's marital mobility and men's mobility through employment casts doubt on the hypothesis that the factors which affect the selection of marriage partners are less associated with social origins than the factors which affect men's mobility through employment. It can be said from our finding that men and women take into account the factors which are related to social origins - such as family wealth, parental education, or the prestige of the family - as much as the factors independent of social origins - such as beauty and physical attractions - when they choose marriage partners in contemporary Japan. In other words, it is too naive to suggest that the selection of marriage partners takes place independent of social origins.

5 COMPARISON OF WOMEN'S MARITAL MOBILITY WITH WOMEN'S

   MOBILITY THROUGH EMPLOYMENT

This section focuses on the two different channels of mobility available for women: employment and marriage. The comparison between women's intergenerational mobility through their own employment position and women's marital mobility is aimed at investigating the three hypotheses set out in the introductory section of this chapter: (1) women are more mobile

---

12. Other CASMIN Project results agree with this observation and suggest that England/Wales is a rather deviant case, compared with other European nations (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1988).

intergenerationally through employment than through marriage, (2) in absolute terms women's mobility through marriage offers better chances of intergenerational upward mobility - mobility into the service class - than women's mobility through their own employment, and (3) in relative terms women's marital mobility offers better chances of upward mobility than women's mobility through employment.

First, when we examine the total mobility rates, women are more mobile through their employment than through marriage: 83.4 per cent and 73.1 per cent, respectively. This finding supports the first hypothesis. The comparison of outflow patterns between different types of mobility for women shown in Table 9 suggests that women have more favourable opportunities to move into the service class through marriage than through their own employment in absolute terms. In fact, in every origin, the percentages indicating the outflows into the service class are greater in marital mobility (lower figures) than those in employment mobility (upper figures). Especially in higher routine non-manual and petty bourgeois origins, differences in percentages are large.

The results of outflow rates show that in absolute terms women are more upwardly mobile through marriage than they are through their employment. Therefore, the second hypothesis is supported. However, this finding and the finding of a higher total mobility rate for mobility through employment than for mobility through marriage are primarily influenced by the difference in destination distributions. The index of dissimilarity between husband's destination and women's employment destination is 39.9. Husbands are much more likely to be found in the service class than wives in the labour market. The sex-segregated labour market appears to have produced a differential

pattern of outflow rates and different total mobility rates for women through marriage and through employment.

When we move from absolute to relative mobility, we are concerned with the third hypothesis: women's mobility through marriage offers better <u>relative chances</u> of intergenerational upward mobility - mobility into the service class - than women's mobility through their own employment. In order to examine relative chances of marital mobility and mobility through employment among women, we again resort to log-linear analysis. The results of this analysis are given in Table 10. The most important finding in Table 10 is that the common social fluidity model fits very well; G^2 is 29.6 with 36 degrees of freedom and the proportion of cases misclassified by the model is only 4.3. This means that relative opportunities of mobility are very similar both through women's own career and marriage and that differences in outflow patterns between marital mobility and employment mobility are almost entirely accounted for by differences in marginal distributions between husband's and women's employment.

As far as relative chances are concerned, the third hypothesis, or the revision of the hypergamy thesis (Parkin 1971, p. 55) cannot be supported; women's mobility through marriage does not offer better relative chances of intergenerational upward mobility than women's mobility through employment. Patterns of association which exist in mobility between fathers and husbands are similar to patterns of association underlying mobility between fathers and daughters through employment.

In summary, the two channels of women's mobility show a remarkably similar pattern of relative chances of mobility while absolute rates of mobility differ greatly between the two channels.

6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this paper, we examined three different sets of comparisons depicting intergenerational mobility among women: (1) the comparison of intergenerational mobility through employment between men and women, (2) the comparison of men's mobility through employment with women's mobility through marriage, and (3) the comparison of mobility through employment and mobility through marriage among women. The first comparison focused on individual current positions in the labour market between men and women, the second comparison concerned women's marital mobility and men's intergenerational mobility through employment, and the third comparison focused on the two different channels of intergenerational mobility for women, that is, marriage and employment.

Two hypotheses were investigated regarding the first comparison: (1) women are more mobile intergenerationally than men and (2) origin and destination are less associated for women than for men. The first hypothesis was supported by the results of total mobility and outflow mobility matrices. The higher tendency towards mobility through employment for women than men appears to be mainly derived from sex differences in the inheritance pattern of the service class and the petty bourgeoisie. Men are far more likely to stay in the service class and the petty bourgeoisie through employment than women of the same class origins. Even if women were born either in the service class or in the petty bourgeoisie, they tend to move to other places because fewer women are found in these classes than men, while men have better opportunities to take advantage of a favourable origin and are more likely to stay in these classes than women. This higher tendency towards intergenerational mobility for women through employment is attributable to the sex-segregated labour market (Roos 1985; Portocarero 1983b; Erikson and

Pontinen 1985); women's employment tends to be restricted to certain types of work such as routine non-manual and non-skilled manual work. Because origin distribution is determined by the father's class for both men and women, the sex-segregated labour market should lead to higher intergenerational mobility between fathers and daughters than between fathers and sons.

The results of relative mobility rates confirm this observation. A log-linear analysis showed that the relative chances of mobility through employment are basically similar between men and women[13] (Hauser, Featherman, and Hogan 1977; Dunton and Featherman 1983; Goldthorpe and Payne 1986b; Portocarero 1983b; Roos 1985). This means that differences in the outflow mobility pattern between men and women must be explained overwhelmingly by the sex-segregated labour market.

Furthermore, similarity in relative rates does not support the second hypothesis concerning the comparison between men's mobility through employment and women's mobility through employment. Contrary to the prediction of this hypothesis that the effect of origin on destination is weaker among women than among men, women's chances of mobility (net of marginal distributions) are as much dependent on their origins as men's chances. Although the labour market is sex-segregated and thereby produces differences in absolute mobility patterns between men and women, relative chances appear to be unaffected by sex-segregation in the labour market. Patterns of social fluidity among women and men are remarkably similar.

---

13. However, it is important to remember that there was one instance which deviated from the common social fluidity pattern. The inheritance pattern of the non-skilled manual working class showed a difference between men and women; men are more likely to inherit non-skilled manual work than women. However, this peculiarity can be explained by the sex difference in employment status within non-skilled and lower routine non-manual work. The proportion of part-time and home workers among female non-skilled workers is much higher than among male counterparts.

This finding has an important implication for previous studies on intergenerational mobility in Japan which concentrated on men. Because there is a similarity in the pattern of social fluidity between men and women, the conclusions about the openness in the Japanese society derived from studies on men may not be as misleading as the second hypothesis predicted. Although men's mobility patterns in absolute terms will definitely produce a misleading picture about the same patterns among women, the pattern of the association between origin and destination among men can be thought of as a fairly accurate description of the social fluidity pattern in contemporary Japan.

When we move to the comparison of men's mobility through employment with women's marital mobility[14], we set up three hypotheses (1) women are more mobile through marriage than men through employment; (2) women have better chances in absolute terms to move up into the service class through marriage than men through employment; and (3) origin and destination are less associated in women's marital mobility than in men's mobility through employment. The first hypothesis was supported by the examination of total mobility rates for women and men. Women were more mobile intergenerationally through marriage than men through employment. In particular, there was a different pattern of inheritance in the petty bourgeois origin between men's mobility through employment and women's marital mobility; men are more likely to inherit father's capital through employment than women through marriage. We found in the previous comparison that women were less likely to inherit a petty bourgeois origin through employment than men, but, again, women tend to be excluded from inheriting father's capital by marriage as well.

Rather than inheriting a petty bourgeois position via marriage, daughters of the petty bourgeoisie are more likely to marry up into the

---

14. Non-married men were excluded for this comparison.

service class than sons of the corresponding origin through employment. Furthermore, women of manual backgrounds have better chances of upward mobility into the service class through marriage than men of the same class background through employment. However, in routine non-manual and farm origins, women's better chances of upward mobility are not found. Therefore, the second hypothesis which claims that women have more favourable opportunities to move up into the service class through marriage than men through employment receives partial support from our data.

When we address the question of whether origin and destination are less associated in women's marital mobility than in men's mobility through employment, the results of a log-linear analysis suggests that this third hypothesis is not supported. Relative chances of mobility are the same between men's mobility through employment and women's marital mobility except for one peculiarity in the inheritance pattern of the petty bourgeoisie; sons of petty bourgeois fathers are more likely to inherit father's capital through employment than are daughters through marriage. The results also suggest that the factors which affect the selection of marriage partners are associated with social origins as much as the factors which affect men's mobility through employment.

Finally, we come to summarise findings from the comparison of women's mobility through marriage and that through employment. Three hypotheses were discussed in the light of empirical data: (1) women are more mobile through employment than through marriage, (2) women's marital mobility offers better absolute chances of upward mobility into the service class than women's mobility through employment, and (3) women's marital mobility also offers better relative chances of upward mobility than women's mobility through employment.

The first hypothesis was supported from findings on the total mobility rate. Furthermore, this tendency towards lower intergenerational mobility through marriage for women was accompanied by mobility in the upward direction. Women have better chances in absolute terms to marry up into the service class than the same chances produced by employment. This finding, therefore, supports the second hypothesis.

However, women's favourable opportunities to marry up into the service class are influenced by differences in marginal distributions between women and husbands. When we apply the common social fluidity model to women's marital mobility and women's mobility through employment, the fit is very good. In other words, once differences in marginal distributions between husbands and women are taken into account, relative chances of mobility are not different between marital mobility and mobility through employment among women. Consequently, women do not show any favourable propensity to marry up into the service class in relative terms, thereby the third hypothesis was not supported.

Two channels of mobility for women, marriage and employment, provide different mobility chances in absolute terms. Women can obtain more favourable chances of upward mobility through marriage than through employment, but marital mobility does not seem to produce more favourable chances in relative terms than mobility through employment.

In summary, the most important finding in this study is that sex segregation in the labour market plays a crucial role in explaining sex differences in the pattern of intergenerational mobility in absolute terms. In contrast, relative chances of mobility and immobility appear to be remarkably similar not only between men and women's mobility through

employment but also across the different channels of mobility available for women, despite the existence of sex segregation in the labour market.

Table 1   Comparison of Father-Daughter and Mother-Daughter
            Outflow Mobility Patterns

				[DAUGHTER]				
	I+II	IIIa	IVab	IVc	V/VI	VIIa+IIIb	VIIb	N
[FATHER]								
I+II	30.2	24.6	6.3	1.6	13.5	19.8	4.0	126
IIIa	5.3	31.6	5.3	0	21.1	28.9	7.9	38
IVab	10.4	23.3	9.3	1.0	16.6	36.8	2.6	193
IVc	7.3	12.1	3.2	4.8	16.5	36.7	19.4	248
V/VI	9.8	30.5	3.7	1.2	26.8	26.8	1.2	82
VIIa+IIIb	17.2	27.6	6.9	1.7	13.8	31.0	1.7	58
VIIb	10.0	0	10.0	0	10.0	50.0	20.0	10

				[DAUGHTER]				
	I+II	IIIa	IVab	IVc	V/VI	VIIa+IIIb	VIIb	N
[MOTHER]								
I+II	34.4	31.3	3.1	0	15.6	15.6	0	32
IIIa	32.6	32.6	4.3	0	6.5	23.9	0	46
IVab	8.6	20.0	11.4	0	11.4	42.9	5.7	35
IVc	3.3	9.8	6.6	11.5	9.8	42.6	16.4	61
V/VI	13.3	22.7	2.7	0	37.3	20.0	4.0	75
VIIa+IIIb	8.1	30.1	5.7	0	15.4	39.0	1.6	123
VIIb	7.3	13.2	3.3	5.3	15.9	32.5	22.5	151

Note: I+II = Service class
      IIIa = Higher routine non-manual class
      VIab = Petty bourgeoisie class
      VIc = Farm class
      V/VI = Supervisor and the skilled manual class
      VIIa+IIIb = Semi- and non-skilled manual and lower routine
                non-manual class
      VIIb = Farm workers

Table 2   Results of Applying Log-linear Models to the
            Father-Daughter Table and the Mother-Daughter Table

	G^2	df	p	ID	% Reduction in G^2
Independence	845.8	84	0.0	32.3	-
CSF	44.3	36	0.16	5.2	94.8

Note: ID = Percentage of cases misclassified by the model.

Table 3   Percentage Distribution of Origins (father's main
           employment) and Destinations (respondent's current
           employment) of Men and Women

	[MEN]		[WOMEN]	
	Origin	Destination	Origin	Destination
I	10.0	15.6	9.9	1.3
II	7.3	13.4	6.8	11.5
IIIa	3.6	10.1	5.0	21.1
IIIb	1.6	3.2	1.7	11.9
IVab	26.7	18.6	25.6	5.8
IVc	33.4	5.8	32.8	2.4
V	3.8	6.1	3.4	0.9
VI	5.9	13.5	7.4	16.2
VIIa	6.6	13.1	6.0	20.3
VIIb	1.2	0.5	1.3	8.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Dissimilarity index	36.4		61.3	

Dissimilarity index in origin between men and women = 3.3
Dissimilarity index in destination between men and women = 37.2

Note: I = Higher professional and administrative class
        II = Lower professional and administrative class
        IIIa = Higher routine non-manual class
        IIIb = Lower routine non-manual class
        IVab = Petty bourgeoisie class
        IVc = Farm class
        V = Supervisor in manual work
        VI = Skilled manual class
        VIIa = Semi- and non-skilled manual class
        VIIb = Farm workers

Table 4   Inflow Mobility Matrices for Women's Mobility
           through Employment (upper figures) and Men's
           Mobility through Employment (lower figures)

			[DESTINATION]				
	I+II	IIIa	IVab	IVc	V/VI	VIIa+IIIb	VIIb
[ORIGIN]							
I+II	39.2	19.5	18.2	11.1	13.2	10.3	7.7
	32.4	30.8	8.4	0	9.2	8.6	0
IIIa	2.1	7.5	4.5	0	6.2	4.5	4.6
	5.2	8.2	1.1	0	3.4	2.2	0
IVab	20.6	28.3	40.9	11.1	24.8	29.2	7.7
	24.2	16.9	47.9	4.5	24.5	24.0	10.0
IVc	18.6	18.9	18.2	66.7	31.8	37.4	73.8
	24.5	19.0	29.5	89.3	37.5	36.4	80.0
V/VI	8.2	15.7	6.8	5.6	17.1	9.1	1.5
	8.6	13.3	5.0	2.7	16.1	9.6	0
VIIa+IIIb	10.3	10.1	9.1	5.6	6.2	7.4	1.5
	4.7	9.7	6.1	2.7	7.9	18.2	10.0
VIIb	1.0	0	2.3	0	0.8	2.1	3.1
	0.5	2.1	1.9	0.9	1.3	1.0	0
N	97	159	44	18	129	243	65
	559	195	359	112	379	313	10

Note: See note for Table 1 for the explanation of class
      categories.

Table 5   Outflow Mobility Matrices for Women's Mobility
           through Employment (upper figure) and Men's
           Mobility through Employment (lower figure)

[ORIGIN]	[DESTINATION]							
	I+II	IIIa	IVab	IVc	V/VI	VIIa+IIIb	VIIb	N
I+II	30.2	24.6	6.3	1.6	13.5	19.8	4.0	126
	54.4	18.0	9.0	0	10.5	8.1	0	333
IIIa	5.3	31.6	5.3	0	21.1	28.9	7.9	38
	42.0	23.2	5.8	0	18.8	10.1	0	69
IVab	10.4	23.3	9.3	1.0	16.6	36.8	2.6	193
	26.3	6.4	33.5	1.0	18.1	14.6	0.2	514
IVc	7.3	12.1	3.2	4.8	16.5	36.7	19.4	248
	21.3	5.7	16.5	15.5	22.0	17.7	1.2	644
V/VI	9.8	30.5	3.7	1.2	26.8	26.8	1.2	84
	25.8	14.0	9.7	1.6	32.8	16.1	0	186
VIIa+IIIb	17.2	27.6	6.9	1.7	13.8	31.0	1.7	58
	16.5	12.0	13.9	1.9	19.0	36.1	0.6	158
VIIb	10.0	0	10.0	0	10.0	50.0	20.0	10
	13.0	17.4	30.4	4.3	21.7	13.0	0	23

Note: See note for Table 1 for the explanation of class
      categories.

Table 6   Results of Applying Log-linear Models to Women's
           Mobility through Employment and Men's Mobility
           through Employment

	G^2	df	p	ID	% Reduction in G^2
Independence	632.39	72	0.000	18.26	-
CSF model	58.80	36	0.010	4.01	90.71
CSF model blocking (VIIa+IIIb - VIIa+IIIb) cell					
	45.80	35	0.100	3.32	92.76

Note:Independence model=Origin(O).Sex(S)+Destination(D).Sex(S)
     Common social fluidity (CSF) model = O.S + D.S + O.D
     ID = Percentage of cases misclassified by the model.

Table 7   Outflow Mobility Matrices for Women's Marital
           Mobility (upper figures) and Married Men's
           Mobility through Employment (lower figures)

| | [DESTINATION] | | | | | | | |
[ORIGIN]	I+II	III	IVab	IVc	V/VI	VIIa	VIIb	N
I+II	53.9	13.8	12.6	4.2	9.6	6.0	0	167
	61.0	14.2	11.2	0	8.2	5.2	0	267
III	32.1	17.9	16.1	5.4	16.1	12.5	0	56
	43.6	16.7	15.4	1.3	15.4	7.7	0	78
IVab	38.1	9.4	22.5	1.6	16.4	11.5	0.4	244
	28.0	8.3	36.8	1.2	16.4	9.0	0.2	432
IVc	17.2	5.8	17.9	21.4	22.1	13.3	2.3	308
	21.1	7.1	17.5	17.3	20.7	15.2	1.1	560
V/VI	35.7	9.5	19.0	1.2	22.6	11.9	0	84
	26.2	17.7	12.1	1.4	29.8	12.8	0	141
VIIa	31.6	15.8	15.8	5.3	21.1	10.5	0	57
	20.2	14.9	11.7	2.1	19.1	31.9	0	94
VIIb	36.4	0	0	18.2	27.3	9.1	9.1	11
	9.5	19.0	33.3	4.8	23.8	9.5	0	21

Note: See note for Table 1 for the explanation of class
      categories.

Table 8   Results of Applying Log-linear Models to Women's
           Marital Mobility and Men's Mobility through Employment

	G^2	df	p	ID	% Reduction in G^2
Independence	601.11	72	0.000	18.74	-
CSF model	58.37	36	0.011	5.14	90.29
CSF model blocking (IVab - IVab) cell	44.40	35	0.130	3.62	92.61

Note: Independence model=Origin(O).Sex(S) + Destination(D).Sex(S)
      Common social fluidity (CSF) model = O.S + D.S + O.D
      ID = Percentage of cases misclassified by the model.

Table 9   Outflow Mobility Matrices for Women's Mobility
           through Employment (upper figures) and Women's
           Marital Mobility (lower figures)

| | [DESTINATION] | | | | | | | |
[ORIGIN]	I+II	IIIa	IVab	IVc	V/VI	VIIa+IIIb	VIIb	N
I+II	30.2	24.6	6.3	1.6	13.5	19.8	4.0	126
	53.9	13.2	12.6	4.2	9.6	6.6	0	167
IIIa	5.3	31.6	5.3	0	21.1	28.9	7.9	38
	35.7	11.9	14.3	7.1	19.0	11.9	0	42
IVab	10.4	23.3	9.3	1.0	16.6	36.8	2.6	193
	38.1	7.4	22.5	1.6	16.4	13.5	0.4	244
IVc	7.3	12.1	3.2	4.8	16.5	36.7	19.4	248
	17.2	4.2	17.9	21.4	22.1	14.9	2.3	308
V/VI	9.8	30.5	3.7	1.2	26.8	26.8	1.2	82
	35.7	7.1	19.0	1.2	22.6	14.3	0	84
VIIa+IIIb	17.2	27.6	6.9	1.7	13.8	31.0	1.7	58
	29.6	11.3	16.9	4.2	18.3	19.7	0	71
VIIb	10.0	0	10.0	0	10.0	50.0	20.0	10
	36.4	0	0	18.2	27.3	9.1	9.1	11

Note: See note for Table 1 for the explanation of class
      categories.

Table 10   Results of Applying Log-linear Models to Women's
            Mobility through Employment and Women's Marital Mobility

	G^2	df	p	ID	% Reduction in G^2
Independence	710.0	84	0.00	25.6	-
CSF model	29.6	36	0.77	4.3	95.8

Note: Independence model = Origin(O).Sex(S) + Destination(D).Sex(S)
      Common social fluidity (CSF) model = O.S + D.S + O.D
      ID = Percentage of cases misclassified by the model

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acker, Joan. 1973. 'Women and Social Stratification: A Case of
     Intellectual Sexism.'American Journal of Sociology 78:
     936-45.

Chase, Ivan D. 1975. 'A Comparison of Men's and Women's
     Intergenerational Mobility in the United States.'
     American Sociological Review 40: 483-505.

Cole, Robert E. and Ken'ichi Tominaga. 1976. 'Japan's Changing
     Occupational Structure and Its Significance.' Pp. 53-95
     in Japanese Industrialization and Its Social
     Consequences, edited by Hugh Patrick. Berkeley:
     University of California Press.

Delphy, Cristine. 1981. 'Women in Stratification Studies.' Pp. 28-
     39 in Doing Feminist Research, edited by Helen Roberts.
     London: Routledge.

Dunton, Nancy E. and David L. Featherman. 1983. 'Social Mobility
     through Marriage and Career.' Pp. 285-321 in Achievement
     and Achievement Motives, edited by Janet T. Spence. San
     Francisco: Freeman.

Erikson, Robert. 1976. 'Patterns of Social Mobility.' Pp.
     171-204 in Readings in the Swedish Class Structure
     edited by Richard Scase.
_____ and John H. Goldthorpe. 1987a. 'Commonality and Variation in
     Social Fluidity in Industrial Nations. Part I: A Model for
     Evaluating the "FJH Hypothesis".' European Sociological
     Review 3 (May): 54-77.
_____ and John H. Goldthorpe. 1987b. 'Commonality and Variation
     in Social Fluidity in Industrial Nations. Part II: The Model
     of Core Social Fluidity.' European Sociological Review
     3 (September): 145-66.
_____ and John H. Goldthorpe. 1988. 'Does the Class Mobility of
     Women Differ from That of Men?: Cross-sex Comparison in
     Cross-national Perspective.' CASMIN Working Paper No. 15.
_____ and Seppo Pontinen. 1985. 'Social Mobility in Finland and
     Sweden: A Comparison of Men and Women.' Pp. 138-62 in Small
     States in Comparative Perspective, edited by Risto Alapuro
     et al. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.

Glenn, Norval D., Adreain A. Ross and Judy Tully. 1974.
     'Patterns of Intergenerational Mobility of Females
     Through Marriage.' American Sociological Review 39:
     683-99.

Goldthorpe, John H. 1982. 'On the Service Class: Its Formation and
     Future.' Pp. 162-85 in Social Class and the Division of
     Labour, edited by Anthony Giddens and G. Mackenzie.
     Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 1983. 'Women and Class Analysis: In Defense of the
        Conventional View.' Sociology 17 (November): 465-88.
_____. 1984. 'Women and Class Analysis: A Reply to the
        Replies.' Sociology 18 (November): 491-99.
_____ (Catriona Llewellyn and Clive Payne). 1987. Social
        Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain, 2nd and
        revised edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
_____ and Clive Payne. 1986a. 'Trends in Intergenerational Class
        Mobility in England and Wales 1972-1983.' Sociology 20
        (February): 1-24.
_____, and Clive Payne. 1986b. 'On the Class Mobility of
        Women: Results from Different Approaches to the Analysis
        of Recent British Data.' Sociology 20 (November):
        531-556.

Goodman, Leo A. 1972. 'Some Multiplicative Models for the
        Analysis of Cross-classified Data.' Pp. 649-96 in
        Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on
        Mathematical Statistics and Probability, edited by
        J. Neymann. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hauser, Robert M., David L. Featherman, and Dennis P. Hogan.
        1977. 'Sex in the Structure of Occupational Mobility
        in the United States, 1962.' Pp. 191-215 in The
        Process of Stratification, edited by Robert M. Hauser
        and David L. Featherman. New York: Academic Press.

Havens, Elizabeth M. and Judy C. Tully. 1972. 'Female Intergenerational
        Occupational Mobility: Comparison of Patterns?' American
        Sociological Review 37: 774-77.

Heath, Anthony. 1981. Social Mobility. Fontana Paperbacks:
        Glasgrow.

Ishida, Hiroshi. 1993. Social Mobility in Contemporary Japan
        Stanford: Stanford University Press.
_____, John, H. Goldthorpe, and Robert Erikson. 1991.
        'Intergenerational Class Mobility in Post-war Japan'
        American Journal of Sociology 96:954-992.

Kojima, Hideo. 1986. 'Josei no Shakai Ido no Nichi-Bei Hikaku
        Kenkyu' (A Comparative Study of Women's Social Mobility in
        Japan and the United States). Pp. 41-52 in Shakai Kaiso no
        Susei to Hikaku, edited by Ken'ichi Tominaga. Tokyo:
        SSM Susei to Hikaku Kenkyu Kai.

Llewelyn, C. 1981. 'Occupational Mobility and the Use of the
        Comparative Method' in Doing the Feminist Research,
        edited by H. Roberts. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Lockwood, David. 1958. The Blackcoated Worker. London:
        Allen & Unwin.
_____. 1986. 'Class, Status and Gender.' Pp. 11-22 in
        Gender and Stratification, edited by Rosemary Crompton

and Michael Mann. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Parkin, Frank. 1971. Class Inequality and Political Order.
        London: McGibbon & Kee.

Portocarero, Lucienne. 1983a. 'Social Mobility in Industrial
        Nations: Women in France and Sweden.' The Sociological
        Review 31: 56-82.
_____. 1983b. 'Social Fluidity in France and Sweden.' Acta
        Sociologica 26: 127-39.
_____. 1985. 'Social Mobility in France and Sweden: Women,
        Marriage and Work.' Acta Sociologica 28: 151-70.

Roos, Patricia A. 1985. Gender and Work: A Comparative Analysis
        of Industrial Societies. New York: State University of
        New York Press.

Rosenfeld, Rachel A. 1978. 'Women's Intergenerational
        Occupational Mobility.' American Sociological Review
        43: 36-46.

Shirahase, Sawako and Hiroshi Ishida. 1994. 'Gender Inequality
        in the Japanese Occupational Structure: A Cross-national
        Comparison with Great Britain and the United States.'
        International Journal of Comparative Sociology (35):
        188-206.

Stanworth, Michelle. 1984. 'Women and Class Analysis: A Reply
        to John Goldthorpe.' Sociology 18 (May): 159-70.

Stevens, Gillian and Monica Boyd. 1980. 'The importance of Mother:
        Labour Force Participation and Intergenerational Mobility
        of Women.' Social Forces 59 (September): 186-199.

Tominaga, Ken'ichi (ed.). 1979. Nihon no Kaiso-kozo
        (Stratification System in Japan). Tokyo: University
        Tokyo Press.

Tyree, Andrea and Judith Treas. 1974. 'The Occupational and
        Marital Mobility of Women.' American Sociological
        Review 39: 293-302.

Yasuda, Saburo. 1971. Shakai Ido no Kenkyu (The Study of
        Social Mobility). Tokyo: Todai Shuppan kai.

Working Paper Series (E)

* *Working Paper Series* are provided for discussions and critical comments, and their circulation is limited.
Do not quote and cite without a written consent from the authors.

1. The Pattern of Intergenerational Mobility Among Men and Woman
(Sawako Shirahase)
July 1997