

ESRC Research Project
Education and Social Mobility in Scotland in the Twentieth Century

Working Paper 7

**A NOTE ON VARIATIONS OF SOCIAL MOBILITY
IN SCOTLAND AMONG INDUSTRIAL SECTORS
AND AREAS OF RESIDENCE**

Lindsay Paterson and Cristina Iannelli

August 2005

Lindsay Paterson, Moray House School of Education, University of Edinburgh,
Holyrood Road, Edinburgh, EH8 8AQ. Email: lindsay.paterson@ed.ac.uk

Cristina Iannelli, Centre for Educational Sociology, Moray House School of
Education, University of Edinburgh, St John's Land, Holyrood Road, Edinburgh, EH8
8AQ. Email: c.iannelli@ed.ac.uk

Acknowledgements

Cristina Iannelli's work was undertaken as part of the project 'Education and Social Mobility in Scotland in the 20th Century', funded by the UK Economic and Social Research Council (grant number R000239915). The questions on parental occupation in the 2001 Scottish Household Survey were partly funded by the British Academy (grant number SG32371).

A note on variations of social mobility in Scotland among industrial sectors and areas of residence

This Note looks at variations in social mobility in Scotland among sectors of industry and areas of residence, and how that interacts with gender. It should be read in conjunction with Iannelli and Paterson (forthcoming), which explains the context and background of debates on social mobility, defines the social class measure that we use (the Goldthorpe scheme that is standard in this area of research), gives details of the Scottish Household Survey of 2001 on which the analysis is based, and explains the technical details of the statistical modelling procedures which (following many other authors) we use to analyse mobility tables. The purpose of the Note is not to offer finished results, but to suggest some hypotheses for further investigation, which we would suggest must use longitudinal data. The reason for this caution is inherent in the nature of the information we have about industrial sector and area of residence. They refer to the current occupation of respondents and current place of residence. There is no information on these matters for any point in the respondents' past lives. In particular, therefore, we do not know from this survey how personal social mobility might have interacted with movement within or among sectors, nor with spatial mobility. We also have no information about the industrial sectors in which respondents' parents were employed. So the analysis here has to be suggestive rather than conclusive. It tells us something about the origins of people in particular destinations, and how these origins vary by the nature of their current work and by where they currently live. That is of some interest, perhaps, in describing the characteristics of the workforce in particular current sectors or in particular regions, but is not nearly as sociologically informative as would be data from fuller life histories.

The Note discusses industrial sectors that have been grouped into four broad categories (Table 1) in order to allow large enough sample sizes to analyse social mobility. The primary sector in Scotland is very small, having declined in two main phases: farming had already dwindled by the second half of the twentieth century, and mining and quarrying collapsed in the 1980s. The primary sector already had only 5.4% of employment in the census of 1981, and this fell to 3.6% in the census of 2001 (Paterson et al, 2004, p. 47). The secondary sector of manufacturing and similar activities was still quite substantial in the 1970s (having been the bedrock of the Scottish economy since the late-nineteenth century): it had 34.1% of employment in 1981, but by 2001 that had fallen to 21.7%. Both of the broad service sectors have expanded, especially those activities that have been grouped here as private services. These grew from 32.3% in the census of 1981 to 42.6% in 2001; public services grew from 27.5% to 31.9%. These census figures for 2001 indicate, moreover, that the distribution of respondents in the survey (Table 1) is quite representative of the population. Table 1 also confirms the common finding that men are more likely to be found in the secondary sector than women, and that women are particularly likely to be employed in public services.

Area of residence has been grouped in the way shown in Table 2. The rationale also, as with the grouping of sectors, relates to the development of the Scottish economy since the 1970s. The area labelled as 'Strathclyde' is the old industrial

heartland in the west-central part of the country, and so its economy has been struggling with the collapse of manufacturing industry and resulting growth of unemployment and poverty. The main economic growth has happened in the area referred to here as 'east', in services such as finance in and around Edinburgh in the south east, in electronics in the Lothians around Edinburgh and Fife just north of Edinburgh, or in the oil industry in and around Aberdeen in the north east. One consequence of the changing economic balance between these two broad regions has been a shift of population from west to east (Paterson et al, 2004, p. 27). The Highlands and Islands in the north is an area of long-standing economic stagnation, poverty and emigration. However, its mainly rural economy has recently been growing rapidly, based on small-scale enterprises and in-migration, on tourism, and on services of other kinds (such as educational and health-related) in and around the region's main population centre of Inverness. By contrast, the final of our four regions, the rural south, has continued to stagnate economically, and the continuing crisis of farming and the virtual ending of textile manufacture there have intensified these problems since the 1980s.

These geographical groupings capture only some aspects of the spatial distribution of economic opportunities. Our third categorisation, in Table 3, tries to measure a dimension that cuts across the area-based measure. It shows the size of settlement and the proximity to large urban centres. Thus, for example, the category 'large urban' groups together the city at the centre of the old manufacturing region, Glasgow, with two rapidly growing cities on the east coast (Edinburgh and Aberdeen) and with Dundee, also on the east, but in its historical industrial structure more similar to Glasgow than to its city neighbours to the north and the south. The category 'other urban' groups expanding towns that have, for example, burgeoning electronics or service industries with declining towns such as the former textile centres in the south. The category 'accessible non-urban' contains areas that are within easy commuting distance of larger centres, and its characteristics might reflect the migration of relatively affluent people who work in cities and large towns to live in their semi-rural hinterlands. The final category ('remote rural') is the only truly rural one, in the sense of consisting of communities that have to be somewhat self-sufficient in employment. It overlaps to a significant extent with the Highlands and Islands area of our other spatial variable: 55% of respondents in the Highlands and Islands are in the 'remote' category, and 64% of those who are remote are in the Highlands and Islands.

The regional distribution of each gender is almost identical (Tables 2 and 3 again). This is not surprising, although not demographically inevitable: it reflects the absence of much migratory labour in Scotland. In the past, seasonal agricultural labour, for example, would have involved temporary migration that would have differed between men and women. In other parts of Europe, temporary migrant labour is often predominantly male, for example people from Turkey in Germany remitting part their income to their families back home. UK immigration policy that has allowed families to be united has, on the whole, avoided that kind of pattern appearing in Scotland.

Table 4 shows the distribution of class origins and class destinations by the sector of respondents' employment. Taking men and women together (part (a)), and looking first at destination class, we see that services have notably high levels of employment in all non-manual jobs (the first three class categories), especially lower professional in the public services and routine non-manual in the private services. The primary

sector has very high levels of self-employment, reflecting the importance in this of farming and fishing. The origin classes show similar patterns, although the differences among the sectors are weaker. In all sectors, but especially services, men are more likely than women to be in the higher professional class; and in all sectors, but especially in the secondary sector, men are more likely than women to be in the skilled manual class. Women are much more likely than men to be in the routine non-manual class, especially in private services. There is little gender difference in origin class in any sector.

Tables 5 and 6 show the same information for area of residence. From the destination-class columns of part (a) of Table 5, we can see that professional employment is less common in the north and south than in the two large regions, and Table 6 suggests this is because professional employment tends to be concentrated in large urban centres. In Table 5, the variation among areas in the working-class and self-employed proportions is greater for origin class than for destination class. For the north and south of the country, this is probably because of the decline of agriculture – the loss of both owners and labourers. That may be confirmed by part (a) of Table 6, where in both the ‘remote’ category and the ‘accessible non-urban’ category self-employment and working-class employment are lower in the destination class than in the origin class. In the Strathclyde region in Table 5, by contrast, the decline of working-class employment from origin to destination class reflects the collapse of manufacturing and extractive industries, and is reflected also in the similar decline in the two urban categories in Table 6. However, all these tentative explanations of the contrast between origin and destination classes are at best plausible speculations, because we have no information on the place of residence of respondents at the age when the origin class was measured. There have also been changes to the class structure even within declining sectors, partly because of mechanisation of routine processes and the creation of new layers of employment that demand higher levels of skill, so that the weakening of manufacturing industry is not the only reason why the working class has become smaller: see detailed analysis by Paterson et al (2004, pp. 85-7).

In each region (however defined, Table 5 or Table 6), men are more likely than women to be in the higher professional and skilled manual classes, and women are more likely than men to be in the lower professional and routine non-manual classes. There is no regional variation in these patterns.

We now turn specifically to social mobility. Table 7 shows the rates of upward mobility, downward mobility and stability according to sector of current employment. Two points stand out. One is the importance of services to upward mobility, confirming points made by many other authors (see summary by Iannelli and Paterson (forthcoming)). Social mobility has largely been driven by the changing structure of employment, from a manufacturing base to one based on services. The other notable point from the table probably is a consequence of the importance of direct inheritance in farming and fishing – the high rate of class immobility in the ‘primary’ category. The patterns of absolute mobility are similar for men and women.

Table 8 shows, however, that, as well as these differences in absolute mobility rates among sectors, there is also, for women only, significant variation among current sectors in relative mobility, which we will refer to here as social fluidity: for women, but not for men, the model with all main effects and all two-way interactions

does not fit the data satisfactorily, and so the three-way interaction ODS is needed. Table 9 gives examples of the odds that lead to the result (omitting the 'primary' category which is too small to calculate individual odds reliably). These odds show the chances of reaching professional employment (and avoiding working-class employment) for each origin class. The pattern of variance of the odds within columns suggests that there is more inequality among women who are currently employed in the services, especially private services, than there is among women employed in manufacturing etc: that is, the odds are most unequal in the private services sector, somewhat less unequal in the public services sector, and least unequal in the secondary sector. There is in fact a similar but less marked pattern for men. This is despite the larger absolute rates of upward mobility in the services sector than in the secondary sector shown in Table 7. The main question raised by this for further research is what the mechanisms are by which class advantage is passed on to people working in services, and why that mechanism seems to be particularly strong for women.

Table 10 shows rates of absolute mobility by area of current residence. Unlike with industrial sector, there is hardly any variation in this across areas. The only notable variation is that men are rather more likely than women to be downwardly mobile in the north and the south, predominantly rural areas. Table 11 shows that there are variations in fluidity: for neither men nor women does the final model fit well, and so the three-way interaction is needed. Table 12 illustrates the odds underlying this analysis (analogously to Table 9 for sector). For both men and women, there is more inequality of odds in the east than in Strathclyde, and more there than in the north and the south,. The east has the more dynamic economy, and so the question for further research is what the relationship is between economic expansion and social inequality, and how these interact with geographical mobility and gender segregation of the labour market. One explanation can be ruled out, however: for neither gender is the need for the ODA interaction removed by controlling for industrial sector. That is, in the four-way table of origin (O), destination (D), sector (S) and area (A), models were fitted that involved all the terms in the triple O, D and S, the main effect of A, and the interactions of A with O, D, S, DS and OS. That sequence leaves only two terms short of the saturated model – ODA and the four-way interaction. Adding ODA reduced the deviance for men by 118.1 and for women by 97.4, both for 75 degrees of freedom; these have, respectively, p-values of 0.001 and 0.042. Thus the variation among areas in the OD interaction cannot be explained by variation among areas in industrial sector, although it nearly can be for women.

Rather similar conclusions were reached for the type of area. The rates of absolute mobility are shown in Table 13. As with geographical area (Table 10), there is little variation. The most notable feature is the higher rate of downward mobility among men than among women in the remote rural area, consistent with the observation we made on the north and the south of the country from Table 10. Table 14 shows, again, that there is clear evidence of differences in fluidity among regions for men, although the evidence is less certain for women: the model without the three-way interaction clearly does not fit the data well for men. Table 15 illustrates the odds, and suggests that the greatest inequality is among people currently living in urban areas, especially large urban areas. Once again, moreover, this conclusion could not be explained by differences of industrial structure among the types of area.

Our overall conclusion is, then, that the social-mobility trajectories by which people reach their current class vary among sector of current employment and spatially, and that both of these interact in interesting ways with gender. But the limitations of the data prevent our taking this any further, because we have no information on the sectors through which respondents have passed, on the areas where they have been resident from the point in time when their origin class was measured, or on the sector in which that origin class was recorded. Only longitudinal data can allow us to investigate these topics. Nevertheless, the present analysis has raised some questions that could be studied longitudinally. The three most notable are:

- Is there an association between social inequality and expanding industrial sectors? That is, are the absolute opportunities for mobility that are made available by new sectors accompanied by intensifying inequalities of mobility?
- Is the opening up of new professional opportunities for women in these expanding sectors disproportionately restricted to women who themselves are from advantaged class origins?
- Similar to but not synonymous with the first question, is there an association between social inequality and expanding regional economies? In particular, what is the relationship between social and spatial mobility, and how does spatial mobility both offer new opportunities but also intensify social inequality even among the spatially mobile?
- Are there particular features of rural economies that hinder absolute mobility but somewhat mitigate inequalities of mobility for women? Are men in rural areas more likely to be downwardly mobile than men elsewhere?

References

- Iannelli, C. and Paterson, L. (forthcoming), 'Social mobility in Scotland since the middle of the twentieth century', *Sociological Review*, to appear.
- Paterson, L., Bechhofer, F. and McCrone, D. (2004), *Living in Scotland: Social and Economic Change since 1980*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Table 1

Broad industrial sector of current occupation, by gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001

<i>area</i>	male (%)	female (%)	all (%)
Primary	5.4	0.9	3.0
Secondary	35.3	11.2	22.7
Private services	37.4	40.2	38.8
Public services	21.9	47.8	35.5
<i>Sample size</i>	2978	3396	6374

Industry sector is defined for the respondent in terms of the 1992 Standard Industrial Classification as:

<i>Primary</i>	<i>Agriculture, hunting and forestry; fishing; mining and quarrying</i>
<i>Secondary</i>	<i>Manufacturing; electricity, gas and water supply; construction</i>
<i>Private services</i>	<i>Wholesale and retail trade, repair trades; hotels and restaurants; transport, storage and communication; financial intermediation; real estate, renting and business activities</i>
<i>Public services</i>	<i>Public administration and defence, compulsory social security; education; health and social work; other community, social and personal services</i>

Weighted; sample size unweighted.

Table 2

Broad area of residence, by gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001

<i>area</i>	male (%)	female (%)	all (%)
Highlands and Islands	9.2	8.7	8.9
East	44.8	44.6	44.7
Strathclyde	41.5	41.5	41.5
South	4.6	5.2	4.9
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>4115</i>	<i>5357</i>	<i>9472</i>

Area of residence defined in terms of boundaries of the local authorities:

Highlands and Islands: Eilean Siar, Argyll and Bute, Highland, Moray, Orkney, Shetland

East: Aberdeen, Aberdeenshire, Angus, Dundee, Perth and Kinross, Stirling, Fife, Clackmannanshire, Falkirk, West Lothian, Edinburgh, East Lothian, Midlothian

Strathclyde: West Dunbartonshire, East Dunbartonshire, Glasgow, East Renfrewshire, Inverclyde, Renfrewshire, North Lanarkshire, South Lanarkshire, South Ayrshire, East Ayrshire, North Ayrshire

South: Borders, Dumfries and Galloway

Weighted; sample size unweighted.

Table 3

Type of area of residence, by gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001

<i>area</i>	male (%)	female (%)	all (%)
Large urban	39.0	38.9	39.0
Other urban	29.6	29.0	29.3
Accessible non-urban	23.4	24.6	24.1
Remote	8.0	7.5	7.7
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>4104</i>	<i>5346</i>	<i>9450</i>

Type of area of residence is derived from the urban-rural classification in the survey as:

Large urban *Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Dundee, Glasgow (settlements of over 125,000 people)*

Other urban *Settlements of between 10,000 and 125,000 people*

Accessible non-urban *settlements of up to 10,000 people and within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 people or more*

Remote *settlements of up to 10,000 people and not within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 people or more*

Weighted; sample size unweighted.

Table 4**Distribution of origins and of destinations, by broad industrial sector of current occupation and gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001**

Column percentages within gender <i>Class</i>	(a) All							
	Primary		Secondary		Private services		Public services	
	origin	destn	origin	destn	origin	destn	origin	destn
Higher grade professional (I)	7.9	8.7	8.6	14.9	11.3	17.0	12.5	13.7
Lower grade professional (II)	12.6	7.8	12.1	13.4	14.3	22.0	18.5	43.8
Routine non-manual (IIIa,b)	6.8	4.9	14.8	9.6	16.8	32.9	18.3	25.1
Self-employed (IVa,b,c)	30.4	31.6	7.8	6.1	9.2	4.2	7.4	2.2
Skilled (V,VI)	15.7	12.6	26.7	35.7	20.6	11.3	20.8	2.9
Unskilled (VIIa,b)	26.7	34.5	30.1	20.4	27.8	12.7	22.6	12.4
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>202</i>	<i>218</i>	<i>1283</i>	<i>1430</i>	<i>2205</i>	<i>2472</i>	<i>2052</i>	<i>2226</i>
	(b) Male							
Higher grade professional (I)	8.6	9.1	9.1	16.5	12.7	25.0	12.1	23.9
Lower grade professional (II)	11.0	8.6	11.3	12.0	14.7	22.6	20.7	41.7
Routine non-manual (IIIa,b)	5.5	0.6	14.2	3.5	18.9	11.9	17.5	16.2
Self-employed (IVa,b,c)	33.7	34.3	8.1	7.5	9.7	5.5	6.7	1.5
Skilled (V,VI)	15.3	14.9	27.3	42.5	18.8	22.7	20.6	7.1
Unskilled (VIIa,b)	25.8	32.6	29.8	18.0	25.1	12.3	22.4	9.6
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>173</i>	<i>187</i>	<i>955</i>	<i>1059</i>	<i>976</i>	<i>1086</i>	<i>591</i>	<i>621</i>
	(a) Female							
Higher grade professional (I)			7.4	10.3	10.1	10.2	12.6	9.6
Lower grade professional (II)			14.0	17.3	13.9	21.6	17.5	44.6
Routine non-manual (IIIa,b)			16.2	26.9	14.9	50.5	18.6	28.7
Self-employed (IVa,b,c)			6.8	2.0	8.8	3.0	7.8	2.5
Skilled (V,VI)			24.8	16.3	22.1	1.6	20.9	1.2
Unskilled (VIIa,b)			30.8	27.1	30.1	13.0	22.6	13.5
<i>Sample size</i>			<i>328</i>	<i>371</i>	<i>1229</i>	<i>1386</i>	<i>1461</i>	<i>1605</i>

Origin class defined by higher of status of mother and father; destination class defined by respondent's current or latest job or by job of highest-income person in household when respondent had no class. Omits people who could not be assigned to classes in these ways. Categories of Goldthorpe scheme contributing to each summary category are shown in brackets.

Industry sector is defined as in Table 1. Sample sizes were too small to show patterns for women in the primary sector.

Weighted; sample sizes unweighted.

Table 5

Distribution of origins and of destinations, by broad area of residence and gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001

Column percentages within gender <i>Class</i>	(a) All							
	Highlands and Islands		East		Strathclyde		South	
	origin	destn	origin	destn	origin	destn	origin	destn
Higher grade professional (I)	7.8	10.7	11.8	18.5	8.7	14.6	8.4	10.3
Lower grade professional (II)	12.2	22.5	14.6	27.0	13.4	27.2	11.4	25.0
Routine non-manual (IIIa,b)	14.2	24.1	16.1	22.2	15.1	22.9	15.4	20.1
Self-employed (IVa,b,c)	16.4	8.4	8.5	4.8	6.3	4.1	12.9	6.4
Skilled (V,VI)	21.7	16.0	21.5	14.4	27.2	15.2	19.6	13.9
Unskilled (VIIa,b)	27.7	18.3	27.5	13.1	29.3	16.1	32.2	24.2
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>1206</i>	<i>1023</i>	<i>3578</i>	<i>3069</i>	<i>3142</i>	<i>2542</i>	<i>385</i>	<i>339</i>
	(b) Male							
Higher grade professional (I)	8.9	15.3	11.0	23.0	9.5	19.5	12.1	15.3
Lower grade professional (II)	11.1	16.9	13.6	23.1	14.5	22.4	8.6	22.9
Routine non-manual (IIIa,b)	14.4	6.8	16.2	9.0	14.7	12.1	14.4	6.4
Self-employed (IVa,b,c)	17.8	12.7	8.8	6.6	6.9	5.5	14.9	9.6
Skilled (V,VI)	20.3	27.6	22.6	25.5	26.9	25.3	21.3	22.3
Unskilled (VIIa,b)	27.5	20.8	27.7	12.8	27.5	15.3	28.7	23.6
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>558</i>	<i>476</i>	<i>1568</i>	<i>1335</i>	<i>1351</i>	<i>1098</i>	<i>156</i>	<i>136</i>
	(a) Female							
Higher grade professional (I)	6.9	7.1	12.4	14.9	8.1	10.6	5.9	6.9
Lower grade professional (II)	13.1	27.0	15.5	30.0	12.5	31.1	13.4	26.4
Routine non-manual (IIIa,b)	14.1	38.0	16.0	32.6	15.4	31.5	16.1	29.4
Self-employed (IVa,b,c)	15.2	5.0	8.2	3.5	5.9	3.0	11.4	4.3
Skilled (V,VI)	22.8	6.5	20.6	5.6	27.4	7.1	18.5	8.2
Unskilled (VIIa,b)	27.9	16.5	27.3	13.4	30.7	16.7	34.6	24.7
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>648</i>	<i>547</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>1734</i>	<i>1791</i>	<i>1444</i>	<i>229</i>	<i>203</i>

Origin class defined by higher of status of mother and father; destination class defined by respondent's current or latest job or by job of highest-income person in household when respondent had no class. Omits people who could not be assigned to classes in these ways. Categories of Goldthorpe scheme contributing to each summary category are shown in brackets.

Area of residence defined as in Table 2.

Weighted; sample sizes unweighted.

Table 6

Distribution of origins and of destinations, by type of area of residence and gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001

Column percentages within gender <i>Class</i>	(a) All							
	Large urban		Other urban		Accessible non-urban		Remote	
	origin	destn	origin	destn	origin	destn	origin	destn
Higher grade professional (I)	12.1	17.8	8.3	14.7	9.5	15.8	8.5	11.2
Lower grade professional (II)	14.3	27.6	13.2	25.7	13.9	26.4	12.9	24.7
Routine non-manual (IIIa,b)	15.2	23.7	16.3	24.0	15.6	19.8	13.5	21.2
Self-employed (IVa,b,c)	7.2	4.0	6.7	3.6	10.2	6.7	16.7	9.1
Skilled (V,VI)	24.2	13.1	26.1	16.2	21.5	15.6	19.3	14.9
Unskilled (VIIa,b)	27.0	13.8	29.4	15.9	29.4	15.7	29.1	18.8
<i>Sample size</i>	2859	2275	2374	2022	1968	1703	1091	955
	(b) Male							
Higher grade professional (I)	12.0	22.1	7.6	19.9	10.5	20.9	11.4	16.0
Lower grade professional (II)	15.2	23.9	13.6	20.7	11.9	22.6	10.1	19.4
Routine non-manual (IIIa,b)	14.9	11.8	16.4	11.5	15.6	6.8	12.7	4.9
Self-employed (IVa,b,c)	7.6	5.0	7.2	4.7	10.4	9.8	20.5	13.9
Skilled (V,VI)	24.7	22.9	26.5	28.0	22.3	26.0	17.5	25.3
Unskilled (VIIa,b)	25.6	14.3	28.7	15.2	29.2	13.9	27.9	20.5
<i>Sample size</i>	1246	993	1029	880	850	715	499	449
	(a) Female							
Higher grade professional (I)	12.2	14.3	8.8	10.5	8.6	12.2	6.1	7.2
Lower grade professional (II)	13.6	30.6	12.9	29.8	15.3	29.1	15.2	29.3
Routine non-manual (IIIa,b)	15.4	33.2	16.2	34.0	15.6	29.3	14.2	35.2
Self-employed (IVa,b,c)	6.9	3.1	6.4	2.7	10.0	4.4	13.6	5.1
Skilled (V,VI)	23.8	5.2	25.7	6.6	20.9	8.0	20.9	6.0
Unskilled (VIIa,b)	28.0	13.5	30.0	16.4	29.5	17.0	29.9	17.3
<i>Sample size</i>	1613	1282	1345	1142	1118	988	592	506

Origin class defined by higher of status of mother and father; destination class defined by respondent's current or latest job or by job of highest-income person in household when respondent had no class. Omits people who could not be assigned to classes in these ways. Categories of Goldthorpe scheme contributing to each summary category are shown in brackets.

Type of area of residence defined as in Table 3.

Weighted; sample sizes unweighted.

Table 7**Social mobility, by broad industrial sector of current occupation and gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001**

	(a) All			
<i>Mobility (column percentage within gender)</i>	Primary	Secondary	Private services	Public services
downward	33.3	29.6	22.4	20.3
immobile	44.4	25.7	23.3	23.9
upward	22.2	44.7	54.3	55.8
<i>Sample size</i>	201	1282	2205	2026
	(b) Male			
downward	31.7	29.7	25.5	17.1
immobile	46.6	26.0	21.0	23.7
upward	21.7	44.3	53.5	59.2
<i>Sample size</i>	172	954	976	568
	(b) Female			
downward		29.5	19.8	21.6
immobile		24.7	25.2	24.0
upward		45.7	55.0	54.4
<i>Sample size</i>		328	1229	1458

Based on class categories shown in Table 4; broad industrial sector defined in Table 1. Sample sizes were too small to show patterns for women in the primary sector.

Weighted; sample sizes unweighted.

Table 8

Results of log-linear models of origin class, current class and broad industrial sector, by gender

	Model	df	L ²	
			male	female
1	O, D, S	130	1205.7	914.0
2	O, D, S, DS	115	537.9	497.8
3	O, D, S, DS, OS	100	380.1	450.6
4	O, D, S, DS, OS, OD	75	80.4	118.5

Unweighted data.

df = residual degrees of freedom

O = origin class (Goldthorpe with 6 categories)

D = current class (Goldthorpe with 6 categories)

S = broad industrial sector (defined as in Table 1)

Table 9**Social fluidity, by broad industrial sector of current occupation and gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001**

<i>origin class</i>	(a) Male		
	Secondary	Private services	Public services
Higher grade professional	1.5	5.8	16.0
Lower grade professional	1.3	3.7	13.0
Routine non-manual	0.6	1.3	5.7
Self-employed	0.7	2.0	5.8
Skilled	0.4	0.8	4.1
Unskilled	0.2	0.6	1.3
<i>Variance of odds within columns</i>	<i>0.23</i>	<i>3.33</i>	<i>26.4</i>
	(b) Female		
Higher grade professional	1.5	28.0	15.6
Lower grade professional	1.8	13.1	6.6
Routine non-manual	1.0	2.8	4.5
Self-employed	1.3	7.2	3.6
Skilled	0.4	1.3	4.0
Unskilled	0.5	0.7	1.5
<i>Variance of odds within columns</i>	<i>0.28</i>	<i>91.4</i>	<i>20.7</i>

The table shows the odds of being in current classes I or II as opposed to current classes V, VI or VII.

Based on class categories shown in Table 4; broad industrial sector defined in Table 1; the sample size in the sector 'primary' was too small to show odds.

Weighted.

Table 10**Social mobility, by broad area of residence and gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001**

	(a) All			
<i>Mobility (column percentages)</i>	Highlands and Islands	East	Strathclyde	South
downward	27.7	22.2	23.7	25.4
immobile	22.2	26.4	23.1	27.4
upward	50.2	51.4	53.2	47.3
<i>Sample size</i>	938	2781	2223	306
	(b) Male			
downward	32.9	23.3	25.4	30.9
immobile	25.4	24.8	24.2	23.0
upward	41.7	51.9	50.4	46.0
<i>Sample size</i>	439	1219	962	120
	(b) Female			
downward	23.5	21.4	22.4	21.3
immobile	19.5	27.6	22.1	30.3
upward	57.0	51.0	55.4	48.3
<i>Sample size</i>	499	1562	1261	186

Based on class categories shown in Table 5; broad area of residence defined in Table 2.

Weighted; sample sizes unweighted.

Table 11

Results of log-linear models of origin class, current class and broad area of residence, by gender

	Model	df	L ²	
			male	female
1	O, D, A	130	659.4	670.6
2	O, D, A, DA	115	584.3	614.6
3	O, D, A, DA, OA	100	490.2	516.5
4	O, D, A, DA, OA, OD	75	125.1	117.0

Unweighted data.

df = residual degrees of freedom

O = origin class (Goldthorpe with 6 categories)

D = current class (Goldthorpe with 6 categories)

A = area of residence (defined as in Table 2)

Table 12**Social fluidity, by broad area of residence and gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001**

<i>origin class</i>	(a) Male			
	Highlands and Islands	East	Strathclyde	South
Higher grade professional	1.3	6.0	3.3	2.2
Lower grade professional	1.0	4.7	2.7	1.6
Routine non-manual	0.4	1.5	1.4	0.8
Self-employed	0.5	1.4	2.1	1.5
Skilled	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.7
Unskilled	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5
<i>Variance of odds within columns</i>	<i>0.11</i>	<i>4.48</i>	<i>1.00</i>	<i>0.36</i>
	(b) Female			
Higher grade professional	5.0	14.0	8.2	0.8
Lower grade professional	3.3	7.2	5.9	3.0
Routine non-manual	2.4	2.4	3.3	1.0
Self-employed	1.2	5.5	4.4	1.1
Skilled	1.1	1.8	1.1	0.7
Unskilled	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.6
<i>Variance of odds within columns</i>	<i>2.21</i>	<i>20.3</i>	<i>6.80</i>	<i>0.68</i>

The table shows the odds of being in current classes I or II as opposed to current classes V, VI or VII.

Based on class categories shown in Table 5; broad area of residence defined in Table 2.

Weighted.

Table 13**Social mobility, by type of area of residence and gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001**

<i>Mobility (column percentages)</i>	(a) All			
	Large urban	Other urban	Accessible non-urban	Remote
downward	23.6	22.9	23.3	26.1
immobile	25.3	24.2	24.7	24.9
upward	51.2	53.0	52.0	48.9
<i>Sample size</i>	2006	1798	1554	875
	(b) Male			
downward	24.8	24.8	24.5	32.4
immobile	24.9	23.0	25.3	26.3
upward	50.3	52.2	50.1	41.3
<i>Sample size</i>	888	777	658	411
	(b) Female			
downward	22.5	21.3	22.4	20.8
immobile	25.6	25.1	24.3	23.8
upward	51.9	53.6	53.3	55.4
<i>Sample size</i>	1118	1021	896	464

Based on class categories shown in Table 6; type of area of residence defined in Table 3.

Weighted; sample sizes unweighted.

Table 14

Results of log-linear models of origin class, current class and type of area of residence, by gender

	Model	df	L ²	
			male	female
1	O, D, A	130	685.6	628.8
2	O, D, A, DA	115	573.0	581.0
3	O, D, A, DA, OA	100	456.0	486.9
4	O, D, A, DA, OA, OD	75	104.0	88.1

Unweighted data.

df = residual degrees of freedom

O = origin class (Goldthorpe with 6 categories)

D = current class (Goldthorpe with 6 categories)

A = type of area of residence (defined as in Table 3)

Table 15**Social fluidity, by type of area of residence and gender, among people aged 25-64 in 2001**

<i>origin class</i>	(a) Male			
	Large urban	Other urban	Accessible non-urban	Remote
Higher grade professional	4.5	3.1	3.8	3.0
Lower grade professional	4.1	2.7	3.2	1.1
Routine non-manual	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.1
Self-employed	2.8	1.4	1.4	0.3
Skilled	0.9	0.6	0.8	0.9
Unskilled	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4
<i>Variance of odds within columns</i>	<i>2.44</i>	<i>1.02</i>	<i>1.51</i>	<i>0.80</i>
	(b) Female			
Higher grade professional	20.7	11.2	4.1	4.0
Lower grade professional	6.9	6.0	4.7	4.5
Routine non-manual	2.9	3.4	1.7	2.7
Self-employed	14.0	2.9	2.2	1.6
Skilled	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.1
Unskilled	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.9
<i>Variance of odds within columns</i>	<i>53.5</i>	<i>12.4</i>	<i>2.09</i>	<i>1.92</i>

The table shows the odds of being in current classes I or II as opposed to current classes V, VI or VII.

Based on class categories shown in Table 6; type of area of residence defined in Table 3.

Weighted.
