



Working Paper No. 38

November 1992

Gender and Class Mobility: Evidence from
the Republic of Ireland

Richard Breen* Christopher T. Whelan

Subsequently published in "[Gender and Class Mobility: Evidence from the Republic of Ireland](#)", Sociology, Vol. 29, No 1

* The Queen's University of Belfast

ESRI working papers represent un-refereed work-in-progress by researchers who are solely responsible for the content and any views expressed therein. Any comments on these papers will be welcome and should be sent to the author(s) by email. Papers may be downloaded for personal use only.

ABSTRACT

Gender has consistently been identified as the most controversial issue confronting class analysis. In this paper we make use of data from the Republic of Ireland to assess the extent to which the incorporation of women into class mobility analyses requires us to alter our understanding of the basic processes involved. When we focus on women's employment mobility we find that the sole source of greater variation in mobility chances is differences in the objective opportunity structures faced by men and women. There is no evidence of class/gender interaction. Similarly marriage and labour markets involve almost identical underlying processes. Differences in the underlying patterns of social fluidity between mobility tables that include only men and those also including women are extremely modest. This fundamental similarity indicates that, in the Irish case, substantial changes in levels of labour force participation by married women have had a negligible effect on the underlying process of class mobility.

Introduction

Gender has consistently been identified as the most controversial issue confronting present day class analysis (Marshall *et al.*, 1988; McRae 1990). In a forthcoming paper Hayes and Miller acknowledge that the debate has become increasingly acrimonious and offer a review of the evidence which is intended to promote discussion and reflection. However, their conclusion that the neglect of women

... has effectively distorted understanding of the central social processes of social mobility

is itself far from uncontroversial, as anyone familiar with Erikson and Goldthorpe's (1992; forthcoming) most recent contributions to the debate will recognise.

In this paper we use data from the Republic of Ireland to examine a number of issues which have been prominent in the debate concerning gender and class mobility. The first of these is the question of the appropriate unit of composition for class analysis. Those, like Erikson and Goldthorpe, who seek to uphold the so-called 'conventional view' insist on continuing to regard the family as the appropriate unit of class analysis. Against this, many feminist sociologists (and others) argue that it is the individual who is the appropriate unit of class analysis. In this paper we take advantage of the availability of data which are particularly suitable for testing hypotheses relating to the appropriate unit of composition for class analysis. The second issue we examine concerns women's mobility through marriage. If, as some authors have argued, mobility through marriage is of a quite different nature than mobility through labour markets, then the neglect of women in mobility analysis will indeed provide a distorted picture of a society's mobility regime. Once again, using Irish data, we are able to examine women's mobility through marriage and compare it with the process of labour market mobility among men.

While we recognise that many of the controversies in this area have their roots in

fundamental conceptual differences (Goldthorpe, 1983, 1984, 1990; Stanworth, 1984) we nevertheless believe that conceptual pluralism can be allied to critical evaluation provided we attend to the empirical consequences of opting for one approach rather than another (Goldthorpe 1990:407-409). Thus the purpose of this paper is to confront different theoretical positions with evidence in order to adjudicate between them.

In the conceptual framework which we adopt, the following points are critical.

- (i) We are concerned with *class* rather than occupational mobility. Many legitimate questions relating to individual occupational attainment are not part of our brief.¹
- (ii) So far as the analysis of mobility is concerned structural effects are treated as essentially 'exogenous' and requiring historical accounts. Class analysis focuses on the processes occurring within a given context.²
- (iii) The class schema we use differentiates positions in terms of the employment relations that they entail. The implications of such relations must be seen as extending beyond the work place in terms of their consequences for

...experiences of affluence or hardship, of economic security or insecurity, of prospects of continuing material advance, or of unyielding material constraints (Erikson and Goldthorpe, 1992:236).
- (iv) The family is given priority over the individual as the unit of class composition because of its key role as a unit of strategic action in terms of consumption and production. This position does not require that women be excluded from class analysis nor does it require that in households with married or cohabiting couples it should be the male who determines the

¹ One example of such issues is the influence of mothers' occupation on labour market status on the corresponding outcomes for daughters and the potential impact of role models and socialisation. However assertions that "studies of 'class mobility' are in fact studies of occupational mobility, because class is operationalised in terms of occupation" (Abbot and Payne, 1990:16) seem to involve simply a refusal to acknowledge the conceptual basis of the work of authors such as Erikson and Goldthorpe.

² The assumption underlying this approach is not that structural factors should be treated as if they were a nuisance but rather that it is unlikely that a useful sociological theory of occupational change or class structural change can be advanced (Goldthorpe, 1985, 1990).

family's class location.

- (v) The position does not involve a neglect of differences in resources and power among family members. In most cases the class position of other family members is seen as being 'derived' from the male head in virtue of their degree of economic dependence on him.
- (vi) It is from such a conceptual framework that evaluations are made as to which phenomena are to be interpreted in class terms. Thus with regard to matters such as men's class identification and political partisanship the crucial issue is not whether a wife's job makes a difference in terms of variance explanation but how the *pattern* of association between the respondent's class, the spouse's class and the dependent variables is to be interpreted.

Changes in Female Participation Rates in the Republic of Ireland

As McRae (1990:122) notes, the initial impetus for the challenge to the conventional approach to class analysis arose as a result of the marked increase in the labour force participation of married women. The widespread rise in total female participation rates is due mainly to the growth in married women's labour force participation. Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992:235), however, question whether this revolution in participation has been accompanied by similarly dramatic changes in women's attachment to the workforce, in the continuity of their work histories or in the contribution they are able to make through employment to family incomes. Indeed, Hakim (1992: 144) has recently argued that, in the case of Britain, the

increase in women's employment since World War II is revealed to be largely illusory... From World War II until the second half of the 1980s there was no substantial change in women's labour-force participation that might act as a catalyst for change in occupational segregation and, in consequence, the earnings gap between men and women.

Since the labour force participation of married women in Ireland has traditionally been low, it might appear, at first glance, that it is not a particularly suitable case for exploring hypotheses relating to the appropriate unit of class composition. However, since the early 1970s approximate stability in the aggregate participation rate has gone together with major

shifts in the composition of female participation. The most significant change has involved the increased labour force participation of married women. The vast bulk of this change occurred after 1971 with the rate trebling from 7.5 per cent in 1971 to 23.4 per cent in 1987. The increases were even more spectacular in the 20-34 age group. The Irish case thus takes on a particular interest because the critique of the conventional approach would suggest that models of mobility which might have been adequate in the early 1970s will have become increasingly misleading. Since mobility data is available for 1973 and 1987 we can test this hypotheses. The Irish case also provides a rather better testing ground than the overall participation rate might suggest because in 1987 only 14 per cent of female employment was part time compared to 45 per cent in the UK (Callan and Farrell, 1992:24)

Data

The survey of Poverty, Income Distribution and Usage of State Services carried out by The Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin, in 1987 provides the database for our analysis. A detailed description of this survey is provided in Callan *et al* (1989). The survey was designed to provide a national sample from the population of the Republic of Ireland resident in private households. A wide range of information was gathered through a number of questionnaires, including the following:

- (i) For each household one questionnaire covered household characteristics and composition.
- (ii) For each individual aged 15 or over and not in full-time education an individual questionnaire dealt with the respondent's income, labour force status, level of psychological distress, etc.
- (iii) Where a full questionnaire could not be completed an abbreviated one, focusing on key information required for estimation of household income, and for re-weighting purposes, was administered.

The full range of individual information is available for 6,764 individuals distributed

across 3,294 households. At various points in the analysis we focus on different levels and sub-sections of the sample. Thus in constructing measures of income and life-style deprivation we operate at the household level; our 'complete' mobility tables are based on 4,455 individuals aged between 20-64, while the men only table includes 2,394 men in the same age range. Finally our table for women's employment mobility has N of 971. Our 1973 mobility data comes from the CASMIN data set.³

Theoretical Models of Social Fluidity and Their Operationalisation

In this paper we take as our basic theoretical model that outlined by Goldthorpe (1980:99), under which the pattern of social fluidity (or relative mobility) is considered to be shaped by three factors. These are the relative desirability of different class destinations; the resources available to individuals within each origin class which help them gain access to more desirable destination classes; and barriers to movement between classes. Typically we think of resources as 'economic, cultural and social resources' (Erikson and Goldthorpe, 1987a:64), while barriers to mobility would include the necessity to own the means of production; educational and other qualifications needed for entry to the occupations that comprise a class grouping; and so forth.

Models which have sought to explain social fluidity, or, equivalently, the pattern of odds ratios in a given mobility table, can themselves be viewed as falling into one of two broad classes. The first of these uses macro-sociological variables to account for cross-national differences in rates of social fluidity (Grusky and Hauser, 1984). The second approach to explaining social fluidity begins with a single mobility table and attempts to

³ These data were originally collected in the 'Determinants of Occupational Status and Mobility in Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic' project, under the direction of John Jackson.

explain the pattern of social fluidity observed there in terms of some explanatory variables.

It is important to distinguish between two sorts of 'explanatory variable' used in such studies. On the one hand, studies such as those of Hauser (1984), Hope (1982) and Hout (1984) have used what we term measured explanatory variables. A typical example would be, say, a measure of average educational attainment for men of each origin class. Clearly, one would expect, in any modern industrialised country, that such a measure should explain some part of social fluidity. On the other hand are studies which use explanatory variables which have not been measured but, rather, have been constructed by the sociologist. The argument here, which is usually implicit, seems to be something along the lines of the following. The sociologist believes that a particular social process accounts for some share of the pattern of social fluidity but lacks any measure of this process by which to test this belief, and is therefore obliged to hypothesise such a measure. This measure then usually takes the form of a dummy variable applied to particular cells of the table. The quasi-perfect mobility model is perhaps the simplest example. A particularly important example of this approach is Erikson and Goldthorpe's (1987a, b, 1992) 'Core Model of Social Fluidity'.

In what follows we apply a particular version of the measured variable approach which we describe as the Agriculture, Hierarchy, Property (AHP) model. This approach has the advantage that questions relating to the appropriateness of employing class schema devised for men in the analysis of female mobility can be subjected to empirical investigation, since our measured variables can take into account characteristics of the situations of both men and women. Thus, for example, it is not necessary to assume that the hierarchical ordering of class categories in term of their desirability or barriers to their entry is identical for women and men. The question of the extent to which there is any interaction between gender and hierarchy is also one which can be subjected to empirical inquiry.

Outline of Our Analysis

Our analysis addresses a range of issues which have recently been reviewed by Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992). In addition to examining whether the more recent data for the Irish case supports their conclusions we also extend our analysis in order to establish the extent to which our measured variable approach to the analysis of social fluidity can shed further light on the nature of women's social mobility.

- (i) We consider, successively, the implication of adopting the individual as the unit of class analysis for women who are currently in 'home duties', and those currently in the labour force. Then, restricting our attention to the latter, we examine the impact of class origins on women's employment chances: this analysis also reveals how class mobility would look under the individual approach. In particular we are interested in establishing whether our results confirm Erikson and Goldthorpe's well known conclusion that different objective opportunity structures are the sole source of variation in mobility patterns between men and women.
- (ii) Secondly, we compare women's marital mobility to married men's mobility employing our AHP measured variable model.
- (iii) Finally we proceed to examine complete mobility tables employing what has been described as the dominance approach to the issue of the appropriate unit of analysis (Erikson, 1984). Employing the AHP model we address the question of the extent to which our understanding of the mobility process is changed by extending our analysis beyond men only mobility tables.⁴

Do Women's Jobs Make a Difference? (i) Married women outside the paid labour force

A strict application of the individual approach would require that not only should married women who are currently in the labour force be classified on the basis of their own occupation but also that those in 'home-duties' should be assigned a class position on the

⁴ In each case class origins are operationalised on the basis of class of the person who was "the main breadwinner in your family while you were growing up". This might be viewed as a rather crude implementation of the dominance procedure to be discussed later. In most cases the individual in question is the father. Even if separate information on mothers' occupation was available, on theoretical grounds we would not wish to conceptualise mobility from such positions as *class* mobility.

basis of their most recent occupation. Certain consequences follow for our ability to explain variation in life-chances. These are apparent in Table 1 where we show the degree of association between, on the one hand, class, defined in both individual and conventional (i.e., where the wife is allocated to the husband's class) terms, and, on the other hand, income and two measures of household deprivation,⁵ in households where the wife is in 'home duties'. Our results, clearly show the greater explanatory power of the conventional approach. For primary deprivation (that is, the enforced lack of basic items) the conventional approach explains .07 of the variance, as against .027 explained using the individual approach: thus the ratio of variance explained by the conventional over the individual approach is of the order of 2.6:1 (shown in the last line of the table). This ratio rises to 3.7:1 in the case of secondary deprivation (the enforced absence of items associated with a comfortable working class lifestyle) and finally to 6.7:1 for income. In all cases, then, adopting the conventional method of classifying women results in a class categorisation which has greater power to explain differences in life chances than has the individual method.

In Table 2 we examine the issue from a slightly different perspective and look at the proportion of variance explained which is due to the woman's own class and her husband's class. In other words, we are here assigning both women and their husbands to a class on the basis of their own most recent occupation, and we are examining the extent to which each accounts for variation in our three measures of life chances. Our results show that it is the husband's class which is of overriding importance. So, a model which expresses the level of primary deprivation as a function of both the woman's class and that of her husband explains about eight per cent of the variance. The woman's class taken alone explains just

⁵ The operationalization of these measures is discussed in an appendix. In Tables 1 and 2 we use the modified seven class CASMIN class schema.

over one per cent, while her husband's class alone explains about five per cent. The ratio of these latter two figures is given on the last row of the table: it is close to 5:1 for primary deprivation and income; while for secondary deprivation it rises to over 13:1.

In Table 3 we look at the relative power of the woman's and her husband's class to predict whether or not the household is in poverty (once again confining the analysis to households where the wife is in 'home duties'). In this case our class categorization is the three-class aggregated version of the modified CASMIN schema and we use log-linear models to examine this question. The baseline model, shown on line one of the table (and referred to as the 'no effects model') asserts that neither the woman's class nor that of her husband are related to the incidence of poverty, but that there is a relationship between husband's class and wife's class. As we might expect, this fails to fit the data by a long way, returning a G^2 of 138.7 on 8 df. The model on the second line of the table shows the effect of the woman's own class alone on the chances of the household being in poverty; and line three shows the effect of her husband's class alone. The results are very clear. The model on line two provides a very poor fit to the data, reducing the G^2 associated with the no effects model by only five per cent, showing that wife's own class is a very poor predictor of whether or not a household will be in poverty. By contrast the model on line three reduces this G^2 by 93 per cent and is not statistically significantly different from the saturated model, showing that once we allow for the effect of husband's class position on the chances of household poverty, the wife's own class position is irrelevant.

These results, concerning households where the wife is not in the paid labour force, show very clearly the extent to which the implication of class position, defined in conventional terms, extends beyond the work place to the whole of the individual's and family's economic lives. We now turn to the situation of households where both spouses are

in the paid labour force.

Do Women's Jobs Make a Difference? (ii) Married women in the paid labour force

In Table 4 we look at the unique contribution of married women's individual class position and their husband's class position (using the modified seven class categorization) in explaining deprivation and household income. In contrast to Table 1 (which showed the same thing for households where the woman was not in the paid labour force) the overall variance explained is considerably larger and the variance ratios (shown on the last line of the table) are much lower. Nevertheless, with the exception of income (where parity exists in the unique contributions of the woman's class and that of her husband in explaining variation in this measure) it is again the husband's class which is the more important explanatory factor, with a ratio of 1.65 obtaining for primary deprivation and 1.36 for secondary deprivation.

In Table 5 we again extend our analysis to the prediction of poverty (moving once again to the three class categorization) and find that a model which allows for the impact of wife's own class gives a G^2 of 155.8 with 6 df and explains six per cent of the conditional 'no effects' model's deviance. In comparison the model which substitutes the effect of husband's class gives a G^2 of 47.0 with 6 df and explains 72 per cent of the no effect model's G^2 . In this case, then (and in contrast to the results reported in Table 3) when we take account of husband's class, the wife's own class position continues to be relevant in predicting the chances of the household being in poverty, but its effect is tiny when compared with that of the husband's class.

Drawing on survey data from a range of societies, Erikson and Goldthorpe (forthcoming) have examined the relationship between, on the one hand, married women's class identification, and, on the other, her own class, and that of her husband. They find that,

when both the relationship between spouse's classes and the effect of wife's own class on her class identification are taken into account

A further significant association still regularly occurs between wife's class identification and *husband's* class position; and when both are considered separately, the latter association tends to be *stronger* than that between wife's class identification and her own class position (Erikson and Goldthorpe, 1990:250).⁶

The implication of this, in a situation in which assignment of class position to individuals typically results in a large proportion of married women holding class positions different from that of their husband, is the existence of a substantial degree of false consciousness among married women. Our own results relating to life-style/poverty provide substantial support for Erikson and Goldthorpe's rejection of such false consciousness arguments on the grounds that, once the objective situation is adequately represented, the need to invoke such arguments in fact disappears (Erikson and Goldthorpe, 1990:252; Lockwood, 1958/1989). In circumstances where married women are currently in home duties the argument for a derived class approach is, of course, even more compelling.

Women's Employment Mobility

In this section we continue our examination of the individual approach to the analysis of social mobility by examining the mobility of women from their class origins (indexed by the class of the main breadwinner when they were growing up, - which in the vast majority of cases was their father) to the positions they held in the work force in 1987. Women who were not in the labour force at that time are excluded.

For both men and women we use the modified seven class CASMIN schema.

⁶ It may still be true, as Hayes and Jones (1992) find for Australia, that wives' characteristics may exert an independent influence on the political choices of their husbands.

Comparing the two mobility tables we find that, as we might expect, while the origin class distributions of men and women differ little, their destination class distributions reflect the existence of gender segregation. Women are concentrated in classes IIIa and VIIa + IIIb and under-represented in IVa+b, IVc and V/VI. In Ireland there are more women in class I+II than might have been expected in the light of Erikson and Goldthorpe's (1992) comparative analysis, and this may be related to the fact that there is evidence for a slightly stronger selection effect in Ireland with more women than men coming from service class origins. Women are more mobile than men - 70 per cent of women have changed class as against 60 per cent of men. The difference here relates primarily to vertical mobility (which has been experienced by 57 per cent of women and 44 per cent of men) and, within this, to differences in downward mobility, which has been experienced by 29 per cent of women but only 18 per cent of men. As with Erikson and Goldthorpe's (1992) analysis the results are very much along the lines that we would expect from the pattern of sex segregation that current employment displays.

When we direct our attention to relative mobility rates the major question which we must address is whether the sole source of variation in men's and women's mobility chances is differences in the objective opportunity structure. In order to test this hypothesis we apply the Constant Social Fluidity model (CSF) to the combined table for men's and women's mobility. The results shown in Table 6 provide strong evidence in support of this hypothesis. The CSF model has a G^2 of 57.2 with 36 df. It reduces the conditional independence G^2 by 95.6 per cent and classifies 96.5 per cent of the cases correctly. It falls marginally short of fitting the data using the conventional criterion, but this arises solely from large residuals in two cells of the mobility table IVc - I+II (farmer origin, service class destination) and V/VI - IIIa (skilled manual origin, higher routine non-manual destination). If these cells are fitted

exactly the percentage of cases misclassified drops to 2.75 per cent. For men the numbers mobile to the service class from farm backgrounds are overestimated while for women the numbers are underestimated. Similarly, the outflow from the skilled manual class to higher routine white collar work is underestimated for men and overestimated for women. The former is clearly explicable in terms of the differential attractiveness of the farming destination for men and women while the latter suggests additional barriers to entry for women.

Our analysis supports Erikson and Goldthorpe's rejection of claims to the effect that class background and gender interact (Abbot and Sapsford, 1987:72).

The forces that make for inequalities in relative mobility chances among men, stemming from the differential distribution of resources from one class origin to another, are not in any serious way modified in regard to women. And the fact that they operate in a way that is 'gender blind' would thus in turn suggest that, if an adequate account is to be provided of the social processes that generate sex segregation in employment - and hence women's restricted opportunities - this will in fact need to be one that is for the most part developed independently of class analysis. (Erikson and Goldthorpe, 1992:253)

Women's Mobility Through Marriage

The debate on the appropriate unit of class composition has led to agreement on all sides that women's mobility through marriage is an important and neglected topic. Thus Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992: 253) recognise that if married women are to be seen as tending to derive their class position from their husbands then an understanding of their intergenerational class mobility requires that we direct our attention to the experience of women in 'marriage markets' rather than labour markets; specifically it is necessary to examine rates and patterns of marital mobility.

A recurring hypothesis in the literature is that women experience more mobility

through marriage than do men through employment and their 'class fate is more loosely linked' to their social origins than is the case for men (Heath, 1981). The main argument underlying this hypothesis, as Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992:254) note, is that physical or personality attributes, which can make women more or less attractive as marriage partners, are less closely associated with social origins than are those that mainly influence men's achievements in their working lives.

In other words, the processes of social selection that operate in marriage markets are different from those operating in labour markets (Erikson and Goldthorpe, 1992:254).

If this hypothesis is true then focusing solely on men's mobility could lead to substantial underestimation of the extent of mobility opportunities within the society.

For this analysis we revert to the conventional seven class CASMIN schema in which both types of routine non-manual work are combined in Class III. Employing this schema, we proceed to compare women's marital mobility to the class mobility of married men through employment.

As in all nine of the nations studied by Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992) - including Ireland 1973 - we find that women experience higher rates of mobility than men - 71 per cent having been mobile compared to 63 per cent of men,⁷ with women experiencing more upward (32 per cent against 30 per cent of men) and also more downward (16 as against 13 per cent) mobility. Consequently, the ratio of upward to downward mobility slightly favours men. The analysis of absolute mobility patterns, then, provides no basis for concluding that mobility through marriage provides for women more favourable chances of social ascent than are available to men.

⁷ Though both men and women in Ireland displayed higher rates of mobility in 1987 than they had in 1973.

Our attention is now directed to relative mobility and the question of whether, underlying the higher rates of social mobility experienced by women, are differences in the underlying patterns of social fluidity. As a first test of this hypothesis we applied the CSF model to the joint table for women's marital mobility and married men's mobility through employment. This model produces a G^2 of 74.1 with 36 df and accounts for 93.4 per cent of the conditional independence model G^2 . Thus it provides strong evidence for substantial underlying similarities in social fluidity patterns but also suggests significant differences between the two types of mobility.

In order to explore such differences we draw on the AHP model which seeks to explain social fluidity in terms of measured independent variables. In our 1987 data we have measures relating to destination and origin classes. We identify the former with the desirability of class destinations and the barriers to mobility into such destinations and we identify the latter with resources for mobility.

Turning first to destination classes, here we have four possible measures. These are

- Y1: gross mean household income in each destination class;
- Y2: mean score in each destination class on a 20 item consumption scale;
- Y3: mean percentage of men in each destination class permanently unable to work due to illness or unemployed at the survey date;
- Y4: mean percentage of men in each destination having more than primary education;

Y1, Y2, and Y3 plausibly represent different aspects of the desirability of destinations, while Y4 is a measure of the barriers to class entry due to educational requirements.

Turning to origin classes here we use two measures:

- X1: mean percentage of fathers in each origin class having only primary education;
- X2: mean score in each origin class on a scale measuring the respondent's perceptions of his family's relative financial deprivation when he was growing up.

Both X1 and X2 can be viewed as measures of resources for mobility. As yet we have said nothing about ownership of the means of production: this is clearly both a resource for mobility among men of farming, petty bourgeois and proprietorial origins, as well as a barrier to entry among those from the remaining class origins. We operationalise these by using two further measures:

P1: the proportion of fathers in each origin class who are self-employed;

P2: the proportion of men in each destination who are self-employed.

We have, then, five variables which score our table's destinations and a further three scoring the origins. We could enter these into the model as terms formed by multiplying each origin score by each destination score, to give terms such as Y1X1, Y1X2, Y2X1, and so on. This would yield 15 terms, each using a single degree of freedom, and, indeed, we have fitted such a model. Such a model would tell us, for example, how each of the possible combinations of different desirability/barriers and resources measures influenced social fluidity. The model we discuss here, however, is rather more parsimonious. What we want is a model in which some measure of overall desirability/barriers and some generalised resource measure are used to shape the pattern of social fluidity. To arrive at such measures we simply took the first principal component of the origin scores, X1 and X2, as a measure of generalised resources (labelled X); and the first principal component of the destination scores Y1, Y2, Y3 and Y4, to yield a measure of desirability and barriers (labelled Y). We excluded from the principal components analysis the more specific measures of resources and barriers associated with ownership of the means of production. These measures - P1 and P2 - were multiplied together to form the variable P12 which captures the level of ownership of the means of production in each origin/destination combination.

A very specific resource for mobility is demonstrated by the tendency for class

inheritance. For all classes, an origin in a given class is a resource which improves one's chances of remaining in that class relative to the chances of people born in other classes entering that class. The reasons for this are diverse but they include such things as direct inheritance of the means of production; family tradition, and access to social networks. To capture this we fit a single parameter to the cells on the main diagonal of the table (termed INH1).

Within the model we include two further parameters which capture the special position of the agricultural sector. The first of these is a single parameter for farm inheritance over and above the general level of inheritance (INH2). The second captures the barrier to mobility into the agricultural sector (AGB). Note that this is a uni-directional barrier: it does not apply to movement out of agriculture. Indeed, we believe that to model a two-way barrier (into and out of agriculture) with the same parameter is likely to prove very misleading.

Finally, although we sought to capture the effects of ownership of the means of production as both a resource and a barrier, we find that we require one additional parameter to capture the propensity of people of petty bourgeois and farm origins to move into the higher managerial, professional and large proprietor class (SLP).

Our final model then includes, apart from the origin and destination main effects, the following variables:

- XY: which captures the effect of generalised resources, desirability and barriers, conceptualised in a hierarchial fashion. Note that this term models the effects of desirability and barriers as varying according to the resources for mobility enjoyed by the different origin classes, and *vice versa*;
- P12: a measure of ownership of the means of production in each origin/destination combination;
- SLP: the term for movement between petty bourgeois or farm origins and the higher managerial, professional and large proprietor class. Together P12 and SLP capture the pattern of movement within the classes which own the means of production:

INH1: the term for overall class inheritance;

INH2: the term for farm inheritance, measures as additional to the level of overall class inheritance;

AGB: the term reflecting the barrier to movement into agricultural destinations from non-agricultural origins.

We can write this model as

$$\log F_{ij} = \lambda + \lambda^F + \lambda^S + \lambda^{SLP} + \lambda^{INH1} + \lambda^{INH3} + \lambda^{AGB} + \alpha(XY) + \beta(P12)$$

where F_{ij} is the expected value in the ij^{th} cell of the table, α is the parameter of association between X and Y and β that between P1 and P2.⁸

In order to carry out a formal analysis of the differences in mobility patterns between women's marital mobility and married men's mobility we use the AHP model and follow the logic set out by Breen (1985). The results of this analysis are set out in Table 7. We began by fitting Model 1 a common (homogenous) model to both tables, using only one parameter to allow for the different sample sizes. The reason for fitting such a model is that, conditional on the AHP model being true of both tables, we can relax successive parameter constraints to determine the relative contribution of different factors to mobility differences. The common mobility model or 'no difference model' clearly fails to fit the data having a G^2 of 114.1 with 78 df.⁹ At the other extreme if we fit the AHP model to each table separately (a completely heterogenous model - shown as Model 3 in Table 7) this returns a G^2 of 65.1 with 60 df and does provide a satisfactory statistical fit. This model allows all mobility effects to differ

⁸ It should be noted that in this analysis the scores applied to the origins and destinations to represent resources and desirability/barriers are those derived from our analysis of men 20-64 since they continue to represent our best estimate of such attributes.

⁹ Although, compared with the model of independence, this model reduces G^2 by 89.9 per cent.

between the two tables. What we would like to explain is the difference in G^2 values of these models. This has a value of 49.0 and is associated with 18 degrees of freedom (panel B, Table 7). We term it the total mobility difference variance.

Our next step is to allow the origin and destination effects - but not the interaction effects which shape odds ratio - to vary between the two tables. This is Model 2, and has a G^2 of 102.4 with 66 df. The G^2 difference between this model and Model 1 is 11.7 with 12 df and it accounts for 23.9 per cent of the mobility difference. This difference is attributable to structural mobility - defined to mean the effect of differences in the marginal distributions of the two tables. The fact that this mobility difference is not statistically significant tells us that, given the AHP specification of odds ratios in the two tables, their marginal distributions do not differ from each other in a significant fashion. The difference between Model 2 and Model 3 is 37.3 with 6 df representing 76.1 per cent of the mobility difference variance, and it is associated with differences in social fluidity (or relative mobility) between the two tables. Thus it is differences in relative mobility which are the major factors contributing to the overall mobility difference variance.

In identifying the nature of this difference it is important to note that Model 4, which allows only two of the interaction parameters (AGB and INH1) to vary between the two tables, provides as good a fit to the data as does Model 3 which allows all of the AHP parameters to vary. The G^2 for Model 4 is 68.9 with 64 df. The row and column scores (measuring resources and desirability/ barriers respectively) are given in panel C of Table 7, and the parameter estimates for model 4 are given in panel D. These show that the only significant differences in the underlying patterns of social fluidity as between women's marital mobility and men's employment mobility are that (a) the barriers to entry to agriculture are weaker for women; and, (b), among women there is no overall inheritance effect. These

results indicate that women are more likely to change class through marriage than men are to change class through employment mobility; and that it is easier (*ceteris paribus*) for women to marry farmers and farm workers than for men not born into agriculture to become farmers or farm workers themselves.

These results from the AHP model confirm the extraordinary similarity of the degree and pattern of fluidity displayed by women's marital mobility and married men's mobility through employment.

If we know how men of a given class origin have themselves become distributed within the class structure in the course of their employment we can predict, with no great inaccuracy, how their 'sisters' will have been distributed through marriage (Erikson and Goldthorpe, 1992:261)

The rather modest differences that do exist relate mainly to relative rather than absolute mobility and cannot be interpreted in terms of superior mobility opportunities for women.

The Analysis of Complete Mobility Tables

While rejecting the individual approach to class, Erikson and Goldthorpe have accepted that men only mobility tables do suffer from certain disadvantages and consequently, may be in some measure misleading if not supplemented by analysis of the marital mobility of respondents' wives. Such an approach, however, neglects the experience of unmarried women. Furthermore, as a consequence of automatically taking the husband as the head of the conjugal family, it fails to take into account those situations where, on the basis of labour market criteria, it is the wife rather than the husband who should be regarded as occupying the dominant position, and should determine how the class allocation of the family as a unit should be made.

In order to construct mobility tables which display the experience of the male and female adult population together we employ Erikson's (1984) dominance approach. This

involves classifying all unmarried people according to the 'individual' approach, and classifying all married persons according to the class position of whichever partner is considered 'dominant'. Two criteria of dominance have been proposed. The first is the 'work time' criterion: here class position is assigned according to the rule that employment dominates non-employment and full-time employment dominates part-time.

The second criterion ('work position') requires that higher-level employment should dominate low level employment. Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992:266) describe two dominance orderings of their class categories. We follow them in adopting that ordering which maximises the number of wife dominated couples. This is as follows:

1. I+II
2. IVa+b
3. IVc
4. IIIa
5. V+VI
6. IIIb + VIIa
7. VIIb

The composition of the complete mobility table that results is as follows:

- (i) 16 per cent and 15 per cent are, respectively, single men and women;
- (ii) 51 per cent are couples with the husband dominant;
- (iii) 8 per cent are couples with the husband wife equal;
- (iv) 8 per cent are couples with the wife dominant

The main sources of difference between the complete and men-only mobility tables lie in their destination distributions. The complete mobility table implies a somewhat larger white collar class and a marginally smaller skilled manual class.

Our findings confirm that complete tables tend to give higher rates of mobility than

the men only tables - 67 per cent compared with 60 per cent in this case.¹⁰ There are some systematic differences between the two types of table of which mobility into the white collar classes is the most significant. In the complete table 15.8 per cent have been mobile into the service class and 6.7 per cent into the higher routine non-manual class, while for the men only tables, the comparable figures are 12.3 per cent and 3.2 per cent. However, it is difficult to disagree with Erikson and Goldthorpe's (1992:270) conclusion that one could well be more impressed with the similarities than the differences.¹¹

This leads us to the question of how far such differences as there are between the tables can be attributed to differences in their marginal distributions (particularly in the destination distributions) or, on the other hand, to differences in the pattern of social fluidity. Clearly, if the latter is the case, then the use of complete mobility tables would require us to revise those conclusions concerning social fluidity in Ireland which have been derived from men-only tables.

In order to deal with this issue, we again make use of the AHP model.¹² When we fit this model to the complete table we get a G^2 of 51.5 with 30 df which compares to a G^2 of 39.8 for the men only table. That is to say, using the conventional statistical yardstick, the model fits the men only table but does not fit the complete table. However, in order to find

¹⁰ The difference arises entirely from the greater vertical mobility (51 per cent as against 44 per cent) in the complete table. Consistent with earlier findings, the rate of upward mobility is higher (29 per cent compared with 27 per cent), but, in the Irish case so is downward mobility (22 per cent *versus* 18 per cent).

¹¹ The striking consistency between our results and those of Erikson and Goldthorpe is particularly significant because of the widespread assumption that what is taken to be Goldthorpe's thesis has been thoroughly refuted (Jacobs 1992:25-25).

¹² In this case the row and column scores applied to the complete table are derived from all respondents included in the mobility table.

a version of the model which fits it is necessary only to make a slight adjustment to the SLP term. This is the term which captures the additional advantages displayed by the propensity of men of petty-bourgeois and farm origins to move into the service class. It emerges that in the complete table this advantage extends to access to the higher routine non-manual class also.

In Table 8, panel C, we compare the parameter estimates for both tables. The similarity is quite striking. Apart from the modification to the SLP term, already referred to, the only noteworthy difference relates to the inheritance parameters. Consistent with the results of our earlier analysis of women's employment mobility, the inheritance effects are much weaker in the complete table. This finding is in agreement with the results of Erikson and Goldthorpe's (1992) analysis but offers a somewhat more general conclusion. Application of their model (the Core Model of Social Fluidity) did not produce a statistically acceptable fit to any of the complete tables they analysed. Examination of the residuals, however, suggested that a major reason for this was the lower propensity for intergenerational immobility among those from petty bourgeois and farming class origins than their model predicted. Our own results suggest that the tendency to overestimate immobility in the men only table is more general and extends to all origins. The propertied classes are distinctive, however, in that in the complete table we must take into account not only their lower propensity to immobility (relative to what is found in men only tables) but also compensatory advantages in terms of ease of access to the higher routine non-manual class.

Nevertheless, the results we have reported demonstrate that only modest differences exist in the patterns of social fluidity associated with complete and men only tables. Similarly in an earlier analysis we have shown that for men-only tables relatively little change can be observed in the mobility regime between 1973 and 1987 (Breen and Whelan, 1992).

Consequently, despite the substantial expansion of labour force participation by married women throughout the 1970's and 1980's, a model of social fluidity which provides a satisfactory fit for men in 1973 will come very close to accounting for the pattern of social fluidity in the complete table for 1987. Such a finding provides substantial support for Erikson and Goldthorpe's (1992:273) conclusion that gender and class inequality are not of a cognate kind.

Conclusions

The central issue of this paper has been the extent to which the incorporation of women into class mobility analysis requires us to alter our understanding of the basic processes involved. To avoid any possible confusion we should make clear that we fully accept the desirability of such incorporation. At the outset we described the conceptual framework from within which we have sought to answer this question, since a great deal of the debate in this area has involved people talking past each other. We do maintain, however, that evidence is crucial in the evaluation of different conceptual approaches¹³ to this issue. Accordingly, much of this paper has been devoted to replicating the analysis of Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992) using new data.

The Irish case offers a particularly useful opportunity to pursue such analysis. The changing participation rates of married women in recent years provides an interesting test case of some of the claims associated with the individual approach to class analysis. In addition, we are in the fortunate position that the data available allow us to explore the consequences

¹³ Following Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992:231) we are convinced that nothing in the argument we have provided is inconsistent with ".... a belief in and practical concern that women should possess a full and equal opportunity with men *de jure* and *de facto*, so far as participation in economic and public life is concerned". Our approach is based on a recognition of the limited extent to which women's increased levels of participation have gone together with such equality of opportunities.

of varying the unit of class composition and, additionally, permit an examination of the implications of different approaches to class analysis for our ability to explain variations in life-chances. However, we have sought to extend the work of Erikson and Goldthorpe by making use of a mobility model (the AHP model) which allows us to pinpoint the areas of difference and similarity in mobility regimes much more clearly than was possible with the models used by Erikson and Goldthorpe.

We began our analysis by examining the individual approach to the assignment of persons to classes. This revealed the problems associated with the class position of wives, regardless of whether they are currently in the paid labour force or not. In both cases the conventional approach to class analysis (assigning married women to the class position of their husband) provided a better account of differences in objective life chances than did the individual approach. In addition, when we employed the individual approach we found that husband's class was more important than wife's own class in accounting for the household's level of deprivation and income. We also employed the individual approach to compare the mobility of men and women who were in the Irish labour force in 1987. Here we found only miniscule differences in the pattern of social fluidity among men and women, so supporting Erikson and Goldthorpe's view that differences in mobility patterns between men and women are overwhelmingly due to differences in the objective opportunity structures facing them. Despite the frequency with which it has been asserted there is no evidence to support the claim for class/gender interaction.

We then turned to an examination of women's marital mobility, comparing this with men's mobility through the labour market. In this analysis we made use of the AHP mobility model which, while being based on Goldthorpe's (1980) theoretical resources/ desirability/ barriers framework, uses mainly measured variables in accounting for social fluidity. Because

of this (and because the model provides a statistically adequate account of the mobility process) our discussion of parameter differences allowed us to define precisely the nature of the differences between men's labour market mobility and women's marital mobility. In fact such differences turned out to be rather modest. Women are more likely to be mobile into agriculture through marriage than are men through the labour market; and the likelihood of women marrying someone from a different class background is greater than the likelihood of men being mobile out of their class of origin.

Lastly we examined so-called 'complete' mobility tables, constructed using Erikson's (1984) 'dominance' approach. Using the AHP model to compare this table with the men only table revealed some significant differences. Once again these involve higher mobility into the white collar classes. These findings are consistent with our earlier results relating to female employment mobility and on this occasion we once again find that the objective opportunity structure is the critical factor. The only differences in the underlying patterns of social fluidity for men-only and complete mobility tables relate to lower inheritance parameters, and a broadening of the affinity term (relating to the ease of mobility from petty bourgeoisie and farm origins to the service class) to incorporate mobility into the higher white collar class. The fundamental similarity between the mobility regimes for these two types of tables, and the earlier evidence for relatively modest differences between 1973 and 1987 for the men only tables, indicates that substantial changes in the levels of labour force participation of married women have had a negligible effect on the process of class mobility.

We should stress that our analysis clearly recognises the disadvantages suffered by women as a consequence of gendered labour market segmentation and the lack of continuity in their work histories. Indeed, it is precisely because of such features - and the consequent economic dependence of the majority of women within the family - that the family unit

continues to be the appropriate one for class analysis. Our findings consistently support the argument of Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992:235) that 'the lines of class division run between, but not through, families'.

Table 1

Percentage of Variance Explained by Individual and Conventional Class Schemas in Income and Life-Style for Households where the Wife is in Home Duties

	<i>Primary Deprivation</i>	<i>Secondary Deprivation</i>	<i>Household Income</i>
1. Individual	.027	.052	.033
2. Conventional	.070	.192	.221
3. Ratio of 2:1	2.6	3.7	6.7

Table 2

Impact of Individual Class and Spouse's Class on Income and Life-Style for Married Women in Home Duties

	<i>Primary Deprivation</i>	<i>Secondary Deprivation</i>	<i>Household Income</i>
1. Total R ²	.081	.201	.228
2. Unique to Individual Class	.012	.010	.006
3. Unique to Spouse's Class	.054	.131	.132
4. Ratio of 3:2	4.5	13.1	5.1

Table 3

*Results of Fitting 'Individual Class' and Husband's Class to Household Poverty Tables where the Wife is Currently in Home Duties**

	<i>G²</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>rG²</i>
No effects Model I*H + P	138.7	8	
Individual Class Effect Only Model I*H + I*P	131.4	6	5.2%
Husband's Class Effect Only Model I*H + H*P	9.3	6	93.3%

I = Individual Class H = Husband's Class; P = Poverty

Table 4

Impact of 'Individual' Class and Husband's Class on Life-Style Where Both Husband and Wife Are in the Labour Force

	<i>Secondary Deprivation</i>	<i>Primary Deprivation</i>	<i>Household Income</i>
	R^2	R^2	R_2
1. Combined Impact of Individual and Husband's Class	.289	.098	.222
2. Unique Contribution of Individual Class	.063	.025	.073
3. Unique Contribution of Husband's Class	.104	.034	.073
4. Ratio 3:2	1.65	1.36	1.0

Table 5

*Results of Fitting 'Individual Class' and Husband's Class to Household Poverty Tables Where Husband and Wife are in the Labour Force**

	G^2	<i>df</i>	rG^2
No effects Model I*H + P	165.9	8	
Individual Class Effects Only H*I + I*P	155.8	6	6.1
Husband's Class Effect Only H*I + H*P	47.0	6	71.7

* I = Individual Class; H = Husband's Class; P = Poverty

Table 6

*Results of Fitting the CSF Model to Mobility Tables for Women and Men's Mobility From Class Origins to Current Employment**

	G^2	<i>df</i>	rG^2
Conditional Independence O*S D*S	1,308	72	-
CSF Model O*S D*S O*D	57	36	95.6

* O = Origin Class; D = Current Employment Situation; S = Sex

Table 7

Results from fitting the AHP Model to tables of Women's Marital Mobility and Married Men's Intergenerational Mobility

A		G ²	df
1	Common Mobility Model (Homogenous AHP Allowing for a Difference in Sample Size Only)	114.1	78
2	Heterogenous Absolute Mobility, Common Social Fluidity	102.4	66
3	Heterogenous Absolute Mobility and Social Fluidity	65.1	60
4	Heterogenous Absolute Mobility and Social Fluidity but with only INH1 and AGB Parameters Varying	68.9	64
<hr/>			
B	Decomposition of Deviance		
	Total Mobility Difference (1-3)	49.0	18
	Absolute Mobility Difference (1-2)	11.7	12
	Social Fluidity Difference (2-3)	37.3	6
<hr/>			
C	Row and Column Scores		
	CLASS	Rows	Columns
	I + II	1.73	1.71
	III	0.42	0.43
	IVa+b	0.39	0.73
	IVc	-0.24	-0.47
	V/VI	0.10	-0.17
	VIIa	-0.37	-1.05
	VIIIb	-0.75	-1.10

D Parameter estimates

COMMON

PARAMETERS	Estimate	S.E.	Parameter
	0.99	(0.26)	INH3
	0.63	(0.11)	SLP
	1.24	(0.14)	α
	0.61	(0.04)	β

HETEROGENOUS
PARAMETERS

Men	Deviation for Women	Parameter
Estimate S.E.	Estimate S.E.	
-1.52 (0.29)	.90 (.33)	AGB
0.36 (0.07)	-.37 (.10)	INH1

Table 8

Results of fitting the AHP Model to Men-Only and Complete Mobility Tables

A.	<i>Complete Table</i>		<i>Men-Only Table</i>	
	Goodness of fit			
	G^2	df	G^2	df
AHP Model	40.7	30	39.8	30
B. Estimated Origin and Destination Scores				
	<i>Origin</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Origin</i>	<i>Destination</i>
I+II	1.77	1.22	1.73	1.71
IIIa	1.39	0.50	1.22	1.15
IVa+b	0.60	0.51	0.39	0.73
IVc	-0.14	-0.48	-0.24	-0.47
V/VI	0.12	-0.32	0.10	-0.17
III+VIIa	-0.24	-0.67	-0.33	-0.85
VIIb	-0.68	-0.65	-0.75	-1.10
C. Parameter Estimates				
<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>S.E.</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>S.E.</i>
INH1	0.12	(.05)	0.27	(.06)
INH3	1.14	(.27)	1.51	(.37)
AGB	-1.69	(.21)	-1.78	(.24)
SLP	0.68	(.08)	0.68	(.13)
α	1.22	(.14)	1.22	(.17)
β	0.70	(.04)	0.53	(.04)

APPENDIX

Our measure of income is household adult equivalent disposable income aggregated to decile level. Our measures of deprivation are scales built from a range of life-style indicators which have been employed in major studies of poverty (Townsend, 1979; Mack and Lansley, 1985). Our previous analyses have identified a number of important dimensions of life-style deprivation (Callan *et al.*, forthcoming; Whelan *et al.*, 1991; Whelan, 1992). The dimensions included in our analysis in this paper are labelled *primary life-style deprivation* and *secondary life-style deprivation*. The former involves the enforced absence of basic food, clothing, heating, etc., and the experience of persistent debt difficulties arising from dealing with routine expenses. The consumption items in this scale all relate to current consumption and display relatively low levels of non-possession and high levels of socially defined necessity. The scale has a reliability of .70 and runs from zero to eight. The latter measure deals with enforced deprivation of items which are characteristic of a middle class, or comfortable working class, life-style. These include holidays, leisure activities and expensive consumer durables. Here we find much higher levels of non-possession and lower levels of socially defined necessity. The scale runs from zero to nine and has a reliability of .76.

We have combined the measure of income and primary deprivation to define a poverty line. A household is considered to be in poverty if its income is less than 70 per cent of the average household income and if its members suffer the enforced absence of one or more primary items.

The class categorization we use is the seven class CASMIN schema (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992: 35-47). We use two versions of this: the 'normal' seven class categories

and a slightly modified, seven class version in which Class III, that of routine non-manual employees, is divided into IIIa and IIIb, with the aim of isolating in IIIb occupations which, in terms of characteristic employment relations, would seem to involve straightforward wage-labour (Erikson and Goldthorpe, 1992:241).

This modified class schema is as follows:

I+II	Service Class
IIIa	Routine non-manual employees higher grade (sales and service)
IVa+b	Petty bourgeoisie
IVc	Farmers
V/VI	Lower grade technicians, supervisors of manual workers and skilled manual
VIIa+IIIb	Non-skilled manual and routine non-manual lower grade (administration and commerce)
VIIb	Agricultural and other workers in primary production

At different points in the paper we use different versions of the schema. In addition, in the log-linear analyses concerned with predicting household poverty we aggregate the *modified* schema into three classes: service class (I+II); intermediate class (IIIa, IVa,b and c, V/VI); and working class (IIIb, VIIa and b). The need for aggregation arises from the relatively low incidence of poverty; within the aggregate classes, however, there is little variation in the incidence of poverty.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, P. , and Sapsford, R. (1987), *Women and Social Class*, London: Tavistock.
- Breen, R. (1985), 'A Framework for Comparative Analyses of Social Mobility', *Sociology*, 19, 1: 93-107.
- Breen, R. and Whelan, C.T. (1992), 'Explaining the Irish Pattern of Social Fluidity: The Role of the Political' in J.H. Goldthorpe and C.T. Whelan (eds), *The Development of Industrial Society in Ireland, Proceedings of the British Academy*, 79, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Callan, T. and Farrell, B. (1992). *Women's Participation in the Irish Labour Market*. Dublin: National Economic and Social Council.
- Callan, T., D. Hannan, B. Nolan, B. Whelan and S. Creighton (1989, *Poverty and the Social Welfare System in Ireland*, Dublin: The Economic and Social Research Institute.
- Callan, T., Nolan, B. and Whelan, C.T. (Forthcoming) 'Resources, Deprivation and the Measurement of Poverty', *Journal of Social Policy*.
- Dex, S. (1990), 'Goldthorpe on Class and Gender' in J. Clarke, C. Modgill and S. Modgill (eds), *John H. Goldthorpe: Consensus and Controversy*, London: The Falmer Press.
- Erikson, R. (1984), 'Social Class of Men, Women and Families', *Sociology*, 18.
- Erikson, R. and Goldthorpe, J.H. (1987a), 'Commonality and variation in Social Fluidity in Industrial Nations, Part I: A Model for Evaluating the "FJH Hypothesis"', *European Sociological Review*, 3: 56-77.
- Erikson, R. and Goldthorpe, (1987b), 'Commonality and variation in Social Fluidity in Industrial Nations, Part II: The Model of Core Social Fluidity Applied', *European Sociological Review*, 3: 145-166.
- Erikson, R. and Goldthorpe, J.H. (1992), *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Erikson, R. and Goldthorpe, J.H. (Forthcoming), 'Individual or Family? Results from the Approaches to Class Assignment', *Acta Sociologica*.
- Goldthorpe, J.H. (with Catriona Llewellyn and Clive Payne) (1980, 2nd edn. 1987). *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Goldthorpe, J.H. (1983), 'Women and Class Analysis: In Defence of the Conventional View', *Sociology*, 17.

- Goldthorpe, J.H. (1984), 'Women and Class Analysis: A Reply to the Replies', *Sociology*, 18.
- Goldthorpe, J.H. (1990), 'A Response', in J. Clarke, C. Modgill and S. Modgill (eds), *John H. Goldthorpe: Consensus and Controversy*, London: The Falmer Press.
- Grusky, D.M. and R.M. Hauser (1984). 'Comparative Social Mobility Revisited: Models of Convergence and Divergence in 16 Countries', *American Sociological Review*, 49, 1: 19-38.
- Hakim, C. (1992). 'Explaining trends in occupational segregation: the measurement, causes, and consequences of the sexual division of labour', *European Sociological Review*, 8,2: 127-152.
- Hauser, R.M. (1984a). 'Vertical Class Mobility in England, France and Sweden', *Acta Sociologica*, 27, 2:87-110.
- Hayes, B.C. and F.L. Jones (1992), 'Marriage and Political Partisanship in Australia: Do Wives' Characteristics Make a Difference?', *Sociology*, 26, 1: 81-101.
- Hayes, B.C., and R.L. Miller (forthcoming), 'The Silenced Voice: Female Social Mobility Patterns with Particular Reference to the British Isles', *British Journal of Sociology*.
- Heath, A. (1981), *Social Mobility*, London: Fontana.
- Hope, K. (1981). 'Vertical and Non-Vertical Class Mobility in Three Countries', *American Sociological Review*, 47, 1:100-113.
- Hout, M. (1984). 'Status, Autonomy and Training in Occupational Mobility', *American Journal of Sociology*, 89.
- Jacobs, J.A. (1992), 'Review of Payne and Abbot. The Social Mobility of Women', *Contemporary Sociology*, 21, 1: 24-25.
- Lockwood, D. (1958, 2nd edn. 1989), *The Blackcoated Worker*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- McRae, (1990), 'Women and Class Analysis' in J. Clarke, C. Modgill and S. Modgill (eds), *John H. Goldthorpe: Consensus and Controversy*, London: The Falmer Press.
- Mack, J. and Lansley, S. (1985), *Poor Britain*, London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Marshall, G. (1990), 'John Goldthorpe and Class Analysis' in J. Clarke, C. Modgill and S. Modgill (eds), *John H. Goldthorpe: Consensus and Controversy*, London: The Falmer Press.
- Marshall, G., Newby, H., Rose, D., and Vogler, C. (1988), *Social Class in Modern Britain*, London: Hutchinson.
- Payne, G. and Abbot, P. (1990), *The Social Mobility of Women*, London: The Falmer Press.

Stanworth, M. (1984), 'Women and Class Analysis: A Reply to John Goldthorpe', *Sociology*, 18.

Townsend, P. (1979), *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Whelan, C.T. (1992), 'The Role of Income Life-Style Deprivation and Financial Strain in Mediating the Impact of Unemployment on Psychological Distress: Evidence from the Republic of Ireland', in D. Fryer (ed) *Marienthal and Beyond Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Unemployment and Mental Health*, special interdisciplinary issue of the *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*.