Robert M. Hauser and David L. Featherman, University of Wisconsin-Madison

In the past decade there has likely been as much concern among social analysts about trends toward "rigidification" in American society as in earlier periods. The first definitive measurements of trends in social mobility were taken in 1962 in the Current Population Survey (CPS) supplement, "Occupational Changes in a Generation" (OCG) [1] in a survey of 20,700 males aged 20-64. Despite earlier pessimism about rates and volume of mobility, the OCG data indicated substantial upward occupational mobility between generations, especially for younger cohorts [1] [3]. Furthermore, age-constant intercohort comparisons uncovered no appreciable changes in the regime connecting the occupations of fathers and sons [5].

Definitive estimates of trends since 1962 await a replication of the OCG survey in 1973 [6], but indirect evidence for changes in the pattern and volume of occupational mobility is presented here through an adaptation of a procedure used by Duncan [3] in analyzing trends between 1940 and 1962. Let $P = (p_{1,1})$ be the transition matrix of an intergenerational occupational mobility table. Its elements represent the probability of a son's movement from the ith category of father's occupation to a current occupation in the jth cate-gory, and $\sum_{j=1}^{p} = 1.0$. Let A = (a_i) be the origin vector of the mobility table, a row vector which gives the proportion of men who originate in the ith occupation class, $\sum_{i=1}^{2} = 1.0$, and let C = (c_j) be the vector which gives the proportionate distribution of men over destination categories, $\Sigma_{c.} = 1.0$. Thus, we have the identity, C = AP. Likewise, we may also write C = BQ, where C is defined as before, while B is the vector of occupations of men in their first full-time jobs, and Q represents the matrix of transition probabilities from first to current jobs.

Functional notation identifies the vectors and matrices of men in a given cohort observed in a particular year. Thus, C(r,s) is the occupation distribution of men in the r^{th} cohort in the s^{th} year, and so on. For a selected cohort and year, then, the transition from fathers' to current occupation distributions takes the form C(r,s) =A(r,s) P(r,s). From the OCG survey we have estimates of C, A, P, B, and Q for cohorts within ages 20-64 in 1962. In order to make inferences about changes over time in P and Q we make the following assumptions: that within the prime working ages cohorts of U.S. males are closed with respect to mortality, net migration and movement into and out of the experienced civilian labor force and that the quality of data on current occupation, father's occupation, and first job does not vary with age or time. These assumptions have two pertinent consequences. First, for men born in year r, A(r,s+t) = A(r,s) and B(r,s+t) = B(r,s), where t may be greater or less than zero. This says that we may use the 1962 survey to estimate the origin vectors (fathers' occupations or first jobs) observed in any year for cohorts covered in the 1962 survey. Second, the assumptions imply that it is legitimate to compare observed destination distributions across years. Thus, we can

make the age-constant intercohort comparison, C(r,s) with C(r+t,s+t), or the intracohort comparison C(r,s) with C(r,s+t). Obviously, our assumptions are not perfectly met, either as to population coverage or response quality, and our inferences are subject to substantial risks of measurement error.

Granting our assumptions, it becomes possible to make inferences about interconort change in a mobility matrix. Consider the null hypothesis P(r,1962) = P(r+t,1962+t), where we have observed only P(r,1962). This says that the mobility matrix for men aged (1962-r) is unchanged t years later (or earlier). Under the null hypothesis we may write

$$C(r+t,1962+t) = A(r+t,1962+t) P(r+t,1962+t)$$

= A(r+t, 1962+t) P(r, 1962),

which we can estimate by

 $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{r+t},1962+t)} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r+t},1962) \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r},1962),$

since A(r+t,1962+t) = A(r+t,1962) by assumption. We denote our estimate of the expected distribution here by $p^{\hat{C}}(r,s)$ in order to differentiate it from $Q^{\hat{C}}(r,s)$, the estimate based on the first job vector and the transition from first to current occupation. For example, we can estimate the 1972 occupation distribution (at age 35-44) of men born in 1927-36 (aged 25-34 in 1962) by applying the 1962 intergeneration transition matrix of men born in 1917-26 (aged 35-44 in 1962) to the origin vector of the younger cohort. The same logic applies to hypotheses about intercohort change in the intragenerational mobility matrix.

Comparisons among expected and observed distribution for recent years permit us to make limited inferences about change in mobility matrices in the past decade. While identity of destination vectors does not imply identity of transition matrices, differences between destination vectors clearly imply rejection of the null hypothesis (subject to the possibility that internal changes in the matrix are due solely to changes in the marginals and not at all to changes in interactions between rows and columns of the matrix).

It is possible to partition the net intercohort differences in occupation distributions for men of the same age into components attributable to intercohort changes in occupational origins, in the transition from father's occupation to first job, and in the transition from first job to current occupation. The necessary identity is

$$C(\mathbf{r+t},\mathbf{s+t}) - C(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{s}) = [C(\mathbf{r+t},\mathbf{s+t}) - Q^{\widehat{C}}(\mathbf{r+t},\mathbf{s+t})] + [Q^{\widehat{C}}(\mathbf{r+t},\mathbf{s+t}) - Q^{\widehat{C}}(\mathbf{r+t},\mathbf{s+t})] + [Q^{\widehat{C}}(\mathbf{r+t},\mathbf{s+t}) - C(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{s})].$$

The two terms in the first bracket on the right differ only because of intercohort differences in the transition matrix from first job to current occupation. This is, C(r+t,s+t) = B(r+t,s+t) Q(r+t,s+t), while

 $Q^{\hat{C}(r+t,s+t)} = B(r+t,s) Q(r,s).$

Thus, since B(r+t,s) = B(r+t,s+t) by assumption, the difference between C(r+t,s+t) and $Q^{\hat{C}}(r+t,s+t)$ is the effect of intercohort change in the transition from first job to current occupation on the net intercohort difference. To interpret the difference in the second bracket, denote the transition matrix from father's occu-

pation to first job as M(r,s). Then

P(r,s) = M(r,s) Q(r,s),

^{so} $p^{\hat{C}}(r+t,s+t) = A(r+t,s) M(r,s) Q(r,s).$ Also, $Q^{\hat{C}}(r+t,s+t) = A(r+t,s) M(r+t,s+t) Q(r,s)$

since

B(r+t,s) = A(r+t,s) M(r+t,s+t)

by assumption. Thus, $\hat{p}C(r+t,s+t)$ and $\hat{C}(r+t,s+t)$

differ only because of intercohort change in the transition from father's occupation to first job, and their difference represents the effect of that change on the net intercohort difference. Finally, the difference between the terms in the third bracket is the effect on the net intercohort difference of the intercohort shift in the distribution of sons by their fathers' occupations. Thus, C(r,s) = A(r,s) P(r,s), while $p\hat{C}(r+t,s+t) = A(r+t,s) P(r,s)$, which differs from the first expression only by virtue of changes between cohorts in the vector of occupational origins.

Because the CPS began using 1970 Census occupational coding materials in January 1971 [2]. observed occupation distributions after that date are not strictly comparable with our expected distributions. Furthermore, had we been limited to tabulations by standard 10-year age-breaks, our efforts would have been stymied by the incompatibility of 1962 and 1972 occupation classifications. Since we have access to unit record tapes of the OCG survey, we have proceeded to make trend comparisons over a shorter period by varying the age-breaks in our origin vectors. Specifically, we have applied the transition matrices for those aged 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 in 1962 to the origin vectors of those aged 27-36, 37-46, and 47-56 in March 1962 in order to generate expected distributions for men aged 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 in March 1970. We obtained observed distributions in 1970 from the March 1970 Current

Table	1	Percentage	distrib	ution by	occupation	and no	et change	2, 1962-3	1970,	by age	3:
		U.S. men in	n the ex	perience	d civilian	labor :	force, Ma	arch 1962	2 and	March	1970

Occupation				45-54		55-64			
•	1962	1970	Change	1962	1970	Change	1962	1970	Change
Professional, technical, and kindred workers									
Self-employed	1.91	1.85	-0.06	1.51	1.59	0.08	1.71	1.55	-0.16
Salaried	10.89	14.45	3.56	7.66	10.38	2.72	7.37	8.77	1.40
Manager, officials and proprietors, exc. farm									
Salaried	9.59	13.50	3.91	8.36	13.56	5.20	9.60	11.70	2.10
Self-employed	7.62	4.15	-3.47	9.94	5.42	-4.52	10.05	5.51	-4.54
Sales workers	5.14	4.93	-0.21	5.00	4.87	-0.13	3.99	5.63	1.64
Clerical and kindred workers	6.47	6.06	-0.41	6.66	6.78	0.12	5.92	6.47	0.55
Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	21.16	22.77	1.61	22.56	23.45	0.89	19.51	22.53	3.02
Operatives and kindred workers	19.10	18.93	-0.17	17.68	18.84	1.16	16.10	16.82	0.72
Service workers, including private household	4.86	4.69	-0.17	6.28	5.16	-1.12	7.91	7.57	-0.34
Laborers, except farm and mine	6.96	5.25	-1.71	6.53	5.24	-1.29	6.51	5.80	-0.71
Farmers and farm managers	4.92	2.46	-2.46	6.41	3.85	-2.56	9.22	6.05	-3.17
Farm laborers and foremen	1.39	0.96	-0.43	1.41	0.87	-0.54	2.11	1.60	-0.51
Total	100.00	0 100.0	0	100.0	0 100.00)	· 100.00	100.00)
Number (1,000)	11,085	10,513		9,594	10,423		6,563	7,151	

Source: March 1962 OCG survey and March 1970 Current Population Survey (person tapes).

Population Survey person tape. In passing we should note that with freedom to vary age-breaks in both the OCG and CPS tabulations it is possible to make annual trend measurements at any desired ages.

NET INTERCOHORT SHIFTS, 1962-1970

The occupation distributions of men aged 35-44, 45-65, and 55-64 in 1962 and 1970 are compared in Table 1. The net intercohort shifts from 1962 to 1970 may be summarized as a fairly smooth continuation of the trends of earlier decades [4]. There were substantial intercohort shifts toward employment as salaried professionals and managers and smaller shifts toward employment as craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers. The former were largest at the two younger ages and the latter at the oldest age. Within the professional category there was no net shift toward self-employment; all of the net change was attributable to increases in salaried professionals. The growth among salaried managers was almost pertectly offset at each age by a substantial decline in the proportion of proprietors. (Our conclusions about shifts within the managers, officials, and proprietors category are unaffected by a 1967 procedural change in the CPS which improved the quality of self-employment reports. We estimate this change of procedure could account for a maximum shift of one percent of the male total from self-employed to salaried status.) A similar, but weaker pattern can be ascertained in net inter- and intragenerational shifts from 1952 to 1962 at younger ages in Duncan's 1965 paper on mobility trends (Table 4, p. 497). Only the decline in the proportion of farmers rivals that among self-employed managers, but the decline in the proportion of nonfarm laborers is also fairly large. The remaining categories show small downward shifts in their share of the occupation distribution.

While the March 1970 CPS estimated there were 7,151 thousand men aged 55-64 in the experienced civilian labor force, the number of men 45-54 in March 1962 estimated from the OCG survey was 9,104 thousand. The net loss of nearly 22 percent of the cohort, presumably due primarily to retirement and mortality, presents a serious threat to our assumption of closure. Thus, our findings for men aged 55-64 should be interpreted with great caution. In the sequel to this paper we expect to remedy this defect by changing our referent population and adding a category of "no occupation" to the destination distribution. In the two younger cohorts there is no prima facie evidence of severe violation of our closure assumption; the 1962 and 1970 estimated population totals differ by only 2.8 and 5.0 percent, respectively, for those aged 25-34 and 35-44 in 1962.

The components of intercohort change in the occupation distribution between 1962 and 1970 are shown in Table 2. The most striking feature of the table is the ract that virtually all of the net intercohort shifts in the occupation distribution are attributable to changes in the matrix of transitions from first jobs to current occupations. In no occupation group at any age is the effect of change in occupational origins or in the transition from origin to first job as large as one percentage point. Moreover, there are relatively few instances in which all three components are consistent as to sign.

With but one exception intercohort shifts in occupational origins at each age increase the chances that a man will become a professional, salaried manager, salesman or clerical worker, and they decrease the chances of his becoming a laborer or farmer. Shifting occupational origins have virtually no impact on the likelihood that a man will become a proprietor or a service worker. Since the occupation categories are listed in an order which approximates the socioeconomic ranking of major occupation groups from top to bottom, it is fair to conclude that the overall effect of intercohort shifts in occupational origins is to produce a slight upgrading of the occupation structure.

The transition from occupation origins to first jobs takes place over an interval in the life cycle which is roughly invariant with respect to calendar time. Thus, comparisons across ages of intercohort shifts due to changes in that transition matrix represent intertemporal change. At ages 35-44 changes in the origin-first job transition matrix place more men in professional and salaried managerial jobs and fewer as salesmen, clerical workers, craftsmen or operatives, while there are virtually no effects on the proportions of proprietors, service workers, laborers, or farmers. At ages 45-54 changes in the same transition matrix place more men as salaried professionals, proprietors, and craftsmen, and fewer are placed as salaried managers, salesmen, clerical workers, operatives, and farmers, while the remaining groups are virtually unaffected. At age 55-64 shifts in the origin-first job transition matrix lead to the placement of more men as proprietors, craftsmen and operatives and fewer as salaried professionals, salesmen, clerical workers, and farmers. In light of these observations and the modest size of the observed shifts we conclude that there are no consistent trends in the influence on the occupational structure of change in the transition matrices from occupational origins to first jobs.

Following the pattern of earlier decades [3], net intercohort shifts in the occupation distribution are largely attributable to changes in the transition matrix from first full-time jobs to current occupations. The components due to shifts in this transition matrix are similar across the age groups, and, of course, they are much like the net intercohort shifts described above. There are substantial positive shifts toward employment as salaried professionals and managers and as craftsmen, and there is a smaller positive shift into the operative category. There is a large shift away from proprietorship, and there are small, but consistent shifts out of the four lowest categories: service workers, farm and nonfarm laborers, and farmers. Finally, shifts involving self-employed professionals, salesmen, and clerical workers are generally small and form no consistent pattern across the age groups.

Overall, the components of intercohort change in the occupation distribution due to changes in the tirst job-current occupation transition matrix can be said to have increased opportunities for upward mobility. The seeming exception to this generalization, net movement out of the category of self-employed managers, may not be as much a contradition as it appears. Proprietors are typically small businessmen, not the heads of large firms or corporations, and they have less

Table 2.-- Components of intercohort change in occupation distributions due to social origins and transitions from father's occupation to first occupation and from first occupation to current occupation: U.S. men in the experienced civilian labor force, March 1962 and March 1970

	35-44				45-54		55-64			
Occupation	Origine	Father's Occ to First Job	First Job to Current Job	Origins	Father's Occ to First Job	First Job to Current Job	Origins	Father's Occ to First Job	First Job to Current Job	
Professional, technical, and kindred workers										
Self-employed	0.13	0.36	-0.55	0.02	-0.05	0.11	-0.02	-0.05	-0.09	
Salaried	0.75	0.56	2.25	0.29	0.46	1.97	0.16	-0.32	1.56	
Manager, officials and proprietors, exc. farm										
Salaried	0.27	0.17	3.47	0.18	-0.16	5.18	0.19	-0.09	2.00	
Self-employed	0.01	0.01	-3.49	0.00	0.41	-4.93	0.10	0.28	-4.92	
Sales workers	0.21	-0.21	-0.21	0.08	-0.13	-0.08	0.17	-0.15	1.62	
Clerical and kindred workers	0.21	-0.30	-0.32	0.12	-0.23	0.23	0.10	-0.23	0.68	
Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	-0.03	-0.35	1.99	-0.01	0.39	0.50	0.21	0.29	2.52	
Operatives and kindred workers	-0.30	-0.28	0.41	-0.04	-0.14	1.33	0.20	0.19	0.33	
Service workers, including private household	0.00	0.03	-0.20	0.07	-0.05	-1.14	0.05	0.11	-0.50	
Laborers, except farm and mine	-0.28	0.07	-1.50	-0.06	-0.11	-1.12	-0.11	0.11	-0.71	
Farmers and farm managers	-0.82	0.03	-1.67	-0.58	-0.27	-1.71	-0.87	-0.18	-2.12	
Farm laborers and foremen	-0.17	-0.08	-0.18	-0.08	-0.11	-0.35	-0.18	0.04	-0.37	

Source: March 1962 OCG survey and March 1970 Current Population Survey (person tapes).

Component of	Age							
intercohort change	35-44	45-54	55-64					
Occupational origin	1.59	0.76	1.18					
Transition from father's occupation to first job	1.22	1.26	1.02					
Transition from first job to current occupation	8.12	9.32	8.71					
Total intercohort change 1962-1970	9.08	10.16	9.43					

Table 3.-- Indexes of dissimilarity representing components of intercohort change in occupation distributions at selected ages: U.S. men in the experienced civilian labor force, March 1962 and March 1970

Source: Tables 1 and 2

education and lower incomes than do salaried managers. The overall pattern of shifts due to change in the intracohort mobility matrices might be described as an upgrading of the occupational structure within both the manual and nonmanual sectors, accompanied by a smaller shift from manual to nonmanual occupations.

By 1970 the groups at the bottom of the occupation hierarchy from which there was net out movement during 1962-1970 contained 13.4, 15.1, and 21.0 percent of the experienced civilian labor force at ages 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64, respectively, compared to 18.1, 20.6, and 25.8 percent in 1962. By 1970 farm occupations included only 3.4 percent, 4.7 percent and 7.6 percent of the labor force at those ages. Thus, the possibilities for continued upward mobility are limited unless there appear new patterns of movement out of occupations in the middle of the hierarchy.

The differences between occupation distributions we have compared to form components of intercohort change are summarized using indexes of dissimilarity in Table 3. The index of dissimilarity is equal to the sum of positive percentage point differences between two distributions. It represents the percentage of cases in one distribution which would have to be shifted to a different category in order to make it identical to a second distribution. The relative sizes of the indexes on the first three lines in each row confirm our earlier observation that changes in occupational opportunities between cohorts are due primarily to changes in the transition matrix from first jobs to current occupations. The indexes for that transition are nearly as large as the indexes for the total intercohort comparisons. shown on the fourth line of Table 3. Further, the indexes of total intercohort change are almost as large as the sums of indexes over the component changes, which implies there is relatively little unnecessary net movement in the shifts between cohorts.

In Table 4 we present out estimates of components of intercohort occupational shifts during 1962-1970 due to changes in intergenerational and intragenerational mobility matrices along side Duncan's [3] estimates for men aged 35-44 and 45-54 in earlier periods. Note that the intergenerational effects shown here include the effects of changes in both the occupational origin-first job and first job-current occupation transition matrices. Unfortunately, we are unable to separate self-employed from salaried professionals prior to 1952.

The indexes of dissimilarity, shown at the base of each column, suggest that net changes in the mobility matrices had a larger effect on the occupational distribution during 1942-1952 than in 1952-1962 or 1962-1970. Because the professional and managerial categories are collapsed we have obviously under-estimated the decline in net occupational redistribution from 1942-1952 to the present, but the decline, if real, is surely not monotonic; shifts in the occupation distribution due to changing mobility patterns are clearly larger during 1962-1970 than in 1952-1962 both at ages 35-44 and 45-54.

At age 35-44 changing mobility matrices produced more movement into professional employment during 1952-1962 than in either 1942-1952 or 1962-1970. At age 45-54 there was no clear pattern of change between 1952-1962 and 1962-1970. There has been a clear shift away from the category of managers, officials and proprietors in the past three decades. At age 35-44 there was a net shift of 3.4 percent due to changes in intragenerational mobility during 1942-1952, but no net shift during 1962-1970. The apparent explanation is a continuing net movement into the ranks of salaried managers, compensated by net movement away from proprietorship, where both sorts of changes occurred more rapidly during 1962-1970 than in the preceding decade. There have been essentially no net movements into or out of sales or clerical occupations during the period covered by Table 4.

		Inte	rgenerati	on mobil	1ty	Intrageneration mobility					
Occupation		35-44		45-54		35-44			45-54		
	1952 -1942	1962 -1952	1970 -1962	1962 -1952	1970 -1962	1952 -1942	1962 -1952	1970 -1962	1962 -1952	1970 -1962	
Professional, technical, and kindred workers											
Self-employed		0.3	-0.2	-0.1	0.1		0.3	-0.6	0.0	0.1	
Salaried	0.9	3.5	2.8	1.5	2.4	1.7	2.8	2.2	1.9	2.0	
Manager, officials and proprietors, ex. farm											
Salaried	3.1	2.4	3.6	0.7	5.0	3 4	2.4	3.5	0.9	5.2	
Self-employed	512	0.0	-3.5	1.0	-4.5	3.4	-0.4	-3.5	0.5	-4.9	
Sales workers	-1.5	0.1	-0.4	0.3	-0.2	-1.3	0.3	-0.2	0.3	-0.1	
Clerical and kindred workers	0.2	0.4	-0.6	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.7	-0.3	0.9	0.2	
Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	3.7	-0.8	1.6	0.1	0.9	3.3	-1.0	2.0	0.2	0.5	
Operatives and kindred workers	3.3	-2.0	0.1	0.0	1.2	2.7	-1.8	0.4	-0.4	1.3	
Service workers, including private household	-1.1	-0.3	-0.2	-0.3	-1.2	-1.4	-0.3	-0.2	-0.2	-1.1	
Laborers, except farm and mine	-3.1	-0.5	-1.4	-1.0	-1.2	-3.3	-0.4	-1.5	-1.1	-1.1	
Farmers and farm managers	-3.5	-2.6	-1.6	-2.3	-2.0	-3.5	-2.3	-1.7	-2.5	-1.7	
Farm laborers and foremen	-2.0	-0.5	-0.3	-0.5	-0.5	-2.1	-0.3	-0.2	-0.5	-0.4	
Index of dissimilarity	(11.2)	(6.7)	(8.2)	(4.2)	(9.6)	(11.6)	(6.5)	(8.1)	(4.7)	(9.3)	

Table 4.-- Differences, in percentage points, between occupation distributions for men of specified ages produced by 1962 intergeneration and intrageneration mobility matrices and by matrices for earlier and later years

Source: March 1962 OCG survey and March 1970 Current Population Survey (person tapes) and O. D. Duncan, "The Trend of Occupational Mobility in the United States," American Sociological Review 30 (August, 1965): Table 4, p. 497.

At age 35-44 there was substantial net movement into the ranks of craftsmen and operatives in 1942-1952, and there were small net shifts away from and into those categories in 1952-1962 and 1962-1970 respectively. At age 45-54 there were essentially no shifts in the craft and operative categories due to changing mobility regimes between 1952 and 1962.

There is a consistent pattern of net movement out of the four lowest manual occupation categories. The net shift away from the two farm categories appears to have declined continuously (along with the relative numbers in those categories) over the three decades. Shifts away from services and nonfarm labor were smaller in 1952-1962 than in the preceding decade, but the net movement may have increased again from 1962 to 1970.

In our view the major research issue posed by our findings is the structure of change in intragenerational mobility matrices. Our further explorations in this area will begin with an effort to adjust that matrix to take account of intercohort shifts in educational attainment. In addition we shall apply procedures like those used here to examine changing mobility patterns among black men.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. GI-31604X) and by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin, Madison. The authors wish to thank Otis Dudley Duncan for suggesting that we, rather than he write this paper and John M. Bregger for supplying unpublished tabulations of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. Computations were carried out using facilities of the Center for Demography and Ecology by Peter J. Dickinson with the assistance of Hernando Gomez-Buendia and James R. Kluegel.

REFERENCES

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

[2] Bregger, John E., "Revisions in Occupational Classifications for 1971" Employment and Earnings (February):5-8. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1971.

[3] Duncan, Otis Dudley, "The Trend of Occupational Mobility in the United States," American Sociological Review 30 (August):491-498. 1965.

[4] _____, "Occupation Trends and Patterns of Net Mobility in the United States," Demography 3:1-18. 1966.

[5] _____, "Patterns of Occupational Mobility among Negro Men," Demography 5: 11-22. 1968.

[6] Featherman, David L. and Robert M. Hauser, "Design for a Replicated Study of Social Mobility in the United States," Working Paper 72-6, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison. 1972.