

The Occupational and Marital Mobility of Women

Author(s): Andrea Tyree and Judith Treas

Source: *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (Jun., 1974), pp. 293-302

Published by: American Sociological Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2094290>

Accessed: 29-05-2015 19:11 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Sociological Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Sociological Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE OCCUPATIONAL AND MARITAL MOBILITY
OF WOMEN

ANDREA TYREE and JUDITH TREAS

University of California, Los Angeles

American Sociological Review 1974, Vol. 39 (June):293-302

The NORC data on occupational mobility of women presented by DeJong, et al. (Dec., 1971) are reanalyzed to the end of comparing male and female patterns of occupational mobility in the U. S. Both male and female occupational mobility patterns are then compared to patterns of marital mobility (from father's occupation to husband's) of wives not in the civilian labor force. For the comparisons, all three matrices are adjusted to identical marginal distributions to eliminate the extent to which size of occupational categories of either origin or destination differ.

The occupational mobility of women is found to be less similar to mobility patterns of men than is women's marital mobility. Thus, similar patterns govern movement of both men and women from their origins to the status of male head of their families. The occupational mobility of the women themselves, however, does not follow the patterns of men so closely as DeJong, et al. concluded in their original article.

DeJong, Brawer, and Robin (1971) addressed themselves to the comparative patterns of occupational mobility of men and women in the labor force. Given scanty interest in the past with the dynamics of achievement of this particular population, the authors had to piece together a sample of 2,371 women in the labor force from six NORC surveys, taken between 1955 and 1965. They analyzed these data exactly as Blau and Duncan (1967, Chapter 2) presented their analysis of the 1962 OCG matrix for men, clearly attempting to render the two sets of data as closely comparable as possible. They concluded that there are no significant differences in patterns of inter-generational occupational mobility of men and women participating in the U. S. labor force.

Havens and Tully (1972) replied criticizing the earlier authors on several grounds. First, mobility ratios (a technique on which DeJong, et al. relied heavily) are inappropriate for

comparing two populations with dissimilar destination (or origin) distributions. We might add that mobility ratios are also inappropriate for comparing cells within a given mobility matrix (see Yasuda, 1964; Tyree, 1973). Second, sex differentials in occupational incumbency within major occupational categories exist but are ignored by DeJong, et al. Third, a ranking of occupational categories appropriate for males is not appropriate for females. We do not find this a particularly pertinent criticism of DeJong and his colleagues, as there is nothing about a matrix of mobility ratios (whatever else their flaws) that requires the occupational categories to be ranked in the marginals, though such ranking offers the convenience of speaking of upward or downward mobility. Fourth, the theoretical discussion (female role conflict leads to low status occupations) is not appropriate to the analysis (or vice versa). Here we agree.

The main argument of Havens and Tully is

the proposition that if men and women are in different occupations, the mobility process that got them there must also be different. In one sense they are surely right. If two populations have similar origin distributions, then there is no one transition matrix that can move them to dramatically different destinations.

In this case the origin distributions (as indicated by occupation of father) are similar. The index of dissimilarity between the origins of the men and women DeJong, et al. compare is only 4.15 over ten categories. This is quite similar to the dissimilarity of origins of men (25-64) and wives (22-61) in the labor force in the 1962 OCG data, 4.0 over twelve categories. Thus, males and females in the labor force come from only slightly different social origins.

The occupational destinations of the two populations, however, are quite different: 41% of the labor force women (or men) compared by DeJong, et al. would have to change to another of the ten major occupational groups for the two distributions to be identical. Again the OCG sample of wives in the labor force is quite in accord with results using the NORC sample of all women, with an index of dissimilarity of 44.0 between the occupational distribution of men and wives.

Instead of major occupational groups we can compare the occupational S.E.S. distributions of men and women, categorizing both sexes by the Duncan socioeconomic status scores of their occupations. These scores, of course, were derived from characteristics of male incumbents, yet are correlated .85 with the education (% high school graduates in 1950) of women incumbents. The comparable association for men is also .85 (Duncan, 1961, p. 124). The association of the scores with the income of women (% with \$2,500 or more income in 1949) is a lower .74 (compared to .84 for men). This difference is probably due to differences among occupations in full-time and part-time employment of women.

Grouping the two populations in 20 five point categories of socioeconomic status scores, 25.4 per cent of either sex would have to change occupations to render the S.E.S. distributions identical.¹ There may be some

suggestive importance in the greater similarity of S.E.S. than of major occupational distributions (the 25.4 versus the 41 or 44). Women, while occupying dramatically different kinds of jobs than men manage to find relatively more similar socioeconomic status positions. Even with this greater similarity, however, men and women are still separated by an index of dissimilarity of 25. In sum, while the origins of men and women in the labor force are similar, their destinations decidedly are not. No single transition matrix could account for both sets of intergenerational movements.

The requirement of identical transition matrices, however, is not what DeJong, Brawer, and Robin had in mind when they asked after the similarities or differences in male and female patterns of mobility. It is not what the independent co-inventors of mobility ratios, Rogoff, Glass, and Carlsson had in mind twenty-five years ago when each of them sought a method of evaluating mobility that would be independent of marginal constraints placed on the process by the social origins of a particular population or the occupational slots available to this population at a particular point in time.

All of these students of mobility (and many others since) were willing to take origin and destination distributions as *given within each population*. That is, they sought to eliminate the extent to which marginals differ, in their examination of mobility matrices.

This venture constituted a theory of mobility. The elements of this theory are clear. First, both origin and destination occupational distributions are externally imposed on a population by (a) economic conditions at some variable time 1 and some specific time 2 and (b) differential fertility of fathers identified at variable time 1 (minus the number of years to the birth of their sons). That is, the marginal distributions are taken as given; they are not taken as problematic in the investigation of patterns of mobility. Second, mobility of persons within these constraints is governed by statistical independence. Most of the study of social mobility in the last twenty-five years has been a test of observations against this model. Now, the formulation of this theory in terms of mobility ratios has been discredited. The theory, however, still provides a viable benchmark or ideal type by which observations can be compared to one another.

We will indulge in a verbal aside before we

¹ Women fourteen and over in the experienced civilian labor force as of the 1960 census compared to men in the 1962 OCG sample.

proceed to the technical matter. We can think of the distribution of social origins of a population of men and women as constrained by the demands for labor in their fathers' times. We can even ignore (for these purposes, but not for others) the fact that daughters of certain origins (particularly toward the middle of the origin distribution) are slightly less likely to participate in the labor force as adults than are other women. We can also assume that occupations are sex typed in this particular society, so that we can entertain the notion that unique distributions of occupations are available to males and females.

These are quite comparable to assumptions made in past mobility studies in comparing the mobility of persons born at different points in time or residing in different countries. The issue of the external imposition of the marginals (especially the destination marginals) is highlighted when the two populations to be compared *ostensibly* compete in the same labor market. We can, however, assume that they do not.

Accepting these marginal constraints, we can then ask whether the patterns of mobility, movements of persons from origin i to destination j , are or are not similar for the two populations. This is rather like asking after the correlation of fathers' and respondents' statuses for men and women separately without asking for the Y intercepts or the regression slopes. While mobility ratios will not answer our question, other methods will.

Bivariate frequency distributions can be adjusted to any desired set of row and column marginals. Let F be an observed m by m mobility matrix, whose entries are f_{ij} , row totals are $r_i = \sum_j f_{ij} = f_{i.}$, and column totals are $c_j = \sum_i f_{ij} = f_{.j}$. The matrix F can be adjusted to be compatible with some other set of marginal totals, say f_i^* and f_j^* ; we can call the resulting matrix F^* .

We may postulate the existence of two sets of adjustment factors, u_i and v_j , elements of two diagonal matrices U and V . The diagonal elements of U provide multiplicative adjustments of all elements of row i of F ; the elements of V provide a multiplicative adjustment of all values in column j of F , so that

$$F^* = UVF, \text{ or } f_{ij}^* = f_{ij} (u_i + v_j),$$

where $\sum_j f_{ij}^* = f_i^*$, for all i

$$\text{and } \sum_i f_{ij}^* = f_j^*, \text{ for all } j.$$

Procedures for estimating the marginal adjustment factors have been available for many years. Deming (1943) describes a number of procedures at length. Duncan (1966) has adjusted Rogoff's 1910 matrix to the marginals of her 1940 data to ascertain if mobility patterns changed between the two periods. In comparing mobility in Denmark and England, Levine (1967) has equated the occupational distributions of fathers and those of sons. Bonacich (1972) has adjusted the size of college athletic teams as a prelude to an index of overlap in the teams' memberships. To compare patterns of inter- and intra-generational mobility in the United States, Tyree (1973) has adjusted the OCG intragenerational matrix to the marginals of the inter-generational matrix.

For comparing any two matrices it is not important which marginals are chosen for f_i^* and f_j^* , but only that the two be the same. By adjusting the male and female matrices examined by DeJong, et al. to identical marginals, we are asking whether the patterns by which men and women get to particular destinations or move from particular origins are different. We are explicitly ignoring the fact that the two populations do have distinct destinations.

In Table 1 we have adjusted both the male OCG matrix and the female NORC matrix² to identical marginal totals. We have reduced both matrices to 9×9 , as the female matrix, originally available as 10×10 (distinguishing farmers from farm laborers), had only one entry in column 9—all women farmers were daughters of farmers. We have further chosen adjusted marginal totals of 9.0, equal to the number of occupational categories. In the case of statistical independence within the adjusted table, the adjusted cell frequencies then take on a value of 1.0, a condition not necessary to the comparison, but convenient to those of us who have spent years looking at mobility ratios, where independence was also reflected with an entry of 1.0.

The two sets of values follow the same basic patterns, showing generally higher fre-

² We thank Professor DeJong for making the original data available to us.

Table 1. Adjusted Mobility from Father's Occupation to Occupation of Respondent: United States, Women 21+ in 1955-1965, Men 25-64 in 1962 (in parentheses)*

Occupation of Father	Occupation of Respondent									Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1. Professionals	2.78 (2.52)	1.68 (1.07)	1.25 (1.06)	1.59 (1.42)	0.00 (0.54)	0.69 (0.73)	1.00 (0.63)	0.00 (0.43)	0.00 (0.61)	9.00
2. Managers, Officials & Proprietors	1.23 (1.36)	1.81 (2.12)	1.03 (1.10)	1.12 (1.46)	1.75 (0.88)	0.53 (0.62)	0.56 (0.53)	0.57 (0.42)	0.41 (0.50)	9.00
3. Clerical workers	1.83 (1.61)	0.70 (1.01)	1.83 (1.37)	1.35 (1.15)	0.00 (0.98)	0.94 (0.61)	0.73 (1.16)	1.64 (0.62)	0.00 (0.49)	9.00
4. Salesmen	0.70 (1.12)	1.30 (1.71)	1.17 (0.88)	0.84 (2.22)	0.70 (0.69)	0.58 (0.69)	0.65 (0.62)	3.06 (0.42)	0.00 (0.65)	9.00
5. Craftsmen	0.64 (0.77)	0.90 (0.97)	1.20 (1.14)	1.26 (0.72)	1.31 (1.75)	1.32 (1.20)	1.21 (1.02)	0.85 (1.01)	0.31 (0.43)	9.00
6. Operatives	0.56 (0.64)	1.09 (0.66)	0.99 (0.91)	0.89 (0.62)	1.65 (1.32)	2.07 (1.65)	1.33 (1.09)	0.00 (1.48)	0.44 (0.64)	9.00
7. Service workers	0.72 (0.52)	0.38 (0.72)	0.79 (1.21)	0.89 (0.76)	1.23 (1.09)	1.48 (1.24)	1.31 (1.90)	0.90 (1.15)	1.30 (0.41)	9.00
8. Laborers	0.17 (0.28)	0.60 (0.37)	0.48 (0.94)	0.40 (0.44)	1.93 (1.07)	0.69 (1.43)	1.38 (1.43)	1.61 (2.37)	1.75 (0.68)	9.00
9. Farmers & Farm laborers	0.37 (0.17)	0.54 (0.38)	0.27 (0.40)	0.67 (0.21)	0.44 (0.69)	0.70 (0.83)	0.83 (0.63)	0.39 (1.10)	4.80 (4.59)	9.00
Total	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	

*Adjusted to row and column totals of 9.0.

quencies along the diagonal and in cells representing mobility within both the white collar and blue collar "classes." However, the association between the adjusted frequencies for men and women is not high enough ($r = .69$) to justify the conclusion of DeJong and his colleagues of no differences in mobility patterns. When those cells are eliminated in which there were fewer than five women (largely movements into the laborer and farm categories), the correlation rises to .84.

Among the differences in the adjusted mobility patterns of men and women, men from nonfarm backgrounds are about equally likely to enter farming, regardless of the occupations of their fathers, while nonfarm origin women in farming are recruited almost exclusively from the daughters of service and laboring fathers. We know that higher blue collar and white collar daughters are more

likely than this to marry farmers (see Table 3), hence move to rural areas where they could conceivably be engaged in farming. Perhaps the women who so marry, marry relatively affluent farmers, so that agricultural employment for the wife is not necessary.

Another difference between men and women in Table 1 is that daughters of professionals who work are more likely than their brothers to be in white collar jobs. This again may be related to the greater availability to women than to men of the option of not working. Thus daughters of professionals who cannot obtain an acceptable kind of employment (white collar) may tend to refrain from working altogether. Last, daughters of farmers (the largest group in the female sample) are more likely than their brothers to rise to white collar jobs, while much less likely to find blue collar work.

Table 2. Index of Dissimilarity between Adjusted Origin and Destination Occupational Distributions of Men and Women, by Destinations and Origins

Origins, Destinations	Dissimilarity of Origins	Dissimilarity of Destinations
Professionals	9.7	17.9
Managers, officials, and proprietors	15.9	11.6
Clerical workers	12.0	24.6
Salesmen	19.6	33.0
Craftsmen	24.6	10.2
Operatives	12.3	19.6
Service workers	11.8	17.8
Laborers	42.2	24.0
Farmers and farm laborers	24.1	13.6

Table 2 presents indexes of dissimilarity between the adjusted origin distributions of men and women in particular occupational destinations and indexes of dissimilarity of destinations of men and women from the same origins. Column 1 reports indexes of dissimilarity between the two sexes computed down columns of Table 1, asking whether male and female incumbents of major occupational groups come from similar origin distributions. Column 2 reports indexes computed across rows of Table 1, asking if brothers and sisters go to similar occupational destinations. If the adjusted mobility matrices were identical, all values in Table 2 would be zero. They are not. Men and women in the same occupational categories do not come from the same distribution of origins. Between 9.7% (professionals) and 42.2% (laborers) would have to change fathers for their origins to be alike. Similarly, brothers and sisters do not find employment in the same distribution of occupational destinations.

MARITAL MOBILITY

Marriage provides a second kind of occupational achievement for women. The girl whose social position is a reflection of the status of her father grows into the woman, who, through her choice of a marital partner, can be ranked as the female half of a couple whose "head" does X in his work. Some women marry well, some poorly.

For convenience, let us call mobility from father's occupation to husband's "marital mobility" of women. We should like to know if the patterns of female marital mobility are more like those of female occupational mobility or of male mobility.

The 1962 OCG study collected data on the occupational origins of wives of the male sample (men 20-64 years old). Table 3 reports the marital mobility matrix based on these data for wives *not* in the civilian labor force, with marginals again adjusted to 9.0, the number of rows and columns. These do not include working women who have an independent route to status or income. The women represented in this table have opted, by choice or circumstance, to achieve their socioeconomic position solely by virtue of the occupations of their husbands.

The value for wives in Table 3 can be compared to those in Table 1—both those for men, gathered in the same OCG survey, and for women's occupational mobility collected by NORC. The adjusted matrix of female marital mobility is quite similar to that of male occupational mobility in Table 1 (in parentheses). The two sets of values are associated with an $r = .93$.³ With the elimina-

³This correlation increases slightly to .94 between the 10 by 10 versions of these mobility matrices, where farmers and farm laborers are distinguished from one another.

Table 3. Adjusted Mobility from Father's Occupation to Occupation of Husband:
Wives not in the Civilian Labor Force of Men 25-64, March, 1962*

Occupation of Father	Occupation of Husband									Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1. Professionals	1.88	1.34	0.89	1.07	0.73	0.75	1.34	0.81	0.19	9.00
2. Managers, officials, and proprietors	1.46	1.59	1.30	1.50	0.89	0.70	0.67	0.54	0.35	9.00
3. Clerical workers	1.20	1.32	1.67	0.73	1.08	0.78	0.99	0.75	0.46	9.00
4. Salesmen	1.59	1.65	0.95	2.07	0.99	0.64	0.38	0.41	0.31	9.00
5. Craftsmen	0.92	0.84	1.24	0.99	1.47	1.30	1.07	0.80	0.38	9.00
6. Operatives	0.62	0.69	1.00	0.91	1.40	1.62	1.04	1.39	0.34	9.00
7. Service workers	0.88	0.81	0.79	0.95	0.98	1.12	1.74	1.30	0.43	9.00
8. Laborers	0.37	0.58	0.89	0.52	1.01	1.58	1.31	2.12	0.61	9.00
9. Farmers and farm laborers	0.08	0.19	0.26	0.26	0.44	0.52	0.47	0.87	5.92	9.00
Total	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	

*Adjusted to row and column totals of 9.0.

tion of the extreme values in cell (9,9), children of farmers married to or employed as farmers, the variability of the adjusted cell frequencies in the two mobility tables is even quite similar, with the variance of male frequencies about 16 per cent higher than that of the females in Table 3.

We could have expected the slightly lower variance of the adjusted cell frequencies for women, as we already knew that a man's occupational S.E.S. (hence the wife's "marital S.E.S.") is better predicted by his own father's occupation than by that of his father-in-law (see Blau and Duncan, p. 486).

The first column of Table 4 presents indexes of dissimilarity between the adjusted origin distributions of men in and nonworking wives whose husbands are in specified occupational categories. The second column reports indexes of dissimilarity of the destinations (as measured by head's occupation) of men and of wives not in the labor force from the same origins. On the whole the values in Table 4 are about one-half of those in Table 2. That is, the origins of men and their wives are more similar than the origins of men and women

employed in the same occupational categories. Homogamy is greater than cross-sex occupational homogeneity. Or, expressed in the form of conventional wisdom, people who marry and live together are more alike in their backgrounds than are people who work at the same job.

Also, the husbands of nonworking women occupationally resemble their brothers-in-law more closely than working women resemble their own brothers. A woman obtains a socioeconomic prognosis similar to her brother by marrying and not entering the labor force. She obtains a different one (not necessarily better or worse) by entering the labor force. The major exceptions to this finding are both supply from and recruitment into the professions and supply from farming. A detailed understanding of these differences between the indexes in Table 2 and Table 4 would require an analysis of origin specific differentials in marriage and labor force participation of women. We do not propose to undertake such an analysis here.

As the reader may suspect, female occupational and marital mobility (values in Table 1

and Table 3) are only modestly associated—indeed almost exactly as male and female occupational mobility were found to be, with an $r = .69$, increasing to $.83$ when the same small cells are eliminated as before.

AN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

In the foregoing analysis we have ignored the structure of opportunities available to workers *regardless of sex*. We have taken each of the nine major occupational categories as of equal interest, of equal weight, assuming nothing about either the total structure of opportunities or any sex differences in such. Jobs are not distributed evenly across the major occupational groups in which we are accustomed to report data. There are more operatives than sales workers and yet fewer laborers. This actual distribution of the total labor force constitutes the structure of opportunities to the extent that we assume what Rogoff Ramsby (1973) refers to as the “sealed black boxes” underlying mobility research.

We assume that the occupational distribution observed at a given point in time is fully explained by the state of technology and by the market forces operating within a self-contained labor market—that there are no lags, maladjustments, or institutionalized features at work other than technological or economic.

To this point we have ignored the usual assumption of the technological-economic black box. However, we have, by using equal weights for all categories, created a possibility that large differences between the sexes in patterns of movement into populous occupational categories would have relatively little effect on indexes of dissimilarity. Conversely, small differences in patterns of movement into or from small categories appear as more important than their frequency in the population might warrant. This is the price of adjusted marginals which, by virtue of an “expected” cell frequency of 1.0, are easy to read. It is possible that our findings are due in part to our selection of marginals, rather than entirely to actual differences in the mobility of women and men.

One reasonable check whether or not this is so is to consider an alternative set of origin and destination distributions, both for occupational and marital mobility. Below we do this. The expected origins and destinations we shall use here are selected as representing the structure of opportunities available at a single point in time—opportunities we assume to be fully explained by technological and economic forces.

Opportunities for work we take to be defined by the occupational structure of the total labor force (men and women combined). This distribution for 1960 serves as the

Table 4. Index of Dissimilarity between Adjusted Origin and Head's Destination Occupational Distributions of Men 25-64 and Wives not in the Civilian Labor Force: U.S., March, 1962

Occupation	Dissimilarity of Origins	Dissimilarity of Destinations
Professionals	12.9	17.5
Managers, officials, and proprietors	10.0	7.6
Clerical workers	8.6	11.3
Salesmen	10.2	9.4
Craftsmen	7.7	7.4
Operatives	5.7	5.4
Service workers	10.0	9.0
Laborers	8.7	6.0
Farmers and farm laborers	15.1	15.3

expected occupational destination distribution for both men and women. Opportunities for marital occupational status we define by the occupational distribution of the OCG men, the only potential partners of the OCG women. This applies to both men and women, though clearly the male "marital mobility" matrix needs no adjustments, since the expected marginals are its actual ones.

We further assume that men and women—married, single, working, non-working—come from the same distribution of social origins. This is to postulate a population in which (1) there are no differences among occupational groups in sex of offspring, and (2) there is no interaction of sex and origins with (a) the labor force participation of these offspring or (b) their probability of marriage. The origins of OCG men provide the most unbiased estimate of the actual origins of residents of the United States available to us. As before, the only element of the model allowed to vary by sex is the mobility matrix which we adjust to the specified marginals.

It is also possible that our findings are attributable to special characteristics of the NORC sample. Respondents in this sample were from six surveys, collected over a decade, accorded occupations if they had ever worked, whether or not they were in the labor force at the time of the survey, and were asked slightly differing questions to ascertain social origins. DeJong, et al. did not design the sample; they simply took the best they could get at the time. We have reanalyzed these same data (1) in order to make clear that the technical formulation of the problem alone alters the answers and (2) because, originally, the NORC data were all that was available to us.

We can now, however, consider another body of data, the National Longitudinal Survey's sample of women 30-44 years old in 1967. The employed portion of this sample consists of a weighted 2,525 women, of whom 2,263 reported the occupation of the head of their household at age fifteen.

Our specific interest with these data is in reassessing our previous finding that patterns of marital mobility of women are more similar to the occupational mobility of men than to the occupational mobility of women. Does this finding hold up (1) under alternative marginal adjustments, (2) with a different

sample of the female labor force? We also seek a better estimate of the magnitude of the implications of the different patterns of mobility of the sexes.

Table 5 reports the dissimilarity of destinations of men and women of specified origins. The first column refers to the comparison of the OCG men with the employed women of the National Longitudinal Survey female sample. The second column compares the OCG men and their wives. There are two reasons the values in this second column should differ from those in the second column of Table 4 (our original comparison of husbands and wives): first, the alteration of the marginal frequencies; second, the expansion of the matrix to 10 by 10, providing one more category to contribute to dissimilarity. Nevertheless, the two sets of indexes are impressive more for their similarity than for their differences.

The comparability of the first column, dissimilarity of occupational mobility, with our previous indexes in Table 2 is further influenced by the substitution of the LGS sample for the NORC one. While the two sets differ in detail (especially the values for craftsmen and operatives), they are of a similar magnitude. Moreover, the dissimilarity of the occupational destinations of men and women is still markedly greater than the dissimilarity of their destinations in marriage. As before, only daughters of professionals find destinations about equally similar to those of their brothers whether they get there via marriage or their own work. On the whole, however, about twice as many working women would have to change jobs as wives would have to change husbands for the two sexes to have the same mobility matrices.

Our finding is now supported by two different analyses. Even if men and women were in the same major occupational groups, if each sex maintained its current mobility patterns, the association of origins with destinations of women and men would be different. Even if the occupational structures of the two sexes were identical, sex would still interact with origins in the allocation of occupational destinations. Sex does not interact so much in the achievement of occupational status through marriage for women and work for men.

Two points about this merit comment.

Table 5. Index of Dissimilarity of Adjusted* Destination Occupational Distributions of Men 25-64 in 1962, Wives not in the Civilian Labor Force, and Employed Women 30-44 in 1967

Origin Occupation	Dissimilarity of Destinations of Men and	
	Employed Women	Wives
Professionals	17.3	17.1
Managers, officials, and proprietors	12.8	8.0
Clerical workers	18.8	13.8
Salesmen	29.0	9.4
Craftsmen	18.9	5.8
Operatives	12.6	3.4
Service workers	19.5	9.3
Laborers	23.1	6.5
Farmers	11.4	5.2
Farm laborers	32.2	7.8

*Column 1 adjustments are to origins of OCG men and destinations of the total civilian labor force in 1960. Column 2 adjustments are to both origins and destinations of OCG men.

First, a caution. If the occupations available to women were the same as those available to men, we might have different women in the labor force than we do. Such a change might reasonably alter the characteristics of the female occupational mobility matrix—possibly to be more like that of men. Second, to the extent that male mobility patterns have defined the expected life chances of a person starting in any particular origin (for men have made up the majority—a presently declining one—of the labor force), women workers are more likely than men to hold occupational statuses inconsistent with their social origins. This kind of status inconsistency is rather different from DeJong's asserted inconsistency between work and womanhood—an inconsistency we find difficult to recognize when almost half of adult women work. We suggest that the value of status inconsistency as a concept is that it explains the labor force behavior of women by their more frequent location in jobs in which they do not share the social background of their peers to the extent men share backgrounds with theirs.

SUMMARY

We have tried to criticize and rework the analysis of DeJong, Brawer and Robin in a way which speaks to their explicit concerns rather than to some others. We find their conclusion of similar patterns of male and female occupational mobility in the United States to be an overstatement. Realizing that how much similarity is "similar" may be markedly different to two observers, we have pointed to a second kind of female mobility, mobility from father's to husband's occupation, which is more similar to male patterns of intergenerational movement.

In adjusting all marginals to the same standard "frequencies," we have ignored any extent to which men or women may be favored or disfavored in particular occupational categories (just as DeJong and his colleagues sought to do). We have treated both sexes as if they have the same distribution of occupations. Professor Rogoff Ramsøy, in her exchange with DeJong et al. in these pages, urged the use of the male occupational distri-

bution to define the expected distribution of females. The crucial element of her argument was the *same* expected distribution should be used for both sexes. Our analysis is responsive to this concern. We have not asked, nor propose to answer, how equal are opportunities of men and women for occupational achievement. We do not see analyses of mobility matrices as a particularly fruitful path to an answer to this question.

By limiting ourselves to analysis of 9 by 9 mobility matrices, we have ignored the differentials in occupational incumbency *within* major occupational groups. These differentials are substantial. For example, while 42 per cent of male professionals are in occupations with S.E.S. scores greater than 80, only 6.5 per cent of female professionals are (U. S. Census, Table 1). While 47 per cent of salesmen are in occupations with S.E.S. scores over 60, only 9 per cent of saleswomen are. In lower major occupational groups, women are found in slightly higher S.E.S. positions than men; e.g., 34 per cent of female laborers hold occupations with S.E.S. scores of 10 or over, while only 23 per cent of male laborers do.

These discrepancies provide a persuasive argument against the continued use of major occupational categories for the comparison of male and female mobility. For whatever methods are used to manipulate the data—mobility ratios, marginal adjustments, transition matrices—all assume that major categories include the same variety of occupations for the two populations.

REFERENCES

- Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan
1967 *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: John Wiley.
- Bonacich, Phillip
1972 "Technique for analyzing overlapping memberships." Pp. 176-85 in Herbert L. Costner (ed.), *Sociological Methodology* 1972. London: Jossey-Bass.
- DeJong, Peter Y., Milton J. Brawer and Stanley S. Robin
1971 "Patterns of female intergenerational mobility: a comparison with male patterns of intergenerational occupational mobility." *American Sociological Review* 36 (December):1033-42.
- Deming, W. Edwards
1943 *Statistical Adjustment of Data*. New York: John Wiley.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley
1966 "Methodological issues in the analysis of social mobility." Pp. 51-97 in N. J. Smelser and S. M. Lipset (eds.), *Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Havens, Elizabeth M. and Judy Corder Tully
1972 "Female intergenerational occupational mobility: comparisons of patterns?" *American Sociological Review* 37 (December):774-7.
- Levine, Joel H.
1967 *Measurement in the Study of Intergenerational Mobility*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Rogoff Ramsø, Natalie
1973 "Patterns of female intergenerational occupational mobility: a comment." *American Sociological Review* 38 (December):806-7.
- Tyree, Andrea
1973 "Mobility ratios and association in mobility tables." *Population Studies* 27 (November):577-88.
- United States Census of Population 1960
1963 *Occupational Characteristics. Subject Reports. PC(2)-7A*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Yasuda, Saburo
1964 "A methodological inquiry into social mobility." *American Sociological Review* 29 (February):16-23.