

**SOCIAL MOBILITY
OF MEN AND WOMEN
IN CONTEMPORARY ITALY**

**HANS M.A. SCHADEE
ANTONIO SCHIZZEROTTO**

**QUADERNO 17
Dipartimento di Politica Sociale
Università di Trento**

I Quaderni del Dipartimento di Politica Sociale costituiscono una iniziativa editoriale finalizzata alla tempestiva diffusione in ambito universitario di *materiale di ricerca, riflessioni teoriche e resoconti* di Seminari di studio di particolare rilevanza. L'accettazione dei diversi contributi è subordinata all'approvazione di un'apposita Commissione scientifica, che si avvale anche del parere di *referees* esterni al Dipartimento. Responsabile della serie dei Quaderni: Prof. Marino Livolsi, Ordinario di Sociologia, Trento. Le richieste dei Quaderni vanno inviate ai rispettivi autori.

1. E. BAUMGARTNER, *L'identità nel cambiamento*, 1983.
2. C. SARACENO, *Changing the Gender Structure of Family Organization*, 1984.
3. G. SARCHIELLI, M. DEPOLO e G. AVEZZÙ, *Rappresentazioni del lavoro e identità sociale in un gruppo di lavoratori irregolari*, 1984.
4. S. GHERARDI, A. STRATI (a cura di), *Sviluppo e declino: La dimensione temporale nello studio delle organizzazioni*, 1984.
- 5/6. A. STRATI (ed.), *The Symbolics of Skill*, 1985.
7. G. CHIARI, *Guida bibliografica alle Tecniche di ricerca sociale*, 1986.
8. M. DEPOLO, R. FASOL, F. FRACCAROLI, G. SARCHIELLI, *L'azione negoziale*, 1986.
9. C. SARACENO, *Corso della vita e approccio biografico*, 1986.
10. R. PORRO (a cura di), *Le comunicazioni di massa*, 1987.
- 11/12. G. CHIARI, P. PERI, *I modelli log-lineari nella ricerca sociologica*, 1987.
13. S. GHERARDI, B. TURNER, *Real men don't collect soft data*, 1987.
14. D. LA VALLE, *Utilitarismo e teoria sociale: verso più efficaci indicatori del benessere*, 1988.
15. M. BIANCHI, R. FASOL (a cura di), *Il sistema dei servizi in Italia*, 1989.
16. B. GRANCELLI, *Le dita invisibili della mano visibile. Mercati, gerarchie e clan nella crisi dell'economia di comando*, 1990.

Dipartimento di Politica Sociale
 Università di Trento
 Via Verdi 26, I - 38100 Trento
 Tel. 0461-881111/881322
 Telx 400674 UNIVTN I
 Italia

Composizione: Copisteria Paradisi - Trento
 © Copyright Dipartimento di Politica Sociale, 1990

CONTENTS

1. The area of investigation and the research hypotheses	pag. 7
2. Classification of social positions, variables and samples	pag. 15
3. The reasons for and the consequences of including women in studies of mobility	pag. 23
4. Social mobility	pag. 30
5. Occupational mobility	pag. 42
6. Matrimonial mobility, homo- and heterogamy	pag. 57
7. Occupational plus matrimonial mobility is social mobility?	pag. 69
8. By way of conclusion	pag. 77
Notes	pag. 81
Bibliography	pag. 91

FOREWORD

This working paper of the Dipartimento di Politica Sociale of the University of Trento is a slightly modified version of a paper we presented in september 1989 in Antwerpen at the congress on Gender and class. A considerably shortened version, with less technical detail and fewer tables, has appeared in Italian in Polis IV: 1: 1990. The longer version in English is meant to document our analyses in more detail than is normally possible within the compass of an article in a scientific journal, moreover we hope it will be useful to those of our colleagues who do not read Italian but who may be interested in the topic dealt with.

We wish to thank M. Barbagli, V. Capecchi, A. Cobalti and A. de Lillo for their permission to use the data of the research project on social mobility in Italy. We discussed this paper with many persons to all of whom we are grateful for their suggestions. Two of them should be mentioned in particular. C. Saraceno provided the original stimulus to write the paper and read and discussed with us a nearly finished version of it; in the final revision we made use of her observations. A. Cobalti read to whole paper with great care; his detailed comments led us to clarify our text in various points.

Our thanks are also due to L. Savori who did a great deal of the

careful data handling necessary for these analyses and to A. Belton who revised the English of the paper.

Obviously the responsibility for errors and mistakes remains ours and ours only.

Our final thanks go to the Dipartimento di Politica Sociale which financed this publication in the series of departmental working papers.

*H.M.A. Schadee
A. Schizzerotto*

Trento, January 1990

1. The area of investigation and the research hypotheses

In this paper we draw on the findings of a survey recently conducted in Italy (1) in an attempt to deal with two principal issues: first, whether in analyses of the processes of mobility - understood as the passage from one social class to another - consideration should also be made of subjects belonging to the female sex; second, the differences that exist between men and women in terms of the channels and opportunities available to them for movement among the various class positions.

We have deliberately formulated the first of these issues in tentative terms in order to emphasise that the great majority of studies of social and occupational mobility (e.g. Glass, 1954; Lipset and Bendix, 1959; Blau and Duncan, 1964; Lopreato and Hazelrigg, 1972; Ammassari, 1977; Featherman and Hauser, 1978; Goldthorpe, 1980) have concentrated only on men in employment, and also to provide a reminder that this approach still enjoys authoritative support. Generally speaking, sociologists who have examined mobility from the perspective of the formation and action of social classes have justified their exclusion of women from analysis on the following grounds. The constitutive core of classes is the family, the placement of which within the class structure largely depends on the head of the household's position in the social division of extra-domestic labour and on the market. Because of the quantitatively and temporally limited nature of the employment of women (married, cohabiting or otherwise), and because of women's effective condition of social inferiority with respect to men, the head of the household has usually been taken to be a person (spouse or parent) of the male sex (Goldthorpe, 1980, 1983 and 1984; Giddens, 1975; Westergaard and Resler, 1977).

This approach (only briefly outlined here) has recently been

criticised on a number of counts. In particular, it has been argued that increasing female participation in the labour market, the numbers of households headed by women, and the existence of not negligible disparities between the social and occupational life-chances of men and women, impede accurate reconstruction of the socio-occupational structure of a social system and the pattern of the processes of mobility within it, if the position of women in each is ignored (Acker, 1980; Heath 1981; Britten and Heath, 1983; Stanworth, 1984; Barbagli, Capecchi and Cobalti, 1988). These objections, we believe, are certainly wellfounded; and we shall later support and supplement them with data and considerations referring specifically to contemporary Italy. For the time being, however, we note that the inclusion of women in samples providing the data for research into mobility does not *per se* resolve the problem of how - in cases where women are married or cohabit and work - their occupational positions are to be accounted for. Put otherwise: when in the course of research into mobility one encounters women or men who hold (or have held) a job and are married to or live with persons who also are (or have been) in employment, two questions arise. Should both members of the couple be given the same class position? If so, how should this common class position be specified?

Recent sociological literature contains, broadly speaking, three principal approaches to the problem. A number of researchers claim that the social conditions of men and women are so profoundly different that any attempt at joint analysis of the occupational positions of married or cohabiting men or women is bound to be misleading (2). More specifically, the proponents of this point of view argue that only separate analysis of the socio-professional positions of men and women - even when they constitute a family nucleus - can show that most women occupy class positions inferior to those of most men (Stanworth, 1984;

Acker, 1988). Other authors have argued, however, that two spouses purely by virtue of the fact that they are such, share the same social position: if both members of the couple are employed, their social position is to be determined on the basis of the specific combination of work and market situations (cf. Lockwood, 1954 and Goldthorpe, 1980) that corresponds to the occupations of the two subjects (Britten and Heath, 1983; Heath and Britten, 1984; Barbagli 1988b). From this point of view, therefore, contemporary society is characterised by the presence of numerous individuals, and even more so of numerous households, with mixed class membership ("cross-class families"); or, better, a class membership that lies at an intermediate point between the two pure classes that comprise the occupations of the individuals themselves and of their respective spouses. The third approach has suggested that both the working spouses should be attributed the class position that corresponds to the occupation which, of the two performed by the members of a given couple, has the most advantageous market situation (Erikson, 1984).

Neither the first nor the second of the approaches outlined above strikes us as convincing. The individualist approach - whereby the social positions of men and women should always be determined independently of their conjugal status - neglects the fact that, even in highly differentiated societies, the life-chances of the components of a family are significantly interrelated. Indeed, studies of mobility and inequality themselves have shown that the social positions of individuals and the advantages (or disadvantages) they enjoy (or suffer) depend to a substantial extent on the resources available within the original or current family household. And if this is so, it does not make a great deal of sense to assume, explicitly or otherwise, that classes consist of individuals rather than families and that the latter are split by class-based contrasts and conflicts, almost as if they were societies

in miniature. In point of fact, behind the individualist orientation of Stanworth's and Acker's approach there lies an unwarranted mingling of class inequalities and gender inequalities. These two researchers maintain, in fact, that gender disparities are a structuring element in inequalities of class (3). But to claim this is to blur the notions themselves of class and gender, and deprive them of their analytical usefulness. Put better: such a claim overlooks the fact that, whereas classes relate to inequalities that are mainly acquired and to groupings that are largely open in character, gender concerns inequalities that centre on an ascribed feature and hence, necessarily, give origin to closed aggregates. Although there is no doubt that disparities arising out of sex differences can flank, overlap and intersect with class inequalities, gender cannot be regarded as a constitutive element of classes. Apart from anything else, gender is not a resource, the exercise of control (or absence of control) over which determines the forms of participation in the social division of extradomestic labour and on the labour market. Moreover, sexual membership is a phenomenon that is (or has been to date) almost wholly impervious to change resulting from the will or behaviour of individuals or groups (4).

The second analytical approach, whereby the same social position - as determined on the basis of a combination of the class locations attached to the job held by each spouse - should be attributed to each of the components of the household, certainly seems to avoid the shortcomings of the individualist argument. However, it runs the risk of excessively fragmenting the class structure and of artificially inflating rates of mobility (5).

Erikson's proposal is much more fruitful in theoretical and practical terms. It has, in fact, a dual advantage: a) it does not mechanically identify the class position of the household with that attaching to the occupation of the male spouse, and b) it does not

break down the class structure of a society into a myriad of miniscule aggregates (6).

In this article, therefore, we shall attempt to show how - by using the dominance principle to establish the class position of working subjects married to or living with individuals who also work - one can give more rigorous treatment to the features of the class structure of a society and to the amount of movement within that structure than is possible using other methods of classification. It should be pointed out, however, that in determining the state of dominance we will take account of the overall class positions corresponding to various occupational roles and not, as Erikson suggests, of their market situations alone. This latter procedure, in fact, risks concentrating attention almost exclusively on the privileges enjoyed by various classes, thus transforming the complex network of power relations among them into some sort of simple rank ordering (7). Instead, by jointly considering the types of resource (means of production, educational or professional credentials, organizational instruments, labour power) possessed by individuals and by groups, and the positions of dominance and subordination that they are able to assume in the social division of labour and on the market by virtue of these resources, it becomes possible to predict whether a class dominates (or is dominated by) one or more other classes or whether there exists a situation of substantial equilibrium of position between two or more classes. For example, the latter is the case of the white-collar middle class and the petty bourgeoisie. From an overall societal point of view, it is difficult to establish with certainty if and which one of them is subordinate to the other; and whether the advantages enjoyed by members of the former - in terms of educational level and job security - provide better or worse life-chances than those deriving from the higher incomes usually earned by members of the latter.

We set out below the specific relations - of dominance, subordination or equilibrium - between various classes that, in our view, can be identified in contemporary Italian society. For the moment it should be made clear that in cases where two persons living together have jobs belonging to classes to which the criterion of dominance does not apply, we attribute to the household, and to the female spouse, the class location corresponding to the occupation of the male spouse. This is a decision taken on practical grounds, and is justified by the fact that, at present, social relationships between genders are, *ceteris paribus*, weighted in favour of men.

The nature of the inequalities between the sexes as regards processes of mobility is - as we pointed out at the beginning of this section - the second of the issues to be addressed by this article. Although, at first sight, this may appear to be a question of more empirical than theoretical and methodological interest, this is by no means the case.

First of all, we should remember that few studies (Heath, 1981; Portocarero, 1985; Goldthorpe and Payne, 1986; Barbagli, Capecchi and Cobalti, 1988; de Lillo, 1988; Cobalti, 1988) have examined gender disparities in processes of mobility from the standpoint of class analysis (8). These studies suffer from two contrasting limitations. Some of them have focused on the occupational, intergenerational and intragenerational mobility of men and women, or on comparison between the occupational mobility of the former and the matrimonial mobility of the latter. Other studies, by contrast, have dealt chiefly with overall social mobility - i.e. by examining, but not discriminating between, mobility achieved through marriage, through the entering of employment or, again, through a combination of these two channels. Of course, no-one would dispute that in order to assess the influence exercised by gender membership over the processes

whereby classes are transformed into socially visible collectivities, one must begin with overall social mobility. But it is equally certain that, in order to understand the way in which the mechanisms of class formation and reproduction are differentiated according to sex, one must examine matrimonial and inter- and intragenerational occupational mobility as well.

On the subject of matrimonial mobility, a further shortcoming in these research studies should be stressed: the fact that, as we have already mentioned, they have analysed matrimonial mobility exclusively in terms of women (9). Certainly, as the vehicle for passage from one social class to another, marriage is more commonly used by women than by men. However, there are no grounds for arguing that marriage does not influence, both through the occupational position of the wife and through her class of origin, the social condition and career of her husband. From this it follows that thorough analysis of recruitment into the various social classes has to take account of matrimonial mobility, and of the differences therein between the sexes, linking the original and current class positions of married men and women with the corresponding conditions of their respective partners.

Although it is perhaps superfluous to say that all the types of mobility that have been discussed so far will be dealt with in this paper, we should, however, point out that they will be studied - using log linear models - in terms of both absolute and relative mobility (cf. Goldthorpe, 1980).

Treatment in absolute terms involves the specification of any differences there may be between the social, matrimonial, professional and career chances available to men and women. Our hypothesis here can be formulated as follows. The unequal distribution of tasks in the management of the family household, the phenomena of female segregation on the labour market and, more generally, the overall position of effective subordination

assigned to women - although this is not as extreme as it has been in the past - are still of such a magnitude as to create systematic disparities in the channels and frequency by which, from common origin, men and women achieve different class locations.

Examining gender differences in terms of relative mobility entails, instead, establishing whether the inequalities among subjects of different social origin in their chances of entering a particular class vary or not according to sex. This is a question fraught with theoretical implications. The existence of distinctly different chances of access to various social classes between men and women would provide strong empirical support for the thesis that class inequalities are structured according to differences of gender. The opposite case, i.e. that the process of mobility operates independently of gender, would instead be considered evidence - albeit indirect - in favour of the hypothesis that, although inequalities between men and women flank and interweave with class differences, they do not lie at their root. We tend towards this latter view and shall try to show that it is true of the most significant of the forms of mobility that we examine - that is to say, of overall social mobility. We also believe, however, that the segmentation by sex of the labour market is such as to breed effective disparities between men and women in their relative opportunities for career achievement and intergenerational occupational mobility. The reason why, despite this conviction, we argue that the chances of social mobility are independent of gender lies in the idea that marriage and the matrimonial mobility of men and women act to compensate for the inequalities of the world of work.

Having outlined the essential features of the problems that this paper seeks to confront, this is an appropriate moment to set out the various stages of the analysis that now follows. The next section gives details of the characteristics of the data used, the

framework we have adopted to represent the class structure of contemporary Italy, and the way in which the social positions of origin and arrival of the subjects examined have been defined. In the third section we discuss female participation in the labour market and show how estimates of the sizes of various classes and the absolute rates of mobility vary when both men and women are considered. The three sections that follow are devoted to the analysis of sex inequalities in the various types of mobility. The seventh section provides a synthesis in the form of an estimate of the contributions of occupational and matrimonial mobility to overall mobility for both genders.

The final section provides a synthesis of the conclusions that we believe can be drawn from the analyses conducted in sections three to seven.

2. Classification of social positions, variables and samples

We have already stated that we define processes of mobility as passages of individuals, families and groups from one social class to another (10), and that we shall study (some of) these processes from an intergenerational perspective (i.e. by comparing the position achieved by a subject or by his/her current family with that of his/her parents), and others from an intragenerational perspective (i.e. by comparing the class locations achieved by the subject at given moments of his/her life). In both cases, however, we must first elaborate some sort of model of the class system within which such mobility phenomena occur.

Our analysis is grounded, generally speaking, in an arrangement of six groupings, labelled as follows: bourgeoisie; white-collar middle class; urban petty bourgeoisie; rural petty bourgeoisie;

urban working class; rural working class. Although this classification has already been used in previous studies of social mobility in Italy (Schadee and Schizzerotto, 1987; de Lillo, 1988; Cobalti, 1988) (11), some explanation of it is required if our research findings are to be read without difficulty. The bourgeoisie is, in fact, composed of three distinct classes - entrepreneurs, members of the professions and the service class (cf. Dahrendorf, 1959; and Goldthorpe, 1982) - grouped together here because they were present only to a limited extent in our various samples. The bourgeoisie comprises, apart from the owners, managing directors and members of the board of directors of firms with more than 15 employees, also intellectual occupations and the upper and middle management of firms and public corporations. The white-collar middle class is formed by staff employees, including teachers, technicians and office employees with intermediate-level skills (e.g. computer operators, technical draughtsmen). The urban and rural petty bourgeoisies should, strictly speaking, be treated as two segments of the same class. But we have kept them distinct, both because of the great dissimilarity between their market situations and because one of the major transformations in the Italian socio-economic structure of the last forty years has been a drastic shrinking in the rural petty bourgeoisie. To the former of these two segments belong craftsmen, tradesmen and self-employed service workers (with or without employees); to the latter, farmers cultivating their own land, sharecroppers and tenant farmers, and self-employed workers in the forestry and fishing industries (with or without employees). The urban and rural working classes are treated separately for the same reasons that the corresponding petty bourgeoisies are. The urban working class includes, apart from manual workers employed in industry and the services (e.g. shop assistants, waiters, porters), low-skilled

office workers (e.g. telephonists, typists) whatever economic sector they may belong to. Unskilled labourers employed in the farming, forestry or fishing industries belong, of course, to the rural working class. It should be clear by now that - in keeping with well established sociological practice - we took occupation type to be the indicator of class membership. Using this criterion, however, caused a number of difficulties of a practical nature. What these difficulties were, and how we resolved them, we shall now explain.

A first problem concerned respondents who declared that they had never had a job. To these we assigned the class that corresponded to the occupation of the person who was (or had been) responsible for their maintenance. Those subjects who instead declared that they had had (some) work experience in the past were placed in the class corresponding to the last job they had held. There seemed, in fact, to be little sense in treating the social positions of all retired or unemployed workers as identical, when their pension and welfare entitlements, as well as their daily lifestyles, varied according to what their work situations had been before they retired or found themselves out of work. Of course, subjects without any contact with the world of work, and those who in their day-to-day lives were dependent on persons who had had jobs in the past, were assigned to the same class position as held by those on whom they depended.

Although we argued above that classes consist of families rather than individuals, so far we have only considered the definition of what might be called individual class positions. We must now, therefore, explain how we constructed the family class positions of the subjects of our research. This we shall do by referring - for the sake of convenience - to subjects who were married at the time of the interview, or had been prior to it. It should be borne in mind, however, that what we say concerning

the partners in the couple applies, automatically, to all those other unemployed persons (mainly children but also persons without kinship ties) who lived (or had lived) with them.

If only one of the spouses had (or had had) a job while the other remained permanently outside the labour market, the latter partner (and the family as a whole) was assigned the same class position as the working partner. This procedure was also followed in the case of widows and widowers, subjects who were separated, divorced or those who had stopped living with somebody: being the widow or widower of a top-level manager is a very different proposition from being the widow or widower of a clerk or a factory worker. If, instead, both spouses or partners held (or had held) jobs that belonged to different classes (16), the family class position was established on the basis of the dominance principle outlined in the previous section.

In order to understand the consequences that derive from the application of this criterion, the structure of the power relationships that, in our opinion, hold among the six classes must be specified. The bourgeoisie dominates all the other classes. There is substantial equilibrium among the white-collar middle class, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the rural petty bourgeoisie. These three classes dominate the urban and rural working classes, neither of which dominates the other.

Therefore, if one of the subjects examined by our study proved to belong by virtue of his/her job to a class that was subordinate to that of his/her spouse, then the subject was allocated to the class of his/her spouse. In the opposite case, it was the spouse that was allocated to the class of the respondent. If, finally, the subject and his/her spouse belonged to classes that, although distinct, were also equivalent from the standpoint of dominance relations at a societal level, then, in line with the principle set out in the previous section, the class of the male spouse was given

precedence. Since we have already stated our reasons for adopting this approach, we will now move on to a brief discussion of the correctness of the dominance criterion in the strict sense.

In practice, the dominance criterion entails that the spouse allocated the lower class position because of his/her job is irrelevant to the overall social location of the family. An objection to this might be that, in fact, the spouse with the subordinate position lowers the social condition of the household by introducing into it elements of social inferiority which would be absent if only the spouse in the superordinate professional position mediated the household's relations with outside society. But one can also argue the opposite: that the spouse of inferior occupational class actually enhances the household's social position by increasing, at least, its material assets. On closer examination, however, these two objections do not stand up: neither the second - in as far as increased assets change the household's standard of living but not its resources for dominance; nor the first - because a household's day-to-day lifestyle, the types of privileges enjoyed by its members and the nature and intensity of their extra-domestic social relations, tend to shape themselves according to patterns established by the power centres of the superordinate occupational class of the two that the individuals comprising the couple belong to for the very good reason that these patterns are socially more valued and, individually, more advantageous and satisfying. To sum up: although it is true that the use of the dominance principle means that possible class disparities within households are overlooked, it is equally true that it enables the researcher to account for the much more significant class differences that exist between households.

Using the set of procedures discussed above, we established both the class of the current families of the subjects covered by

our research and the class of their families of origin; the latter being defined on the basis of the occupational situation of the parents of the interviewee when s/he was 14 years old.

We shall use the variables of class of arrival of current family, of class of family of origin and of sex in order to show how measurement of the size of social classes, and of movements among them, is affected by the decision either to include or to exclude women from mobility analysis. These three variables will also be used to study inequalities of gender in social mobility. However, they will be supplemented by the conjugal status of the subjects examined; this is needed in order to control for the effects of the way in which the class of current family is assigned. It is one thing to assign a particular class position on the basis of largely direct criteria, as happens with single subjects in employment; it is quite another to do so on the basis of the working principles set out above, as happens with married subjects with or without jobs.

We shall examine sex differences in intergenerational occupational mobility principally in terms of the occupational class of arrival of individual respondents and of the occupational class of the heads of their families when they were 14 years old. We use this latter variable rather than family of origin so as a) to enable comparison between our results and those of other studies on the same subject and b) to display the differences, by sex, between occupational mobility and matrimonial mobility. In this latter case, the only information available concerning the family of provenance of the informant's spouse was the job of his/her father. It would therefore have made little sense to compare the effects of this elementary variable with those of a complex variable like the family class of origin. Conjugal status is also employed as a control variable in the analysis of inter- and intragenerational occupational mobility. Here, however, it is not

used as a methodological precaution, but in an attempt to discover whether being married, rather than living alone, has an effect on a person's career.

Analysis of the intragenerational mobility of men and women will broadly follow the analytical procedure outlined above. Subjects' positions of departure and arrival, however, will be established, respectively, by the class corresponding to their first occupation and the class corresponding to their occupation 10 years after starting work. The decision not to consider a subject's present or most recent job as his/her point of arrival was taken in order to eliminate the possible effects of the length of working career.

Examination of matrimonial mobility will be based on joint consideration of the following features: the occupational class of the head of the subject's family; the occupational class of the father of the spouse; the subject's occupational class of arrival or, alternatively, his/her permanent state of non-employment; the occupational class of arrival of the spouse or, alternatively, his/her lack of any professional experience; and gender.

As the variables in each of our specific analyses change, so do the samples on which they are conducted. Put otherwise: these samples represent individual subsets of a general reference sample which, in turn, represents a fraction of the 5,016 individuals, male and female, employed or unemployed and aged between 18 and 65, surveyed by the study of social mobility in Italy conducted by Barbagli, Capecchi, Cobalti, de Lillo and Schizzerotto.

The reference sample - which was used in its entirety to study the differences between males and females in their participation in the labour market and to examine the processes of social mobility - comprised 4,340 subjects with a clearly identifiable family class of origin and with at least one of the following

characteristics: a) they were employed or had been; b) they were married or had been; c) they were 30 years of age or more. Our reasons for considering employed and married subjects should be immediately understandable in the light of the discussion in this and the previous section. Less clear, perhaps, is why we included in our reference sample people who had never worked and who had always lived with their families of origin, as long as they were at least 30 years old. Our reason for doing so was the following. It seemed a reasonable assumption that those subjects who found themselves in this situation and at such an age did so, generally speaking, more out of a deliberate life-choice than because of any objective obstacles to their living on their own. The objection that this confuses intergenerational mobility with what is, in reality, the intragenerational mobility of the family of origin can be countered by pointing out that the subjects in question nevertheless occupied a position in the social structure and that this position was a relatively stable one. And it was precisely because they failed to fulfil this last condition that individuals possessing the above characteristics but who were less than 30 years old were excluded from our sample. Many such subjects, in fact, were looking for work or were students; it therefore made sense to regard them as not yet having entered the mobility process and as living with their families of origin only temporarily.

In order to study intergenerational occupational mobility, we extracted from the reference sample all those subjects who held or had held a job. Obviously, analysis of career mobility was only carried out on subjects that had worked for more than ten years. Matrimonial mobility was examined using two samples: the first comprising only couples where both spouses had jobs, in order to bring out the reciprocal influences between the classes of origin and belonging of each partner; the second also comprising couples where one (or both) spouse was without work

experience, in order to reveal if and how people belonging to the various social classes select their spouses on the basis of their class of origin.

3. The reasons for and the consequences of including women in studies of mobility.

One of the principal reasons adduced for the inclusion of women in mobility research is their growing participation in the labour market. This trend - one that is amply documented in Italy as in other countries (12) - is fully confirmed by the data examined in our study. If the 4,340 subjects in our reference sample are divided into three cohorts, one sees in fact, as one moves from the oldest to the youngest of them, that the proportion of women respondents with some sort of occupational experience increases regularly and constantly (cf. Table 1). Although there is no doubt that even in the youngest cohort considered, the difference between male and female employment rates is still considerable, this does not alter the fact that more than 75% of women born between 1950 and 1967 have, or have

Table 1 - Employment by birth and gender

BIRTH COHORT	GENDER			
	MEN		WOMEN	
	%	N	%	N
1921-1934	99.5	596	61.4	407
1935-1949	99.5	745	69.2	527
1950-1967	99.0	787	76.9	594
<i>Total</i>	<i>99.3</i>	<i>2128</i>	<i>69.5</i>	<i>1528</i>

had, a job. It is therefore difficult to deny that this large proportion of women in employment is an important phenomenon. Indeed, our research shows that it was quite significant in the past as well - at least in Italy (13).

Considerations such as these prompt the objection among the defenders of the traditional approach to the study of mobility (cf. Goldthorpe, 1983 and 1984) that, in most cases, women leave employment or limit themselves to part-time work when they get married. There is some substance to this argument, although it is not entirely convincing.

Table 2 - Employment status by gender and marriage in %

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	MARRIED		SINGLE		TOTAL	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Full time	81.0	26.2	77.9	68.9	80.3	33.4
Part time	2.5	5.7	4.9	8.4	3.1	6.2
Full time in past	15.7	28.1	14.0	17.1	15.3	26.3
Part time in past	.5	4.2	1.1	1.6	.6	3.7
No work experience	.3	35.8	2.1	4.0	.7	30.4
<i>N</i>	1613	1827	530	370	2143	2197

There are, of course, women who are not married, and on the basis of our sample one can estimate that almost all of them have, or have had, a job (cf. Table 2). At the moment of data collection for a survey of mobility, any forecast as to the conjugal future of such women is illegitimate; they should instead be considered on a par with single men living on the income from their work. Nor is the argument entirely valid as it applies to married women. In Italy - at least according to our figures - more than 25% of these subjects hold full-time jobs (cf. Table 3). Moreover, not a few (legally or effectively married) women no longer in employment claim that they left work because they were sacked, because they

Table 3 - Unemployed with past work experience by gender and marriage in %

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	MARRIED		SINGLE		TOTAL	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Unemployed	12.2	4.8	51.2	37.7	21.3	8.2
Pensioner	80.9	26.8	22.5	40.6	67.2	28.2
Other (military service, student, housewife)	6.9	68.4	26.3	21.7	11.5	63.6
<i>N</i>	262	590	80	370	342	659

wanted to look for another job, or because they had reached pensionable age; they did not do so purely and simply in order to devote themselves to the home. Lastly, most married women worked or have worked for at least 10 years (cf. Table 4). To

Table 4 - Length of occupational career by gender and marriage in %

CAREER LENGTH	MARRIED		SINGLE		TOTAL	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Less than 10 years	10.6	34.5	69.4	64.5	24.9	41.5
More than 10 years	89.4	65.5	30.6	35.5	75.1	50.5
<i>N</i>	1609	1173	519	355	2128	1528

define such long-standing careers as only sporadic involvement with the labour market appears excessive. Instead, it seems more reasonable to suppose that many women continue to work after they get married and that they therefore have an influence on the class position of the family they participate in. Put briefly: although it is certain that in Italy - as (or perhaps more than) elsewhere - the level of the involvement of married women in the labour market is much lower than that of men with identical civil status, it is equally certain that this involvement is of a magnitude that cannot be ignored.

One cannot off-handedly dismiss this state of affairs by saying

that the occupational position of married women is generally inferior to that of their spouses or partners; and that one therefore need only consider these latter in order to define the class locations of families accurately. Our sample contains, in fact, both (a few) women who are (or have been) employed and who have husbands with no experience of work, and (many) women holding (or having held) jobs belonging to a class higher than that corresponding to their husbands' professions. Further, a number of our male respondents who have never been employed live with employed women, and others work in jobs that are inferior, in terms of class location, to those of their wives. Taken together, these and the cases already cited are not particularly numerous (14). Nevertheless, they demonstrate that the assumption of the constant superiority of the social position of the male spouse leads inevitably to errors in the attribution of current class of family, and hence to distortions in the measurement of the sizes of these classes and of the flows into them from the various classes of origin. If, moreover, one bears in mind that the traditional approach to the study of mobility also excludes working unmarried women from analysis, one understands how these distortions can grow to significant dimensions. Similar risks exist too, however, for those studies of mobility which, although they consider both men and women, take single individuals rather than families to be the constitutive units of classes. This latter approach, in fact, ignores the influence that the occupation of a subject's spouse exercises over his/her overall class position.

To show that these criticisms do not stem from pure theoretical scruple but that they point out concrete dangers, we have compared the distribution in our sample of family classes of arrival, established using the dominance principle, with the distribution of occupational classes of arrival in the subsample of employed males; and both of these with the distribution of individual classes

of arrival in the subsample of men and women who work (or have worked).

This comparison (cf. Table 5) shows clearly that the three distributions differ. And the direction of these differences corroborates our arguments. The individualist approach

Table 5 - Distribution of current class position for three definitions of class in %

CURRENT CLASS POSITION	WAY OF DEFINING CLASS		
	Dominance (a)	Head of family (b)	Individualist (c)
Bourgeoisie	8.3	7.5	5.3
White collar middle class	22.9	19.8	23.6
Urban petty bourgeoisie	20.5	20.3	17.9
Agricultural petty bourgeoisie	6.5	5.2	5.2
Urban working class	38.8	44.0	44.6
Agricultural working class	3.0	3.1	3.4
N	4340	2128	3656

Notes:

- a) observations for men and women, employed and unemployed, class based on families and constructed with the dominance principle;
- b) observations for employed men, class based on families with family position determined by the class of the male head of family;
- c) observations for occupied men and women, class based on individuals only.

completely ignores the effects of an individual's family membership on his/her overall class location; and the traditional approach ignores a number of these effects (i.e. those deriving from women), as well as the consequences of the segmentation of the labour market by gender (15), which explain why both these analytical procedures underestimate the size of the bourgeoisie and overestimate the size of the working class, why the second of them underestimates the size of the white-collar middle class, and why the first increases the size of the petty bourgeoisie as a

whole. In other words, the individualist approach neglects the fact that many women are married to entrepreneurs, members of the professions and members of the service class. By contrast, the traditional approach forgets that this holds for many men too. It also overlooks the fact that many men belonging to the working class marry women belonging to the white-collar middle class, and that - because of the higher concentration of women in the ranks of white collar workers - this is a much more common situation than its reverse. The individualist approach, for its part, fails to capture the fact that numbers of women from the working class and from the white-collar middle class marry men belonging to the urban or rural petty bourgeoisie (16).

Table 6 - Total mobility for three definitions of class in %

WAY OF DEFINING CLASS		
Dominance (a)	Head of family (b)	Individualist (c)
61.4	58.2	58.9

Notes:

- a) observations for men and women, employed and unemployed, class based on families and constructed with the dominance principle;
- b) observations for employed men, class based on families with family position determined by the class of the male head of family;
- c) observations for occupied men and women, class based on individuals only.

However, apart from their effects on the distribution of social classes, the differences between our approach and the other two are important as regards their possible consequences on the measurement of the size of movements among the classes themselves. To highlight these consequences, we compiled the tables of intergenerational mobility corresponding to each of the three analytical approaches, and then used them to calculate the percentages of the subjects who were mobile (17). The results of these calculations are given in Table 6. They show that by using

samples of men and women, in employment or otherwise, and by assigning a family class of arrival and a family class of origin (established by the dominance criterion) to subjects, one obtains a higher overall rate of absolute mobility than one does by using either the traditional or the individualist approach. In both cases the difference is only slight; nevertheless it indicates that the amount of mobility among social classes in Italy is higher than one might believe solely on the basis of the intergenerational mobility of males or of the intergenerational mobility of men and women taken together. And it is interesting to note that the traditional and individualist approaches give practically identical measurements of the rate of absolute mobility in Italy: a decidedly unflattering result for those who argue that it is only by keeping the social positions of men and women rigidly separate - even when they are married or live together - that one can acquire reliable information about the class structure of a society and the movements taking place within that structure. On the other hand, it gives further support to our argument that the study of social mobility requires samples of both men and women, and that it should be borne in mind that many of these men and women belong to households performing an active function of mediation between the occupational positions and the social positions of their members.

These last remarks only serve to emphasise the complex character of mobility processes; processes which cannot be captured by considering only individuals as such, or without acknowledging the sometimes major disparities between the social and occupational life-chances of men and women. And this is, in fact, the subject of the next sections.

4. Social mobility

This and the following two sections of the paper analyse various mobility tables: social mobility first and then intra- and intergenerational occupational mobility (section 5) and matrimonial mobility (section 6). The reason for this order is that social mobility, as explained before, is the sum of occupational and matrimonial mobility.

For each table the effects of gender and civil status are considered: firstly by describing the differences in the final class distributions of respondents (and their partners) and, secondly, by formulating, on the basis of arguments already presented and some of the descriptive results, a log-linear model for the table. Finally, the meaning of the model is discussed. The notes contain further technical details on the models.

The use of log-linear models in this paper is specific. Each model is formulated in terms of precise hypotheses based on either the literature, or on general knowledge concerning mobility or the way that 'class' has been constructed. Respecification of a model either simplifies it (for example, by requiring certain parameters to be equal, or by setting certain parameters to zero) or adds parameters to deal with certain sets of cells which fit the model, as stated originally, badly. We prefer this strategy to the more usual one, which fits whole blocks of parameters (dealing with a set of interactions of higher order) at once, because we are convinced that this method gives a clearer and more detailed insight into what is going on; in this way the existence of some sizable higher order effects does not lead to large numbers of statistically and substantially insignificant parameters.

Before turning to the analyses a general difficulty in interpreting some results needs dealing with. The analyses treat, among other things, the impact of civil status on mobility. Civil

status and age are related : married respondents have a mean age of 44 years (45 for men, 44 for women), 13 years more than that of the single respondents (30 for men, 32 for women) in the reference sample. But the distributions of class positions, in whatever way these are constructed, differ among various age cohorts. The changes over time can be summarized as follows: for the younger cohorts there are fewer class positions of origin in the agricultural occupations and more in the bourgeoisie and the white collar middle class; this also holds for first occupation and occupation after ten years. For the actual class position two effects exist: on the one hand there are the differences just mentioned; on the other a longer career has more chance of an (upward) movement. The former effect is larger than the latter. Younger cohorts are favoured by having a more recent starting point, but are somewhat disadvantaged by having shorter careers (cf. de Lillo 1988, p. 34-38). The analyses show an impact of civil status on both class of origin and current class when age cohort effects are not included in the analyses. The most natural interpretation of this is that these differences in the class distributions are not due to being married but to the situation faced by a specific age cohort on the labour and marriage market. The reason why age effects are not considered explicitly in these analyses is simply that including them leads to large tables, 300 to 600 cells, requiring samples larger than that available. This problem is tackled as follows. A series of separate analyses (not presented here) consider whether an effect is due to age or to being married (or both). The conclusions of these analyses are seen in the way the effects of civil status are attributed : sometimes to effects of age-cohorts, sometimes to the actual impact of being married.

Table 7 gives the current class position for the reference sample, and for married and single men and women. The table

shows some important differences between the married and the single, as well as, within the latter group, important differences according to gender: the concentration of single women in the white collar middle class (nearly double that of the other groups), the concentration of single men in the working class (slightly over half), and the relatively small fraction of single women in the urban petty bourgeoisie. The remaining differences are less important; single men and women are underrepresented in the agricultural classes and in the bourgeoisie.

Table 7 - Current class of family by gender and marriage in %

STATUS	CURRENT CLASS							% sample	N
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.			
Men married	8.8	23.3	22.4	7.3	35.2	3.0	37.2	1613	
Women married	10.0	19.9	21.0	7.4	38.2	3.5	42.1	1827	
Men single	4.7	20.4	19.4	2.8	50.6	2.1	12.2	530	
Women single	2.7	39.7	11.6	3.8	40.3	1.9	8.5	370	
<i>Total</i>	8.3	22.9	20.5	6.5	38.8	3.0	100	4340	
<i>N</i>	359	995	890	282	1682	132	4340		

Notes:

Bourg. = Bourgeoisie. *Wh. C.* = White Collar. *P.B.U.* = Urban petty bourgeoisie. *P.B.A.* = Agricultural petty bourgeoisie. *U.W.* = Urban working class. *A.W.* = Agricultural working class.

Some of these differences are to be expected, given the dominance criterion used in determining the class (of the current family) of the respondent. Since among those who live together the bourgeoisie dominates the other classes, there should be more respondents with a bourgeois position. Of the other differences some can be partially explained by the age-cohort differences between the married and the single: for example, those that relate to the agricultural classes. But the main differences can not be explained in this way: they are genuine

differences between the distributions of class positions according to gender. The differences between married men and women are not large, nor should they be for family based class. They are due to sampling variation and to the presence among the 'married' of widows - women live longer than men - which shifts the class distribution of the 'married' somewhat (18).

Unfortunately we cannot compare these results with those of other countries as similar tables do not appear to have been published elsewhere. Goldthorpe and Payne (1986) deal with the dominance criterion, but give no information on civil status - crucial for any use of the dominance criterion. On the basis of data concerning occupational mobility in England (Heath 1981) it appears that, as in Italy, single women are relatively more likely to be found in white collar jobs and single men in blue collar jobs; but also that English single women are, as their Italian counterparts are not, more likely to attain bourgeois or petty urban bourgeois positions than are English single men. If this is indeed the case, discrimination against women in Italy is stronger than in England. However, these results, both English and Italian, exclude, at least for single women, a process of proletarianization of feminine labour, the existence of which has been argued for by various authors (Braverman 1974; Venneman 1977; Wright and Perrone 1977; Stanworth 1984). This is especially true in the Italian case as all white collar jobs on the lowest level have been classified by us as urban working class.

Table 8 presents the class of arrival for a given class of origin. One sees from this table that class of origin has a larger impact on class of arrival than gender and civil status do: the percentage differences between rows are (much) larger than they are in the previous table. Yet gender and civil status influence the percentage of the population with a class of origin different from the class of arrival. Of the total sample 61 % change class. Among

the married somewhat more (63 %) do so, while of the single women somewhat fewer (59 %) change class, although for single men mobility is considerably less (50 %) (cf. Table 14). Inspection of the mobility table for single men (not presented here) suggests that this lesser degree of mobility is mainly due to single men of working class origin who remain working class. Two different factors account for the difference in mobility between single and married men: firstly, as single men tend to be young they may be occupationally mobile during their career and therefore move out of the working class, or, secondly they may marry outside the working class thus improving their class position (dominance criterion). This point will be taken up again.

Table 8 - Current class of family by origin in %

ORIGIN	CURRENT CLASS						% sample	N
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.		
Bourgeoisie	48.6	32.6	7.2	2.2	9.4	0.0	4.2	181
Wh. Coll.	20.9	49.6	11.8	0.8	16.3	0.6	8.4	363
P.B.U.	8.8	25.6	34.5	2.3	27.9	0.9	21.0	913
P.B.A.	3.5	13.6	18.8	24.0	38.4	1.7	21.3	927
U. work	4.9	24.4	17.9	0.9	51.0	0.9	35.2	1527
A. work	1.9	5.3	16.8	4.0	50.6	21.4	9.9	429
Total	8.3	22.9	20.5	6.5	38.8	3.0	100	4340
N	359	995	890	282	1682	132	4340	

Notes:

Percentages are class of arrival for given class of origin, the table is an outflow table.

For abbreviations see Table 7.

The four separate mobility tables, one for each combination of gender and civil status, are not presented here. Given our observations concerning the different distributions over the class of arrival according to gender and civil status and the different

distributions of the class of origin (due to age-cohort effects) according to civil status, each table differs somewhat from the others. But the point at issue is whether the relations between class of origin and class of arrival change according to gender and civil status. This will be treated in terms of log-linear models.

Table 9 sets out the various steps in the construction of a model for the social mobility tables. The first model gives some idea of the total variability in the table and predicts an equal number of cases in each cell. The second model takes account of the fact that there are unequal numbers of respondents in the various classes of origin and arrival, and that there are unequal numbers of men and women and married and single subjects in the sample. This model, with a chi square value of 1958, can serve as a benchmark for the evaluation of the weight of the other relations which will be introduced. The third model includes the effects of class of origin on class of arrival. Its chi square value of

Table 9 - Chi square, degrees of freedom and probabilities for models for the social mobility table

MODEL	CHI SQUA-RE	DEGREES OF FREE-DOM	PROB-ABILITY
1: Equiprobability	7571	143	.000
2: Margins only	1958	131	.000
3: 2 + origin * arrival	397	106	.000
4: 3 + civil-sexual status * arrival	222	95	.000
5: 4 + being married * origins	120	90	.018
6: model 5 with respecified civil-sexual status * arrival	126	94	.016
7: 6 + married * women * origin * arrival urban petty bourgeoisie	105	93	.180

Notes:

see note 21 for technical details on fitting the models.

397 shows that 80 % of the variability still present in the second model is now accounted for. The impact of gender and civil status on class of arrival and their relations with class of origin are in any case less than the impact of class of origin on class of arrival.

According to the hypotheses formulated earlier in this paper gender and civil status have no impact on the relations between class of origin and class of arrival, though they affect the distribution of class of arrival. This last effect can be specified more precisely after the discussion of table 7. For married subjects the distribution of the class of arrival is, by construction, practically identical (cf. note 18) Thus in their case gender has no effect on the class of arrival, although for single subjects such an effect exists. Inclusion of these effects leads to model 4 of table 9. There is also a relation between class of origin and civil status - due to the different mean age of married and single respondents - which must be included in the model. No relation between class of origin and gender is hypothesized, we assume that different classes have boys and girls in the same proportions. Model 5 incorporates all these hypotheses. The model is acceptable but the data do not fit the model well.

Two changes were made in this model. First, the relations between civil status, gender and class of arrival can be simplified to relations between civil status and class of arrival and one effect for the single which differentiates according to gender; regardless of their class of origin single women (men) have a higher (lower) propensity to attain the white collar middle classes than single men (women) do. Model 6 containing this respecification is about as acceptable as model 5, and states that the differences in the distribution of the class positions for single men and women noted in table 7 are due to single women obtaining positions in the white collar middle class relatively more frequently than single men do: once account is taken of this no further

distinctions need be made according to gender in the distribution of current class position for the single respondents (19). This effect is to the advantage of single women with an agricultural or urban working class origin in so far as more of them will arrive in the white collar middle class, but for single women with a bourgeois background it is a disadvantage since they are less likely to remain bourgeois.

The final model in table 9 is model 7, which adds a parameter to model 6. In the two previous models the number of married women with origins in the urban petty bourgeoisie and arrival in the same class were overestimated. This involves an effect of being married and gender on the relations between class of origin and arrival, and inclusion of this in the model requires, strictly speaking, a rejection of the hypothesis - that there are no such effects - that was formulated above. Yet the change concerns only one relation; it is not the case that all relations between class of origin and arrival vary according to gender and marriage for social mobility, only that the inheritance of class within the petty bourgeoisie is less for married women than for married men. This can be plausibly ascribed to a tendency among the petty bourgeoisie to privilege sons rather than daughters when daughters are married in capital inheritance (20). Put otherwise: it seems that one of the strategies of social closure (Weber 1922; Parkin 1979; Murphy, 1986) used by the urban petty bourgeoisie is to restrict access by men of a different background to their class through marriage. However, there can be little doubt that the costs of this strategy are borne more by women than by men.

This final model, with a chi square value of 105 for 93 degrees of freedom, is acceptable and fits the data reasonably well (21).

It is interesting to note that no special parameter is needed for single men who do not change class - of whom there is a higher percentage than in the other groups - or for single men of

working class origin and arrival (see above). This shows that identical relations, in terms of log-linear models, between origin and arrival can, when margins differ, lead to noticeable differences in the total fraction of the sample which experiences social mobility. This point casts doubt on an argument advanced by Goldthorpe (Goldthorpe 1983; cf. Goldthorpe and Payne 1986), who claims that as (nearly) no parameters relating class of origin to class of arrival change according to gender (most) results obtained from the study of male social mobility can be applied directly to the study of female social mobility (22).

Table 10 gives the parameter values of the last model of the previous table (23). The size of parameters is related to the size of effects : the larger (the absolute) value of the parameter, the larger the effect (24). We comment here briefly on the relative size of the parameter values and their general pattern. The parameter for married women with class of origin and arrival in the petty urban bourgeoisie is smaller than most of the parameters for the relations between origin and arrival, which shows that the effect of gender on these relations, apart from affecting only one combination of origin and arrival (out of 36), is relatively small, contrary to what has been claimed by feminists. But the parameter controlling the chance of single women attaining the white collar middle class is quite large; the effect of gender and civil status on the chances of arrival are important (25).

The classes in table 10 have been rearranged: the petty agricultural bourgeoisie and the agricultural workers are now placed side by side. This has been done to show a regular pattern in the parameters for the relations between origin and arrival. For each column of parameters there is a maximum value, and the further one moves from this maximum (up or down) the smaller the parameter becomes. A similar pattern holds along the rows.

There are exceptions to this pattern. Two of them - the ordering of the small values in the column for arrival in the bourgeoisie

Table 10 - Parameters for social mobility model 7

General	3.54					
Gender and marriage						
Married men	0					
Married women	.16					
Single men	-1.41					
Single women	-2.04					
MARRIED	ORIGIN					
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	U.W.	P.B.A.	A.W.
Married	0	0	0	0	0	0
Single	0	-.24	-.66	-.83	-1.45	-1.46
MARRIED	CURRENT CLASS					
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	U.W.	P.B.A.	A.W.
Married	0	0	0	0	0	0
Single men	0	.95	.87	1.60	.98	1.32
Single women	0	.93	0	0	0	0
ORIGIN	CURRENT CLASS					
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	U.W.	P.B.A.	A.W.
Bourgeoisie	0	-.76	-2.10	-2.10	-3.09	-4.12
White Collar	-.12	.44	-.85	-.76	-3.25	-3.48
P.B.U.	-.02	.84	1.46	.86	-1.49	-2.46
Urban working class	-.07	1.35	1.13	2.03	-1.83	-1.85
P.B.A.	-.89	.37	.75	1.38	.99	-1.68
Agr. working class	-2.22	-1.31	-.13	.88	-1.53	.07
Married women P.B.U.	0	0	-.58	0	0	0

Notes:

0: parameters which are set at zero because applying to a reference set of cells (cf. note 23).

The parameter for origin bourgeois and arrival agricultural worker can not be estimated precisely, comparisons for this parameter are suspect.

Note the different order of the classes in this table as compared to other tables. For abbreviations see Table 7.

with an origin in any of the urban classes and the ordering in the row for an origin in the white collar middle class and arrival in the petty urban bourgeoisie and the working class - are insignificant and may easily be due to sampling fluctuations. The remaining exceptions are to be found in the column for arrival in the agricultural petty bourgeoisie and origin in the urban bourgeoisie, in the row regarding an agricultural working class origin and arrival in the petty agricultural bourgeoisie, and finally in the row for origin working class and arrival in the white collar class. We return to these exceptions after commenting the general pattern.

For the married the value of an origin-arrival parameter plus a constant (3.54 for married men, 3.70 for married women) is the logarithm of the frequency the model predicts for the relevant cell. For the single respondents the additional effects for origin and arrival have to be added, but while this changes the frequencies predicted for these respondents their patterns can be described in the same way as that of the married (26). The maximum value in a row shows the most likely class of arrival with a given origin. For the agricultural classes this is the urban working class while for other origins a maximum occurs when class of origin and arrival coincide. And, with the exceptions already noted, the further the class of arrival is (along the row) from the most likely class of arrival, the less frequent is arrival in that class. The maximum value in a column indicates the most frequent class of origin in a given class of arrival. And again, the further an origin is (along the column) from the most likely origin, the less likely is it to be a class of origin for that class of arrival - always with the exceptions already noted.

The pattern is meaningful: it orders the classes. There are two aspects to this ordering. It reflects a) the ordering, along some dimension of overall advantageousness, of the occupations

defining the classes (cf. de Lillo and Schizzerotto 1985; cf. Schadee, Schizzerotto 1987); and b) the size, and changes in it, of the classes (27). The first accounts for the decline of parameter values along the rows the further an origin is from a class of arrival, for in competitive situations greater gains in advantage are harder to achieve and greater losses more successfully resisted. The second, since the two classes first in the ordering are growing, the two in the middle are stable and large, and the last two classes, the agricultural ones, are declining, accounts for the ordering in the columns. It also explains why the most likely class of arrival for the declining agricultural classes are the urban working class and not the agricultural classes. Changes in size also account for one of the exceptions to the pattern in the rows: the white collar class is growing rapidly starting from a relatively small basis and therefore recruits more heavily from the working class than the stable petty urban bourgeoisie. The remaining exceptions can be accounted for by noting that for the working class and the petty bourgeoisie sectoral differences, agricultural or urban, are less important than the differences between them in terms of class advantages. An urban petty bourgeois origin is more likely to give rise to an agricultural petty bourgeois arrival than an urban working class arrival, and an agricultural working class origin is more likely to lead to an urban working class arrival than an agricultural petty bourgeois arrival. The point here is that the ordering of the classes is acceptable when one is dealing with relations between different classes such as bourgeoisie, white collar middle classes, petty bourgeoisie and working class, but is not completely satisfactory when dealing with fractions within each class such as the urban-agricultural distinction within the petty bourgeoisie and working class. But these exceptions can be understood in the terms that account for the ordering itself.

5. Occupational mobility

This section analyses occupational mobility and the impact of gender and civil status on it. It considers, firstly, the intra-generational occupational mobility, or career mobility, between the first occupation and the occupation after ten years for the 54% of the reference sample which has worked for (at least) 10 years. Dealing with the first ten years eliminates the impact of the length of career on occupational mobility. Moreover, since respondents have worked for at least ten years the mean ages of the married and the unmarried differ little in this subsample - the single men in this sample have a mean age of 42 years, the other groups all have a mean age of 47 years - so there are no problems of confusing age-cohort effects with those of civil status.

Secondly, it analyses intergenerational occupational mobility between the class of the head of family of origin and the current occupation for the 85% of the reference sample currently occupied. This table is, among those analysed here, the most comparable with mobility tables for other countries, though the latter often refer only to occupied men. Note that for this table age-cohort effects are implicitly present in those of civil status.

Table 11 shows the distribution of occupational class for the first occupation, the occupation after ten years and the current occupation for civil status and gender. The general direction of the differences among these three sets of distributions is clear. The first three classes increase, from the first occupation to the occupation after ten years and the current occupation, the last three classes decrease. This is due to upwards career mobility. One exception - for single men in the agricultural petty bourgeoisie where the percentage increases for those who are occupied for 10 years - is in line with this interpretation: the

Table 11 - Occupational individual class by gender and marriage in %

STATUS	CLASS AT BEGINNING OF WORK (working 10 years)							
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	% sample	N
Men married	3.0	15.2	9.6	8.9	55.8	7.5	59.5	1388
Women married	1.2	21.2	9.2	10.2	51.3	6.9	29.0	678
Men single	2.7	14.6	6.7	6.7	61.3	8.0	6.4	150
Women single	.8	36.1	5.9	7.6	46.2	3.4	5.1	119
<i>Total</i>	2.3	18.0	9.1	9.1	54.4	7.1	100	2335
<i>N</i>	55	420	212	211	1270	167	2335	
STATUS	CLASS AFTER TEN YEARS (working 10 years)							
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	% sample	N
Men married	5.2	18.2	15.9	7.3	47.9	5.5	59.5	1388
Women married	1.2	23.6	13.8	9.9	44.7	6.8	29.0	678
Men single	2.7	16.7	16.7	7.3	51.3	5.3	6.4	150
Women single	.8	42.8	6.7	7.6	39.5	1.7	5.1	119
<i>Total</i>	3.6	20.9	14.9	8.1	46.8	5.7	100	2335
<i>N</i>	85	489	349	188	1092	132	2335	
STATUS	CURRENT OCCUPATIONAL CLASS (working)							
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	% sample	N
Men married	8.6	19.7	20.8	6.0	41.6	3.3	44.1	1618
Women married	2.0	25.1	15.3	5.9	46.9	4.8	32.1	1177
Men single	4.8	20.2	19.3	2.9	51.1	1.7	14.1	519
Women single	2.8	41.0	11.0	3.1	40.4	1.7	9.7	356
<i>Total</i>	5.4	23.6	17.9	5.2	44.5	3.4	100	3670
<i>N</i>	197	866	656	191	1634	126	3670	

Notes:

6 respondents (5 married men and 1 single women) were added to the reference sample because class of head of family of origin was available while family of origin based class was lacking.

For abbreviations see Table 7.

difference is due to agricultural workers who become owners of the land they work. Three other (small) exceptions appear when the distribution of occupations after ten years is compared with that of the current occupations: in the white collar middle classes

the proportion of single women is less than among those who have worked ten years, and women, married and single, are less frequent in the working class among those who have worked for ten years. Noting that younger respondents, who have not worked yet for ten years, are included in the distribution of current occupations accounts for these differences; this appears to be one of the (few) cases where career effects are stronger than age-cohort effects.

In table 11 the proportion of women, whether married or single, in the white collar middle class is persistently above that of the men, a 5-6% difference for married and of over 20% for single women. For family based class such differences are, by construction, impossible within the group of the married, but the appearance of a difference for the married here suggests there are differences in access to the white collar middle class according to gender (28). But the direction of the difference (the greater presence of women in the white collar middle class) contradicts, as already noted, any hypothesis about an increasing proletarianization of feminine labour (Braverman 1974; Venneman 1977; Wright and Perrone 1977; Stanworth 1984). For men there is a greater concentration in the bourgeois class than for women in each group. Moreover, the longer the career the more marked the proportion of married men in the bourgeois class becomes. This point gives rise to two observations. Firstly, being married, as opposed to being single, favours men in attaining bourgeois positions; as age differences between the married and single are small here one must assume that it is precisely being married, that is, the aid of a wife, which helps in obtaining bourgeois positions (for men). Secondly, women in Italy find access to elite positions difficult, more so than in England (Heath 1981), France or Sweden (Portocarero 1985).

Table 12 gives the career mobility table. It shows a high

concentration of respondents on the diagonal, 78%; or, put differently, only 22% change class in the first 10 years of their careers. There are noticeable differences according to gender: 25% of the married and 24% of the single men change class, being thus (much) more mobile than single and married women of whom 14% and 13% experience change in class due to their occupational careers (29). The table shows a general tendency to upward social mobility. Values in the lower triangle are in general higher and involve more substantial groups than in the upper triangle, but large career movements (cells distant from the diagonal) remain fairly rare.

Table 12 - Class of first occupation and after ten years in %

FIRST OCCUPATION	CLASS AFTER TEN YEARS							N
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	% sample	
Bourgeoisie	80.0	16.4	3.6	.0	.0	.0	2.3	55
White Collar	9.3	85.5	3.1	.2	1.9	.0	18.0	420
P.B.U.	.9	6.6	82.6	.0	9.9	.0	9.1	212
P.B.A.	.0	1.4	3.3	77.7	13.3	4.3	9.1	211
U.W.	.0	8.1	11.7	.7	78.6	.9	54.4	1270
A.W.	.0	.6	1.8	8.4	22.1	67.1	7.1	167
Total	3.6	20.9	14.9	8.1	46.8	5.7	100	2335
N	85	489	349	188	1092	132	2335	

Notes:

Percentages are class after ten years for given first occupation. For abbreviations see Table 7.

Table 13 contains the inter-generational mobility table, it resembles the social mobility table (cf. table 8). Two differences may be noted because they contrast occupational with social mobility. The percentage of respondents from a bourgeois background who remain bourgeois is less in the occupational mobility table (by 14%) than in the social mobility table, while

the percentage of respondents with a working class background who remain so is higher (by 7%). In both cases the difference is explained by noting that the dominance criterion increases permanency in the bourgeois class - which dominates other classes - and decreases it for the working class, which is dominated by other classes.

Table 13 - Current occupation by class head of family of origin in %

HEAD OF FAMILY OF ORIGIN	CURRENT OCCUPATIONAL CLASS							N
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	% sample	
Bourgeoisie	32.3	47.1	7.7	1.9	11.0	.0	4.2	155
White Collar	14.8	52.3	13.5	.3	19.1	.0	8.3	304
P.B.U.	5.9	26.6	33.5	1.9	30.8	1.3	19.0	698
P.B.A.	2.3	12.2	14.8	21.7	45.3	3.7	19.9	731
U.W.	2.8	23.9	14.5	.4	57.6	.8	38.8	1423
A.W.	1.1	5.3	15.1	2.8	54.0	21.7	9.8	359
Total	5.4	23.6	17.9	5.2	44.5	3.4	100	3670
N	197	866	656	191	1634	126	3670	

Notes:

Percentages are current occupational class for a given class of the head of the family of origin (outflow table).

For abbreviations see Table 7.

Total mobility is, with 61%, somewhat less in the inter-generational occupational mobility table than in the social mobility table (cf. table 6). Of the married men 61% are mobile, 59% of the married women, 50% of the single men and 61% of the single women. The occupational mobility of the married, especially the women, is less than their social mobility (2% for the men and 9% for the women). This shows the impact of matrimonial mobility on social mobility (30). The differences for the single respondents originate in changes in the sample (31). Table 14 gives the percentages of total mobility by gender and

civil status.

These various results suggest the following description. Women tend to be mobile more often than men, with respect to their families of origin, in the first job they take; in effect, single, that is young, men have lower (social) mobility than young women. But the women remain much more often in the same occupation; they have far less career mobility than men. In the end it appears that men and women have about the same amount of occupational mobility, but that they achieve these amounts in distinctly different ways. This result for Italy is in any case quite different from the one Portocarero obtained, using data from 1979 and a class scheme with 5 classes in France and Sweden (Portocarero 1983), where women were distinctly more mobile than men.

Table 14 - Mobility by gender and marriage in % of each group

MOBILITY STATUS	FAMILY BASED SOCIAL	OCCUPATIONAL	
		INTER-GENERATIONAL	INTRA-
Men married	63.3	61.4	24.8
Women married	68.5	59.5	12.7
Men single	50.0	50.1	24.0
Women single	58.6	61.0	14.3
Total	61.4	59.2	22.0

Notes: Cf. Table 6.

The foregoing discussion makes two points. Firstly, the relations between gender and occupational mobility, whether intra- or intergenerational, are more complex than the relations between gender and social mobility. This also suggests that in the log-linear analyses the impact of gender on career and intergenerational occupational mobility relations will be larger and more complex than for social mobility. Secondly, the use of a dominance criterion and the inclusion of matrimonial mobility in

social mobility and their exclusion from occupational mobility affect the margins of the tables, as well as the distribution of classes for a given first occupation or class of origin and some other quantities of interest. We now turn to the impact of gender and civil status on career and intergenerational occupational mobility.

Table 15 sets out the steps in formulating a log-linear model for the career mobility table (32). The first two models are the same as the two first models for the social mobility table and can be interpreted in the same way. Model 3 includes effects of first occupation on occupation 10 years later. But not all effects are included as not all of them are relevant. Most respondents remain in the class of their first job, so parameter values for the frequencies on the diagonal of the career mobility table have to be included. In addition, the following career movements appear large: those from the urban working class to the white collar middle class and the petty urban bourgeoisie, and the flows between the urban and agricultural fractions of the working class. The parameters for these are therefore included. The size of the remaining career movements are due to chance in this model: they are predictable, once account is taken of the great stability (observations on the diagonal) and the movements already mentioned, from the marginal distribution of initial occupations and occupations after 10 years. In model 4 an effect is added for the concentration of women in their first job in the white collar middle class. In the discussion of social mobility such a relation between women and the white collar middle class was noted for the class of arrival. These two effects together show the concentration of women in the white collar middle class to be the result of a change of class (with respect to their family of origin) from the first job they obtain and not of a career made subsequently - a suggestion already made in the discussion of the

mobility tables. There is no need at this point to introduce an impact of civil status on either the first job or the occupation 10 years after beginning to work. Model 4 is compatible with the hypotheses concerning social mobility formulated earlier in the paper; adding further effects of a higher order implicitly contradicts these hypotheses.

But while marriage is practically irrelevant to career mobility, gender is not so. First there is the effect already noted above : women are less mobile than men. Hence for women the value of the parameter on the diagonal is even higher than for men; this effect appears to be of the same size for all classes, with one exception treated at the end of this paragraph. Secondly, for men there is an interchange between the urban and agricultural fractions of the working class and an additional flow from the urban petty bourgeoisie to the white collar middle class. This last effect can be related to the earlier observations about the differences in career patterns for men and women: the parameter applies to men only because women from the petty urban bourgeoisie who change class tend to begin their careers in the white collar middle classes while the men start their careers later. These effects of gender on the relations between first occupation and occupation after ten years are included in model 5. Further inspection suggested two additional effects. First, for married men there is an interchange between bourgeois and white collar class, this effect is quite sizable and accounts for the increase of married men in the bourgeoisie already commented upon (33). The difference is quite relevant, if the same interchange applied to women, with their concentration in the white collar middle class, their presence in the bourgeoisie would be greater than it is. Something restricts the access of women with white collar middle class occupations to the bourgeoisie (34); it is plausible to see this as the effect of discrimination against women. In addition, this

effect supports the idea that it is marriage - that is the support of a wife - which helps men move into the bourgeoisie. Model 6 incorporates this effect and is a marginally acceptable model for the data. One further effect involves single women with a white collar middle class background who remain in this class: here the tendency to remain in the same class is even stronger than it is in general for women (model 3 and 5). This model with a chi square value of 125 for 116 degrees of freedom is acceptable and fits the data quite well. Further inspection did not show further effects which needed to be added.

Table 15 - Chi square, degrees of freedom and probabilities for models for the career mobility table

MODEL	CHI SQUARE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	PROBABILITY
1: Equiprobability	8879	143	.000
2: Margins only	3574	131	.000
3: 2 + some career relations	328	122	.000
4: 3 + women * white collar first job	304	121	.000
5: 5 + some gender * career relations	244	118	.000
6: 5 + married men * bourgeoisie * white collar (both directions)	145	117	.036
7: 6 + single women * white collar * white collar	125	116	.276

Notes:

See note 32 for technical details on fitting the models and the main text for specification of models 3 to 7.

The parameter values for the final model are given in table 16. The main effects on occupation after ten years are those of the initial job: moreover there are fewer effects than in the table for social mobility. In this sense the pattern of career mobility is simpler than that of social mobility. But the effects of gender and civil status on the relations between first job and occupation after

Table 16 - Parameters for career mobility model

General	-.70					
Civil status, gender						
Married men	0					
Married women	-1.01					
Single men	-2.04					
Single women	-3.05 (sum of previous two parameters)					
GENDER	FIRST JOB					
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.
Men	0	1.19	1.45	1.67	1.77	1.10
Women	0	1.65	1.45	1.67	1.77	1.10
	JOB AFTER TEN YEARS					
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.
	0	.01	1.08	.50	1.70	-.20
FIRST JOB	JOB AFTER TEN YEARS					
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.
Bourgeoisie	3.94	0	0	0	0	0
Wh. C.	0	4.58	0	0	0	0
P.B.U.	0	0	2.79	0	0	0
P.B.A.	0	0	0	3.09	0	0
Urban work.	0	3.11	2.42	0	3.59	1.09
Agric. work.	0	0	0	0	1.09	3.97
First job gender						
P.B.U. men	0	1.68	0	0	0	0
P.B.A. men	0	0	0	0	0	1.34
A.W. men	0	0	0	1.34	0	0
Bourgeoisie wom.	.46	0	0	0	0	0
Wh. C. women	0	.46	0	0	0	0
P.B.U. women	0	0	.46	0	0	0
P.B.A. women	0	0	0	.46	0	0
U.W. women	0	0	0	0	.46	0
A.W. women	0	0	0	0	0	.46
First job Civ-Sex						
Bour. mar-men	0	3.03	0	0	0	0
Wh. C. mar-men	3.03	0	0	0	0	0
Wh. C. sin wom.	0	.90	0	0	0	0

ten years are sizable and significant. The conclusion from this is that the occupational careers of men and women are structured by gender and marriage in certain areas, which are shown by the parameters added in models 5, 6 and 7. In this sense the patterns of career mobility are more complex than those of social mobility. These results offer little hope of generalizing from the study of career mobility for men to the career mobility of women.

Table 17 shows the steps in the construction of a log-linear model for the intergenerational occupational mobility table. The first two steps are identical to the model for social mobility; the chi square value of model 2 can serve as a benchmark for the variability remaining in the data when the model contains no interactions between variables. The relation between origin and current occupation accounts for 78% of this variability; it being the most important set of interactions in the model.

Gender has an effect on the distribution of current occupations. This effect is included in model 4, while model 5 adds to this the effect of civil status, a proxy for age in this case, on the class of origin. There is no obvious way to simplify these models. Investigation into further effects on the distribution of class origins or current occupations for combinations of gender and civil status did not greatly improve chi square values. Model 5 then corresponds to the hypothesis of the absence of effects of gender and civil status on the relations between class of origin and current occupation. But this model does not fit the data in an acceptable way.

Notes to Table 16:

0: parameters which are set at 0.0 because applying to a reference set of cells (cf. note 23). The second and higher order interactions have been arranged in blocks so that each block refers to one parameter only. The career interactions between the two fractions of the working class (agricultural to urban and vice versa) are equal. First job parameters differ only according to gender for white collar women. For abbreviations see Table 7.

Table 17 - Chi square, degrees of freedom and probabilities for models of intergenerational occupational mobility

MODEL	CHI SQUARE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	PROBABILITY
1: Equiprobability	7124	143	.000
2: Margins only	1684	131	.000
3: 2 + origin * arrival	376	106	.000
4: 3 + gender * arrival	267	101	.000
5: 4 + being married * origins	187	96	.000
6: 5 + gender * origin * arrival working class	156	95	.000
7: 6 + single * women * origin urban petty bourg * arrival white collar	138	94	.002
8: 7 + married * gender * origin (bourg. Wh. C. PBU) * arrival PBU	117	93	.045

Notes:

See note 37 for technical details on fitting the models and the text for further specification of the models.

Further exploration suggested the following additional effects. The first concerns respondents with a working class background and working class arrival. In the discussion of social mobility it has been noted that these partly accounted for the relatively low mobility of single men. This effect is present here as well, but it affects more cells. There are less married men with working class background and current occupation, more married and less single women with background and current occupation working class than predicted by model 5. Model 6 incorporates this complex effect, which contrasts civil status (age) and gender effects; it can be described as follows. Single (young) men of working class background are more willing or likely to start out in the working class jobs than are similar single (young) women. However, as the intragenerational mobility table shows, men have a higher career mobility than women, thus they are more likely to move out of

this first working class occupation, while women remain in it. This more than compensates for the unequal start, and reverses the original situation. As a description this is acceptable and in line with the earlier interpretation of some effects concerning career mobility; but why all this should be so remains unclear (35). The effect is not large but definitely exists.

A second effect regards a flow of single women from the petty urban bourgeoisie to the white collar middle class. This is not surprising since it fits in with other effects concerning the relations between petty urban bourgeoisie and the white collar middle class. The effect is not due to the civil status of the women concerned: it is an age effect and indicates for single (young) women of petty urban bourgeoisie background a greater movement towards the white collar middle class. This movement is an accentuation of trends already present in older cohorts; we will offer an interpretation of it when the next effect is discussed. Model 7 incorporates this effect, and though the chi square value begins to become acceptable it can not be accepted as a model for this table. The size of this effect is medium and cannot be ignored.

The final effect regards the married respondents with origins in one of the first three classes and arrival in the petty urban bourgeoisie. There are fewer (married) men with bourgeoisie or white collar background in the petty urban bourgeoisie, and more with an petty urban bourgeoisie background, than the models examined so far predict. For married women the pattern is the opposite. Note that this effect contains, as it were, an effect found in examination of social mobility: the lesser permanence of married women in the petty urban bourgeoisie (36). It may be interpreted in relation to the already mentioned closure strategies of the petty urban bourgeoisie. It hinders access for men of bourgeois and white collar class to the petty urban bourgeoisie

Table 18 - Parameters for occupational mobility model

General	3.34					
Gender and marriage						
Married men	0					
Married women	-.77					
Single men	-1.57					
Single women	-2.34 (sum of previous two parameters)					
ORIGIN HEAD OF FAMILY						
MARRIED	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	U.W.	P.B.A.	A.W.
Married	0	0	0	0	0	0
Single	0	.07	-.27	-.32	-1.01	-.84
CURRENT OCCUPATIONAL CLASS						
GENDER	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	U.W.	P.B.A.	A.W.
Men	0	0	0	0	0	0
Women	0	1.56	1.02	1.17	1.26	1.57
CURRENT OCCUPATIONAL CLASS						
ORIGIN	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	U.W.	P.B.A.	A.W.
Bourgeoisie	0	-.12	-1.67	-1.40	-2.88	-3.72
Wh. Coll.	-.13	.63	-.47	-.20	-2.92	-3.74
P.B.U.	-.12	.75	1.24	1.22	-1.62	-2.08
Urban work.	-.13	1.51	1.25	2.57	2.56	-1.76
P.B.A.	-.85	.31	.73	1.80	1.05	-.89
Agric. work.	-2.10	-1.24	.01	1.24	-1.67	.15
Married men U.W.	0	0	0	-.21	0	0
Married women U.W.	0	0	0	.21	0	0
Single men U.W.	0	0	0	.21	0	0
Single women U.W.	0	0	0	-.21	0	0
Married men bourg.	0	0	-.39	0	0	0
Married men Wh. C.	0	0	-.39	0	0	0
Married men P.B.U.	0	0	.39	0	0	0
Married women bourg.	0	0	.39	0	0	0
Married women Wh. C.	0	0	.39	0	0	0
Married women P.B.U.	0	0	-.39	0	0	0
Single women P.B.U.	0	.79	0	0	0	0

Notes:

0: parameters which are set at zero because part of reference set of cells (cf. note 23). The parameter for origin bourgeois and arrival agricultural worker can not be estimated precisely, comparisons for this parameter are suspect (cf. note 37). Note the different order of the classes here as compared to other tables (except Table 10). For abbreviations see Table 7.

and facilitates it for men who already have this class background. Women of petty urban bourgeoisie background instead leave this class. But for bourgeois or white collar background women access is not restricted when they marry a petty bourgeois husband.

For this final model, model 8 of table 18, the chi square value is 117 with 93 degrees of freedom; it is acceptable though it does not fit the data well. Further investigation failed, however, to reveal additional regularities in the residuals so this remains the final model (37).

Table 18 gives the parameter values for the final model for the intergenerational occupational mobility table. The following comments are in order. The parameters relating the occupation of the head of family in the family of origin to the actual occupation of the respondents show the same pattern, and are of the same size as those for the social mobility table; it would indeed be strange were this not the case. Secondly, the additional parameters showing interactions between three and four variables in the table are, with the exception of that for single women with petty urban bourgeois origin and white collar middle class arrival, fairly small: the effects are there but cannot be considered as greatly disturbing the overall similarities in the relations between origins and arrival for the sexes. But, thirdly, the differences according to gender are sufficiently large to make any extrapolation for results for men to results for women hazardous. Portocarero (1983 b; 1986), Goldthorpe and Payne (1986) and Barbagli, Capecchi and Cobalti (1988) arrive at similar conclusions for intergenerational occupational mobility for Sweden and France, England and Emilia Romagna respectively. But these authors, and especially the first three, stress the similarities in male and female mobility patterns rather than the differences. In many ways this is acceptable insofar as the bulk of the variability in relative mobility can be explained without

considering the effects of gender (and to some, lesser extent marriage) ; but the differences are there and are relevant when describing the mobility regimes.

More interesting than an argument about the relevance or otherwise of gender differences is that they are not always to the advantage of men, and that they are less than gender differences in career mobility. This latter point suggests that changes in the distribution of positions in the class system over the generations diminish the effects of the segmentation of the labour market according to gender.

It is clear that the table for occupational mobility is less 'regular' than that for social mobility; but this is hardly surprising since use of a dominance criterion makes gender differences for the married disappear. Moreover, many differences between men and women in the occupational mobility table switch signs according to the civil status of the respondents, here use of a dominance criterion tends to make gender differences less. Put otherwise: the differences between occupational and social mobility are due to the effect of marriage : they are what should properly be called matrimonial mobility, which is included, by construction, in the social mobility table. It is to matrimonial mobility that the next section is dedicated.

6. Matrimonial mobility, homo- and heterogamy

This section deals with the way in which marriage can be a source of social mobility. It is appropriate to begin this discussion with the distribution of the occupations, or lack of it, among the partners of our respondents (for which data about the father's and father in law's occupation are available). As already noted the

Table 19 - Class of partner by gender in %

STATUS BOTH WORKING	OCCUPATIONAL CLASS OF OCCUPATION OF PARTNER								
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	No occ.	% sample	N
Husbands	10.7	18.4	18.8	6.3	42.8	3.0	n.a.	52.2	1011
Wives	1.7	32.1	14.6	6.9	39.4	5.3	n.a.	47.8	925
Total	6.4	24.9	16.8	6.6	41.2	4.1	n.a.	100	1936
N	124	483	325	128	797	79	n.a.	100	1936
STATUS ALL	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	No occ.	% sample	N
Husbands	10.4	17.3	17.8	6.5	43.4	3.6	1.0	51.1	1539
Wives	1.1	20.3	9.2	4.4	24.8	3.3	36.9	48.9	1470
Total	5.8	18.8	13.6	5.5	34.3	3.5	18.5	100	3009
N	176	565	409	164	1033	104	558	100	3009
UNOCC. Women's	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	No occ.	% sample	N
Husbands	9.8	15.0	15.8	6.8	47.8	4.9	0.0	100	528

Notes:

These are husbands and wives, so the husbands are data taken from female respondents. The estimate of husbands without any occupational experience is slightly higher than that of male respondents in the same condition. This indicates that non-occupied married men are somewhat less likely to be included in the sample (unwilling to be interviewed or giving incorrect answers to questions about occupation).

For abbreviations see Table 7.

distribution of occupations (and non-occupation) differs according to gender. Hence table 19, which gives these data, is divided according to the exclusion and inclusion of non-occupied partners; the distribution of occupied respondents was given in table 11.

The following points can be made about this table. Firstly: 63% of the wives have an occupation but 99% of the husbands does so. Consequently the distribution of the occupations of the wives including the non-working is, taking account of rounding, the same as that for working wives (the values in the row for wives including the non-working are 63% of the values of the row for

working wives excluding non-working wives). As regards the men there are differences due to the presence of 528 husbands with non-employed wives: the percentage of men in the first three classes is higher when both partners are working than when husbands with both employed and non-employed wives are considered. The distribution of occupations for men with non-employed wives shows the same effect. This is because men in the first three classes more often have occupied wives (cf. table 20), although the interpretation of this is less clear. It may be that men in the first three classes have, in part, achieved their positions because they have working wives who give support, or it may be that such men are more likely to have wives who work or have worked (cf. Crompton and Mann 1986). But it is also possible that women who have an occupation have better chances to marry a husband from one of the three first classes.

Table 20 gives the cross tabulation of the occupations for those couples where both partners have an occupation (1936 couples), as well as the table where non-occupied is included as a category on the same level as having an occupation (3009 couples for which we have information on the father and the father in law and the occupation of the spouse out of the 3440 married couples in the sample). The units in this table are couples, independently of whether the man or the woman in the couple was interviewed. For the purposes of presentation the table has been percentualized in terms of the husbands, also because more of the men than the women are in employment.

The table is an occupational homo-heterogamy table. When both spouses work there exists a fairly strong relation between the occupation of the husband and that of the wife; for example the percentage of two-earner couples where both spouses have occupations belonging to the same class is 55% (38). This percentage is less than that for career immobility - showing that

Table 20 - Occupational homo- heterogamy in % of husband

BOTH WORKING		WIVES								
HUSBANDS	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	No occ.	% sample	N	
Bourgeois	15.3	66.0	6.9	1.0	10.8	0.0	n.a.	10.5	203	
Wh. C.	1.3	60.0	11.7	.8	26.0	.2	n.a.	19.9	385	
P.B.U.	.2	18.4	39.2	2.3	36.4	3.4	n.a.	19.9	385	
P.B.A.	0.0	6.5	6.5	63.4	16.3	7.3	n.a.	6.3	123	
U.W.	.1	12.6	8.7	3.9	69.3	5.4	n.a.	40.5	784	
A.W.	0.0	1.8	8.9	7.1	26.8	55.4	n.a.	2.9	56	
Total	2.0	28.1	15.0	6.5	43.4	5.0	n.a.	100	1936	
N	38	544	291	127	840	96	n.a.	100	1936	
ALL		WIVES								
HUSBANDS	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	No occ.	% sample	N	
Bourgeois	10.7	46.1	4.8	.6	7.6	.0	30.2	9.7	291	
Wh. C.	.9	41.5	8.1	.5	17.9	.2	30.9	18.5	557	
P.B.U.	.2	12.3	26.2	1.6	24.3	2.2	33.2	19.2	576	
P.B.A.	.0	4.3	4.3	4.7	10.6	4.8	34.2	6.2	187	
U.W.	.1	7.8	5.3	2.4	42.7	3.3	38.4	42.3	1273	
A.W.	.0	.9	4.7	3.8	14.2	29.2	47.2	3.5	106	
No occ.	.0	36.8	.0	.0	57.9	5.3	.0	.6	19	
Total	1.3	18.3	9.7	4.2	28.3	3.2	35.0	100	3009	
N	38	551	291	127	851	97	1054	100	3009	

marriage does indeed contribute to the social mixing of classes - but higher than the percentage of intergenerational occupational immobility. The latter fact is not all that surprising: among adults husbands and wives are nearer (in most senses) to one another than to their respective parents. This manifests itself in the occupational sphere too, where homogamy is more frequent than occupational immobility (cf. Peach 1974). But homogamy tables resemble those of social mobility: they reflect the same distances and barriers among the classes as are represented by occupational mobility tables (cf. Hout 1982 for the USA).

Secondly, the higher the class position of the husband, the greater the likelihood that both spouses work. This pattern is regular but it deviates from the pattern of relations between (occupational) class of husband and (occupational) class of wife. It is this pattern which accounts for the differences between the distributions of class position of husbands with employed wives and husbands whose wives have no occupation. Bonney (1988) gives a similar pattern for the UK for census data of 1981, though the differences between the highest three occupational classes of husbands in terms of percentage working wives are less than in Italy. Interestingly enough the pattern in 1971 in the UK was different, in that year the wives in the highest classes less frequently had occupations than in 1981. Whether a similar development over time has taken place in Italy is unclear.

Where one of the partners does not work the calculation of class and work similarity between the spouses becomes slightly more complicated. In 35% of all couples one of the partners has no occupation. In 36% the partners have occupations belonging to the same class (ie 55% of 65%); the remaining 29% of couples are marriages where both spouses are employed but their occupations belong to different classes. This information can be read in two ways. One can argue that for 71% of the couples there is no problem in determining the class to which a couple belongs. Either both spouses have occupations belonging to the same class or one of the spouses has no occupation: the problem of how to assign a class to the couple therefore does not arise. But there is another way of looking at this. For 64% of all couples the experience of the partners in terms of work is quite different: for 35% of the couples one of the partners has no occupation (and presumably does the housework and other unpaid work), and for 29% of the couples partners have occupations falling in different classes and so, presumably, have different experiences in

their job-situation. Work-heterogamy, which implies different experiences regarding work of the partners in a couple, is about as frequent as intergenerational occupational or social mobility.

Occupational differences between spouses, including having an occupation or otherwise, contribute to social mobility; the next section deals with the problem of estimating the contributions of intergenerational occupational mobility and occupational heterogamy to social mobility and also discusses what the literature calls marital mobility tables - the cross tabulation of male respondents' occupations with the occupations of their fathers in law. This section, instead, turns to the relations among classes originating in marriage. First, those between gender, current occupational class of each spouse and of their fathers are looked at for two-earner couples; then the relations between having an occupation or not with respect to class of spouse and parents are analysed. The analysis is carried out in two steps in order to distinguish clearly the relations between classes of husband, wife and their parents - where gender influences only the marginal distributions of the classes - from the relations between being employed (or not) and the class variables where gender (as is also clear from the observations made about table 20) influences the relations among classes.

To analyse the effect of gender on the relations among the current occupational class of respondent, spouse, and the class of their parents fully (six classes in four class distributions and gender) would require a table of 2496 cells. The number of class categories involved in the analysis must therefore be reduced. The class of father (father in law) is reduced to three classes: bourgeois, middle class which combines the white collar middle class with the urban and agricultural petty bourgeoisie, and the working class consisting of both urban and agricultural workers. The current occupational class of the respondent and spouse are

Table 21 - Chi square, degrees of freedom and probabilities for matrimonial mobility (both partners working)

MODEL	CHI SQUA- RE	DEGREES OF FREE- DOM	PROB- ABILITY
1: Equiprobability	4838	267	.000
2: Margins only	1796	276	.000
3: 2 + origin * arrival (each partner)	1318	267	.000
4: 3 + gender * class (each partner)	1176	258	.000
5: 2 + origin * arrival (both partners) + gender * class (both partners) (respecification of 4)	1199	267	.000
6: 5 + respondent * partner	394	258	.000
7: 6 + father * father in law	266	254	.288
8: 5 + respondent * partner symmetric + father * father in law symmetric (respecification of 7)	277	263	.276

Notes:

See note 39 for technical details on fitting the models.

recodified in four classes. In the middle class white collar occupations and petty bourgeoisie are distinguished because of the substantial gender effects involving the white collar middle class. All in all, for 1936 respondents a table with 5 variables and 288 cells is analysed.

The first model, equiprobability, gives an idea of the total variability in the table, while the second model takes into account the different sizes of the classes in the various distributions (father, father in law, respondent and spouse) and gender. From the previous section it is known that there are relations between father's occupational class and current occupational class. The same holds, because of symmetry, for the relations between occupational class of father in law and spouse. Parameters for these effects are therefore included in model 3. Married men and

women are present in different proportions in the various classes, so gender differences for class of respondent and spouse are added in model 4.

There is no reason to think that the relations between the occupational class of father and respondent differ from those between class of father in law and spouse; in both cases a sample of married persons is analysed according to their intergenerational mobility. Hence a parameter relating class of father to class of respondent should be equal to the corresponding parameter linking class of father in law to class of spouse. A similar argument holds with respect to the relations between gender and current occupational class. In this table men are either male respondents or husbands of female respondents. The differences in the distribution of occupations between male and female respondents ought to be equal to the differences between the distributions of husbands (of female respondents) and wives (of male respondents). But for any male respondent there is also a wife, so the distribution of male respondents over the occupational classes ought to differ from that of their wives in the same way as it differs from that of the female respondents. These considerations of symmetry when both spouses work lead to two respecifications which have been included in model 5. With respect to model 4, the chi square value increase is relatively small (22 for a difference of 9 degrees of freedom) and, though statistically significant, does not appear such that the logical considerations which have led to the respecification of model 4 in the form of model 5 should be revised. This model, with an unacceptable chi square value of 1199 for 267 degrees of freedom, is the proper starting point for evaluating the effects of relations originating in marriage between classes.

Two possible additional sets of effects suggest themselves immediately. The first set regards the relations between class of

respondent and class of spouse: these, added to the previous model in model 6, account for just over two thirds (67%) of the variability left in the table. The social meaning of these parameters is a dual one. On the one hand they represent effects of (mutual) choice between the spouses on the basis of occupational achievements or other achievements for which the occupational ones function as proxies. Yet the data are not for occupation at the time of marriage or courtship, but for current occupation. They therefore also represent the effect of marriage bringing partners in closer correspondence as far as their occupations are concerned (when both remain working). Since intra-generational mobility is limited, the former of these effects counts more than the latter. The second set of parameters which can be added concern the relations between the (class of) occupation of respondents' father and the (class of) occupation of respondents' father in law. Here one should interpret the effects as representing an effect of choice: partners choose one another with, among other things, respect to their fathers occupations, or characteristics these occupations are proxies for. This set of effects accounts for an additional tenth (10.5%) of the variability in the data not accounted for in model 5. With an overall chi square value of 266 for 258 degrees of freedom (probability .29) this model is acceptable and fits the data quite well.

Yet a further simplification is in order. The interaction parameters for class of occupation of father and father in law and those of respondent and partner are nearly symmetric. This is not surprising. Men and women in a couple have parents with the same distribution of occupational classes, and, moreover, one should assume that men consider the background of women as much as women consider that of men in choosing a partner, so the relations between backgrounds should be symmetric. For the relations between current occupations of the spouses a similar

Table 22 - Parameters for matrimonial mobility model
Couples with both partners working only

General	1.01			
Gender				
Respondent men	0			
Respondent women	.09			
GENDER * CLASS	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.	Working
Respondent men	0	-1.10	-.86	-1.11
Respondent women	0	1.10	.86	1.11
Husbands	0	-1.10	-.86	-1.11
Wives	0	1.10	.86	1.11
PARENTS	OCC. CLASS FATHER IN LAW			
OCC. CLASS FATHER	Bourg.	Middle	Working	
Bourgeois	0	-.34	-1.57	
Middle	-.34	.52	-.51	
Working	-1.57	-.51	-.74	
OCCUPATIONAL CLASS	CLASS RESPONDENT (PARTNER)			
(FATHER IN LAW)	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.	Working
Bourgeois	0	0	0	0
Middle class	0	.89	2.10	2.47
Working class	0	1.35	2.08	3.57
MATRIMONIAL	OCCUPATIONAL CLASS PARTNER			
OCC. CLASS RESPONDENT	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.	Working
Bourgeois	0	-.61	-3.12	-4.03
White Collar middle	-.61	.15	-2.08	-2.46
Petty Bourgeoisie	-3.12	-2.08	-1.69	-3.09
Working class	-4.03	-2.46	-3.09	-2.53

Notes:

See note 39 for technical details. For abbreviations see Table 7.

argument holds, provided one controls for the propensities of the two sexes to finish in different classes. Indeed, if symmetry did not hold for this table one would have an effect of gender on the relations between occupation of husband and wife. So for both sets of relations - father and father in law - symmetry of

interaction was imposed in model 7 leading to model 8. With a chi square value of 277 for 263 degrees of freedom (probability .27) it fits the data as well as the previous model; it is the model accepted here. It is interesting in that the symmetry of the interactions imply that the effects of marriage on occupational homogeneity work equally for both genders. Moreover it is in accordance with the literature, in which symmetric interactions for models concerning assortative marriage appear quite frequently (eg. Ultee, Luijkx 1989 for educational homogamy; Johnson 1981 for religious homogamy; Hout 1982 for occupational homogamy). Table 22 presents the parameters for this model (39). They need little comment except to note that the interactions between class of father and class of father in law are less in size than the (roughly) corresponding interactions between class (of occupation) of husband and wife. Again, this is plausible: for a married adult the spouse is in more direct contact (physically, geographically, in terms of time and so on) than the father (cf. Peach 1974).

The lack of further effects in the data deserves comment. First it may be noted that there is no effect (of the class) of the occupation of the father in law (father) on the occupation of the respondent (spouse). So controlling for the actual occupation of the spouse (respondent), father in laws' (fathers') occupation has no additional effect. Or, put differently, the occupation of a father in law does not affect the mobility chances of a respondent once the indirect effect of it through their own sons and daughters - who are the spouses of the respondents - are taken into account (40). We think that this hypothesis (that is that there are no direct effects of the class of father in law on the respondent, effects are mediated through the spouse) should be the starting point in further analyses of the effect of marriage on mobility chances. The second set of effects which did not appear are effects of

Table 23 - Chi square, degrees of freedom and probabilities of model for partner occupied or not

MODEL	CHI SQUA-RE	DEGREES OF FREE-DOM	PROB-ABILITY
1: Equiprobability	878	125	.000
2: gender	106	124	.881
3: 2 + class respondent	69	118	.999

Notes:

See note 42 for technical details on fitting the models.

gender on the relations between origin and current class found in the analyses of intragenerational occupational mobility. We think this is mainly due to the smoothing effect of reducing the number

Table 24 - Parameters logit model for non-occupation of partner

General	-97
GENDER	
Men	0
Women	-3.67
CLASS RESPONDENT	
Bourgeois	0
White collar	.24
P.B.U.	.35
P.B.A.	.19
Urban Work.	.66
Agric. Work.	.91
Non-occupied *	-.48

Notes:

See note 42 for technical details. Parameters are for impact of gender and class respondent on chances that the spouse has no occupation. * any large negative value is possible, the data do not permit a precise estimate of this parameter. For abbreviations see Table 7.

of classes in our schemes, but another interpretation is worth exploring: once marriage and the occupation of the spouse is taken into account, some of the apparent effects of gender on occupational mobility disappear or diminish in size (41).

There remains the question of what, for the variables considered here, determines whether the spouse of a respondent has an occupation? The main answer has already been given in the discussion of table 19. Married women may or may not have an occupation; married men nearly always have an occupation. In addition, the higher the class of the husband the greater the likelihood that the wife will work. A model for a table of class of occupation of respondent, father, father in law, gender and whether the partner works or not adds little to this, apart from the conclusion that the effect of gender is the main effect and that the effects for the class of the respondent exist (42). The model including the effects of gender and class of respondent has a chi square value of 69 for 118 degrees of freedom (probability .999) and fits the data very well. Table 23 and 24 give the steps in fitting the model and the parameter estimates for the effects of gender and class of respondent.

7. Occupational plus matrimonial mobility is social mobility?

The foregoing discussion has examined social, occupational and mobility due to marriage. It was mentioned a number of times that the channels, or carriers of total (social) mobility are intergenerational occupational and marriage based mobility This section of the paper looks at two things: what are the rules of decomposing social mobility into occupational and marriage based mobility, and what estimates of these quantities are

obtained from our sample. To do so we discuss first what is traditionally called the matrimonial or marital mobility table: the cross-tabulation of the class of origin of a married woman and the (occupational) class of her husband (cf. Tyree and Treas 1974; Glenn, Ross and Tully 1974; Erikson 1976; Thélot 1982; Goldthorpe and Payne 1986). Table 25 gives two examples of such a matrimonial mobility table: the first for the married female

Table 25 - Matrimonial mobility, male respondents and couples in %

FATHER IN LAW	MALE RESPONDENT								
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	N. occ.	% sample	N
Bourgeois	37.3	25.4	25.9	3.0	7.5	.0	.0	4.6	67
Wh. Coll.	29.8	37.4	13.0	2.6	16.5	.0	.9	7.8	115
P.B.U.	7.1	32.5	27.1	.8	31.8	.8	.0	17.3	255
P.B.A.	5.2	10.8	20.3	15.7	44.5	3.5	.0	23.4	344
U.W.	6.1	19.3	17.6	2.1	52.7	1.8	.4	34.8	512
A.W.	2.6	6.8	22.6	8.5	43.5	15.8	.0	12.0	177
Total	8.9	19.8	20.5	5.9	41.2	3.5	.2	100	1470
N	131	291	302	87	605	51	3	100	1470
FATHER IN LAW	HUSBANDS								
	Bourg.	Wh. C.	P.B.U.	P.B.A.	U.W.	A.W.	N. occ.	% sample	N
Bourgeois	47.4	24.1	18.0	2.2	8.3	.0	.0	4.4	133
Wh. Coll.	27.4	39.6	12.6	2.2	16.5	.4	1.3	7.6	230
P.B.U.	11.1	27.3	25.7	2.6	32.7	.6	.0	16.6	498
P.B.A.	4.6	9.6	19.5	18.8	44.3	2.8	.4	23.0	691
U.W.	6.1	18.9	18.2	1.4	52.5	1.7	1.2	37.3	124
A.W.	2.7	6.0	16.8	6.0	49.3	19.2	.0	11.1	333
Total	9.7	18.5	19.2	6.2	42.3	3.5	.6	100	3009
N	291	557	576	187	1273	106	19	100	3099

Notes:

For abbreviations see Table 7.

respondents in the sample and the second based on all the couples in the sample, independently of the gender of the respondent.

These tables are often read as indicating the mobility women obtain through marriage. The formal similarity with social or occupational mobility tables suggests this, and in fact these tables tend to resemble social mobility tables. For example, in the table based on the couples the percentage of women whose husband is in a class different from her father is 64 % which may be compared with occupational (slightly less) and social (somewhat more) mobility. This also illustrates another, often noted, feature of these tables: matrimonial mobility thus defined seems to be somewhat higher than intergenerational occupational mobility. But the whole analogy is misleading. First, there is no reason to suppose a causal connection here: the real impact of the class of a woman's father on the position of her husband is, rather, an effect of assortative marriage. Secondly, assuming that this measures matrimonial mobility assumes that women have no jobs or occupational mobility and that men have no marriages or mobility through them. Thirdly, the oft noted similarity between 'marital mobility' tables and occupational mobility tables is hardly surprising if one bears in mind that a) husbands and wives come from a population with the same class distribution for family of origin; and that b) practically everybody marries without c) evidence of systematic marrying upwards or downwards. In such conditions, given an attempt not to move socially downwards in important areas such as marriage or occupation, the outcomes will be fairly similar. Finally, if comparison is made between matrimonial mobility thus defined for women and occupational mobility strictly defined for men, the mobility of men is underestimated by ignoring their matrimonial mobility. This kind of criticism of marital mobility is fairly standard (cf. Heath 1981;

Portocarero 1985), but surprisingly enough, after the criticism is made little is done to answer the questions - such as to what extent social mobility is due to marriage and whether there are differences according to gender in the use made of matrimonial and occupational channels - which led to marital mobility tables.

The above considerations point to another way of formulating the decomposition of total social mobility into its components. We want such rules to treat men and women in the same way and to handle both occupational and matrimonial mobility. The starting point is that to determine the mobility for any individual three elements have to be taken into account: own position with respect to the labour market (in the form of occupational class for those who are employed), position of marriage partner on the labour market for those who are married, and class of the family of origin. If class is assigned on an individual basis then one accepts a) that persons who do not participate in the labour market have no class assigned and b) that there are families with two or more classes within them. We have argued before that this is unattractive and assume here that some sort of family assignment rules exist, justifying the use of the term class of family of origin.

For the employed single, whether male or female, mobility reduces to occupational mobility from the position of the family of origin. The class for singles without occupation is that of the family of origin: they are thus always immobile or their mobility is the career mobility of their family of origin.

For married individuals without occupation, class is class of their current family. Hence either they are immobile, or their mobility comes from matrimony, so it is matrimonial mobility.

For the married with partners who do not work, class is family class, presumably based on their own occupational class. Thus if they are mobile their mobility is occupational.

For the employed married with employed partners, the rules are more complex because then mobility may be occupational mobility, matrimonial mobility, or both combined. But the immobile may have been occupationally and matrimonially mobile with the forms of mobility cancelling one another out and leading to a (seeming) social immobility. Moreover, the precise nature of assignment rules must depend on the rules adopted for determining family class. In this paper dominance is used with the following rules derived from it. For the immobile in couples with both partners employed, if occupational class is the same as the individual occupational class, then the individual is truly immobile. If it is different then he or she is occupationally and matrimonially mobile, but the two forms of mobility cancel out. In table 26 this is indicated with the sign Comp (compensating). Mobility of this kind can create problems because if only matrimonial or only occupational mobility is calculated then mobility of this type is included, but if total, social mobility is calculated directly it disappears. The problem cannot be ignored: it involves about one twelfth of married men in couples where both partners work, about 1.5 % of the married women in a similar situation. For the mobile individuals in couples with both partners working, where mobility is defined in first instance by a difference between class of family of origin and class of family of arrival, assignment is as follows. If the family class of arrival is equal to the occupational class of the individual then the mobility is occupational; if it differs from that of the family class of arrival then it is matrimonial. There are two difficulties with this procedure. Firstly, in the case of an individual who has been occupationally mobile and who has a spouse whose occupation is of the same class, the mobility is classified as occupational although one might just as well call it matrimonial. Because we see the position on the labour market as underlying the class

system we accept this. Secondly, the rule will work well when difference between class of (family) of origin and class of current family is determined completely, but unclear situations occur : the following example highlights the problem and how to handle it. In the dominance rules used to assign class to a family the bourgeoisie dominates the middle classes, which in turn dominate the working classes. Hence for differences between these three no difficulty exists in deciding whether mobility is matrimonial or occupational. But within the working classes and the middle classes there are more classes (or class-fractions). Assume a woman from an agricultural petty bourgeoisie background has a white collar occupation and is married to a husband with an urban petty bourgeois occupation. She is assigned the class of her husband, in this case by convention, and she would be regarded as matrimonially mobile (she is also occupationally mobile). There are two objections to this. In the same situation a man is classified as occupationally mobile and it is not clear whether the asymmetry of the classification is justified by appealing to the convention of (weak) male dominance in assigning class. Secondly, one may wonder whether all these movements within a middle class really deserve the name of movements, and whether they are not to be regarded as immobility (in which case our previous rules for immobile individuals take over). For table 26 the following solution has been adopted. Mobility is defined strictly as any case where class (of family) of origin differs from current class (of family). However the mobility is not assigned to either matrimonial or occupational mobility when it is within a single block of classes (middle, working) but is treated as sui generis. In table 26 it is found as Und (undecidable). If a male dominance principle is adopted then all Und cases for female respondents are matrimonial mobility, and for male respondents they are occupational mobility ; in reality one does not want to

Table 26 - Mobility by gender and marriage in % of each group

MEN	Occ.	Marr.	Und.	Comp.	Tot.	% sample		N
						Mobile	Group	
Single	50.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	50.0	6.1	12.2	530
Married n. occ.	n.a.	100.0	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	.1	.1	4
Wife n. occ.	60.7	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	60.7	8.6	14.2	618
Both occ.	32.3	26.8	5.7	8.5	64.8	14.8	22.8	991
All marr. men	43.1	16.7	3.5	5.2	63.3	23.5	37.2	1613
Total	44.8	12.6	2.6	3.9	60.0	29.6	49.4	2143
WOMEN	Occ.	Marr.	Und.	Comp.	Tot.	% sample		N
						Mobile	Group	
Single	58.6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	58.6	5.0	8.5	370
Married n. occ.	n.a.	58.2	n.a.	n.a.	58.2	8.8	15.1	654
Husband n.occ	47.4	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	47.4	.2	.4	19
Both occupied	31.8	27.1	7.9	1.6	66.8	17.8	26.6	1154
All marr. wom	28.6	38.0	5.0	1.0	63.0	26.8	42.1	1827
Total	27.0	31.6	4.1	.8	62.7	31.8	50.6	2197
ALL	Occ.	Marr.	Und.	Comp.	Tot.	% sample		N
						Mobile	Group	
Single	53.5	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	53.5	11.1	20.7	900
Married n. occ.	n.a.	58.5	n.a.	n.a.	58.5	8.9	15.2	658
Partner n. occ.	60.2	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	60.2	8.8	14.7	637
Both occupied	32.0	27.0	6.9	4.2	65.9	32.6	49.4	2145
All married	31.1	28.0	4.3	2.9	63.4	50.3	79.3	3140
Total	35.8	22.2	3.4	2.1	61.4	61.4	100.0	4340

Notes:

Occ. = mobility due to occupational mobility. Marr. = mobility due to matrimony. Und. = mobility either due to occupational mobility or to matrimony (heterogamy for middle and working cl by convention to occ for men and marr for women). Comp. = matrimonial and occupational mobility which cancel out against one another. Tot. = Total mobility in group = Occ. + marr. + Und. is % mobile within group. Mobile = Group mobile as % total sample. Group = Group as % of total sample. N = Number of cases in group. (NB: Tot * group / 100 = mobile).

assign it to either, but to leave the classification open. Of course such distinctions can also be made within the group of matrimonial and occupational mobility which cancel one another out, but it is questionable whether it is worth the trouble.

The following points are worth emphasizing concerning these rules. First, their logical scheme is applicable to situations where class assignment of families proceeds on bases different from dominance. Second, the details of the rules depend on the details of the assignment rules adopted, in particular whether family class in the case of unclear decisions is assigned according to the male, the female partner or some sort of combination. Thirdly, the way mobility is defined (difference between class of origin and class current family) influences the results. Fourthly, the scheme is not simply put forward as a logical counting scheme, it is based on a theory which implies that families are basic units in the social class system, even if many of the details of such theories are left open.

Table 26 gives numerical estimates of the kinds of mobility in this decomposition. 32% of all women are matrimonially mobile, but only 13% of the men. However the main difference lies in the fact that there is a substantial group of married women who have no occupation and hence are, by definition, matrimonially mobile. If one looks at those couples where both spouses work then there is no difference between men and women; 32% is occupationally mobile and 27% is matrimonially mobile. In effect a difference between men and women would be surprising in this situation in so far as it would imply a systematic marrying upwards (downwards) for the sex which was more matrimonially (occupationally) mobile. As there is no sign of such systematic hyper- and hypogamy in western societies, it is not surprising men and women come out, for the couples where both partners work, as using both channels in the same way. The slight preponderance

of occupational over matrimonial mobility in this situation is a consequence of one of the assignment rules adopted: when both spouses have the same occupational class and are mobile with respect to their family of origin then the mobility is classified as occupational (see above). If the rules were completely symmetrical with respect to occupational and matrimonial mobility then, in the absence of systematically marrying upwards or downwards, matrimonial and occupational mobility should be of the same size for couples where both spouses work. (43)

8. By way of conclusion

This last section summarizes some of the results of the foregoing sections and tries to bring out some of their theoretical and empirical implications.

The presence of women on the labour market is growing in the younger age cohorts. Even if this trend does not continue and if feminine participation stabilizes at the levels reached by the younger age groups, the participation of women in the labour market will increase as older generations are replaced. But at the moment even such a limited reversion of trends appears implausible; increasing participation is much more likely. Research about the effects of this is therefore important because of the sheer number of persons involved; conclusions are likely to become more important over time as the phenomena to which they apply become more common.

There are notable differences between the distributions of occupational class positions men and women attain in contemporary Italy. Women are more likely than men to attain white collar middle class positions and less likely to end up in managerial (bourgeoisie), autonomous (urban petty bourgeoisie)

or working class positions. This tendency favours women in as far as they avoid ending up in the working class but discriminates against them in attaining managerial or autonomous positions. It also accounts for the higher intergenerational occupational mobility of women. To counterbalance this, and here to the disadvantage of women, they are less likely to experience (upward) intra-generational occupational mobility.

The relations between first occupation and occupation after ten years and between occupation of father in the family of origin and current occupation differ for men and women, though the differences are relatively modest; and the differences are sometimes in favour of men, sometimes in favour of women. The appearance of such differences in absolute and relative mobility shows that it is insufficient to study only men in studying intra- and intergenerational occupational mobility. However, the differences do not appear, to us, sufficiently large to support arguments which see in gender differences in the command over persons and resources a basic principle structuring class relations.

This last point has a bearing on the way class is conceived. If class is assigned only on the basis of occupational position, individuals without (past) occupational position would not belong to a class. In practice family membership mediates class positions for such persons, but difficulties emerge in assigning class to a family: if one wishes to take the variety of family configurations into account one may end up with (very) many classes, but if no account is taken of this variety resulting classes will be heterogeneous. In this paper we suggest the use of a dominance principle, assigning to the family the 'highest' occupational class position occurring among the members of the family. The procedure does not deny important differences in life chances within the classes or among families and individuals assigned to the same class, but suggests that these are less than the

differences between classes. To evaluate this argument one should distinguish between the factual question as to how large the actual differences in life chances are in various life spheres and the conceptual problem as to how these differences are to be combined in an overall measurement. It must be accepted that different weighting procedures concerning the existent differences could lead to conflicting decisions. This problem is inextricably related to the interpretation of a mobility table: such a table provides a meaningful condensation of unequal life chances and experiences where agreement exists on the weighting procedures for the various aspects of inequality, otherwise such tables are misleading.

Basing class on family and adopting a dominance principle diminishes the differences in social mobility between men and women. It also brings into focus mobility through matrimony. It is important to distinguish social mobility through occupational mobility from that through matrimonial mobility because the way class membership is mediated differs for the two forms, which presumably leads to differing life chances and experiences. The analysis of occupational homo- and heterogamy in couples where both partners work shows symmetry with respect to gender once account has been taken of the different distributions of the occupations of men and women; for such couples there are no gender differences in the relations between class of origin, current class and class of spouse.

Rules are given for breaking down total social mobility into occupational and matrimonial components. Women are more often matrimonially mobile than men, but this is due to the wives without paid employment (there are practically no husbands in that situation) in the sample. For couples where both partners work there is no gender difference in the incidence of occupational and matrimonial mobility, a result which confirms

the conclusion of the analysis of occupational homo- and heterogamy. But the fact of matrimonial mobility among men leads to underestimation of total social mobility in any analysis which does limit itself to occupied men only. Moreover, if female participation on the labour market will increase further the discrepancy will increase in size.

NOTES

(1) The first results of this study of mobility are set out in the following works: Barbagli (1988a and 1988b); de Lillo (1988); Cobalti (1988); and Schizzerotto (1988a).

(2) Henceforth we shall use, for brevity's sake, the terms 'married', 'husband', 'wife' and similar to refer also to cohabiting men and women. We believe that the fact that someone is part of a household is much more influential on their life chances and class membership than the legal status of the household itself.

(3) Both Acker and Stanworth, in fact, talk of a general trend towards the subordination in the world of work of the female sex to the male sex. However, such a phenomenon, if in fact it exists, could be more simply interpreted as the effects of sexual discrimination augmenting class-based differentiations, which are neutral regarding sex. The two authors are right, however, when they argue that it is difficult to obtain an accurate picture of the distribution of the members of a society among its various classes if women are left out of analysis.

(4) For further clarification of the distinction between sex inequalities and class inequalities, see Schizzerotto (1988b).

(5) The thesis of the existence of so-called "cross-class milieus" has, we believe, two further shortcomings. It does not make clear whether such families give origin to new classes or, more simply, to strata within the classes. It is difficult to establish if and which dominance relations exist among the various groupings of families. Does a nucleus comprising a husband who is a member of the professions and a housewife occupy a social position that is above, below or equivalent to that of a family made up of a member of the professions and an office worker?

(6) In truth, Erikson's proposal is not free of its limitations either, since he deals with only one aspect (and probably the least important one) of class inequalities. Our position in this regard is clarified below.

(7) This is, in fact, the line of analysis followed by Erikson (1984) and after him by Goldthorpe and Payne (1986).

(8) More attentive to the influence of sex on social position, or, better, on achieved occupational status, have been those researchers who have referred to (or used) status attainment research. Cf., for example, DeJong, Brawer and Robin (1971); Tyree and Treas (1974); Treiman and Terrel (1975); Pontinen (1983); Payne, Payne and Chapman (1983).

(9) In point of fact, neither has matrimonial mobility in the strict sense of the term ever been studied in the case of women: it has been systematically reduced

to so-called marital mobility. We deal with this topic in the sixth and seventh sections below.

(10) The reference to individuals does not conflict with our thesis that classes are mainly formed by households. There also exist individuals who live alone and others (heads of households with non-working members) who pull, so to speak, their families with them.

(11) An exception is the framework adopted for the study of matrimonial mobility. See the final part of the seventh section.

(12) See, among others, Johnson and Pencavel (1984) for the USA; Pontinen (1983) and Erikson (1984) for the Scandinavian countries; Barbagli, Capēcchi and Cobalti (1988) for Italy.

(13) It is very probable that this result derives from the fact that the questionnaire used for this mobility survey considers every form of participation in the labour market (provided it is important for the livelihood of the respondent or his/her family) and not only official forms of such participation.

(14) To be exact, they amount to 264, divided as follows: a) 19 employed respondents with husbands without any work experience; b) 126 employed respondents in a professional class superordinate to that of their husbands; c) 2 respondents without any work experience with wives in employment; d) 117 respondents with an occupational class below that of their wives. Obviously, in all situations where female subjects need to be referred to, the 355 single employed women should also be included (cf. Table 2).

(15) In the next section we examine in detail the aspects and consequences in terms of mobility of the gender discrimination to be found in the occupational sphere.

(16) These remarks only concern the respondents, although they are confirmed by the tables of occupational homo- and heterogamy in the sixth section (cf. Tables 19 and 20).

(17) It should be remembered that to calculate mobility rates according to the two approaches alternative to ours, we have taken respondents' classes of origin to be the occupational classes of their fathers when they (the respondents) were 14 years old. This procedure is certainly congruent with the assumptions of the traditional approach. It might be at odds with the presuppositions of the individualist approach, although its authors are not forthcoming on the subject. It should also be pointed out that the figures given in the second and third columns of Table 5 are not directly comparable with the data used in the study of intergenerational occupational mobility. In the latter case, in order to keep to our theoretical principles and to increase the size of the sample, a subject's class of origin was taken to be the occupational class

of the head of his household (not always the father). The reason why cross-class families have not been considered is given in note 5.

(18) If only currently married respondents are considered to be 'married', then the two class distributions are identical for the population, and all differences between random samples of men and women would be due to sampling variability. Distinguishing those 'who have been married' from the 'actually married' does not change any of the conclusions of this paper.

(19) This is why this effect is specified as affecting (single) women rather than (single) men.

(20) There are some problems here. Selective inheritance thus diminishes the chances of women (compared with men) of having both origin and arrival in the petty urban bourgeoisie. But then the effect should apply to all women, not only to married ones; such a model also fits the data (chi square of 109 for 93 degrees of freedom, probability .11). But if the effect only applies to married women then this selective inheritance only functions for married women (originating in the petty urban bourgeoisie). Alternatively, it could be argued that selective inheritance is less frequent among the young (the single women are younger) than among the older women; which would mean one is dealing with an age-cohort effect (implying increasingly equal treatment of both genders within the petty urban bourgeoisie). Which of these two interpretations is more likely cannot be decided as there are insufficient cases for any firm conclusion to be drawn.

(21) The following information is relevant. There are 20 cells in the table with an observed frequency of 0. To stabilize estimates .5 was added to these cells. The table of origin by arrival contains one empty cell: origin bourgeois with arrival agricultural working class. Therefore the corresponding parameter cannot be estimated (except that it is negative and relatively large), and from model 3 onwards one should, to correct for this, subtract 3 degrees of freedom from each model (cf. Bishop, Fienberg, Holland 1975, p. 114-119). Model 7, when adjusted for this, has a chi square of 105.3 with 90 degrees of freedom; the probability of this or a more extreme chi square value is .13 when the model as estimated is true. Civil-sexual status has three categories: married (men and women), single men and single women. This matches the hypothesis of no gender effects within the group of married. Putting civil-sexual status into the model, with gender and civil status already present, introduces the interaction between gender and civil status, so this interaction is (implicitly) present in the model. The relations between civil-sexual status and class of arrival can be respecified by stating them as the interaction between civil status and arrival and a special parameter which applies only to cells for single women currently in the

white collar middle class (cf. note 19). This respecification is based on the parameter values of civil-sexual status * arrival in model 5 (not presented here). The cell of married women with petty urban bourgeoisie as origin and arrival was identified by an inspection of residuals. The difference in chi square values between model 7 and model 6 is 20 for 1 degree of freedom. This is unlikely to be due to pure chance, so the effect is probably real, though fitting a parameter to a single cell is still problematic. Despite the large number of models proposed for mobility tables we make no attempt here to model the origin * arrival parameters. What interests us is whether they vary according to civil status and gender, so modelling them is pointless.

(22) Of course, total mobility can be reconstructed given the parameters for the distribution of class positions and the interactions between origin and arrival, but one cannot transfer the result from one table directly to the other.

(23) The parametrization of the models is governed by considerations of simplicity. Practically all models in this paper are 'unbalanced' and some are non-hierarchical (Breen 1984); they involve parameters for incomplete sets of interactions or (equality) constraints on parameters. For such parameters it is simpler to give the values as differences with a reference set of cells (which have parameter value of 0 applying to them) - known as 'corner constraints' - rather than the 'usual constraints' where parameters sum to 0 across sets of cells (cf. Bishop, Fienberg and Holland 1975 ; Dobson 1983). To simplify presentation, corner constraints are used for all parameter values. Reference sets of cells are formed by the cells regarding men for gender distinctions, the married for differences according to civil status, and the bourgeois with respect to class of origin and arrival. The remaining reference sets, for incomplete sets of interactions, are all cells not involved in the interaction modelled by the parameter(s) for the effects included in the model. Class of origin and arrival are considered a single variable (with 36 categories), for the presentation of parameters referring to their interaction.

(24) The parameters are given as natural logarithms; in the multiplicative version of the model one should exponentiate all parameters and sums of (log) parameters become products.

(25) The reader should keep in mind that single men and women arrive less frequently in the bourgeoisie (because they are younger). Hence, since the bourgeoisie is the reference category, most parameters of arrival in the other classes are positive and sizable. This observation does not, however, affect the comment on the relative size of the effect of gender on arrival.

(26) The parameters for combinations of origin and arrival are log-odds for that particular combination compared to having a bourgeois origin and a

bourgeois arrival. Given the parametrization of the model, with men, married and bourgeois origin and arrival as reference categories the interpretation in terms of frequencies follows. The inclusion of the additional margins for the single leaves the pattern unaltered in the following sense: the location of a maximum in row or column does not change, no additional exceptions are generated in the remainder of the pattern and some of the previous minor exceptions disappear in the column regarding bourgeois arrival. One exception, not dealt with in the text but present in the model, regards married women with an urban petty bourgeois origin: for them the most likely class of arrival is the urban working class and not the petty urban bourgeoisie. The difference is, however, slight, and well within sampling error.

(27) The usual parametrization has effects for origin, arrival and the interactions between them. One could interpret the parameters for origin and arrival in terms of size, and a large part of the interaction parameters in terms of an ordering of the classes in terms of overall privileges and resources. However, among the interaction parameters some of the effects of growth and decline in size, and specific recruitment patterns, reappear. This being so one has to discuss size and its changes together with the ordering in terms of advantages in any case. More complex parametrizations which disentangle the effects are possible but not used here.

(28) That there are fewer married women in the white collar middle class according to family based class is explained by noting that, when both partners work, class of the family is that of the men when partners come from the following three classes: white collar middle class, urban and agricultural petty bourgeoisie. Moreover, married women who do not work are assigned the class of their (working) husbands, which dilutes the presence of married women in the white collar middle class further (for class assigned according to the occupations of family members, since fewer men are present in the white collar middle class).

(29) Part of this lesser mobility may be because women who find themselves in the white collar middle class are relatively well off and therefore are not prone to change. However, even adjusting for differential mobility according to first occupation does not change the fact that women are less career mobile than men.

(30) Matrimonial mobility is important for men and women in explaining the difference between social and occupational mobility. It is larger for women partly because the rules for the assignment of family based class (cf note 28) tend to change the class of women more often than that of men but mainly because respondents without occupation - nearly all women with considerable

matrimonial mobility (cf. section 6 and 7) - are not considered here.

(31) The inclusion of single respondents who do not work, over 30 years of age and assigned the class of their family of origin, in the social mobility table decreases social mobility for the singles (slightly). (Cf. section 2 on the sample).

(32) The table has 67 empty cells, these were given value .5 to stabilize the estimates, even if the great number of sampling zeroes can create serious problems. The first fits were margins and the interaction between first job and job after 10 years (chi square of 195 for 106 degrees of freedom). Then the third order interaction gender*first job* job after ten years was added (chi square of 82 for 71 degrees of freedom with a probability of .176). But many of these interactions concern what are either sampling zeroes or statistically insignificant effects, so the models were respecified by choosing only some of the interaction parameters. Choice of the career relations (first job * job after 10 years) was made on the basis of substantial flows (model 3). The remaining gender * first job * job after 10 years parameters were added after checking the residuals of model 3 and the parameter values of the second order interactions in the model with all gender * first job * job after 10 years interactions. The last two parameters were added on the basis of residuals. All this was checked as follows. For the last two parameters we tested to see whether adding them to model 4 resulted in significant chi square values. In both cases this gave a chi square above 20 for 1 degree of freedom. Secondly, with the EM algorithm values based on the model with first job * job after 10 years interactions were fitted for the zero cells, and then models 3 to 7 were fitted again to make sure that none of the interactions found could be due to the values in the cells with sampling zeroes (cf. Schadee 1988). The conclusions concerning the presence of interactions did not change ; though chi square values for the models were lower and parameters changed somewhat.

(33) This may appear surprising, insofar as the effect applies to flows in either direction. But a fraction of the bourgeoisie leaving it to become white collar middle class represents far fewer individuals than the same fraction of the white collar middle class leaving it to become bourgeoisie.

(34) The other side of this would be a mechanism that stops women from leaving the bourgeoisie once they are part of it. But there are too few cases to confirm the existence of this mechanism. Its existence therefore remains a hypothesis.

(35) We tentatively suggest two interpretations. From the analysis of married respondents later in the paper it appears that women with a working class husband are less likely to have, or have had, an occupation than women with husbands in other, 'higher' classes. It may be, therefore, that the pressure on

young women to get a job compared with that on young men is less in the working class - with a more ready assumption that she will eventually marry and become a (non-occupied) housewife - than in the other classes. Another possibility is that working class girls often have better educational qualifications than working class boys and thus are in a better position to obtain non-working class jobs.

(36) A model which substituted the parameter mentioned with one which regarded only married women, with origin and arrival in the petty urban bourgeoisie (as in the model for social mobility) but which included the other parameters mentioned here had a chi square value of 127 with 93 degrees of freedom (probability .011). This would be barely acceptable as a model as well.

(37) The following information is relevant. There are 21 cells in the table with an observed frequency of 0. To stabilize estimates .5 was added to these cells. The table of origin by arrival contains one empty cell : origin bourgeois with arrival agricultural working class. Therefore the corresponding parameter cannot be estimated (except that it is negative and relatively large), and from model 3 onwards one should, to correct for this, subtract 3 degrees of freedom from each model (cf. Bishop, Fienberg, Holland 1975, p. 114-119). Model 8, when adjusted for this, has a chi square of 117 with 90 degrees of freedom ; the probability of this or a more extreme chi square value is .029 when the model as estimated is true. The parameters fitted in model 6, 7 and 8 were found by inspection of the residuals of the previous model ; the parameters added in model 6 and 8 involve 4 and 6 cells respectively, the parameter added in model 7 involves 1 cell. The parameters all are significant, though this extensive fitting on the basis of residuals is problematic.

(38) There are few published occupational homo- heterogamy tables. Hout (1982) gives one , but from the figures it appears that occupational homogamy in the USA holds for only 33.8 % of working couples, while for a comparable table on male intergenerational occupational mobility there are 46.9 immobile (p. 400, own calculations). The data are difficult to evaluate in so far as the figures have been adjusted (Hout 1982 p. 399), but the discrepancy appears too large to be due only to different definitions of classes and adjustments.

(39) The table has 1936 cases for 288 cells ; 124 cells are empty. Yet, given that the only effects which are involved in the final model concern interactions between pairs of variables all parameters remain estimable in the model. To stabilize the estimates .5 was added to cells with zero cases. Two additional models were fitted for the zero cells with the aid of the EM algorithm (cf. note 32, Schadee 1988): model 4 and model 7 (the latter with a chi square value of 200 for 254 degrees of freedom). In both cases further exploration of the table

led to the same conclusions as had been reached adding .5 to the zero cells, though some of the parameter values change somewhat. Adding the symmetry constraints to model 7 using the fitted values for the zero cells obtained by the EM algorithm gave a chi square 213 for 263 degrees of freedom, which shows that the acceptability of the symmetry constraints are not due to the adding of .5 to the zero cells. Parametrization of this model is somewhat arbitrary, the choice has been made to give the two tables which represent the matrimonial and 'parents' effect the same form as the sets of parameters which in other tables regard mobility relations, but at the price of having a rather unnatural parametrization for the inter-generational occupational mobility estimates. Other parametrizations are possible and might be more plausible although convincing reasons for a particular choice are lacking.

(40) Some care must be taken here. One can plausibly speak of effects of father in laws' occupation on the spouse(s' occupation) and the spouse(s' occupation) in turn having an effect on the respondent(s' occupation). But it is not reasonable to speak in the same way of a direct (causal) effect of the father in laws' occupation on the occupation of the fathers respondent and through this on the respondent. The relation between class of father in law and father is a consequence of some sort of choice of the respondent ; at best the choice indicates something about other attitudes which may be relevant to the class in which the respondent arrives. This discussion is an example of a problem which is general in any substantive interpretation of effects in models : whether one ascribes a causal effect or not depends not on the model but on the content of some of the variables involved in the model.

(41) We are aware of only one other analysis in which class of respondent, spouse, father and father in law are considered (Green 1989). Green assigns scores to the classes and develops an association model involving all interactions between pairs of variables. There are various implausibilities to this, the main one being that there is no justification for the different scores of class of father and father in law, or the differences between husband and wife for intergenerational occupational mobility. In addition Green's model includes effects of (class of) father in law on (class of) respondent and of (class of) father on (occupational class of) spouse, neither of which we consider necessary or acceptable.

(42) Estimating how being employed depends on gender and class of partner is problematic. The discussion of tables 19 and 20 shows that a) practically only women do not have an occupation, b) there is a relation between class of husband and having an occupation, c) there are relations between the occupation of the husband and the occupation of the wife when the wife has an

occupation. Hence, when non-employment is treated as a category in the same way as a class of occupation, the relations between class of fathers' and father in laws', husband and wife vary with gender because the relations change. To take non-employment into account requires a large table - at least 450 cells if the classes are compacted as in the analysis of matrimonial mobility for couples with both partners working - and the model for it will have to include interactions of gender with the various relations between (pairs) of classes. This leads to a model with a chi square of 332 with 359 degrees of freedom (probability .84). Such an analysis is plagued by the presence of sampling zeroes in the table, 219, of which 124 are not very important as they occur in the part of the table which regards couples where both partners are employed, but the remaining 95 are nearly all concentrated in cells for men (as married men are rarely unemployed) leading to some unestimable parameters.. For the result given here the sampling zeroes were put at .5 and the problem of inestimable parameters was ignored. An additional problem is the fact that only 4 classes (plus being without occupation) are considered for respondents. The alternative chosen here is to analyse only the partner employed/non-employed dichotomy for couples. Due to collapsing of the variable which regards the occupational class position spouses into a dichotomy , there are interactions between gender and the other class relations in the data. But these effects are uninteresting : we already know that they are due to the way one variable has been collapsed. Hence, they may as well be included wholesale in the model and the relations between being employed or not with gender, class of husband, father and father in law, can be investigated conditional upon the other relations. This leads to a logit analysis with the probability of having an employed spouse as the dependent variable and with gender, class of father, father in law and husband as independent variables. This analysis is equivalent to a log-linear analysis which includes all interactions between the independent variables, the margin of the dependent variable, and such interactions between dependent and independent variables as there are independent variables included in the model. There are 61 observations of 0 but this creates no problem for the logit analysis. However, there were also some cases where the observed total (non-working and non-working partner) was zero. In such cases .1 was added to the total. The value of the parameter for non-working in table 24 depends on this, strictly speaking the parameter can not be estimated apart from stating that it is large and negative. If one were to adjust for this one should subtract 8 degrees of freedom from model 3 in table 23.

(43) This is a logical argument. Men and women have fathers (families of origin) with the same distribution of classes. Hence for every partner in a

marriage where the occupations of the spouses belong to different classes, one spouse is occupationally mobile and one is matrimonially mobile. Hence occupational and matrimonial mobility should be equal for this group if the assignment rules treat matrimonial and occupational mobility in precisely the same way. The rules outlined in the main text do not do so and assign more cases to occupational mobility.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acker, J.R. (1980) 'Women and stratification: a review of recent literature' *Contemporary sociology* 9:25-39
- Acker, J.R. (1988) 'Class, gender and the relations of distribution' *Signs* 13:3:473-497
- Amassari, P. 1977 'Occupational mobility trends in Italy' Dublin, ISA, Research committee on social stratification
- Barbagli, M. (1988 a) 'Da una classe all'altra' *Polis* 2:1 april 15-18.
- Barbagli, M. (1988 b) 'Quando in famiglia ci sono due classi' *Polis* 2:1 aprile 125-150
- Barbagli, M, Capecchi, V., Cobalti, A. (1988) *La mobilità sociale in Emilia Romagna* (Il Mulino, Bologna)
- Bettio, F. (1988) *The sexual division of labour, the Italian case* (Clarendon Press, Oxford)
- Bishop, Y.Y.M., Fienberg, S.E., Holland, P.W. (1975) *Discrete multivariate analysis* (MIT press, Cambridge Mass.)
- Blau, P.M., Duncan, O.D. (1964) *The american occupational structure* (Wiley, New York)
- N. Bonney (1986) 'Gender, household and social class' *British Journal of Sociology* 39:1:28-46
- Braverman, H. (1974) *Labour and monopoly capital: the degradation of work in the twentieth century* (Monthly review Press, New York)
- Breen, R. (1984) 'Fitting non-hierarchical and association log-linear models using Glim' *Sociological methods & research* 13:1:77-107
- Britten, N., Heath, A. (1983) 'Women, men and social class' in E. Gamarnikow, D. Morgan, J. Purvis, D. Taylorson eds. (1983) *Gender, class and work* (Heinemann, London)
- Cobalti, A. (1988) 'Mobili e diseguali' *Polis* 2:1:april:53-82
- Crompton, R., Mann, M. (1986) *Gender and stratification* (Basil Blackwood, Oxford)
- Dahrendorf, R. (1959) *Class and class conflict in industrial society*, Stanford U.P. Stanford
- de Jong, P.Y., Brawer, M.J., Robin, S.S. (1971) 'Patterns of female intergenerational occupational mobility: a comparison with male patterns' *American Sociological Review* 36:1:103-141
- de Lillo, A. (1988) 'La mobilità sociale assoluta' *Polis* 2:1 aprile 19-52
- de Lillo, A., Schizzerotto, A. (1985) *La valutazione sociale delle occupazioni* (Il

- Mulino, Bologna)
- Dobson, A.J. (1983) *An introduction to statistical modelling* (Chapman Hall, London)
- Erikson R. (1976) 'Pattern of social mobility' in R. Scase ed. *Readings in the Swedish class structure* (Pergamon Press, Stockholm)
- Erikson, R. (1984) 'Social class of men, women and families' *Sociology* 18:4:500-514
- Erikson, R. , Pontinen, S. (1984) 'Social mobility in Finland and Sweden: a comparison of men and women' in Alapuro L. et.al. eds. (1984) *Small states in comparative perspective* (Norwegian University Press, Oslo)
- Featherman, D.L., Hauser, R.M. (1978) *Opportunity and change* (Academic Press, New York)
- Glass, D.V. (1954) *Social mobility in Britain* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London)
- Glenn, N.D., Ross, A.D., Tully, J.C. (1974) 'The pattern of intergenerational mobility of females through marriage' *American Sociological Review* 39:683-699
- Goldthorpe, J.H. (1980) *Social mobility and class structure in modern Britain* (Oxford U.P , Oxford-London)
- Goldthorpe, J.H. (1983) 'Women and class analysis, in defence of the conventional view' *Sociology* 17:4:465-485
- Goldthorpe, J.H. (1984) 'A reply to the replies' *Sociology* 18:4:491-499
- Goldthorpe, J.H. , Payne, C. (1986) 'On the class mobility of women: results from different approaches to the analyses of recent British data' *Sociology* 20:4:531-555
- Green, M. (1989) 'Generalizations of the Goodman association model for the analysis of multi-dimensional contingency tables' in A. Decarli, B.J. Francis, R. Gilchrist, G.U.H. Seber (1989 eds.) *Statistical modelling* (Springer Verlag, Heidelberg) p. 165-171
- Heath, A. (1981) *Social mobility* (Fontana Collins, London)
- Heath, A., Britten, N. (1984) 'Women's jobs do make a difference: a reply to Goldthorpe' *Sociology* 18:4:475-490
- Hout, M. (1982) 'The association between husbands' and wives' occupations in two-earner families' *American Journal of Sociology* 2:397-409
- Johnson, R.A. *Religious assortative marriages in the United States* (Academic Press, New York)
- Johnson, T.R. , Pencavel, J.H. (1984) 'Dynamic hours of work, functions for

- husbands, wives and single females' *Econometrica* 52:2:363-389
- Lipset, S.M. , Bendix, R. (1959) *Social mobility in industrial society* (University of California Press, Berkeley)
- Lockwood, D. (1958) *The blackcoated worker* (Allen & Unwin, London)
- Lopreato, J. , Hazelrigg, L.E. (1972) *Class, conflict and mobility* (Chandler, San Francisco)
- Murphy, R. (1986) 'The concept of class in closure theory' *Sociology* 20:2:247-264
- Peach, C. (1974) 'Homogamy, propinquity and segregation: a re-evaluation' *American Sociological Review* 39:oct: 638-645
- Parkin, F. (1979) *Marxism and class theory* (Columbia University Press, New York)
- Payne, C., Payne, J. Chapman, T. (1983) 'Trends in female social mobility' in C. Gamarnikov, D. Morgan, J. Purvis, D. Taylorson (eds.) *Gender, class and work* (Heinemann, London)
- Pontinen, S. (1983) *Social mobility and social structure* (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Helsinki)
- Portocarero, L. (1983 a) 'Social mobility in industrial nations, women in France and Sweden' *Sociological Review* 31: :56-82.
- Portocarero, L. (1983 b) 'Social fluidity in France and Sweden' *Acta Sociologica* 26:2:127-139
- Portocarero, L. (1985) 'Social mobility in France and Sweden; women marriage and work' *Acta Sociologica* 28:3:151-170
- Schadee, H.M.A. , Schizzerotto, A. (1987) 'The collective perception of occupational inequalities in contemporary Italy: multidimensional evaluations and one-dimensional scales' *European Sociological Review* 3:2:september:127-144
- Schadee, H.M.A. (1988) 'The use of the E-M algorithm to deal with sampling zeroes in log-linear tables' Paper, Dubrovnik , methodology congress
- Schizzerotto, A. (1988 a) 'Il ruolo dell'istruzione nei processi di mobilita'' *Polis* 2:1:april:83-123
- Schizzerotto, A. (1988 b) 'Il concetto di classe sociale' in A. Schizzerotto (ed) *Classi sociale e societa' contemporanea* (Franco Angeli, Milano)
- Sixma, H. , Ultee, W.C. (1984) *Marriage patterns and the openness of society; educational heterogamy in the Netherlands in 1959,1971 and 1977* in Bakker, B.F.M. , Dronkers, J. , Ganzeboom, H. (eds) (1984) *Social stratification and mobility in the Netherlands* (? , Amsterdam)
- Stanworth, M. (1984) 'Women and class analysis: a reply to John

Goldthorpe' Sociology 18:2:159-169

- Stanworth, M. (1985) *Gender and Class* (Polity Press, Cambridge)
- Thélot, C. (1982) *Tèl pere tèl fils ?* (Dunod, Paris)
- Treiman, D.J., Terrel, K. (1975) 'Sex and the process of status attainment, a comparison of working women and men' *American Sociological Review* 40:174-220
- Tyree, A., Treas, J. (1974) 'The occupational and marital mobility of women' *American Sociological Review* 39::293-302
- Ultee, W.C., Luijkx R. (1989) 'Educational heterogamy and intergenerational mobility in 23 industrial nations' Tilburg university, Faculteit Sociale wetenschappen, working papers no. 26
- Venneman, R. (1977) 'The occupational composition of American classes: results from cluster analysis' *American Journal of Sociology* 82:4:783-807
- Weber, M. (1922) *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (Mohr, Tubingen)
- Westergaard, J., Resler, H. (1976) *Class in a capitalist society* (Penguin, Harmondsworth)
- Wright, E.O. (1978) *Class, crisis and the state* (New Left Books, London)
- Wright, E.O., Perrone, L. (1977) 'Marxist class categories and income insecurity' *American Sociological Review* 42:1:32-55