Intergenerational Economic Mobility in the United States[1]

Measures, Differentials, and Trends

Robert M. Hauser

Department of Sociology
Center for Demography and Ecology
The University of Wisconsin-Madison

Rev. June 1998

Intergenerational Economic Mobility in the United States

Measures, Differentials, and Trends

ABSTRACT

Economic research on intergenerational mobility has tended to focus on the extremes of the distribution of economic well-being -- either on the inheritance of wealth or on the persistence of poverty. In the general population, there are few reliable measurements of the persistence of income or earnings across generations, and there are no trend data. In this context typical occupational levels of economic compensation may be a useful proxy for personal income or earnings, for many large, national surveys have ascertained the occupations of adult workers and of their parents. For purposes of comparison, I index occupations in two ways, by typical income levels and by typical education levels of workers. I have estimated age-specific intergenerational economic mobility over a 35 year period, using these indicators and data from the 1962 and 1973 Occupational Changes in a Generation Surveys (OCG), the 1986-88 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), and the 1972 to 1996 NORC General Social Surveys (GSS). Education levels of occupations persist much more strongly across generations than income levels of occupations. For example, among Nonblack men, the former regressions or correlations are about 0.37, while the latter are about 0.21. This fact raises interesting questions about the differences between economic and social mobility. While there are differences in intergenerational occupational persistence by race and sex, there is no global trend in the intergenerational persistence of occupational income or education from the 1960s to the 1990s. However, occupational stratification has increased in the Black population, and intergenerational occupational stratification by education has decreased among Nonblack men.

Economic research on intergenerational mobility has tended to focus on the extremes of the distribution of economic well-being -- either on the inheritance of wealth or on the persistence of poverty.[2] In the general population, there are few reliable measurements of the persistence of income or earnings across generations, and there are no trend data.

Estimates of intergenerational economic persistence have tended to rise in recent years along with improved measurement and estimation procedures in new bodies of data, but not as a consequence of additional time-series observations. Behrman and Taubman (1985) estimated the intergenerational correlation of log earnings to be about 0.2. Becker and Tomes (1986) were equally sanguine in their review of a handful of studies in which intergenerational income correlations had been estimated.[3] Subsequent economic work has raised these low estimates of intergenerational income persistence in a variety of ways.

At the opposite extreme from Becker and Tomes (1996), Stokey (1996) has recently concluded, "there is much less social mobility than we thought just a decade ago. The persistence coefficient for relative status seems to be at least 0.50 and perhaps as high as 0.60 or 0.70." Solon (1989; 1992) identified problems of restriction of range in some prior studies and estimated corrections for attenuation of earnings of fathers and of sons in a small sample from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (Solon 1989:Solon 1992).[4] Zimmerman (1992) introduced similar

---

[2] For example, see Brittain (1978) or Corcoran and Adams (1997). There is a larger body of work on the measurement of short-term income mobility (Hungerford 1993; Gottschalk and Moffitt 1994; Gottschalk 1997; Fields, et al. 1998).

[3] Goldberger (1989; 1989) led the effort to point economists toward sociological research on intergenerational mobility.

[4] Solon's criticism of estimated intergenerational earnings correlations in the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study (Sewell and Hauser 1975) -- based on the restriction of their sample to high school graduates -- has been carried forward in subsequent economic work in the phrase that the Wisconsin sample is "homogeneous." This criticism has some merit, but it ignores the high population coverage reported by Sewell and Hauser. A more salient factor in their estimates was

corrections in his analysis of data from the National Longitudinal Survey, and he also suggested the

use of a measure of occupational status -- Duncan's socioeconomic index for occupations (SEI) --

as a proxy for economic standing (Duncan 1961). Like Solon, Zimmerman estimated

intergenerational correlations of about 0.4 for corrected earnings measures. Despite the small

sample size and large, model-dependent corrections used to obtain it,[5] one of Solon's estimates,

0.4, has become widely accepted as a point estimate of intergenerational earnings mobility in the

United States (McMurrer and Sawhill 1998:46-47; Johnson and Reed 1996; Bjorklund and Jantti

1997a; Bjorklund and Jantti forthcoming; Mulligan 1995). None of the economic studies provides

evidence of trend in intergenerational earning or income correlations. Rather, they have brought

together data from a variety of sources in order to generate more plausible point estimates.

The similarity of the estimated earnings correlations with intergenerational correlations of

the occupational SEI led Zimmerman to suggest that one might regard occupational socioeconomic

status as roughly equivalent to permanent income in studies of intergenerational mobility.[6] Other

economic work has estimated intergenerational economic persistence using instrumental variables

or has based such estimates on proxy variables.[7] Some estimates have treated alternative

---

the youth of the sample. Early in the career the inverse relationship between educational
attainment and labor force experience suppresses intergenerational economic correlations. A
more recent example of such low correlations appears in the national data for the U.S. and
Germany reported by Couch and Dunn (1997).

[5] Most of Solon's (1992:397) analysis is based on about 350 father-son pairs from the
Panel Study of Income Dynamics. It is striking that Solon's estimate is widely accepted, while
Olneck's (1977) estimates of fraternal resemblance -- in a local sample of the same size -- is not.

[6] Also, see Goldberger (1989).

[7] See the review by Stokey (1996). Some of the more recent IV estimates were
anticipated by Treiman and Hauser (1977).

measures of occupational standing as essentially equivalent,[8] but there are substantively important

differences in the intergenerational persistence of different occupational measures. To my

knowledge, no one has attempted to estimate trends in intergenerational mobility using the typical

earning levels of worker's occupations as a proxy for individual economic standing.

Parent-child relationships are not the only source of estimates of family persistence in

economic standing. An alternative and preferable way to measure the intergenerational

persistence of economic standing is to focus on the similarity of siblings, typically, to examine

correlations between the economic status of brothers and, occasionally, of sisters (Hauser, et al.

forthcoming-b). Such correlations do not directly estimate economic immobility, but they do tell

us about the overall association between family of origin and economic success. One major

advantage of such measures is that they can be obtained without asking retrospective questions

about the economic status of the family of origin and without following children from youth to

adulthood. As recently as 1979, Griliches (1979) could write that sibling studies were small and

unrepresentative,[9] but this is no longer the case. The Wisconsin Longitudinal Survey provides a

large, longitudinal sample of brothers and sisters from a single state (Hauser 1984; Hauser and

Sewell 1986; Hauser and Mossel 1987; Hauser, et al. forthcoming-b). National data on sibling

resemblance are available from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (Solon, et al. 1991), the

National Longitudinal Studies of the late 1960s (Altonji and Dunn 1996a; Altonji and Dunn

1996b), the 1979 National Longitudinal Study of Youth (Korenman and Winship 1995; Murray

---

[8] For example, see Stokey's (1996:10) comment that "the Hodge-Siegel-Rossi score of occupational prestige ... is similar to the Duncan index."

[9] For example, Brittain's (1977) study of the resemblance of brothers from Cleveland made headline news.

1996; Murray 1998), and the 1994 NORC General Social Survey (GSS) (Hauser, et al. forthcoming-a). However, each of the national studies except the 1994 GSS was initially restricted to relatively young adults, and none has yet provided estimates of trend in sibling resemblance.

Intergenerational Social Mobility and Measures of Occupational Standing

A long tradition of sociological research on intergenerational social mobility is based on persistence in one or another measure of occupational standing. In the United States, most recent trend analyses are based on the Occupational Changes in a Generation Surveys of 1962 (Blau and Duncan 1967) and 1973 (Featherman and Hauser 1978) or on the NORC General Social Surveys (GSS), from 1972 to the present (Hout 1988; DiPrete and Grusky 1990; Grusky and DiPrete 1990; Hout 1996). Most of this work is based on correlations of Duncan's SEI and subsequent variants of it. The methodological basis of this work is that adults can provide valid reports of their parents occupations in social surveys. There is ample evidence to support this assumption.[10] Overall, a typical finding has been that intergenerational occupational status correlations were about 0.33 for white American men in the mid 1970s -- but only about 0.23 for Black men -- and that correction for attenuation may raise these estimates to about 0.39 for Whites and 0.36 for Blacks (Bielby, et al. 1977). Across a variety of measures, there is strong evidence that intergenerational occupational status correlations have declined during this century among Whites, but that such correlations have increased among Blacks as racial discrimination has declined (Hauser, et al. forthcoming-a). The available evidence also suggests that intergenerational

---

[10] Much of this evidence is reviewed by Hauser and Warren (1997).

occupational mobility has increased over a longer time-span, since the mid-nineteenth century (Grusky 1986).

In order to think about occupation as a proxy for economic standing, it is useful to review sociological measures of occupational status. Socioeconomic status is typically used as a shorthand expression for variables that characterize the placement of persons, families, households, census tracts, or other aggregates with respect to the capacity to create or consume goods that are valued in our society. Thus, socioeconomic status may be indicated by educational attainment, by occupational standing, by social class, by income (or poverty), by wealth, by tangible possessions -- such as home appliances or libraries, houses, cars, boats, or by degrees from elite colleges and universities. At some times, it has also been taken to include measures of participation in social, cultural, or political life.

Job-holding is the most important social and economic role held by most adults outside their immediate family or household. When we meet someone new, our first question is often, "What do you do?" and that is a very good question. Job-holding defines how we spend much of our time, and it provides strong clues about the activities and circumstances in which that time is spent. Job-holding tells us about the technical and social skills that we bring to the labor market, and for most people job-holding delimits current and future economic prospects. Thus, even for persons who are not attached to the labor market, past jobs or the jobs held by other members of the same family or household provide information about economic and social standing. As market labor has become nearly universal among adult women as well as men, it is increasingly possible to characterize individuals in terms of their own current or past jobs.

There is a long standing and well-developed methodology for measuring one aspect of socioeconomic status using characteristics of job-holders.[11] The procedure is to link Census occupation lines to a weighted average of occupational educational attainment and occupational income or earnings, thus providing a scalar measure of occupational status. Beginning with Duncan, the weights of occupational education and income have usually been chosen by regressing popular ratings of occupational prestige on these occupational characteristics. The Duncan SEI was constructed by regressing occupational prestige for 45 occupations in a 1947 NORC survey on the characteristics of male workers in 1950 (Duncan 1961). It was subsequently updated for use with the 1960- and 1970-basis Census occupational classifications (Hauser and Featherman 1977). Prestige ratings of all occupations were obtained in the 1960s (Siegel 1971), and Stevens and Featherman (1981) constructed a new socioeconomic index for men (MSEI2), based upon characteristics of male workers in 1970. This was subsequently updated for use with the 1980 Census classification (Stevens and Cho 1985). A third national study of occupational prestige was carried out in 1989, and updated versions of the SEI were created using 1980 Census characteristics (Nakao and Treas 1994) and using 1990 Census characteristics (Hauser and Warren 1997).

Duncan originally constructed the SEI because prestige scores were available only for a small subset of Census occupational titles. For this reason -- or because of confusion about the use of prestige scores in construction of the SEI -- the Duncan SEI has sometimes been regarded as equivalent to a prestige measure. It is not. Soon after the Duncan SEI was constructed, researchers learned that occupational socioeconomic status has much greater predictive validity

---

[11] Hauser and Warren (1997) have comprehensively reviewed the history and methodology of occupational status measurement in the U.S.

than occupational prestige.[12] For example, intergenerational correlations of the occupational SEI are consistently stronger than those of occupational prestige (Jencks 1990). Thus, studies of social mobility continued to use the SEI and variants of it, long after prestige scores became available for all occupations.

Occupational status appears to indicate a reliable and valid characteristic of persons or households by dint of its temporal stability and its substantial correlation with other social and economic variables. Because past as well as current occupations can be ascertained reliably, even by proxy or retrospectively, status indexes can be used to measure persistence and change in occupational standing across generations and within the career. Occupational status indexes have disadvantages as well as advantages. A scalar measure of occupational standing obviously cannot reflect everything about a job that might be relevant to other social, economic, or psychological variables (Jencks, et al. 1988; Rytina 1992; Hauser and Logan 1992), nor is there a strong theoretical basis for the concept of occupational socioeconomic status (Hodge 1981). Moreover, some common occupations do not fit typical relationships among socioeconomic characteristics and occupational prestige (Hauser and Warren 1997); in particular, farm occupations are often given special treatment. Measures of occupational status do not tell us everything about social standing, and ideally they should be used in combination with other socioeconomic variables, e.g., educational attainment, income, earnings, and wealth.

However, there are serious problems of heterogeneity in the components of occupational socioeconomic status. First, as shown by Hauser and Warren (1997:225-50), intergenerational persistence in occupational education is much greater than persistence in occupational income.

---

[12] For example, see Featherman, Jones, and Hauser (1975) and Featherman and Hauser (1976).

Intergenerational correlations of occupational income are similar to those in occupational prestige -- much lower than those of occupational education. In fact, one can plausibly regard occupational education as the central dimension of intergenerational occupational stratification and specify occupational prestige and occupational income each as weak indicators of that construct. Second, because the occupational education of women typically exceeds that of men, while the occupation earnings or income of men typically exceeds that of women, composite indexes of occupational status do not provide an accurate account of gender differences in occupational standing (Boyd 1986; Warren, et al. forthcoming). A socioeconomic index for occupations will show higher standing of women or of men, depending arbitrarily on the weights given to occupational education and occupational income. It is thus desirable to separate the analysis of intergenerational occupational mobility in terms of typical occupational levels of education from mobility in terms of typical occupational levels of income.

National Surveys of Occupational Mobility

Four major surveys provide intergenerational observations of occupational standing that cover the period from the early 1960s to the mid-1990s. Some surveys provide evidence about earlier periods, because they include retrospective questions about career beginnings. The 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation Survey (OCG) was carried out as a supplement to the March 1962 Current Population Survey (CPS). It covered 20,700 American men between the ages of 20 and 64 (Blau and Duncan 1967). The 1973 OCG survey repeated and extended the content of the 1962 OCG in a supplement to the March 1973 CPS. It covered 33,600 American men between the ages of 20 and 65. Both OCG surveys are limited to men, and they provide modest samples of Black as well as White men. During 1986 to 1988, some of the content of the two OCG surveys was repeated in the family background module administered in the Survey of Income and

8

Program Participation. The SIPP data cover women as well as men between the ages of 25 and 64, and there are approximately 32,000 members of the civilian labor force. The NORC General Social Survey (GSS) is a small, national household survey, which has been administered almost annually to about 1500 adults since 1972. Since 1994, the GSS has been administered every other year to a double sample. From 1972 to 1996, the GSS provides almost 25,000 observations for women and men between the ages of 25 and 64.[13]

The OCG, SIPP, and GSS data have been classified into Census occupational systems from the 1960s to the 1980s. The 1962 OCG data are classified only into the 1960-basis Census occupational classification. The 1973 OCG data were coded twice, both into the 1960 and 1970 Census classifications. The GSS data were coded using the 1970 Census system from 1972 to 1990 and using the 1980 Census system from 1988 to 1996. There is a three-survey overlap from 1988 to 1990 in which both systems were used. The SIPP data were coded only using the 1980 Census occupational classification. This creates a problem of comparability, both in classification and in the linkage of occupations with their socioeconomic characteristics.   Obviously, each occupational classification system is directly linked to characteristics of occupational incumbents only in surveys or censuses using that classification. The 1960 and 1970 classification systems are similar, as are the 1980 and 1990 systems, but there were major changes between 1970 and 1980.

In the present analysis, occupational characteristics -- educational attainment and income -- were obtained from the Censuses of 1970 and 1990. Each 1970-basis 3-digit occupation line (and selected subsets determined by industry or class of worker) was assigned two characteristics,

---

[13] The Appendix lists numbers of cases for each survey by age, race, and sex. In the analyses reported here, the data have been weighted to estimate population totals, and weights have been adjusted downward in relation to sample design effects in order to yield approximate standard errors.

obtained from a special tabulation of the entire 1970 Census of Population that was commissioned by Charles Nam and Mary Powers.[14] These were the percentage of all occupational incumbents who earned $10,000 or more in 1969 and the percentage of all occupational incumbents who had completed at least 1 year of college. Each 1990-basis line (or subset) was assigned the percentage of all occupational incumbents who earned $25,000 or more in 1989 and who had attended at least 1 year of college. At the level of occupational aggregates, there is little difference in the behavior of alternative measures, e.g., median earnings, earnings of full-time workers, estimated wage rates, median educational attainment, or percentage of workers with less than a high school education (Hauser and Warren 1997).

Each occupational variable was expressed as a started logit, $\ln((p_i + .01)/(1 - p_i + .01))$, where p_i is the percentage of incumbents in the ith occupation above the indicated threshold. Since the occupation variables are each expressed on a logarithmic scale, one could interpret intergenerational regression coefficients as elasticities.

Characteristics of occupations in the 1960 Census classification (only at the three-digit level) were estimated by taking weighted averages of component 1970-basis occupation lines in a large sample from the 1960 Census that had been coded using both systems (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1972). Thus, data from the 1962 OCG survey were analyzed in terms of the characteristics of occupational incumbents in 1970. Data from the 1973 OCG survey have been tabulated twice, once using three-digit 1960-basis codes to which characteristics of occupations in 1970 were attached, and, again, using the full 1970-basis breakdown of occupation, industry, and class of worker, to which characteristics of occupational incumbents in 1970 were attached. The 1980-

---

[14] These data are available on request from the author.

basis Census occupational classification is so close to that in 1990 that it was possible to assign characteristics of workers in 1990 directly to those lines. The SIPP data were thus linked to occupational characteristics from the 1990 Census. The GSS data were coded using the 1970 occupational classification and characteristics from 1972 to 1990 and using the 1980 occupational classification and 1990 occupational characteristics from 1988 to 1996.

For these reasons, different parts of the data may or may not be strictly comparable. Intercohort comparisons within the 1962 and/or 1973 OCG data are comparable in terms of the 1960 Census classification and characteristics of occupations in 1970. Intercohort comparisons within the GSS data are comparable from 1972 to 1990 in terms of the 1970 Census classification and occupational characteristics, and they are comparable from 1988 to 1996 in terms of the 1980 Census classification and 1990 occupational characteristics. The 1970-basis data from the 1973 OCG survey provide some internal intercohort comparisons in mobility to first jobs, and they are strictly comparable to the beginning of the 1970-basis GSS series. The SIPP data are similarly comparable to the beginning of the 1980-basis GSS series. Of course, each survey permits direct comparisons of the occupational standing of fathers and sons or daughters in its own terms.

Mean Intergenerational and Intercohort Mobility

Table 1 shows means and standard deviations of occupational education for Nonblacks in the two OCG surveys and SIPP. Data have been tabulated separately by four age groups, 25 to 34, 35 to 44, 45 to 54, and 55 to 64, in order to permit age-constant intercohort comparisons. My discussion focuses on intergenerational and intercohort shifts in occupational standing, to the neglect of cross-sectional age comparisons, except in the case of first jobs. In the case of occupational origins and first jobs, it is possible to compare age groups within the same survey as if they were cohorts, but such comparisons are not appropriate in the case of current occupation.

11

All of the intergenerational (father to son) comparisons of mobility to current occupations in the OCG data indicate upward mobility in occupational education, as do the father-to-daughter comparisons in the 1986-88 SIPP. However, in the 25 to 34 year age group, the SIPP data show essentially no difference between the average occupational education of fathers and sons.

In the case of first occupations, there was essentially no net upward mobility in the 1962 OCG data, while there were substantial upward shifts in the 1973 data. Since the 1973 survey covered essentially the same cohorts 11 years later, this appears inconsistent. However, there was a methodological difference in the measurement of first jobs in the two surveys. Both surveys aimed to ascertain the first job after the man left school for the last time, but in 1973 the respondent was reminded of the timing and level of school completion just before the question on first job. This probably accounts for the difference in findings. It is probably more appropriate to compare mobility from father's occupation to first jobs across age groups within each survey, and in these comparisons there are essentially no intercohort differences in mean upward or downward mobility.

Table 2 is similar to Table 1, but it shows descriptive statistics for Blacks. In the 1962 OCG survey, there was essentially no upward mobility between father's occupations and those of men at any age. However, by 1973 there was pronounced upward intergenerational mobility in occupational education at younger ages. Large upward intergenerational shifts also appear in the SIPP data for men (with one anomalous exception) and in those for women. Similarly, the two OCG surveys show large upward intercohort shifts in the occupational education of current jobs, especially at younger ages. Evidently, the civil rights era lifted the job ceiling for Black Americans to a substantial degree.

Tables 3 and 4 are similar to Tables 1 and 2, but they describe average occupational income levels, rather than educational levels. The findings with respect to intergenerational and intercohort shifts in occupational income are similar to those in occupational education, but with two very important exceptions. First, the data from both OCG surveys show substantial downward mobility to first jobs in intergenerational occupational income. These appear smaller in the 1973 OCG data than in the earlier survey, but the intergenerational shifts are still negative. Thus, men typically enter low wage jobs, but not necessarily low education jobs early in their careers. Second, in the 1986-88 SIPP data, women of all ages experience very large drops in occupational income relative to their fathers. This is perhaps obvious, given the typical earnings differential between women and men, but it is not so trivial to think about the difference when it is expressed intergenerationally.

Tables 5 and 6 show mean levels of occupational education for Nonblack men and women in the GSS from 1972 to 1996.[15] Note that the 1980-basis GSS statistics for 1988 to 1991 are similar to those in Table 1 for SIPP from 1986 to 1988.[16] Nonblack men and women show somewhat different trends in intergenerational mobility in occupational education. Most intergenerational shifts are positive, both for men and women. Among men, however, there is evidence of declining upward shifts in recent years at younger ages. Net father-to-son mobility is negative after 1980. Above age 45, however, net upward intergenerational mobility in occupational education is essentially constant. Among women, there is a stronger interaction

---

[15] The GSS data do not provide enough cases of Black men and women for an analysis at this level of disaggregation.

[16] The GSS and SIPP means and standard deviations are also consistent in occupational income. Compare the 1980-basis GSS data for 1988 to 1991 in Tables 7 and 8 with the 1980-basis SIPP data in Table 3.

effect between intergenerational shifts, age, and period. Intergenerational mobility in occupational education is positive in all of the 1970-basis or 1980-basis comparisons, but it is smaller at younger ages and larger at older ages in more recent years. Intercohort shifts in occupational education are relatively small, both for men and women, except that women have experienced substantial upward intercohort shifts in occupational standing since the late 1980s in the two older age groups.

Tables 7 and 8 show descriptive statistics for occupational income in the GSS data. Among men, these shifts are almost always positive, and among women, the intergenerational shifts are almost always negative. In general, the shifts are more positive for men and less negative for women at older ages. That is, occupational changes during careers tend to improve occupational earnings relative to one's parents. One significant exception to these patterns is that the youngest men have experienced downward occupational earnings mobility relative to their fathers throughout the period covered by the GSS data. The generational gap may have grown in recent years, and there is a corresponding decline in net intergenerational occupational earnings mobility among men at ages 35 to 44. Although intergenerational mobility in occupational earnings is consistently negative among women, it appears to have grown smaller at every age between the early 1970s and the late 1980s. However, the 1980-basis comparison between the late 1980s and the early 1990s suggests a possible turnaround among younger women. That is, the decline in the intergenerational occupational earnings gap may not have continued for young women after 1990. Among men, intercohort changes in current occupational earnings levels have been small, but among women, growth in typical levels of occupational earnings was substantial at all ages until the end of the 1980s.

Intergenerational Regression of Occupational Standing

14

In the remainder of this paper, I compare estimates of intergenerational occupational regressions and correlations in the OCG, SIPP, and GSS data.[17] Table 9 shows estimated intergenerational regressions of occupational education by age and survey in the OCG and SIPP data. These estimates will look familiar to anyone who has looked at corresponding estimates based on the Duncan SEI or variants of it (Hauser, et al. forthcoming-a), for the behavior of occupational education is very similar to that of the SEI. Among Nonblack men, age-specific intergenerational regressions and correlations range from about 0.30 to 0.45, without correction for measurement error. Such corrections might raise the correlations by at most 20 percent. In the 1960-basis coding, there is a modest decline between 1962 and 1973 in the regressions and correlations in the three youngest age groups for Nonblack men. In the 1973 OCG data, age-specific regressions and correlations are appreciably higher when the estimates are based on the 1970-basis coding than when they are based on the 1960-basis coding. This leads me to suggest that one should exercise as much caution in comparing regressions among alternative data sources and coding and scaling conventions than in comparing means or standard deviations.

The absence of trend among Nonblack men in the period covered by the two OCG surveys is yet more evident in the cross-sectional comparisons across age groups of regressions and correlations of status of first job and father's occupation. There is no systematic trend across the four cohorts covered in either survey. For example, in the 1962 data, the four regressions are 0.376, 0.368, 0.354, and 0.390. However, these observations do suggest a possible decline in age-specific correlations between 1962 and 1973. Note that men aged 25 to 34 in 1962 are essentially the same as those aged 35 to 44 in 1973, and so on. In each of the three possible

_____

[17] I have carried out more extensive analyses, to be reported in the revision.

comparisons, the regressions are somewhat larger in the 1973 data (coded to 1960 specifications) than in the 1962 data. This suggests there is something about the 1973 survey that raises the correlations -- or else that recollections of first jobs and parental occupations tend to become more similar with increasing age. If the latter possibility does not hold, then the age-specific comparisons in regressions of current occupational education on father's occupational education may understate the decline in occupational persistence.

Among Black men, the estimates are much less reliable, but some large differentials and changes stand out. Intergenerational regressions and correlations of occupational education are lower for Blacks than Nonblacks, especially in the 1960s. In general, though not in all comparisons, the regressions and correlations have become larger in more recent periods, especially at younger ages. That is, since the 1960s, decreased racial discrimination has increased intergenerational occupational stratification. Blacks, like Whites, can now successfully transmit privilege or deprivation from one generation to the next.

Table 9 also shows estimates of intergenerational regressions in occupational education for Black and Nonblack women from SIPP, and it is instructive to compare these estimates with the corresponding estimates for men. Among Nonblack women, as among Nonblack men, the regressions are essentially the same at all four ages, but they are much smaller for women than men. That is, Nonblack women's occupational attainments, as indexed by occupational levels of education, are less constrained by social background than those of men.[18] In the SIPP data, among Black women and men, there is an inverse relationship between age and the intergenerational regressions. That is, the regressions are low among older workers. This is consistent with recent

_____

[18] However, one might possibly compare that lack of constraint to the "equal opportunity" (to fail) enjoyed by Black men in the period of American apartheid.

growth in occupational stratification in the Black population. While the regression estimates differ

substantially between Black women and men in the two youngest age groups, the data are not

reliable enough to warrant any strong conclusion about gender differences in stratification by

occupational education within the Black population.

The entries in Table 10 correspond exactly to those in Table 9, except the estimates pertain

to typical occupational levels of income, rather than occupational levels of education. The

strikingly obvious fact about the comparison is that intergenerational persistence of occupational

income levels is much lower than that of occupational education. For example, among Nonblack

men, the intergenerational regressions and correlations of occupational education are about 0.37,

while those of occupational income are about 0.21. The persistence of occupational income is

about 55 to 65 percent as large as that of occupational education. The relative size of the income

effects is somewhat larger for first jobs than for current jobs, and it is larger among Nonblack

women (in the 1986-88 SIPP data) than among Nonblack men.

I can think of no methodological reason why occupational income should be less valid as

an indicator of the economic standing of occupations than occupational education should be as an

indicator of their social standing or their knowledge requirements. It seems quite clear that the

similarity in estimates of occupational persistence based on heroically corrected wage regressions

and uncorrected regressions of the socioeconomic status of occupations has little to do with the

value of occupational socioeconomic indexes as an indicator of the economic standing of

occupations. It would appear that the major axis of intergenerational occupational stratification

has far less to do with the typical economic levels of occupations than with their typical

educational levels. In fact, Hauser and Warren (1997) were able to write a model of

intergenerational occupational stratification in the 1994 GSS data in which correlations among

17

occupational income variables in the generation of fathers and sons were incidental to a structural

model in occupational education.

In my mind, this finding raises interesting questions. Why should occupational education,

rather than occupational income, be the major basis for intergenerational occupational

stratification? Years ago, when they first encountered the Duncan SEI, some economists suggested

that it was a poor substitute for occupational income. Surely, that composite and its cousins are

grievously flawed, but not because they fail to reflect an important dimension of intergenerational

stratification. More important, why is the economic stratification of occupations so weak, and why

is it, apparently, distinct in magnitude from economic stratification as expressed directly in

(corrected) wages or earnings?

As in the case of the stratification of occupational education, the estimates for Black men in

Table 10 are somewhat unstable, yet the regressions of occupational income appear to show the

same tendency toward secular growth that appears in Table 9. If anything, the estimates of

regression by occupational income among Black men are even lower than among Nonblack men

relative to the estimates by occupational education. However, the 1986-88 SIPP data provide one

striking exception to the general finding. Among Black women at every age, the correlations and

regressions of occupational income are as large or larger than those of occupational education.

Why should the economic standing of occupations be so much more important among Black women

than in other population groups?

Tables 11 and 12 give the intergenerational regressions of occupational education and of

occupational income among Nonblack women and men in the GSS from 1972 to 1996. Here, as in

Tables 9 and 10, the larger effects of occupational education are evident, but the GSS data also

show interesting trends. Among men, there may be a downward drift in the economic stratification

of occupations relative to their educational stratification. The economic regressions and correlations were about 0.7 as large as the educational regressions in 1972 to 1975, but they ranged between 0.5 and 0.6 thereafter. The pattern is quite different among women. In each comparison of periods within the 1970-basis series, and in the comparison between the two 1980-basis series, the economic regressions become larger relative to the education regressions. For example, in 1972 to 1975, the economic regressions and correlations were only about 0.34 as large as the educational regressions, but in 1986 to 1998, the economic regressions and correlations were almost 0.7 times as large as the educational regressions. However, this has not occurred because occupational stratification by earnings has become more important among women, but because occupational stratification by education has declined. For example, at age 25 to 34, the regression coefficient was 0.459 among women in 1972 to 1975, while it was only 0.209 in 1986 to 1990.[19] Again, the findings raise interesting questions. Why should economic stratification by occupation have remained essentially constant among American women over the past 25 years, while educational stratification has declined, even as there have supposed been increases in educational credentialism? Is there a relationship between this trend and women's increasing demands for economic parity or the increased participation of women in the labor market?

Discussion

I hope that this analysis has raised more questions than it has answered. If occupations can be used to indicate economic standing, then ample data are available to measure economic

---

[19]   The latter estimate is not significantly different from that of 0.267 among Nonblack women in SIPP during 1986 to 1988 (see Table 9), while the GSS regression estimate of 0.205 is not significantly different from that of 0.227 among Nonblack women in SIPP (see Table 10).

persistence across generations in major population groups and to appraise trends and differentials in economic persistence. On the other hand, the relatively low levels of intergenerational persistence of the economic standing of occupations, relative to their educational standing, raises serious questions about the use of occupation as an economic proxy. Does this occur because occupations are a poor proxy for economic prospects, or does it occur because intergenerational economic persistence is less than that in social or cultural standing? If the latter, why should occupations be the vehicles for this form of intergenerational reproduction, rather than purely economic relations between the generations.

References

Altonji, Joseph G. and Thomas A. Dunn. 1996a. "Using Siblings to Estimate the Effect of School

Quality on Wages." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 78(4):665-71.

_____. 1996b. "The Effects of Family Characteristics on the Return to Education." *Review of*

Economics and Statistics 78(4):692-704.

Becker, Gary S. 1989. "On the Economics of the Family: A Reply to a Skeptic." *The American*

Economic Review 79(3):514-18.

Becker, Gary S. and Nigel Tomes. 1986. "Human Capital and the Rise and Fall of Families."

Journal of Labor Economics 4:S1-S47.

Behrman, Jere and Paul Taubman. 1985. "Intergenerational Earnings Mobility in the United States:

Some Estimates and a Test of Becker's Intergenerational Endowments Model." *The Review*

of Economics and Statistics, February, 144-51.

Bielby, William T., Robert M. Hauser, and David L. Featherman. 1977. "Response Errors of

Black and Nonblack Males in Models of the Intergenerational Transmission of

Socioeconomic Status." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:1242-88.

Bjorklund, Anders and Markus Jantti. 1997a. "Intergenerational Mobility of Economic Status: Is

the United States Different?" American Economic Association. New Orleans, LA, January

4-6.

_____. forthcoming. "Intergenerational Mobility in Sweden Compared to the United States."

American Economic Review.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Boyd, Monica. 1986. "Socioeconomic Indices and Sexual Inequality: A Tale of Scales." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 23(4):457-80.

Brittain, John A. 1977. *The Inheritance of Economic Status*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

_____. 1978. *Inheritance and the Inequality of Material Wealth*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Corcoran, Mary and Terry Adams. 1997. "Race, Sex, and the Intergenerational Transmission of Poverty." Pp. 518-40 in *Consequences of Growing Up Poor*, edited by Greg J. Duncan and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Couch, Kenneth A. and Thomas A. Dunn. 1997. "Intergenerational Correlations in Labor Market Status." *Journal of Human Resources* 32(1):210-32.

DiPrete, Thomas A. and David B. Grusky. 1990. "Structure and Trend in the Process of Stratification for American Men and Women." *American Journal of Sociology* 96(1):107-43.

Duncan, Otis Dudley. 1961. "A Socioeconomic Index for All Occupations." Pp. 109-38 in *Occupations and Social Status*, edited by Albert J. Reiss, Jr. New York: Free Press.

Featherman, David L. and Robert M. Hauser. 1976. "Prestige or Socioeconomic Scales in the Study of Occupational Achievement?" *Sociological Methods and Research* 4(4):403-22.

_____. 1978. *Opportunity and Change*. New York: Academic Press.

Featherman, David L., F. Lancaster Jones, and Robert M. Hauser. 1975. "Assumptions of Social

      Mobility Research in the U.S.: The Case of Occupational Status." *Social Science*

      Research 4:329-60.

Fields, Gary S., Jesse B. Leary, and Efe A. Ok. 1998. "Income Movement in the United States in

      the Seventies and Eighties." Brookings Institution Conference on Social Mobility.

      Washington, D.C., June 3-4.

Goldberger, Arthur S. 1989. "Economic and Mechanical Models of Intergenerational

      Transmission." *The American Economic Review* 79(3):504-13.

Gottschalk, Peter. 1997. "Inequality, Income Growth, and Mobility: The Basic Facts." *Journal of*

      Economic Perspectives 11:21-40.

Gottschalk, Peter and Robert Moffitt. 1994. "The Growth of Earnings Instability in the U.S. Labor

      Market." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 2:217-72.

Griliches, Zvi. 1979. "Sibling Models and Data in Economics: Beginnings of a Survey." *Journal*

      of Political Economy 87:S37-64.

Grusky, David B. 1986. "American Social Mobility in the 19th and 20th Centuries," diss.

      University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Grusky, David B. and Thomas A. DiPrete. 1990. "Recent Trends in the Process of Stratification."

      Demography 27(4):617-37.

Hauser, Robert M. 1984. "Some Cross-Population Comparisons of Family Bias in the Effects of

      Schooling on Occupational Status." *Social Science Research* 13:159-87.

Hauser, Robert M., et al. forthcoming-a. "Occupational Status, Education, and Social Mobility in

      the Meritocracy." In *Meritocracy and Inequality*, edited by Kenneth Arrow, Samuel

      Bowles and Stephen Durlauf. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

23

Hauser, Robert M. and David L. Featherman. 1977. *The Process of Stratification: Trends and Analyses*. New York: Academic Press.

Hauser, Robert M. and John A. Logan. 1992. "How Not to Measure Intergenerational Occupational Persistence." *American Journal of Sociology* 97(6):1689-711.

Hauser, Robert M. and Peter A. Mossel. 1987. "Some Structural Equation Models of Sibling Resemblance in Educational Attainment and Occupational Status." Pp. 108-37 in *Structural Modeling by Example: Applications in Educational, Sociological, and Behavioral Research*, edited by Peter Cuttance and Russell Ecob. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hauser, Robert M. and William H. Sewell. 1986. "Family Effects in Simple Models of Education, Occupational Status, and Earnings: Findings from the Wisconsin and Kalamazoo Studies." *Journal of Labor Economics* 4:S83-S115.

Hauser, Robert M., Jennifer T. Sheridan, and John Robert Warren. forthcoming-b. "Socioeconomic Achievements of Siblings in the Life Course: New Findings from the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study." *Research on Aging*.

Hauser, Robert M. and John Robert Warren. 1997. "Socioeconomic Indexes for Occupations: A Review, Update, and Critique." Pp. 177-298 in *Sociological Methodology 1997*, edited by Adrian E. Raftery. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Hodge, Robert W. 1981. "The Measurement of Occupational Status." *Social Science Research* 10:396-415.

Hout, Michael. 1988. "More Universalism, Less Structural Mobility: The American Occupational Structure in the 1980s." *American Journal of Sociology* 93(6):1358-400.

_____. 1996. "Speed Bumps on the Road to Meritocracy: Occupational Mobility of Women

    and Men in the United States, 1972-1994." Manuscript. Memorial Conference for Clifford

    C. Clogg. State College, PA, September.

Hungerford, Thomas L. 1993. "U.S. Income Mobility in the Seventies and Eighties." *Review of*

    Income and Wealth 39:403-17.

Jencks, Christopher S. 1990. "What is the True Rate of Social Mobility." In *Social Mobility and*

    Social Structure, edited by Ronald L. Breiger. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jencks, Christopher S., Lauri Perman, and Lee Rainwater. 1988. "What is a Good Job? A New

    Measure of Labor Market Success." *American Journal of Sociology* 93(6):1322-57.

Johnson, Paul and Howard Reed. 1996. *Two Nations: The Inheritance of Poverty and Affluence*.

    Commentary, vol. 53. London: The Institute for Fiscal Studies, An E.S.R.C. Research

    Centre. 25.

Korenman, Sanders and Christopher Winship. 1995. "A Reanalysis of The Bell Curve."

    Unpublished paper. October.

McMurrer, Daniel P. and Isabel V. Sawhill. 1998. *Getting Ahead: Economic and Social*

    Mobility in America. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.

Mulligan, Casey B. 1995. "Economic and Biological Approaches to Inheritance: Some Evidence."

    Department of Economics, University of Chicago, October.

Murray, Charles. 1996. "Income Inequality and I.Q.." Conference paper, American Enterprise

    Institute for Public Policy Research. Seminar Series on Understanding Economic

    Inequality. Washington, D.C., December 16, 1996.

_____. 1998. *Income Inequality and IQ.* Washington, D.C.: The AEI Press.

Nakao, Keiko and Judith Treas. 1994. "Updating Occupational Prestige and Socioeconomic
Scores: How the New Measures Measure Up." Pp. 1-72 in *Sociological Methodology,
1994*, edited by Peter Marsden. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

Olneck, Michael R. 1977. "On the Use of Sibling Data to Estimate the Effects of Family
Background, Cognitive Skills, and Schooling: Results from the Kalamazoo Brothers
Study." Pp. 125-62 in *Kinometrics: Determinants of Socioeconomic Success Within and
Between Families*, edited by Paul Taubman. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Rytina, Steve. 1992. "Scaling the Intergenerational Continuity of Occupation: Is Occupational
Inheritance Ascriptive After All?" *American Journal of Sociology* 97(6):1658-88.

Sewell, William H. and Robert M. Hauser. 1975. *Education, Occupation, and Earnings:
Achievement in the Early Career*. New York: Academic Press.

Siegel, Paul M. 1971. "Prestige in the American Occupational Structure," doctoral diss.University
of Chicago.

Solon, Gary. 1989. "Biases in the Estimation of Intergenerational Earnings Correlations." *Review
of Economics and Statistics* 71(1):172-74.

Solon, Gary, et al. 1991. "A Longitudinal Analysis of Sibling Correlations in Economic Status."
Journal of Human Resources 26(3):509-34.

Solon, Gary. 1992. "Intergenerational Income Mobility in the United States." *American Economic
Review* 82:393-408.

Stevens, Gillian and Joo Hyun Cho. 1985. "Socioeconomic Indexes and the New 1980 Census
Occupational Classification Scheme." *Social Science Research* 14:142--168.

Stevens, Gillian and David L. Featherman. 1981. "A Revised Socioeconomic Index of
Occupational Status." *Social Science Research* 10(4):364-95.

Stokey, Nancy L. 1996. "Shirtsleeves to Shirtsleeves: The Economics of Social Mobility."

    Manuscript. Nancy L. Schwartz Lecture. Northwestern University, May.

Treiman, Donald J. and Robert M. Hauser. 1977. "Intergenerational Transmission of Income: An

    Exercise in Theory Construction." In *The Process of Stratification: Trends and Analyses*,

    edited by R.M. Hauser and D.L. Featherman. New York: Academic Press.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1972. *1970 Occupation and Industry Classification Systems in Terms*

    of Their 1960 Occupation and Industry Elements. Technical Paper 26. Washington, D.C.:

    U.S. Government Printing Office.

Warren, John Robert, Jennifer T. Sheridan, and Robert M. Hauser. forthcoming. "How Do Indexes

    of Occupational Status Affect Analyses of Gender Inequality in Occupational Attainment?"

    Sociological Methods and Research.

Zimmerman, David J. 1992. "Regression Toward Mediocrity in Economic Stature." *American*

    Economic Review 82:409-29.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of Occupational Education: Nonblack Men, 1963 and 1973 Occupational Changes in a Generation Surveys (OCG), and Nonblack Men and Women, 1986-88 Surveys of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)

Variable	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occupational education in 1970)								
Current job	-1.16	1.46	-1.19	1.35	-1.28	1.27	-1.30	1.25
First job	-1.53	1.30	-1.70	1.12	-1.74	1.09	-1.71	1.10
Father's job	-1.56	1.15	-1.62	1.09	-1.69	1.02	-1.68	1.04
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occupational education in 1970)								
Current job	-1.07	1.47	-1.02	1.44	-1.12	1.36	-1.29	1.30
First job	-1.24	1.48	-1.26	1.48	-1.41	1.36	-1.57	1.26
Father's job	-1.46	1.25	-1.60	1.16	-1.68	1.09	-1.72	1.04
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occupational education in 1970)								
Current job	-1.05	1.69	-0.99	1.66	-1.14	1.53	-1.32	1.45
First job	-1.26	1.68	-1.29	1.69	-1.50	1.54	-1.67	1.43
Father's job	-1.55	1.36	-1.69	1.27	-1.77	1.19	-1.79	1.16
1986-88 SIPP Men (1980-basis occupations, occupational education in 1990)								
Current job	0.15	1.38	0.34	1.43	0.38	1.40	0.33	1.40
Father's job	0.19	1.42	0.06	1.28	-0.26	1.13	-0.36	1.06
1986-88 SIPP Women (1980-basis occupations, occupational education in 1990)								
Current job	0.52	1.29	0.55	1.31	0.37	1.27	0.20	1.19
Father's job	0.26	1.43	-0.01	1.29	-0.24	1.15	-0.26	1.16

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations of Occupational Education: Black Men, 1963 and 1973 Occupational Changes in a Generation Surveys (OCG), and Black Men and Women, 1986-88 Surveys of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)

Variable	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occupational education in 1970)								
Current job	-2.01	0.93	-2.00	0.89	-2.11	0.78	-2.14	0.75
First job	-2.05	0.83	-2.17	0.65	-2.21	0.48	-2.18	0.52
Father's job	-2.02	0.80	-2.09	0.63	-1.95	0.93	-1.99	0.85
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occupational education in 1970)								
Current job	-1.69	1.15	-1.67	1.27	-1.90	1.04	-2.03	0.87
First job	-1.81	1.04	-1.87	1.14	-2.03	0.91	-2.10	0.85
Father's job	-2.11	0.89	-2.10	0.84	-2.18	0.75	-2.17	0.59
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occupational education in 1970)								
Current job	-1.78	1.37	-1.80	1.44	-2.06	1.20	-2.20	0.91
First job	-1.93	1.19	-2.00	1.28	-2.16	1.08	-2.24	0.92
Father's job	-2.24	0.96	-2.24	0.91	-2.27	0.82	-2.25	0.66
1986-88 SIPP Men (1980-basis occupations, occupational education in 1990)								
Current job	-0.33	1.22	-0.20	1.25	-0.31	1.30	-0.52	1.05
Father's job	-0.56	1.08	-0.59	1.02	-0.79	0.71	-0.66	0.87
1986-88 SIPP Women (1980-basis occupations, occupational education in 1990)								
Current job	0.12	1.20	0.17	1.43	-0.27	1.23	-0.16	1.43
Father's job	-0.42	1.19	-0.71	0.96	-0.73	0.81	-0.67	0.68

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of Occupational Income: Nonblack Men, 1963 and 1973 Occupational Changes in a Generation Surveys (OCG), and Nonblack Men and Women, 1986-88 Surveys of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)

Variable	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occupational income in 1970)								
Current job	-1.27	1.14	-1.12	1.07	-1.19	1.02	-1.26	1.06
First job	-1.94	1.16	-2.08	1.13	-2.22	1.08	-2.22	1.10
Father's job	-1.40	1.00	-1.38	0.98	-1.43	0.95	-1.37	0.88
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occupational income in 1970)								
Current job	-1.17	1.08	-1.03	1.05	-1.07	1.05	-1.22	1.06
First job	-1.63	1.22	-1.65	1.25	-1.77	1.25	-1.99	1.21
Father's job	-1.36	1.11	-1.46	1.09	-1.51	1.07	-1.51	1.03
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occupational income in 1970)								
Current job	-0.97	1.20	-0.77	1.18	-0.86	1.22	-1.08	1.24
First job	-1.55	1.32	-1.58	1.37	-1.73	1.36	-1.99	1.32
Father's job	-1.25	1.22	-1.39	1.19	-1.46	1.17	-1.47	1.13
1986-88 SIPP Men (1980-basis occupations, occupational income in 1990)								
Current job	-0.83	0.93	-0.68	0.88	-0.64	0.89	-0.71	0.91
Father's job	-0.70	0.91	-0.85	0.86	-0.97	0.83	-1.04	0.79
1986-88 SIPP Women (1980-basis occupations, occupational income in 1990)								
Current job	-1.37	1.07	-1.34	1.04	-1.42	1.01	-1.60	0.95
Father's job	-0.65	0.91	-0.81	0.87	-0.96	0.84	-0.99	0.83

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations of Occupational Income: Black Men, 1963 and 1973 Occupational Changes in a
Generation Surveys (OCG), and Black Men and Women, 1986-88 Surveys of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)

Variable	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occupational income in 1970)								
Current job	-2.39	0.90	-2.22	0.91	-2.27	0.86	-2.50	0.90
First job	-2.58	0.86	-2.58	0.92	-2.84	0.88	-2.84	0.87
Father's job	-1.94	0.99	-2.03	0.89	-1.78	0.80	-1.75	0.84
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occupational income in 1970)								
Current job	-1.83	1.02	-1.83	1.00	-1.99	0.94	-2.19	0.93
First job	-2.33	1.04	-2.39	1.04	-2.46	0.96	-2.64	0.99
Father's job	-2.31	1.13	-2.28	1.13	-2.30	1.18	-2.16	1.07
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occupational income in 1970)								
Current job	-1.70	1.15	-1.71	1.06	-1.88	1.05	-2.15	0.95
First job	-2.31	1.18	-2.34	1.16	-2.42	1.07	-2.55	1.08
Father's job	-2.24	1.22	-2.30	1.21	-2.27	1.20	-2.10	1.12
1986-88 SIPP Men (1980-basis occupations, occupational income in 1990)								
Current job	-1.26	0.91	-1.10	0.87	-1.13	0.79	-1.24	0.87
Father's job	-1.17	0.80	-1.23	0.74	-1.43	0.54	-1.49	0.71
1986-88 SIPP Women (1980-basis occupations, occupational income in 1990)								
Current job	-1.63	0.99	-1.53	1.06	-1.78	0.89	-1.79	1.00
Father's job	-1.16	0.77	-1.31	0.75	-1.41	0.59	-1.37	0.63

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations of Occupational Education: Nonblack Men
in the NORC General Social Survey, 1972 to 1996

| | Age 25 to 34 | | Age 35 to 44 | | Age 45 to 54 | | Age 55 to 64 | |
Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
1972 to 1975 (1970-basis occupations and occupational education)								
Current job	-0.96	1.62	-0.94	1.71	-1.18	1.50	-1.29	1.51
Father's job	-1.41	1.44	-1.69	1.27	-1.79	1.20	-1.80	1.18
1976 to 1980 (1970-basis occupations and occupational education)								
Current job	-1.10	1.66	-0.92	1.73	-1.17	1.55	-1.14	1.53
Father's job	-1.39	1.51	-1.64	1.40	-1.84	1.20	-1.68	1.30
1982 to 1985 (1970-basis occupations and occupational education)								
Current job	-1.32	1.51	-0.88	1.75	-0.93	1.67	-1.20	1.58
Father's job	-1.21	1.53	-1.39	1.45	-1.75	1.26	-1.79	1.16
1986 to 1990 (1970-basis occupations and occupational education)								
Current job	-1.18	1.51	-0.79	1.70	-0.87	1.75	-0.94	1.60
Father's job	-1.15	1.52	-1.30	1.50	-1.54	1.42	-1.63	1.32
1988 to 1991 (1980-basis occupations and occupational education in 1990)								
Current job	0.03	1.25	0.25	1.32	0.28	1.33	0.31	1.30
Father's job	0.09	1.21	-0.12	1.19	-0.33	1.02	-0.42	1.05
1993 to 1996 (1980-basis occupations and occupational education in 1990)								
Current job	0.03	1.23	0.26	1.34	0.35	1.30	0.27	1.34
Father's job	0.17	1.25	0.15	1.31	-0.04	1.22	-0.25	1.03

Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations of Occupational Education: Nonblack Women
in the NORC General Social Survey, 1972 to 1996

Variable	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
1972 to 1975 (1970-basis occupations and occupational education)								
Current job	-0.79	1.49	-1.09	1.40	-1.29	1.39	-1.40	1.38
Father's job	-1.46	1.41	-1.67	1.22	-1.65	1.24	-1.81	1.12
1976 to 1980 (1970-basis occupations and occupational education)								
Current job	-0.95	1.45	-0.98	1.53	-1.15	1.39	-1.29	1.42
Father's job	-1.48	1.33	-1.71	1.28	-1.76	1.25	-1.79	1.17
1982 to 1985 (1970-basis occupations and occupational education)								
Current job	-0.88	1.30	-0.67	1.44	-0.93	1.40	-1.14	1.33
Father's job	-1.26	1.53	-1.43	1.48	-1.70	1.23	-1.82	1.23
1986 to 1990 (1970-basis occupations and occupational education)								
Current job	-0.73	1.40	-0.59	1.49	-0.89	1.48	-1.08	1.39
Father's job	-1.04	1.64	-1.24	1.49	-1.57	1.32	-1.77	1.19
1988 to 1991 (1980-basis occupations and occupational education in 1990)								
Current job	0.38	1.18	0.46	1.20	0.18	1.22	0.01	1.22
Father's job	0.15	1.26	-0.01	1.21	-0.30	1.07	-0.39	1.05
1993 to 1996 (1980-basis occupations and occupational education in 1990)								
Current job	0.34	1.13	0.43	1.21	0.62	1.23	0.36	1.19
Father's job	0.17	1.26	0.05	1.29	-0.07	1.18	-0.28	1.10

Table 7. Means and Standard Deviations of Occupational Income: Nonblack Men
in the NORC General Social Survey, 1972 to 1996

Variable	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
1972 to 1975 (1970-basis occupations and occupational income)								
Current job	-1.06	1.17	-0.78	1.25	-0.87	1.25	-1.02	1.09
Father's job	-0.98	1.16	-1.04	1.15	-1.16	1.11	-1.29	1.07
1976 to 1980 (1970-basis occupations and occupational income)								
Current job	-1.11	1.18	-0.72	1.23	-0.92	1.23	-0.94	1.14
Father's job	-1.04	1.18	-1.09	1.15	-1.26	1.06	-1.19	1.04
1982 to 1985 (1970-basis occupations and occupational income)								
Current job	-1.17	1.18	-0.79	1.20	-0.65	1.23	-0.89	1.29
Father's job	-0.82	1.16	-0.97	1.14	-1.20	1.12	-1.17	1.07
1986 to 1990 (1970-basis occupations and occupational income)								
Current job	-1.02	1.30	-0.74	1.25	-0.80	1.28	-0.87	1.26
Father's job	-0.86	1.19	-0.87	1.21	-1.04	1.16	-1.11	1.05
1988 to 1991 (1980-basis occupations and occupational income in 1990)								
Current job	-0.90	0.93	-0.76	0.88	-0.69	0.88	-0.70	0.84
Father's job	-0.74	0.91	-0.79	0.88	-0.97	0.79	-1.07	0.80
1993 to 1996 (1980-basis occupations and occupational income in 1990)								
Current job	-0.95	0.90	-0.73	0.91	-0.57	0.87	-0.70	0.94
Father's job	-0.63	0.90	-0.65	0.89	-0.79	0.90	-0.92	0.81

Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations of Occupational Income: Nonblack Women
in the NORC General Social Survey, 1972 to 1996

Variable	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
1972 to 1975 (1970-basis occupations and occupational income)								
Current job	-2.44	1.20	-2.68	1.14	-2.51	1.24	-2.68	1.20
Father's job	-1.02	1.17	-1.15	1.14	-1.20	1.13	-1.26	0.96
1976 to 1980 (1970-basis occupations and occupational income)								
Current job	-2.48	1.20	-2.39	1.26	-2.41	1.28	-2.44	1.21
Father's job	-1.00	1.18	-1.23	1.10	-1.18	1.02	-1.29	1.06
1982 to 1985 (1970-basis occupations and occupational income)								
Current job	-2.26	1.31	-2.10	1.37	-2.29	1.36	-2.35	1.34
Father's job	-0.94	1.22	-1.00	1.25	-1.12	1.08	-1.27	1.04
1986 to 1990 (1970-basis occupations and occupational income)								
Current job	-2.00	1.48	-1.96	1.43	-2.13	1.42	-2.30	1.36
Father's job	-0.78	1.17	-0.84	1.18	-1.13	1.21	-1.25	1.14
1988 to 1991 (1980-basis occupations and occupational income in 1990)								
Current job	-1.42	1.05	-1.34	1.03	-1.46	1.00	-1.63	1.00
Father's job	-0.73	0.89	-0.76	0.86	-0.93	0.87	-1.04	0.88
1993 to 1996 (1980-basis occupations and occupational income in 1990)								
Current job	-1.46	1.03	-1.35	1.06	-1.26	1.03	-1.50	1.00
Father's job	-0.65	0.86	-0.75	0.90	-0.85	0.88	-0.95	0.83

Table 9. Intergenerational Regressions of Occupational Education: 1962 and 1973 Occupational
Changes in a Generation Surveys (OCG) and 1986-88 Surveys of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)

Group and variables	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	b	r	b	r	b	r	b	r
Nonblack men								
Father's occupation and current occupation								
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.445 (0.025)	0.346	0.434 (0.023)	0.345	0.421 (0.025)	0.336	0.376 (0.029)	0.310
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.386 (0.016)	0.325	0.413 (0.019)	0.326	0.393 (0.019)	0.310	0.401 (0.023)	0.319
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.428 (0.017)	0.342	0.458 (0.019)	0.350	0.444 (0.019)	0.344	0.429 (0.022)	0.341
1986-88 SIPP (1980-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1990)	0.343 (0.016)	0.348	0.355 (0.021)	0.313	0.438 (0.027)	0.349	0.435 (0.035)	0.322
Father's occupation and first occupation								
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.390 (0.025)	0.336	0.354 (0.020)	0.334	0.368 (0.021)	0.339	0.376 (0.025)	0.355
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.425 (0.017)	0.354	0.469 (0.020)	0.365	0.430 (0.019)	0.341	0.419 (0.023)	0.348
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.449 (0.017)	0.359	0.494 (0.020)	0.371	0.463 (0.019)	0.357	0.440 (0.022)	0.356
Black men								
Father's occupation and current occupation								
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.063 (0.083)	0.052	0.295 (0.102)	0.195	-0.087 (0.063)	-0.106	0.236 (0.088)	0.248
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.376 (0.046)	0.287	0.255 (0.061)	0.168	0.284 (0.059)	0.200	0.143 (0.082)	0.095
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.341 (0.052)	0.235	0.263 (0.063)	0.167	0.228 (0.062)	0.154	0.117 (0.077)	0.082
1986-88 SIPP (1980-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1990)	0.473 (0.065)	0.422	0.220 (0.087)	0.172	0.103 (0.168)	0.054	-0.143 (0.129)	-0.123
Father's occupation and first occupation								
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.138 (0.073)	0.133	-0.055 (0.074)	-0.052	0.048 (0.040)	0.093	0.085 (0.057)	0.142
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.421 (0.044)	0.355	0.221 (0.060)	0.158	0.233 (0.054)	0.188	0.384 (0.078)	0.271
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1970)	0.353 (0.048)	0.272	0.223 (0.060)	0.156	0.236 (0.057)	0.179	0.252 (0.077)	0.179
Nonblack women: Father's occupation and current occupation								
1986-88 SIPP (1980-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1990)	0.267 (0.016)	0.297	0.249 (0.020)	0.243	0.295 (0.028)	0.267	0.280 (0.031)	0.275
Black women: Father's occupation and current occupation								
1986-88 SIPP (1980-basis occupations, occ. ed. in 1990)	0.232 (0.064)	0.219	0.336 (0.095)	0.219	0.105 (0.130)	0.065	0.147 (0.219)	0.074

Table 10. Intergenerational Regressions of Occupational Income: 1962 and 1973 Occupational
Changes in a Generation Surveys (OCG) and 1986-88 Surveys of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)

Group and variables	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	b	r	b	r	b	r	b	r
Nonblack men								
Father's occupation and current occupation								
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	0.265 (0.023)	0.232	0.225 (0.021)	0.205	0.220 (0.022)	0.205	0.238 (0.030)	0.196
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	0.188 (0.014)	0.194	0.208 (0.015)	0.214	0.196 (0.015)	0.200	0.194 (0.019)	0.188
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	0.186 (0.014)	0.190	0.215 (0.015)	0.216	0.229 (0.016)	0.219	0.218 (0.020)	0.200
1986-88 SIPP (1980-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1990)	0.227 (0.017)	0.222	0.213 (0.019)	0.208	0.239 (0.024)	0.223	0.203 (0.032)	0.174
Father's occupation and first occupation								
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	0.287 (0.024)	0.246	0.222 (0.023)	0.189	0.263 (0.024)	0.228	0.284 (0.031)	0.225
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	0.279 (0.016)	0.255	0.272 (0.019)	0.235	0.258 (0.019)	0.220	0.239 (0.023)	0.205
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	0.266 (0.015)	0.247	0.279 (0.018)	0.242	0.291 (0.018)	0.248	0.245 (0.022)	0.210
Black men								
Father's occupation and current occupation								
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	-0.001 (0.064)	-0.001	-0.028 (0.070)	-0.027	0.001 (0.082)	0.001	-0.116 (0.107)	-0.103
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	0.054 (0.034)	0.059	0.081 (0.036)	0.093	0.019 (0.034)	0.023	-0.033 (0.047)	-0.039
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	0.053 (0.035)	0.035	0.082 (0.035)	0.094	0.037 (0.037)	0.042	-0.019 (0.047)	-0.023
1986-88 SIPP (1980-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1990)	0.271 (0.069)	0.246	0.094 (0.083)	0.078	0.084 (0.124)	0.059	-0.226 (0.129)	-0.193
Father's occupation and first occupation								
1962 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	-0.021 (0.059)	-0.026	-0.044 (0.074)	-0.042	0.008 (0.084)	0.007	0.101 (0.104)	0.093
1973 OCG (1960-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	0.201 (0.036)	0.214	0.103 (0.040)	0.112	0.005 (0.037)	0.059	0.111 (0.052)	0.120
1973 OCG (1970-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1970)	0.216 (0.037)	0.221	0.103 (0.040)	0.108	0.076 (0.039)	0.083	0.101 (0.054)	0.104
Nonblack women: Father's occupation and current occupation								
1986-88 SIPP (1980-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1990)	0.227 (0.022)	0.194	0.205 (0.024)	0.171	0.166 (0.031)	0.137	0.187 (0.036)	0.162
Black women: Father's occupation and current occupation								
1986-88 SIPP (1980-basis occupations, occ. inc. in 1990)	0.305 (0.080)	0.231	0.326 (0.090)	0.225	0.359 (0.124)	0.230	0.341 (0.164)	0.223

Table 11. Intergenerational Regressions of Occupational Education: Nonblack Men
and Women in the NORC General Social Survey, 1972 to 1996

Group and variables	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	b	r	b	r	b	r	b	r
Men								
1972 to 1975 (1970-basis occupations and occ. ed.)	0.298 (0.064)	0.262	0.342 (0.082)	0.255	0.330 (0.071)	0.261	0.503 (0.074)	0.392
1976 to 1980 (1970-basis occupations and occ. ed.)	0.327 (0.059)	0.295	0.510 (0.071)	0.417	0.498 (0.079)	0.381	0.457 0.074	0.390
1982 to 1985 (1970-basis occupations and occ. ed.)	0.308 (0.053)	0.312	0.412 (0.073)	0.341	0.444 (0.087)	0.338	0.652 (0.082)	0.482
1986 to 1990 (1970-basis occupations and occ. ed.)	0.365 (0.049)	0.360	0.351 (0.056)	0.307	0.375 (0.074)	0.301	0.486 (0.086)	0.394
1988 to 1991 (1980-basis occupations and 1990 occ. ed.)	0.277 (0.062)	0.268	0.296 (0.062)	0.262	0.322 (0.096)	0.240	0.455 (0.102)	0.365
1993 to 1996 (1980-basis occupations and 1990 occ. ed.)	0.346 (0.050)	0.355	0.458 (0.050)	0.438	0.352 (0.059)	0.322	0.456 (0.093)	0.354
Women								
1972 to 1975 (1970-basis occupations and occ. ed.)	0.459 (0.054)	0.430	0.449 (0.065)	0.387	0.420 (0.058)	0.382	0.390 (0.082)	0.316
1976 to 1980 (1970-basis occupations and occ. ed.)	0.411 (0.056)	0.376	0.468 (0.067)	0.390	0.341 (0.065)	0.318	0.284 (0.075)	0.243
1982 to 1985 (1970-basis occupations and occ. ed.)	0.268 (0.041)	0.312	0.302 (0.056)	0.308	0.296 (0.077)	0.252	0.256 (0.071)	0.240
1986 to 1990 (1970-basis occupations and occ. ed.)	0.209 (0.041)	0.246	0.346 (0.048)	0.349	0.238 (0.064)	0.217	0.256 (0.075)	0.223
1988 to 1991 (1980-basis occupations and 1990 occ. ed.)	0.208 (0.051)	0.225	0.292 (0.054)	0.293	0.322 (0.076)	0.278	0.291 (0.086)	0.257
1993 to 1996 (1980-basis occupations and 1990 occ. ed.)	0.300 (0.045)	0.335	0.319 (0.043)	0.336	0.245 (0.055)	0.234	0.314 (0.075)	0.293

Table 12. Intergenerational Regressions of Occupational Income: Nonblack Men
and Women in the NORC General Social Survey, 1972 to 1996

Group and variables	Age 25 to 34		Age 35 to 44		Age 45 to 54		Age 55 to 64	
	b	r	b	r	b	r	b	r
Men								
1972 to 1975 (1970-basis occupations and occ. inc.)	0.180 (0.058)	0.177	0.276 (0.067)	0.253	0.241 (0.063)	0.217	0.243 (0.062)	0.237
1976 to 1980 (1970-basis occupations and occ. inc.)	0.204 (0.055)	0.204	0.247 (0.037)	0.230	0.287 (0.074)	0.245	0.174 (0.074)	0.160
1982 to 1985 (1970-basis occupations and occ. inc.)	0.150 (0.057)	0.147	0.201 (0.066)	0.191	0.220 (0.074)	0.207	0.309 (0.079)	0.263
1986 to 1990 (1970-basis occupations and occ. inc.)	0.179 (0.056)	0.164	0.119 (0.053)	0.115	0.307 (0.067)	0.275	0.300 (0.086)	0.254
1988 to 1991 (1980-basis occupations and 1990 occ. inc.)	0.133 (0.063)	0.129	0.103 (0.057)	0.102	0.250 (0.080)	0.223	0.294 (0.089)	0.278
1993 to 1996 (1980-basis occupations and 1990 occ. inc.)	0.169 (0.055)	0.165	0.261 (0.052)	0.254	0.188 (0.056)	0.190	0.247 (0.089)	0.211
Women								
1972 to 1975 (1970-basis occupations and occ. inc.)	0.168 (0.057)	0.164	0.151 (0.061)	0.150	0.149 (0.063)	0.135	0.105 (0.082)	0.089
1976 to 1980 (1970-basis occupations and occ. inc.)	0.250 (0.053)	0.249	0.286 (0.066)	0.256	0.257 (0.076)	0.212	0.097 (0.760)	0.085
1982 to 1985 (1970-basis occupations and occ. inc.)	0.224 (0.053)	0.209	0.185 (0.065)	0.168	0.199 (0.085)	0.156	0.238 (0.084)	0.190
1986 to 1990 (1970-basis occupations and occ. inc.)	0.205 (0.061)	0.165	0.226 (0.061)	0.187	0.216 (0.065)	0.195	0.116 (0.079)	0.099
1988 to 1991 (1980-basis occupations and 1990 occ. inc.)	0.139 (0.066)	0.117	0.242 (0.067)	0.202	0.177 (0.075)	0.159	0.091 (0.089)	0.080
1993 to 1996 (1980-basis occupations and 1990 occ. inc.)	0.227 (0.063)	0.190	0.311 (0.055)	0.266	0.222 (0.062)	0.189	0.212 (0.087)	0.175

APPENDIX: Sample Counts in 1962 and 1973 Occupational Changes in a Generation Surveys, Survey of Income and Program Participation (1986-88), and General Social Survey (1972-96)

Survey and population	Age	Black	Nonblack
1962 OCG: Men	25-34	343	4143
	35-44	360	4854
	45-54	318	4226
	55-64	217	2960
1973 OCG: Men	25-34	1010	6904
	35-44	876	5818
	45-54	873	6017
	55-64	521	3984
1986-88 SIPP: Men	25-34	444	5808
	35-44	358	4850
	45-54	225	3235
	55-64	159	2254
1986-88 SIPP: Women	25-34	540	4788
	35-44	452	4093
	45-54	282	2639
	55-64	186	1712
1972-96 GSS: Men	25-34	--	3161
	35-44	--	2800
	45-54	--	2114
	55-64	--	1723
1972-96 GSS: Women	25-34	--	3851
	35-44	--	3241
	45-54	--	2482
	55-64	--	2188

APPENDIX: Sample Counts in 1962 and 1973 Occupational Changes in a Generation Surveys, Survey of Income and Program Participation (1986-88), and General Social Survey (1972-96)

Survey and population	Age	Black	Nonblack
1962 OCG: Men	25-34	343	4143
	35-44	360	4854
	45-54	318	4226
	55-64	217	2960
1973 OCG: Men	25-34	1010	6904
	35-44	876	5818
	45-54	873	6017
	55-64	521	3984
1986-88 SIPP: Men	25-34	444	5808
	35-44	358	4850
	45-54	225	3235
	55-64	159	2254
1986-88 SIPP: Women	25-34	540	4788
	35-44	452	4093
	45-54	282	2639
	55-64	186	1712
1972-96 GSS: Men	25-34	--	3161
	35-44	--	2800
	45-54	--	2114
	55-64	--	1723
1972-96 GSS: Women	25-34	--	3851
	35-44	--	3241
	45-54	--	2482
	55-64	--	2188