An Analysis of Missing Data in the Study
of Intergenerational Mobility

Tom W. Smith

NORC
University of Chicago

December, 1989

GSS Methodological Report No. 67

Intergenerational occupational mobility has been one of the key social processes studied by social scientists. It has been the chief indicator in examinations of the attainment process and one of the main standards for assessing the openness of society.

Intergenerational occupational mobility is not an easy process to measure. It necessitates the accurate collection of parental (usually paternal) and child's occupation, the reliable classification of occupations into either a categorical hierarchy or into prestige or socio-economic status dimensions, and the appropriate analysis of the resulting matrix to take into account such factors as structural mobility, changes in the gender composition of the parental and child's work force, and shifts in age structure.

Among the many methodological difficulties associated with intergenerational occupational mobility one that has been largely ignored in recent years has been item non-response[1]. This paper studies the problem of missing data on the measurement of intergenerational occupation mobility, assessing 1) its magnitude and source, 2) item non-response bias, and 3) its impact on measurement of the attainment process.

Overall information on occupational mobility is missing for 20.2% of the respondents on the 1972-1988 General Social Surveys (GSS)[2] (Table 1). The main source of missing data is lack of parental information (12.9%). Most of the omission results from the respondent not living with a father or father substitute when they were age 16. A small amount results from inadequate knowledge of father's occupation. Second, missing data come from respondents who are not employed and who have never been in the labor force for as long as a year (6.4%). In addition, a few respondents are missing both their father's and their own occupational data (1.5%).[3]

---

[1]   A good deal of attention was devoted to this issue by Blau and Duncan (1967), but latter studies (Hauser and Featherman, 1977; Featherman and Hauser, 1978; and Grusky and DiPrete, 1987 have paid little attention to the issue.

[2]   The GSS are national cross-sectional samples of the adult household population of the United States conducted from 1972 through 1988 with the exceptions of 1979 and 1981. The data are collected for the National Data Program for the Social Sciences by the National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago. Full details are available in Davis and Smith, 1989.

[3]   Missing data also is related to survey year. The amount of missing data falls about three percentage points from the early 1970 to the late 1980s. Most of this decline is related to the increased labor force participation of women over time. The decline does not appear to be

1

Within the narrow confine of examining intergenerational transmittance of position in the labor force almost all of the item non-response from respondents not in the labor force could be considered as legitimately not applicable (as could a very small portion of the paternal non-response that resulted from fathers who were not in the labor force). However, within the broader study of intergenerational attainment or of social mobility, the exclusion of children (or fathers) who are not in the labor force is inappropriate and thus represents item non-response.

The problem is less among men and marginally better among men 25-64, the group on which intergenerational occupational mobility studies have traditionally focused (Blau and Duncan, 1967). Only 15% of all men and 13.5% of men 25-64 are missing (Table 1). This is due to the lower labor force participation of women.

Of course, if item non-response were only a random phenomenon, it would only reduce sample size and not introduce any bias into the measurement of intergenerational mobility. As is typically the case in studying non-response, one can not easily or directly measure such bias because information on the variable is missing. However, non-response on occupation mobility is not a random occurrence and is related to many other variables.

Table 2 summaries these relationships while Table 3 provides greater detail. The variables in Tables 2 and 3 are organized into four groups 1) Parental and Upbringing variables which mostly include socio-demographic variables roughly conterminous with father's occupation, 2) Current Attributes which includes respondent demographics and especially SES variables, 3) Attitudes which includes respondent's position on the work ethic, job values, government equalization policies, and other items that might be related to the attainment process, and 4) Other Variables which include a subjective measure of occupational mobility and an evaluation of recent changes in financial status.

Overall item non-response is related to virtually all of the parental, current, and other variables and to many of the attitudes. While the large number of cases involved (up to 22,649) makes it possible for unimpressive differences to achieve statistical significance, most of the associations reported in Tables 2 and 3 are substantively meaningful and non-trivial.

The main relationships may be summarized as follows. First, non-response is of course highest among respondents from female-headed households. In households headed by mothers or other females data are missing in over 99% of the cases. Similar differences appear on the paternal death variable.

Second, non-response is greater among those not in the labor force. While 13.3% of those employed full time have missing data it rises to 36.6% among those keeping house and 53.3% among

---

related to the shift from probability sampling with quotas to full probability sampling. By pooling across years we have averaged over this period and ignored this interaction with time.

students. Non-response is also higher among women and certain age groups.

Third, non-response is higher for lower SES groups. For respondents, non-response rises as SES falls. For example, it is 29.9% for respondents with less than a high school degree, 18.4% for high school graduates, and 9.5% for holders of post-college degrees. For the parental variables non-response is also highest among the lowest SES, but a curvilinear association emerges with non-response lowest in the middle and again rising among as SES rises. For example, data are missing in 38.5% of the parental homes rated as having far below average income, in 16.2% of those with average income and 22.1% of those far above average. Not too much should be made of the curvilinear SES relationship since it manly occurs only among the very small groups that had far above average income and a mother with a graduate level degree. It results because there is more family disruption among these groups than those with average income and educational backgrounds.

Fourth, non-response is related to immigration status. Those living outside the country at age 16 or who are first or second generation immigrants are more likely to have missing data on occupational mobility. This appears related to the disruption of family knowledge and contact across generations (Smith, 1980; 1983).

Finally, non-response is higher among those with collectivist attainment orientations (e.g. favoring government equalization policies and believing individual opportunity is limited) and pessimistic about their situation and the future in general. For example, data are missing for 24.3% of those favoring maximum government efforts to equalize wealth and 16.0% of those most opposed to these measures. Similarly, data are missing for 22.0% of those agreeing that things are getting worse and for 17.9% of those not pessimistic about the future. These associations result from the greater support for such policies and viewpoints among those with lower SES. With multivariate controls for SES, these variables (unlike the first four factors discussed above) were not significantly related to missing data on occupational mobility.

These non-response differences are sometimes primarily related to data being missing on father's occupation, sometimes mostly to respondent's occupation, and sometimes to a combination of the two. For example, non-response differences on racial and parental income are due mostly to father's occupation, while age and gender differences are primarily related to respondent's occupation (Table 4).

Although non-response on occupational mobility is related to numerous variables, we do not know it is related to the measurement of mobility itself. Table 5 explores this question by testing whether the variables in Tables 2 and 3 that were related to non-response were also related occupational mobility. We took a difference score between father's and child's occupational prestige and correlated it with the variables analyzed above. Overall there are many small, but statistically significant, relationships with occupational mobility and a smaller number of fairly substantial

associations.

Of course these comparisons only establish the relationship between these variables and occupational mobility for those cases with no missing data on occupational mobility (and the other variables). We do not know the association between these variables and intergenerational mobility for those with missing information. In addition in a number of cases no relationship appears because of degenerative correlation. In particular since there is virtually no occupational mobility data for parental households headed by women, the association in Table 5 between family structure at age 16 and occupational mobility is uninformative.

The possible bias that missing data may have is further illustrated in Table 6. For these selected seven variables we see that 1) the variables are associated with occupational mobility, 2) the groups with more missing data are the same groups showing downward occupational mobility, and 3) the groups overrepresented among the downwardly mobile are even more concentrated among non-response groups. For example, 17.7% of the upwardly mobile have less than a high school degree, 30.3% of those with no net mobility had no degree, 35.3% of the downwardly mobile lacked a high school degree, and between 38.2% and 61.8% of those with missing data had no high school degree. In each of the cases, the pattern suggests that the missing cases resemble the downwardly mobile.

Table 7 checks for possible non-response bias on occupational mobility by comparing a subjective assessment of intergenerational mobility with the standard GSS measure based on a comparison of father's and child's occupational prestige.[4] For those missing on the standard measure, 54.8% had a subjective ratings. A comparison of the subjective mobility of those with and without standard occupational mobility data indicated no difference in mobility patterns. This comparison is limited however since 45% of those missing on the standard mobility measure were also missing on subjective mobility and by the small number of cases involved.

Table 8 compares the intergenerational associations of SES variables other than occupational prestige by whether information on occupational mobility was present or missing. The top part of the table compare respondent's subjective assessment of his/her parent's relative income with four measures of respondent's current SES – family income last year, relative financial status, subjective social class, and education. The bottom half of the table compares mother's education with the same four current SES

---

[4]   The item which was asked on the International Social Survey Program module in 1987 asked: "Please think of your present job (or the last one if you don't have one now). If you compare this job with the job your father had when you were 16, would you say that the level or status of your job is (or was)... Much higher than your father's, Higher, About equal, Lower, Much lower than your fathers, I never had a job, Did not have father/father never had job.

4

measures. While the pattern is mixed, overall there cases with missing data on occupational mobility are somewhat lower associations between generation than cases with complete data. For relative parental income the association is marginally higher in one case, marginally lower in another, and more notably lower for the other associations. For mother's education, the intergenerational association is marginally lower in three cases and marginally higher in one case. In both cases these measures of intergenerational stratification only indirectly indicate what the association between occupations might be. In addition, while there is less non-response on mother's education and the four current measures than for occupational mobility, there is still a notable amount of missing data (PUT IN NUMBERS). Only for relative parental income and current relative financial status, social class, and education are almost all cases accounted for (PUT IN NUMBERS).

In Table 9 we test for bias from missing data on father's occupation by imputing father's occupation for those cases with missing data based on a regression equation using race, birth cohort, relative parental income, community type at age 16, and (when available) mother's education. Both for all respondents and for men 25-64 the adding of imputed data does not change the correlation between father's and child's occupational prestige. For men 25-64 there is also no change in the net prestige between generation. For all respondents however is somewhat lower when the imputed data are added.

Conclusion

Since information on occupational mobility is missing for nearly 21% of all cases (and 13% of men 25-64), there is a potential for non-response bias to distort the association between parental and child's occupation. The fact that a number of variables associated with being missing on occupational mobility were also related to occupational mobility further supported the possibility that missing data might be distorting the measurement of occupational mobility.

Several tests of the possible bias showed mixed results. First, on net mobility the subjective intergenerational mobility measure and the imputing of father's occupational prestige showed little impact from the missing data. However, for all respondents (but not men 25-64), the tendency for the subjective measure and for imputed father's occupation was for less upward mobility for the missing cases. Second, the estimated impact on intergenerational correlations appears to probably be small. The non-occupational, intergenerational comparisons suggested that intergenerational associations might be weaker for the missing data, but the imputation of father's occupational prestige suggested no change in associations.

While the examined evidence does not point to serious distortion from missing occupational data, the magnitude of the item non-response makes it a matter of continuing concern. To reduce missing data about father's occupation the GSS should

5

consider coding the occupation of mothers/mother substitutes. Ideally this should be done for all cases, but it might at least be done for cases where a female was the head of household.[5] Second, for respondents who have never been in the labor force one might consider either the substitution spouse's occupation for respondent's occupation or the imputing of respondent's occupation from other variable. The utility and appropriateness of these as well as other possible procedures will depend on the purpose of the particular analyses.

---

[5] This procedure was used in Occupational Change in a Generation I and II (Blau and Duncan, 1967; Featherman and Hauser, 1978).

Table 1

Missing Data on Intergenerational
Occupational Mobility

(1972-1988)

	All	Men	Men 25-64
Both occupations	79.2%	85.0%	86.5%
No father's occ.	12.9	12.7	12.7
No child's occ.	6.4	1.9	0.6
Neither occ.	1.5	0.4	0.1
Total missing	20.8%	15.0%	13.5%
	(22649)	(10030)	(7114)

Table 2

Summary of Variables Related to Non-response on Father's and/or Respondent's Occupation

	Prob.	Group with Most Missing Data
A. Parental and Upbringing Variables		
Family structure age 16 (FAMILY16)	.0000	no father
Why family not intact (FAMDIF16)	.0016	-----
Father's death (PADEATH)	.0000	R a chld.
Region raised in (REG16)	.0000	south, for.
Community type lived in (RES16)	.0000	big city
Mother's education (MAEDUC, MADEG)	.0000	>hs,<college
Father's education (PAEDUC, PADEG)	.0052	----
Number of siblings (SIBS)	.0000	0 and 13+
Religion raised in (RELIG16)	.0000	no religion
Immigrant generation (BORN, PARBORN, GRANBORN)	.0000	first
Relative income (INCOM16)	.0000	low
Mother worked (MAWORK)	.0000	worked
B. Current Attributes		
Race (RACE)	.0000	black
Gender (SEX)	.0000	female
Age (AGE)	.0000	young,old
Education (EDUC, DEGREE)	.0000	>hs
Vocabulary test (WORDSUM)	.0000	low
Int. rating of understanding (COMPREND)	.0000	poor
Family income (INCOME, INCOME72, INCOME77, INCOME82, INCOME86)	.0000	low
Subjective social class (CLASS, CLASSY)	.0000	lower
Community type (SRCBELT)	.0000	big cities
Region (REGION)	.0000	south
Moved since age 16 (MOBILE16)	.0000	none, far
Religion (RELIG)	.0000	Prot., Oth.
Labor force status (WRKSTAT)	.0000	not worker
Unemployment history (UNEMP)	.0000	----
Govt. assistance history (GOVAID)	.0000	----
Dwelling tenure (DWELOWN)	.0000	rents
Health, self-rating (HEALTH)	.0000	poor
Subjective financial status (FINRELA)	.0000	low
C. Attitudes		
Work if rich (RICHWORK)	NS	
How people get ahead (GETAHEAD)	NS	
Meaningful job important (JOBMEANS)	.0000	low rank

```
Job advancement important (JOBPROMO)        .0104       ----
Things getting worse (ANOMIA5)              .0000       agree
Unfair to have children (ANOMIA6)           .0000       agree
Govt. help the poor (HELPPOOR)              .0000       pro-help
Govt. equalize wealth (EQWLTH)              .0000       pro-equality
Financial satisfaction (SATFIN)             .0000       not sat.
Opportunity due to fam. wealth (OPWLTH)     .0000       agrees
Opportunity due to parent's education
        (OPPARED)                             NS
Progressive taxation (TAXSHARE)               NS
Has chance for good life (GOODLIFE)           NS
Govt. equalize income (GOVEQINC)            .0072       strg. agree
```

D. Other Variables

```
Intergenerational occ. mob. (OCCMOBIL)      .0000       no job/fathr
Change in recent fin. status (FINALTER)     .0000       worse
Age hit, if ever (HIT, HITAGE)              .0000       as adult
Age threatened with gun, if ever
        (GUN, GUNAGE)                       .0000       as child
```

----=No difference between having occupational mobility data
     and not having data. Significant difference is between
     different patterns of missing data (e.g. father's occupa-
     tion, respondent's occupation, or both missing)

NS=not statistically significant at the .05 level

Table 3

Associates of Missing Data on
Intergenerational Occupational Mobility

                                                      % Missing

A. Parental and Upbringing Variables

    Family structure age 16   (22636)
        Mother/Father   8.4
        Father/stepmother   9.3
        Mother/stepfather   10.9
        Father   11.5
        Mother   100.0
        Male relative   13.2
        Female relative   99.3
        Male and female relative   20.1
        Other   57.8

    Why family not intact   (5047)
        Parent died   56.9
        Divorce/separation   59.3
        Armed forces   0.0
        Parent institutionalized   60.0
        Other   59.6

    Father's Death   (9526)
        No death reported   14.5
        Died before child 16   86.3
        Died since child 16   13.6

    Region raised in   (22649)
        Foreign   24.4
        New England   17.2
        Mid-Atlantic   18.5
        East No. Cent.   17.1
        West No. Cent.   17.5
        South Atlantic   23.9
        East So. Cent.   25.8
        West So. Cent.   24.5
        Mountain   19.9
        Pacific   22.6

    Community type lived in   (22604)
        Rural, not farm   21.6
        Farm   17.8
        Town less than 50,000   21.2
        Town 50,000-250,000   21.8
        Big city suburb   15.8
        City 250,000+   24.7

10

```
Mother's education                            (19931)
     Less than high school                     21.9
     High school                               16.8
     Jr. college                               12.3
     College                                   16.8
     Post college                              21.8

Father's education                            (17695)
     Less than high school                      9.1
     High school                                6.8
     Jr. college                                3.9
     College                                    8.0
     Post college                               8.2

Number of siblings                            (22591)
     0                                         26.7
     1                                         17.6
     2-4                                       19.2
     5-9                                       22.5
     10+                                       23.9

Religion raised in                            (20944)
     Protestant                                20.9
     Catholic                                  18.7
     Jewish                                    16.3
     None                                      27.4
     Other                                     19.9

Immigrant generation                          (14118)
     First                                     26.2
     Second                                    17.8
     Third                                     15.1
     Fourth+                                   20.8

Relative income                               (22387)
     Far below average                         38.5
     Below average                             28.7
     Average                                   16.3
     Above average                             12.6
     Far above average                         22.4

Mother worked                                 (18496)
     Yes                                       20.5
     No                                        16.6
```

B. Current Attributes

```
Race                                          (22649)
     White                                     18.7
     Black                                     35.8
```

```
        Other                           25.1

Gender                                (22649)
        Male                            15.0
        Female                          25.4

Age                                   (22552)
        18-29                           25.7
        30-39                           17.6
        40-49                           17.2
        50-64                           18.6
        65+                             22.8

Education                             (22569)
        Less than high school           29.9
        High school                     18.4
        Jr. college                     13.7
        College                         11.9
        Post college                     9.5

Vocabulary test                       ( 9498)
        0-2 correct                     31.2
        3-5 correct                     24.3
        6-7 correct                     17.7
        8-10 correct                    14.4

Int. rating of understanding          (22359)
        Good                            18.4
        Fair                            28.7
        Poor                            35.6

Family income                         (20848)
        Low                             27.1
        Medium                          18.3
        High                            13.6

Subjective social class               (21711)
        Lower                           36.0
        Working                         20.1
        Middle                          19.5
        Upper                           23.9

Community type                        (22649)
        12 largest central cities       26.9
        13-100 largest central cities   23.2
        Suburbs of top 12               18.1
        Suburbs of 13-100               19.3
        Other urban                     19.6
        Other rural                     20.8
```

```
Region                                (22649)
      New England                       16.9
      Mid-Atlantic                      20.3
      East No. Cent.                    18.8
      West No. Cent.                    18.1
      South Atlantic                    22.9
      East So. Cent.                    24.0
      West So. Cent.                    24.3
      Mountain                          18.6
      Pacific                           21.6

Moved since age 16                    (22231)
      Same city                         21.6
      Same state, diff. city            18.6
      Different state                   21.1

Religion                              (22582)
      Protestant                        21.4
      Catholic                          18.7
      Jewish                            15.2
      None                              22.8
      Other                             23.0

Labor force status                    (22649)
      Full time                         13.3
      Part time                         13.7
      Temporarily not working           14.2
      Unemployed                        20.9
      Retired                           16.7
      In school                         53.3
      Keeping house                     36.6
      Other                             32.7

Unemployment history                  (16010)
      Unemployed                        20.3
      Not unemployed                    21.0

Govt. assistance history              (12085)
      Got aid                           21.2
      No aid                            20.9

Dwelling tenure                       ( 5381)
      Owns                              16.1
      Rents                             25.1

Health, self-rating                   (17508)
      Excellent                         17.8
      Good                              20.3
      Fair                              25.3
      Poor                              26.8
```

13

```
Subjective financial status            (22445)
        Far below average                28.7
        Below average                    24.4
        Average                          20.5
        Above average                    14.1
        Far above average                20.2

C. Attitudes

    Work if rich                         ( 8645)
        Yes                              13.8
        No                               13.5

    How people get ahead                 (14294)
        Hard word                        20.8
        Work and Luck                    19.0
        Luck or help                     21.5

    Meaningful job important             (13317)
        Most important                   18.0
        Second                           20.4
        Third                            22.5
        Fourth                           25.6
        Fifth                            23.9

    Job advancement important            (13317)
        Most important                   22.4
        Second                           19.1
        Third                            20.0
        Fourth                           20.8
        Fifth                            20.4

    Things getting worse                 (13942)
        Agree                            22.0
        Disagree                         17.9

    Unfair to have children              (14005)
        Agree                            24.0
        Disagree                         18.1

    Government help the poor             ( 8209)
        1=Government action              26.9
        2=                               19.4
        3=                               18.1
        4=                               14.3
        5=People help themselves         16.2

    Gov't equalize wealth                ( 9031)
        1=reduce difference              24.3
        2                                19.6
        3                                19.4
        4                                20.5
```

14

```
            5   ·                                    15.5
            6                                        16.4
            7=no gov't action                        16.0

    Financial Satisfaction                        (22550)
            Satisfied                                19.2
            More or less satisfied                   19.6
            Not at all satisfied                     24.6

    Opportunity due to family wealth              ( 1249)
            Essential, Very important                23.0
            Fairly important                         20.8
            Not very important                       11.4
            Not important at all                     19.0


    Opportunity due to parent's education         ( 1261)
            Essential, Very important                21.2
            Fairly important                         14.3
            Not very important                       19.6
            Not at all important                     19.0

    Progressive taxes                             ( 1204)
            Rich should pay much more                21.5
            Rich pay more                            15.2
            Rich pay same share                      18.5
            Rich pay less, Much less                 20.0

    Has chance for good life                      ( 1246)
            Agree                                    16.7
            Neither                                  17.2
            Disagree                                 23.7

    Govt. equalize income                         ( 1224)
            Agree                                    21.7
            Neither agree/disagree                   17.2
            Disagree                                 14.6

D.  Other Variables

    Intergenerational occ. mobility              ( 1229)
            Much higher than father                  11.2
            Higher than father                       10.4
            About equal                               9.4
            Lower than father                        12.1
            Much lower                               15.8
            No job                                  100.0
            No father                                96.4
```

Change in recent financial status	(22455)
Better	16.8
Same	22.6
Worse	23.4
Age hit, if ever	(14464)
As child	18.5
As adult	22.5
As both	20.3
Never	20.6
Age threatened with gun, if ever	(14451)
As child	22.7
As adult	19.9
As both	21.1
Never	20.5

Table 4

Examples Sources of Missing Data on Intergenerational Occupational Mobility

	No Father's	No Child's	Neither
A. Related to Father's Occupation			
Race			
White	11.2%	6.5%	1.1
Black	23.3	5.4	3.9
Other	14.1	7.3	2.7
Relative Parental Income			
Far below aver.	29.6	5.9	3.1
Below average	20.7	5.8	2.1
Average	8.6	6.7	1.1
Above average	5.8	6.1	0.7
Far above aver.	15.5	6.1	0.8
B. Related to Child's Occupation			
Gender			
Male	12.7	1.9	0.4
Female	13.2	9.9	2.3
Age			
18-29	13.3	9.5	2.9
30-39	13.1	3.6	0.9
40-49	12.7	3.7	1.0
59-64	13.1	4.8	0.7
65+	12.1	9.4	1.3

Table 5

Variables Associated with Intergenerational Occupational Mobility

	Pearson's r
A. Parental and Upbringing Variables	
Family structure age 16	.012*
Father's death	-.038
Region raised in	.070
Community type lived in	-.048
Mother's education	.040
Number of siblings	.084
Religion raised in	.046
Immigrant generation	.037
Relative income	.088
Mother worked	.044
B. Current Attributes	
Race	.027
Gender	.027
Age	-.032
Education	-.242
Vocabulary test	-.180
Interviewer rating of understanding	.131
Family income	-.162
Subjective social class	-.117
Community type	.008*
Region	-.029
Moved since age 16	.015**
Religion	.052
Labor force status	.077
Dwelling tenure	.083
Health, self-rating	.084
Subjective financial status	-.126
C. Attitudes	
Meaningful job important	.095
Things getting worse	-.056
Unfair to have children	-.096
Government help poor	-.049
Government equalize wealth	-.057
Financial satisfaction	.056
Opportunity due to family wealth	-.043*
Government equalize income	-.012*
D. Other Variables	
Intergenerational occ. mobility	.301

Change in recent financial status   .070
Age hit, if ever   .040**
Age threatened with gun, if ever   .002*

*=not statistically significant at .05 level
**=significant at .05 level not at .000 level
(all others significant at .000 level)

Note: Pearson's r between net prestige score (father's prestige –
      child's prestige) and other variables.

Table 6

Support for Government Equalization Policies by Intergenerational Occupational Mobility

	R's Educ. >hs	Social Class Lower	Rel. Fin. Status Below Aver.	Unfair to have Chldrn. Agree
Occ. Missing on Father	38.2%	6.8%	34.0%	44.5%
Occ. Missing on Child	54.5%	10.8%	31.3%	42.6%
Occ. Missing on Both	61.8%	15.8%	46.4%	53.0%
Improved Status	17.7%	2.5%	21.9%	30.6%
Same Status	30.3%	4.1%	26.2%	38.6%
Lower Status	35.3%	5.6%	31.3%	40.9%

	For Govt. Reducing Income Diff.	For Govt. Help for Poor	Change in Recent Fin. Stat., Better
Occ. Missing on Father	26.0%	22.1%	34.4%
Occ. Missing on Child	22.7%	29.2%	26.3%
Occ. Missing on Both	25.4%	30.2%	22.8%
Improved Status	15.5%	14.0%	44.2%
Same Status	20.2%	19.0%	39.6%
Worse Status	21.6%	21.7%	36.6%

20

Table 7

Missing data on
Intergenerational Occupational Mobility
by Subjective Intergenerational Occupational Mobility

Missing Data Status	Missing on Subj. Occ. Mob.	Higher	Same	Lower
No missing data	3.8%	50.6%	25.7	23.6 (1015)
Missing	45.2%	49.2	21.4	29.4 (126)

Table 8

Intergeneration Stratification Associations by Missing Data Stautus on Occupational Mobility

(gamma/r)

Associations	Occupation Mobility	
	Data not Missing	Data Missing
Relative Parental Income x		
Current Family Income	.152/.148	.070/.077
Current Rel. Fin. Status	.283/.204	.288/.220
Social Class	.300/.197	.244/.172
Education	.335/.221	.199/.140

Pearson's r

Mother's education x		
Current Family Income	.277	.243
Current Rel. Fin. Status	.189	.171
Social Class	.189	.146
Education	.494	.506

Table 9

Impact of the Imputing of Father's Prestige
on Measures of Intergenerational Occupational Mobility

	All	Men 25-64
A. Correlations		
Raw	.236 (17946)	.254 (6156)
Raw + Imputed	.237 (20776)	.255 (7039)
B. Mean Prestige Change (Father's prestige - child's)		
Raw	-.203	-1.84
Raw + Imputed	-.115	-1.82

References

Blau, Peter M. and Duncan, Otis Dudley, <u>The American Occupational Structure</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Davis, James A. and Smith, Tom W., <u>General Social Surveys, 1972-1989: Cumulative Codebook</u>. Chicago: NORC, 1989.

Featherman, David L. and Hauser, Robert M., <u>Opportunity and Change</u>. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Grusky, David B. and DiPrete, Thomas A., "Recent Trends in the Process of Stratification," Paper presented to the Demographic Workshop, University of Chicago, Feb., 1987.

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

Smith, Tom W. "Ethnic Measurement and Identification," <u>Ethnicity</u>, 7 (March, 1980), 78-95.

Smith, Tom W., "Problems in Ethnic Measurement: Over-, Under-, and Misidentification," <u>Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, 1983</u>.