The Intergenerational Social Mobility of Minority Ethnic Groups

Lucinda Platt

ISER Working Papers
Number 2003-24

Institute for Social and Economic Research

The Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) specialises in the production and analysis of longitudinal data. ISER incorporates the following centres:

- ESRC Research Centre on Micro-social Change. Established in 1989 to identify, explain, model and forecast social change in Britain at the individual and household level, the Centre specialises in research using longitudinal data.

- ESRC UK Longitudinal Centre. This national resource centre was established in October 1999 to promote the use of longitudinal data and to develop a strategy for the future of large-scale longitudinal surveys. It was responsible for the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) and for the ESRC's interest in the National Child Development Study and the 1970 British Cohort Study

- European Centre for Analysis in the Social Sciences. ECASS is an interdisciplinary research centre which hosts major research programmes and helps researchers from the EU gain access to longitudinal data and cross-national datasets from all over Europe.

The British Household Panel Survey is one of the main instruments for measuring social change in Britain. The BHPS comprises a nationally representative sample of around 5,500 households and over 10,000 individuals who are reinterviewed each year. The questionnaire includes a constant core of items accompanied by a variable component in order to provide for the collection of initial conditions data and to allow for the subsequent inclusion of emerging research and policy concerns.

Among the main projects in ISER's research programme are: the labour market and the division of domestic responsibilities; changes in families and households; modelling households' labour force behaviour; wealth, well-being and socio-economic structure; resource distribution in the household; and modelling techniques and survey methodology.

BHPS data provide the academic community, policymakers and private sector with a unique national resource and allow for comparative research with similar studies in Europe, the United States and Canada.

BHPS data are available from the Data Archive at the University of Essex
http://www.data-archive.ac.uk

Further information about the BHPS and other longitudinal surveys can be obtained by telephoning +44 (0) 1206 873543.

The support of both the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the University of Essex is gratefully acknowledged. The work reported in this paper is part of the scientific programme of the Institute for Social and Economic Research.

Acknowledgement:

This paper uses ONS Longitudinal Study data made available via CeLSIUS. I am grateful to ONS and CeLSIUS for permission to use the data and to Alec Ross, in particular, for producing the output data. I am also grateful to Bola Akinwale of ONS for detailed and helpful comments on the paper. Neither ONS nor CeLSIUS, however, bear any responsibility for the results and interpretations presented here. I am grateful to ISER at the University of Essex for a six-month Fellowship during which I carried out the bulk of the work on this study, and to the Department of Sociology at the University of Essex for allowing me to take up the Fellowship to pursue my research, as well as for allowing me a period of study leave during which I completed this paper.

Readers wishing to cite this document are asked to use the following form of words:

> **Platt, Lucinda (October 2003) 'The Intergenerational Social Mobility of Minority Ethnic Groups', *Working Papers of the Institute for Social and Economic Research*, paper 2003-24. Colchester: University of Essex.**

For an on-line version of this working paper and others in the series, please visit the Institute's website at: http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/pubs/workpaps/

Institute for Social and Economic Research
University of Essex
Wivenhoe Park
Colchester
Essex
CO4 3SQ UK
Telephone: +44 (0) 1206 872957
Fax: +44 (0) 1206 873151
E-mail: iser@essex.ac.uk
Website: http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This study examines the intergenerational social mobility of different ethnic groups in Britain between 1971 and 1991. The small body of previous research on intergenerational mobility and ethnicity in Britain has not distinguished between pre-migration and post-migration social class, and thus has been unable to relate findings directly to studies of intergenerational social mobility or to accounts of the changing class composition of different ethnic groups within Britain. This study, instead, focuses on social mobility between generations as it is experienced by different groups in the same country, over the same time period and over the same age range. Using data from the ONS Longitudinal Study, this study describes the different patterns of class mobility experienced by a single cohort of children aged 8-15 in 1971 from each of three ethnic groups: white non-migrants, Indians and Caribbeans. It finds that the relative importance of class origin varies with ethnicity; at the same time class origins can be found to operate in consistent ways across groups. It also finds that for women the impact of ethnicity is much less salient in determining outcomes than it is for men.

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Parent's social class tends to have an influence on children's occupational outcomes. This paper looks at whether the relationship is the same for minority ethnic groups in Britain as it is for the population as a whole. The social class origins in of a cohort of 8 to 15-year olds are identified in 1971 and are distinguished according to three ethnic groups (white, Indian and Caribbean). The occupations of this same cohort are then recorded twenty years later, in 1991, and the relationships with origins assessed. This paper notes the very different starting positions of each group in that the class distributions of origin for the minority groups were heavily skewed towards manual occupations. It then shows how patterns of mobility need to be understood in relation to these different starting points, to changes in class structure over the twenty year period and to the impact of ethnicity, which varies between groups.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper contributes to our understanding of differences in intergenerational social mobility between ethnic groups. It measures the intergenerational mobility of ethnic minorities, where the parent's class is specifically measured post-migration in England and Wales. The design eases the problem of making class comparisons between migrants and non-migrants, where there might be differences in the meaning of class background between Britain and other countries of origin. It shows the differences, by ethnic group, for a single cohort who enter and go through the labour market over the same period and whose class is measured in 1991 and compared with that of their parents' measured in 1971, when they were still at school. It makes a contribution to the literature on minority ethnic group class distributions and outcomes by demonstrating direct parent-child class transitions across the 'first' and 'second' generations, rather than inferring them from comparisons of cross sections from different periods. In illustrating differences in mobility patterns, it assesses the extent to which they support the argument that the downward social mobility of certain sections of the migrant generation on arrival in Britain is reversed in the second generation.

Methodologically this paper is distinctive because it uses a prospective approach to assess parent-child transitions: parent's class is measured at the time the respondents are aged between 8 and 15. This contrasts with retrospective studies of social mobility which depend on the respondent's recall of their parent's occupation at a given age. Such approaches are demonstrably subject to recall error. Furthermore, while only those cohort members from 1971 who are still present in the UK in 1991 can have their class-transitions measured, we can identify the relative size of the surviving sample compared to all those who were in the original cohort; and we also know some of the characteristics of those who are 'lost'. Again, mobility studies are usually dependent on the selected sample which has survived to the point of interview, without knowing what the scale or nature of the selection is.

Furthermore, by selecting a single cohort which is followed over a set period, this study avoids the problem of confounding age and cohort effects. That is, by grouping respondents by birth cohort, as is typically done in mobility studies, it becomes hard to distinguish between effects that are a result of the changing occupational structure over time (cohort effects), and an individual's changing occupational position over the lifecourse (age effects). For the sample in this study, however, class is measured at the same (albeit relatively early) point in their occupational trajectories, when they are aged 28-35, and at a single point in time, Census day 1991. Their parental class is also measured at a single point in time, Census day 1971.

There is a large body of work that has shown that, within Britain and beyond, there is substantial association between parent's and child's social class and that this association has persisted even with the expansion of the middle class in the post-war period. The existence of 'more room at the top' has opened up chances for upward mobility from the working classes, but has also made it easier for those from middle class backgrounds to retain their class position (Goldthorpe 1987; Erikson and Goldthorpe 1993). The relative odds of ending up in the more privileged social classes thus remain firmly in favour of those with more privileged backgrounds – even though there is some suggestion that this strong association between privileged background and advantaged outcomes might be gradually weakening (Heath and Payne 2000). These differential lifechances according to social class background are taken to indicate that Britain is a closed society, rather than a 'meritocracy' (Blair 2001; Aldridge 2001; Goldthorpe 1997). However a society can be closed on other levels than that of class: and levels of inter-generational class stability among minority groups comparable to those of the majority can be read as indicative of greater openness within society to ethnic minority achievement (Hout 1984).

When it comes to measuring intergenerational mobility among minority ethnic groups the two main approaches so far have been to compare occupational cross sections at different time points, or to use surveys with questions on parental class to trace directly intergenerational patterns. Both approaches have shed light on the particular circumstances of minority ethnic groups. But they both raise issues of interpretation; and neither can be directly compared with the other nor with the large body of non-ethnically differentiated studies of British social mobility.[1]

In the first approach, the overall mobility of different ethnic groups can be adduced by comparing the social class profiles of the different groups at different time points using comparable cross-sectional data (Robinson 1990; Brown 1984; Modood 1997a; Heath and McMahon 1997). Such work illustrates the fact that some groups (such as Indians) seem to be improving their class distribution over time. While above-average unemployment rates modify this picture to a certain extent, the overall impression is one of upward mobility. For other groups (such as Caribbeans) improvement is both less substantial

[1] A further body of work has looked at intra-generational mobility, that is, the changing class positions of individuals over time. Robinson (1990) has addressed the question among minority ethnic groups.

and is significantly modified by taking account of the relatively high risks of unemployment for this group.[2]

Explanations of the different patterns of changes in class distributions among minority groups have drawn on evidence of the process of migration. Daniel (1968) drew attention to the extent of downward mobility experienced by immigrants following their entry into Britain. The lack of transparent congruence between qualifications and occupational class (Heath and Ridge 1983; Modood 1997b) is also taken as some evidence of downward mobility in the migrant generation. On the other hand, Smith (1977) emphasised how particular occupational niches, such as Pakistanis employed in the textile industry, may be accounted for by prior experience. Such evidence has contributed to an argument that the current occupational profiles of minority ethnic groups (and the differences from earlier cross-sections) may owe much to their pre-migration history. Groups, such as Indians or Chinese, who had more highly-skilled and educated origins and were more likely to experience downward migration on arrival, were seen as reasserting their backgrounds in the second generation; while those whose class position on arrival in Britain showed greater continuity with a less skilled background were seen as continuing to remain at the less-skilled end of the class spectrum in future generations. The separation between African Asians and Indians in the *Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities* was both informed by and reinforced such a perspective (Modood and Berthoud 1997).

Upward mobility within some minority groups, interpreted as the regaining of an underlying class position, ceases, then, to be at odds with the experience of less upward mobility among other minority groups, since it can be assumed that their occupation following migration, and consequently the occupations of subsequent generations, is in fact consistent with their underlying class background. The impact of migration as a uniform process has already been problematised (Heath and Ridge 1983); instead, it can be differentiated according to the background of the migrant and the conditions under which they migrated. Somewhat paradoxically, such explanations, imply both that standard intergenerational measures of mobility are insufficient to capture the true intergenerational processes for minority ethnic groups and that there is a high degree of congruence and immobility between the pre-migration background of the parents and the class position of the children. In this story apparent mobility is explained by high levels of underlying class stability.

[2] Measures of changing class composition are of course susceptible to the point in the economic cycle at which they are measured, and the hypercyclical patterns of minority groups' employment and unemployment rates mean that the economic downturn of the 1980s may inform to a certain degree findings from that period.

Such comparisons of class distributions over time by ethnic group, while informative and intuitively convincing cannot, however, be directly compared with studies of intergenerational mobility between individual children and their parents. Earlier cross-sections of class distributions will include individuals who will never have children, as well as those who leave the country (with their families). Later cross-sections will be boosted by more recent migrants. In both cases the distinctive age profiles of the groups at the cross-sections will be pertinent to measuring class which is (as intra-generational studies reveal), sensitive to the stage of life or career at which it is measured. Repeated cross-sections cannot, then, be compared with studies of intergenerational mobility which trace the class outcomes of respondents in relation to the class of their parents (or, more commonly, father).

The second approach to exploring inter-generational class change by ethnic group has used data which contain both information on ethnicity (or a proxy for this) and a question on parent's occupation, to track parent-child transitions directly. Heath has been the main proponent of such studies of ethnic minority intergenerational mobility (Heath and Ridge 1983; Heath and McMahon 1999). Heath and Ridge (1983) used the Oxford Mobility Study to compare father-son transitions across English born non-migrants and four groups of migrants, including a 'non-white' migrant group. They were unable to differentiate by group within the 'non-white' migrant group; but they found that there was, for this group as a whole a weaker association between origins and destinations than for the British-born and for the other migrant groups (though the associations were also fairly weak for the Irish-born). They concluded that 'non-white' migrants were disadvantaged in the British labour market. Heath and MacMahon (1999) used pooled years from the General Household Survey to assess the contribution of parent's class, ethnicity and educational qualifications to a series of class outcomes. They concluded that the patterns of access to different class positions are distinct across ethnic groups and reveal complex patterns, while at the same time the salience of a background in the salariat in terms of access to occupations in the salariat can be generalised.

What this literature indicates, then, is that there may be disruption of class position through the processes of migration, but that privileged origins will tend to have salience cross-nationally, even if they take time to assert themselves. But the studies cannot tell us about the processes of migration and ethnic group transitions simultaneously. In earlier studies migration (or place of birth) was the focus of investigation, while in later studies, the impact of ethnicity, regardless of place of birth, was explored. And while the findings from the intergenerational studies overall are consistent with the

inferences made from the cross-sectional comparisons, the two cannot be directly compared. The intergenerational studies cannot tell us about the comparative intergenerational experience of groups within Britain, where the specific occupational structure (and the changes that take place within it) will impact on all groups. Nor can the cross-sectional studies be informative about actual, parent to child cross-generational transitions.

This article therefore sets out to both complement and supplement the insights into ethnic minority class change offered by the existing literature by measuring intergenerational mobility in England and Wales, between the migrant generation, differentiated by ethnic group, and their children. To do this it uses the ONS Longitudinal Study (LS), which makes such an approach possible. The LS is a continuous multi-cohort study relating to approximately one per cent of the population of England and Wales that began in 1974 using the 1971 decennial Census of the Population as the sampling frame. The study's size and scope enable this paper to contribute to our understanding of the nature and characteristics of ethnic minority groups' intergenerational mobility. The two minority ethnic groups focused on in this study are Indians and Caribbeans This paper also compares the patterns of intergenerational mobility for these two groups with those for the entire cohort and with those for the subset of white respondents whose parents were British-born. For the analysis, those aged 8-15, living with parents, in the ethnic groups of interest were selected for inclusion. For this sample, their parent's class in 1971 is measured, and their own class is measured in 1991. While the parents of the study population will have different characteristics, different migration histories and be at different stages of their lives, their class will be being captured at a point that is consistent with many studies of inter-generational mobility. That is, the study design gives parental class at the time the study sample were aged 8-15; surveys using retrospective questions on class origins ask about parent's occupation when the respondent was aged around 14.[3]

Moreover, a major advantage in using the LS is that the measurement of parent's class is not dependent on recall.[4]

This paper, then, traces the different patterns of intergenerational mobility by ethnic group across the 20 year period from when the study sample were aged 8-15 and living with their parents to when they

[3] For example, the *British Household Panel Survey* asks about parents' occupations 'Thinking back to when you were 14'; for the *British Election Survey* it asks 'when you were about 14'; while the *Family and Working Lives Survey* asks for 'when you were 16'.

[4] This also reduces the problem of missing data on parent's class which can be a major problem for some social mobility studies (as noted by Yamaguchi 2003).

were aged 28-35 and making their own way. In doing this it not only reveals differences in the experience of different ethnic groups, it also shows how very different patterns of class composition in 1971 and 1991 can nevertheless be understood in the context of common class processes, operating in England and Wales during this period. It shows that there are both substantial differences in the inter-generational transitions of those from different ethnic groups; at the same time the salience of class origins to outcomes can be generalised across groups.

These findings are illustrated in sections 3 to 5. Section 2 describes the data in more detail. Section 3 briefly outlines the class distributions at the two time-points of 1971 and 1991. Section 4 explores origin-destination transitions across the sample and by ethnic group; and section 5 fits log-linear models to the data to assess whether common class processes can be observed across groups. Section 6 offers some brief conclusions.

2. DATA

The ONS Longitudinal Study is a one per cent sample of the population of England and Wales that is followed over time. It was initially achieved through taking a sample of the 1971 census, based on those born on one of four birth dates (day and month) and has been updated at each census, and through intercensal births, deaths, immigrations, embarkations and re-entires using the same selection criteria. At each census, the sample is linked, at which point information is added to individual records and new records (from intervening births or immigration) are added. So far there is information from the 1971, 1981 and 1991 censuses; that from the 2001 census is due to be added in 2004. In addition to Census data, information is linked from the National Cancer Register, births to sample mothers and enlistments from the Armed Forces. These extra sources provide additional variables about events that occur in the inter-censal period.[5]

This paper uses all LS members enumerated at the 1971 Census who were aged 8 to 15 in 1971 and who were living with at least one parent.[6] That is, it captures children still of compulsory school age (the school leaving age was 15 in 1971, but the Census fell before the end of the school year), and who were living with the parent from whom their class of origin is derived. The width of the age band was determined both by the need to identify those who were a reasonable way into their occupational

[5] For more information on the Longitudinal Study see http://www.celsius.lshtm.ac.uk/index.html

[6] 1734 8-15 year olds or 2 per cent or those present at the 1971 Census (though not necessarily of those who were present at both the 1971 and 1991 censuses) were not living – or could not be shown to be living with a parent at this time.

careers by 1991 (the sample were aged 28-35 by this point), and to ensure sufficient numbers from the minority groups considered. The sample population also had to be present in 1991: first, because ethnic group was ascribed using the 1991 census question, and second in order for social class to be measured at that point. An examination of all 8-15-year olds living with at least one parent in 1971 showed that 15 per cent were no longer observed by the 1991 Census.[7] That is, they had emigrated or died during the period or were simply not enumerated at the Census. However, these 'leavers' showed substantial variation by parent's place of birth as measured in 1971, such that 36 per cent of those with West Indian-born parents were no longer present in 1991, while 24 per cent of those with Indian parents and 22 per cent of those with African Asian parents were similarly absent in 1991. Given that the Longitudinal Study is constructed from census and vital events data, which avoid many of the problems of non-response found in other prospective cohort studies, we would expect that errors in recording entry and exit to the study are randomly distributed across ethnic groups. These differences in presence at 1991 by place of birth must, then, reflect differences in emigration, or death across groups. Given that emigration and death probabilities are likely to be associated with class it is worth reflecting on the impact of the departure (or death) of substantial numbers of those who may well be among the most or least successful of the different groups. Accordingly, the remaining population whose class transitions this paper observes is differentially selected according to parent's place of birth and according to ethnic group to the extent that the two are correlated. The ability to observe and quantify those who leave the study is an advantage that the study design offers. Such 'leavers' are necessarily invisible to retrospective studies and the inability to quantify them in cross-sectional comparisons is likely to lead to under- (or over-) estimating the intergenerational changes in the composition of different groups.

Individuals who emigrated after 1971, even if they subsequently returned for the 1991 Census were also excluded from the study. The resulting sample consisted of 51 005 individuals who were aged 8-15 and living with at least one parent in 1971 and who were living (and largely working) in Britain at the ages of 28-35 in 1991 and who had not emigrated in the interim. For this study sample, information was collected on their co-resident parent's/parents' place of birth and social class, and their own ethnic group and destination class. This whole sample was included in analyses, but in addition, three ethnic groups were identified for differentiation and comparison:

[7] Linked embarkation and death registrations records show that 17 per cent of those sample members aged 8-15 in 1971 who were not traced in 1991 either emigrated or died in the intervening period; but the information on embarkation is known not fully to capture those who actually leave the country.

- 'Indians': those who defined themselves as Indian in 1991 and who had at least one parent who was not born in Britain (N=390);
- 'Caribbeans': those who defined themselves as either Black Caribbean or Black Other at the 1991 Census and who had at least one parent who was not born in Britain (N=519); and
- 'white non-migrants': those who defined themselves as white in the 1991 Census and where all co-resident parents were born in Britain (N=45 264).[8]

The Indian and Caribbean samples are treated as 'second generation' even though a substantial share of them were not actually born in Britain. Nevertheless, all will have experienced at least some schooling in Britain and their entire working life will have been in Britain.[9]

As well as social class, class origins and ethnic group, the sample were also broken down by sex and Table 1 shows the numbers in each ethnic group by sex.

Table 1: Number of study sample individuals, by ethnic group and sex

	women	men
White non-migrant	22 778	22 486
Indian	187	203
Caribbean	286	233
All	**25 651**	**25 354**

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

In this paper, parental class is ascribed for the white-non migrant group on the basis of father's current class if he is present and otherwise on the mother's, following convention. For the minority groups, if there are two parents and only one is a migrant, the migrant parent's class is prioritised. Otherwise the father's class is used. The accurate measurement of an individual's class and in particular their class of origin is, of course, a subject of much debate. The approach used here was felt to be the best possible solution given the aims of the study.

Class of both 'origin' (1971 parental class) and destination (own 1991 class) were defined using the Goldthorpe schema – reduced to a three-class, hierarchical version in which Classes I and II (higher

[8] Groups which are not separately analysed are the census groups of Pakistanis and Bangladeshis, Black Africans, Chinese and 'other' groups, as well as those white respondents whose parents were not born in Britain and those Indians and Caribbeans (including Black Others) for whom neither parent was born outside Britain

and lower grade professionals, and managers and technicians) become the 'Service Class'; Classes III, IV and V (routine non-manual, small proprietors, lower grade technicians and self-employed artisans) become the 'Intermediate Class', and Classes VI and VII (skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled manual wage workers) are combined to become the 'Working Class'. And alternative classification based on the Registrar General's classification was also used in analysis but the results are not quoted here.[10] In addition unemployment was taken as an outcome position, or destination. This is particularly important in this study given the excess unemployment experienced by minority groups. For the breakdown by sex in Section 5, 'looking after home and family' was combined with unemployment for women, as there are good reasons for thinking that these two outcomes have a certain degree of interchangeability. In this paper, results are quoted using both current unemployment as a destination and using a simple three-class version corresponding to the three origin classes, where occupation (if any) prior to unemployment is used to allocate class. Interpretation, however, focuses on the version including unemployment as a destination.

I now go on to outline the class distributions in 1971 and 1991 for the sample, before investigating direct parent-child transitions.

3. 1971 AND 1991 COMPARED

The first thing to notice is that the class distributions of the sample parents in 1971 vary strikingly by ethnic group (see Table 2). This itself has implications for their possibilities for upward and downward mobility within the different groups. Over 21 per cent of the white non-migrant group had parents in the Service Class compared with under 4 percent of Caribbeans and roughly 7 per cent of Indians. Conversely, over 70 per cent of Caribbeans and Indians had parents in Working Class occupations compared to 46 per cent of white non-migrants.

Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Parents' Social Class), 1971

	White non-migrant	Caribbean	Indian	Entire cohort
Service Class	21.3	3.9	7.2	20.9
Intermediate Class	28.0	12.1	15.6	27.7
Working Class	45.9	74.8	71.3	46.6
Other[11]	4.8	9.2	5.9	4.9

[9] A similar quandary of at what stage to distinguish migrant and non-migrant generations can be found in Modood (1997b). He also distinguished those who were 15 or less at time of arrival in Britain from those who arrived as adults.

[10] A version of this paper which employs the Registrar General's classification in a three-class form is available from the author on request.

[11] This includes missings, those classified as 'housewives', those in the armed forces and those otherwise not employed.

Total (N)	45264	519	390	51005

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

By the time the study sample's own class was measured in 1991, 26 per cent of Indians and 19 per cent of Caribbeans were in the Service Class, while white non-migrants had also increased their preponderance in these classes, but not at such a rate to 28 per cent (see Table 3). White non-migrants also had a higher proportion than other groups in working class occupations, reversing the 1971 pattern, but this could be at least partially accounted for by the much greater rates of unemployment among the minority groups. Fifteen per cent of Caribbeans and 9 per cent of Indians were unemployed compared with only 6 per cent of the white non-migrants.

Table 3: Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Social Class, 1991

	White non-migrant	Caribbean	Indian	Entire cohort
Service Class	27.8	18.7	25.9	28.1
Intermediate Class	33.0	34.7	34.9	32.9
Working Class	26.2	22.9	19.2	25.6
Unemployed	5.8	15.0	9.2	6.1
Other[12]	7.2	8.6	10.8	7.3
Total (N)	45264	519	390	51105

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

Obviously, in neither 1971 nor 1991 did the social class distributions for the parents or main sample completely reflect the social class distributions of the entire economically active or working population. The 1971 class distribution is a profile of couples rather than individuals and thus provides the social class of only one parent even if both were working. In addition, these are all people who had a child of the relevant age in 1971 and therefore will have a distinct age profile as well as possessing characteristics which resulted in them having resident children at all. The 1991 distribution only represents the distribution of a narrow age section of the working-age population, those aged 28-35.[13] It will therefore in part represent the occupational trends for future decades and in part represent those still at fairly early stages of their occupational development – factors which are likely to work in opposite directions in terms of skewing the class distribution up or down relative to the whole working age population.

[12] This is the same as for Table 3, except that it does not include those unemployed who are listed separately. The greater size overall of the 'other' category in 1991 is due to the way that parent's social class hierarchically selected a parent with a social class classification over one without, excluding the majority of 'housewives' (3 per cent fall into this category), whereas in 1991 5.5 per cent of respondents were 'looking after home and family'.

[13] The occupations of respondents' spouses, if any, are not taken into account in the measurement of destination class. Thus destinations represent employment outcomes rather than household class *per se*.

These tables illustrate the structural changes in class distribution by which patterns of intergenerational mobility are shaped and constrained. The expansion of the Service and Intermediate Classes and the reduction in the Working Class mean that a certain degree of absolute upward mobility is inevitable. The next section treats the actual transitions across groups.

4. CLASS TRANSITIONS

Between 1971 and 1991 class distributions there was substantial absolute upward mobility for the whole cohort. By 1991 nearly a third of 28-35 year olds were in the Service Class: Table 4 shows that over a fifth of those with parents in the Working Class had moved into the Service Class. However, as Table 5 shows, people with origins in the Working Class only made up under a third of the Service Class, relative to their population proportion of 48 per cent, as expansion movement from the bottom was more than matched by retention at the top. Those with Working Class origins were, in addition, over-represented among the unemployed of whom they made up three-fifths. The expansion of the Service Class can, in part be related to the expansion of higher education following the Robbins Report of 1963 (see Halsey 2000; Heath and Payne 2000).

Table 4: Outflow Percentages from Parent's Class to Destination Class

Origin (Parent's) Class, 1971	Destination Class, 1991							Row Total	N [N no unemployment version]
	With last recorded class overriding current employment			With current employment as separate category					
	Service class	Inter-mediate class	Work-ing class	Service class	Inter-mediate class	Work-ing class	Unem-ployed		
Service Class	52.9	33.1	14.0	51.2	31.9	12.9	4.0	100	10249 [10206]
Inter-mediate Class	32.4	41.1	26.5	31.2	39.4	24.1	5.3	100	13290 [13181]
Working Class	21.9	37.3	40.8	21.0	35.2	36.0	7.8	100	21609 [21279]
Column Totals	**32.1**	**37.5**	**30.5**	**30.9**	**35.7**	**27.3**	**6.2**	**100**	**45148 [44666]**

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

Table 5: Inflow Percentages from Parent's Class to Destination Class

Parent's Class	Destination Class							**Row Total [no unemployment version]**
	With last recorded class overriding current employment			With current employment as separate category				
	Service class	Inter-mediate class	Work-ing class	Service class	Inter-mediate class	Work-ing class	Unem-ployed	
Service Class	37.7	20.2	10.5	37.7	20.3	10.7	14.6	**22.7 [22.9]**
Inter-mediate Class	29.8	32.4	25.7	29.8	32.5	26.0	25.2	**29.4 [29.5]**
Working Class	32.6	47.4	63.8	32.5	47.2	63.3	60.2	**47.9 [47.6]**
Column Totals	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
N	**14335**	**16726**	**13605**	**13927**	**16103**	**12304**	**2814**	**45148 [44666]**

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

These transitions can also be looked at by ethnic group. Tables 6 to 8 show the degree of class association for the white non-migrants, Indians and Caribbeans respectively. The pattern for white non-migrants (Table 6) is comparable to that for the whole cohort (shown in Table 4). However, Tables 7 (Indians) and 8 (Caribbeans) show distinctive patterns of intergenerational mobility for minority ethnic groups. While small cell sizes for some transitions invite caution in interpretation, it seems that there is potentially a greater association between Service Class origins and Service Class destinations among the Indians. However, retention in class of origin is less marked for the other classes, with substantial upward mobility. There would also appear to be some association between class and unemployment, as within the cohort as a whole. For the Caribbeans, however, there is no obvious pattern of class association.

Table 6: Outflow Percentages from Parent's Class to Destination Class, white non-migrants

Origin (Parent's) Class, 1971	Destination Class, 1991							Row Total	N [N for no unemploy-ment version]
	With last recorded class overriding current employment			With current employment as separate category					
	Service class	Inter-mediate class	Work-ing class	Service class	Inter-mediate class	Work-ing class	Unem-ployed		
Service Class	52.4	33.4	14.2	50.8	32.3	13.1	3.9	100	9312 [9273]
Inter-mediate Class	32.0	41.0	27.0	30.9	39.4	24.6	5.1	100	11910 [11820]
Working Class	21.2	37.1	41.8	20.2	35.1	37.1	7.5	100	18922 [18650]
Column Totals	**31.6**	**37.4**	**30.9**	**30.5**	**35.7**	**27.9**	**5.9**	**100**	**40144 [39743]**

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

Table 7: Outflow Percentages from Parent's Class to Destination Class, Indians

Origin (Parent's) Class, 1971	Destination Class, 1991							Row Total	N [N for no unemploy-ment version]
	With last recorded class overriding current employment			With current employment as separate category					
	Service class	Interm-ediate class	Work-ing class	Service class	Inter-mediate class	Work-ing class	Unem-ployed		
Service Class	56.0	36.0	8.0	52.0	36.0	8.0	4.0	100	25 [25]
Inter-mediate Class	49.1	35.1	15.8	45.8	33.9	11.9	8.5	100	59 [57]
Working Class	25.5	45.5	28.9	23.4	41.0	24.6	11.1	100	244 [235]
Column Totals	**32.2**	**42.9**	**24.9**	**29.57**	**39.3**	**21.0**	**10.1**	**100**	**328 [317]**

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

Table 8: Outflow Percentages from Parent's Class to Destination Class, Caribbeans

Origin (Parent's) Class, 1971	Destination Class, 1991							Row Total	N [N for no unemploy-ment version]
	With last recorded class overriding current employment			With current employment as separate category					
	Service class	Inter-mediate class	Work-ing class	Service class	Inter-mediate class	Work-ing class	Unem-ployed		
Service Class	23.5	58.8	17.7	22.2	44.4	5.6	27.8	100	18 [17]
Inter-mediate Class	19.3	50.9	29.8	18.6	44.1	23.7	13.6	100	59 [57]
Working Class	22.1	43.3	34.6	20.1	37.6	26.6	15.8	100	354 [344]
Column Totals	**21.8**	**45.0**	**33.3**	**20.0**	**38.8**	**25.3**	**16.0**	**100**	**431 [418]**

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

We can see then that intergenerational mobility does not operate in the same way across all ethnic groups. Within the same context class origins have a different relationship with outcomes depending on ethnicity. We can also explore variations in total mobility between the different groups. As has been noted, changes in the class structure between 1971 and 1991 require a certain minimum amount of structural mobility: the amount by which the top social class has expanded or the lower classes reduced. Actual mobility, as the tables above illustrate fell well short of perfect mobility but, at the same time, was clearly much greater than the minimum structural mobility required. I go on to consider the extent of mobility among the different ethnic groups before considering by how much this exceeds the minimum necessary to accord with the changing class composition of the overall population and the different groups.

A summary of the mobility chances of different groups can be found in the proportions retained in their class of origin. Table 9 shows the proportions of those who moved up in the class hierarchy, those who moved down, and those who retained their class of origin. In the first three columns of the table the proportions have been calculated taking moves into unemployment as a downward step regardless of class of origin.[14] In the second three columns, class of destination is based on prior employment if any and if there is no employment history in the previous decade the observation is excluded. The difference between the results shown in these two ways highlights the pertinence of considering

[14] Cf Heath and McMahon (1999) where unemployment was for some of the analysis equated with the lowest class outcome.

unemployment as a destination, particularly in studies of minority ethnic groups. For example downward mobility among Caribbeans increases from 7 per cent to 21 per cent once unemployment is considered as a destination. Using the version which includes unemployment as a destination, we see that 41 per cent of the white non-migrants were in the same destination and origin classes compared to around 28 per cent of the Indians and Caribbeans. This differential is accounted for by differences in upward mobility; though the differences between the minority groups in this respect are also substantial.

Table 9: Summary of Mobility and Immobility Patterns, by Ethnic Group

	Where unemployment distinguished as downward mobility				Where previous class attribution over-rides current unemployment			
	up	down	stay	*N*	up	down	stay	*N*
White	35.3	23.8	41.0	*40144*	36.8	19.2	44.0	*39743*
Indian	56.1	15.5	28.4	*328*	61.5	6.3	32.2	*317*
Caribbean	49.9	21.3	28.8	*431*	56.5	7.2	36.4	*418*
All	36.1	23.5	40.5	*45148*	37.8	18.6	43.7	*44666*

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

As mentioned we can compare these actual mobility patterns with the amount of mobility required simply by the structural changes in the class distributions. The minimum mobility required by changes in the marginal class distributions over the twenty year period can be calculated as the expansion of the Service and Intermediate Classes, which equals the contraction of the Working Class if we do not consider unemployment as a class destination. If unemployment is considered as a fourth destination, there is also a minimum of downward mobility required to match the proportions in unemployment in 1991. In this case the amount of 'necessary' mobility can be minimised by taking both upward mobility into the Service and Intermediate Classes and downward mobility into unemployment as matching the total loss from the Working Class. The comparison can be made for the whole sample and for the different ethnic groups. Within the ethnic groups we can look both at the amount of mobility required to match the group's own distribution in 1991 and that required to match the overall 1991 class distribution. These calculations are shown in Table 10, and illustrate that while only 20 per cent of white non-migrant mobility is required by the changing class structure, around half of Indians and Caribbeans would have had to have experienced inter-generational mobility if they were to match the class distributions of the population as a whole in the second generation. For the Indians their upward mobility was in fact greater than that required to achieve parity, though this was partly balanced by a higher proportion of moves into unemployment than in the population as a whole. In this light, the

extent of mobility among the minority groups in the context both of overall changes in class structure and assumptions of greater convergence with the population class structure in the second generation is less striking. Instead, we should perhaps note the degree of mobility among the white group relative to that required by changing class distributions. Accounts of underlying class position and consequent consistency of apparent mobility with class retention tend to assume far greater levels of class retention that we in fact observe in the non-migrant population.

Table 10: Minimum mobility required by structural changes in class distribution, by ethnic group, based on ethnic group destinations and total cohort destinations

	Where unemployment distinguished as downward mobility			Where previous class attribution over-rides current unemployment	
	Up	Down into un-employment	Stay	Up	Stay
White, based on white 1991 class distribution	13.7	6.3	80	16.7	83.3
White, based on total 1991 class distribution	*14*	*6.6*	*79.4*	*17.2*	*82.8*
Indian, based on Indian 1991 class distribution	43.8	10.4	45.8	50.4	49.6
Indian, based on total 1991 class distribution	*41.6*	*6.6*	*51.8*	*44.8*	*55.2*
Caribbean, based on Caribbean 1991 class distribution	40.8	16.5	42.7	48.9	51.1
Caribbean, based on total 1991 class distribution	*48.2*	*6.6*	*45.2*	*51.4*	*48.6*
Total cohort	**14.7**	**6.6**	**78.7**	**17.9**	**82.1**

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

We have seen then that there is substantial change in the profiles of the different groups and that individual mobility is substantial, but at the same time around 30 per cent of minority groups and 40 per cent of non-migrants do not move from their class of origin. We move on to examine a major concern of mobility studies, that is, the relative chances of those from different origins ending up in particular destinations. Given the role of structural changes in contributing to absolute mobility the relative chances of ending up in a higher social class according to origins given by odds ratios, provide a way of evaluating the openness of society or, conversely the extent to which those from more privileged backgrounds manage to preserve that privilege.

Overall, as Table 11 shows, the odds of ending up in the Service Class for those with their origins in the Service Class compared to those with their origins in the Working Class were 4:1. Conversely,

while fewer than 1 in 10 of those with origins in the Working Class end up unemployed, their odds of doing so are twice those for someone with origins in the Service Class.

Table 11 further illustrates the extent to which these patterns of relative immobility are replicated across different ethnic groups. As well as the estimates of relative odds of different outcomes according to origins for the different ethnic groups, Table 11 also provides the confidence intervals of these estimates. This provides a caution against over-interpreting some of the more striking differences. The table gives the relative odds of ending up in a particular class at all (rows 1, 2, 5 and 6), and (in rows 3 and 4) the odds relative to ending up in the alternative class – the so-called symmetric odds ratios. As the table shows, the relative advantage of Service Class origins over Working Class origins for a Service Class destination was smaller for Indians and Caribbeans than for white non-migrants. In fact, for the Caribbeans there may be no such advantage at all. In this context, it might be worth recalling the high proportions of those with West Indian and Indian born parents who are no longer observed in 1991. If these coincided with the most successful families, who had gained the resources necessary to achieve onward or return migration, it could in part explain the lower association between origins and destinations among those who remain.

If a comparison is made between ending up in the Service Class rather than ending up in the Working Class the white non-migrants with origins in the Service Class are seven times as likely as those with origins in the Working Class to achieve this positive outcome, a pattern expected by and consistent with other research. The relative chances for Caribbeans and Indians also increase when compared with ending up in the Working Class rather than any other destination (though estimates are imprecise). Compared with Intermediate Class origins, Service Class origins offer little if any advantage for the Caribbeans and the Indians, though they double the odds for the white non-migrants. Conversely the risks of unemployment are increased by Working Class origins for the white non-migrants, but not significantly for the Indians and Caribbeans. In fact for the Caribbeans, Service Class origins may actually increase the odds of unemployment. The numbers of Caribbeans with origins in the Service Class are small and therefore estimates may be unstable. Nevertheless it seems that for minority groups, higher social class origins would not appear to be protective against unemployment in the way they are for the majority.

Table 11: Relative Odds of Attaining Particular Class Destinations Compared to Alternative Origins, by Ethnic Group (95% confidence intervals of estimates given in brackets)

Class Destination	Class Origins	White	Indian	Caribbean	All
Service	Service and Working compared	4.1 (3.9-4.3)	3.6 (1.5-8.2)	1.1 (0.4-3.6)	4.0 (3.8-4.2)
Service	Service and Intermediate compared	2.3 (2.2-2.4)	1.3 (0.5-3.3)	1.2 (0.3-4.3)	2.3 (2.2-2.4)
Service rather than Working	Service and Working compared	7.1 (6.6-7.7)	6.8 (1.5-31.7)	5.3 (0.6-48.4)	6.9 (6.4-7.4)
Service rather than Intermediate	Service and Intermediate compared	2.0 (1.9-2.1)	1.1 (0.4-3.0)	1.2 (0.3-4.8)	2.0 (1.9-2.1)
unemployment	Working and Service compared	2.0 (1.8-2.3)	3.0 (0.4-23.0)	0.5 (0.2-1.4)	2.0 (1.8-2.3)
unemployment	Working and Intermediate compared	1.5 (1.4-1.7)	1.3 (0.5-3.7)	1.2 (0.5-2.7)	1.5 (1.4-1.6)

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

There is clearly, then, much greater rigidity across the population as a whole in terms of relative chances than there is within the minority groups. The question raised at the beginning of this paper was whether patterns of intergenerational mobility within minority groups are subject to the same form of explanation as patterns within the population as a whole. Lower association between origins and destinations, and relatively easy access to the higher social classes from less privileged origins tends to be taken as evidence of greater openness within society. In the context of relatively strong class associations within the population as a whole, the weaker associations within the minority groups cannot necessarily be viewed in the same light. On the one hand they indicate that there is more variation in class position within this group, on the other they indicate the weakness of class in protecting against downward mobility, including movement into unemployment, and thus the corresponding salience of ethnicity.

5. FITTING MODELS TO EXPLORE TRANSITION PATTERNS

The cohort has so far been considered as a whole. Given that the main aim of the paper is to explore comparative experiences between groups, it has made sense not to disaggregate the groups by sex up to this point. On the other hand we know that gender is an important mediating factor in occupational

outcomes, and that the distribution of sexes across the class distribution varies. The cohort studied here experienced clear differences by sex in the relationship between origins and destinations, as Table 12 illustrates.

Given these gender differences it seems appropriate to treat men and women separately when attempting to model the associations between class origins, class outcomes and ethnicity. Log-linear models are commonly used with the sort of mobility data presented here to evaluate whether the actual data can be simplified to illustrate general trends or patterns. I therefore now go on to test a series of log-linear models to ascertain whether there are particular patterns in terms of associations between origins, destinations and ethnic group, estimating separate models for men and women. It should also be noted that given the way in which marriage can result in a different household class from an individual occupational outcome, the actual meaning of the models will be slightly different for women than for men. Given the way that class is conventionally measured, for men we can speak of their occupational destination as approximating their class. For some married women, by contrast, their class may be less dependent on their own occupational outcome than on their partner's, particularly for those looking after home and family who are grouped with unemployed here.

Table 12: Class Outcomes in 1991 by Sex and Ethnic Group

		Service	Intermediate	Working	Unemployed/ looking after home and family (women only)
	white non-migrant	32.6	25.8	32.8	8.7
Men	Indian	34.6	31.9	24.1	9.4
(N=24 873)	Caribbean	19.1	22.7	35.1	23.1
	All	**32.9**	**25.8**	**32.3**	**9.0**
	white non-migrant	24.0	41.1	20.4	14.5
Women	Indian	19.1	41.0	15.9	24.0
(N=25 242)	Caribbean	19.5	46.6	14.4	19.5
	all	**24.4**	**41.0**	**19.8**	**14.7**

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

I estimate models which explore different patterns of association between ethnic group (E), class origins (O) and destination class (D), starting from the simplest assumption that there is no association between the three variables and that it is only the overall distributions of each variable which constrain

their distributions across the values of the other variables. The most complex model, known as the saturated model, assumes by contrast that there is association between all of the pairs of variables and that this differs at every level of the third. This model describes the data precisely and so creates a perfect fit. With large samples the saturated model is often the only one which can be found to fit the data sufficiently well for traditional measures of significance. However, arguments can be made to give some credence to a 'good enough' fit, if it also shows a substantial improvement on preceding models (see for example, Erikson and Goldthorpe, 1993). Loglinear models, then, offer a way of exploring whether some simpler models, which offer ways of generalising about larger patterns in the data can be utilised to clarify our understanding of the distributions produced by cross-tabulating three or more variables.

The fit of a selection of different models used to test these data is described in Table 13.[15] The model of independence is clearly rejected by the data – as would be expected from the previous discussion. For men, a model which posits that there are only relationships between ethnicity and origins and origins and destinations (EO OD) is also rejected. However, a model which constrains the margins for ethnicity and origin, origin and destination and ethnicity and destination (EO OD ED) but which does not require the interaction between the three effects that would be found in the saturated model approximates the actual distributions reasonably well and is not a significantly worse fit to the data than the saturated model at the 99% level.[16] In addition it is a significant improvement on the OD, EO model. Given the large sample sizes, it is worth also looking at the R^2 analog (Knoke and Burke 1980). This indicates that even the simplest model accounted for 90 per cent of the baseline model (the independence model) variation, and this rose to 99 per cent for the OD, EO, ED model.

[15] Note that the frequencies of all cells were increased by 0.5 to solve the problems created by observed values of zero in some cells. This solution, recommended by Goodman, is conservative in effect tending to underestimate significance (Knoke and Burke 1980).

[16] The same models were also run with the version of destination class that did not include unemployment as a destination. The results from these models are given in the Appendix. Further evaluation of the model fit can be found by an inspection of the standardised residuals. For only one cell is there a standardised residual greater than 2 with this model: that is for Caribbean movement from the Working Class to the Service Class where the predicted value is substantially smaller than the actual value. The p-value for this model is similar even when the model does not include unemployment as a destination.

Table 13: Comparison of Log-Linear models fitting different marginals: destinations include current unemployment

Marginals constrained	Men				Women			
	G2	df	p	R2 analog	G2	df	p	R2 analog
E, O, D	2390.1	28	0.000	--	1923.0	28	0.000	--
E, OD	243.9	22	0.000	90%	195.6	22	0.000	90%
OD, EO	68.5	18	0.000	97%	31.0	18	0.029	98%
OD, EO, ED	19.3	12	0.083	99%	6.8	12	0.870	99.6%

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis
Note: O=Origin class; D=Destination class; E=Ethnic group and the combinations refer to those associations for which the marginals are fixed. Commas separate effects where no association is assumed.

Our preferred model for men can tell us, then, that destination chances between different ethnic groups are held constant across the origin classes. Similarly, associations between particular origins and particular destinations are held constant across ethnic groups. For example, the odds of a white non-migrant from the Service Class origins ending up in the Service Class rather than the Intermediate Class, the Working Class or unemployment are half those of an Indian from Service Class origins; and the odds are the same if we compare a white non-migrant with origins in the Working Class with an Indian with origins in the Working Class. Similarly, the odds of an Indian having their destination in the Intermediate Class if their origins are in the Intermediate Class are 1.4:1 those of an Indian with origins in the Intermediate Class having a destination in the Working Class, and these odds are also true for Caribbean men. This means that we can recognise both a consistent impact of class on outcomes but we can also see that the outcomes are constrained by ethnicity. This would tend to support the perspective that sees apparent class origins as, in some cases, disguising true class origins, for children of migrants, and yet working in a relatively consistent way within groups. By showing that the operation of class within different ethnic groups can be related to the operation of class in England and Wales as a whole, the analysis challenges assumptions about a single direct connection between pre-migration class and second generation class. We also have to pay attention to what is happening within Britain.

For women the results are similar, although the fit for the model without interaction (the EO, OD, ED model) is extremely good, such that it can easily be preferred as an appropriate simplification of the saturated model. This indicates that we do not require the relationship between origin and destination to vary distinctively within each ethnic group. The commonality of class processes is more strongly in evidence for women. But we could go further and accept the model which only constrains the margins

for origin and destination and ethnicity and origin (OD EO). Even though the model of three-way associations provides a better fit it is at the expense of greater complexity and the evidence to reject the simpler one is not overwhelming. The simpler model would suggest that women have directly comparable mobility patterns once their starting positions are given. This in turn would imply that, for women at least, it is their parent's class that is of crucial importance, however unevenly that is distributed.[17] This would suggest that for women ethnicity tends to lose its salience in relation to outcomes. If we consider this in relation to the hypothesis that destinations vary with ethnicity because of the relevance of pre-migration class position, then this result indicates that for women the pre-migration class position of their parents is less relevant than it is for men. Why women from minority groups should experience the impact of their British class origins but not (to the same extent as men) of their ethnic origins is an intriguing question. Explanations could be sought in the fact that women's individual occupational positions are constrained by their gender to the extent that their ethnic origin becomes less significant, in their marriages and their spouses' occupations as forms of upward or downward mobility. The way that aspirations and any 'underlying' class position are transmitted from one generation to another may also vary by gender. Such questions are ones which would repay further exploration.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The occupational disadvantage faced on migration by some past migrants to Britain, which resulted in initial downward mobility, along with the ethnic penalty faced to a varying degree by minority ethnic groups in the labour market, would lead to the expectation that social mobility shows a less clear-cut relationship with outcomes than traditional patterns of class outcomes would lead us to expect. However, no extant work has illustrated actual patterns of intergenerational mobility for ethnic minority groups from the post-migration origin class of the first generation to the destination class of the second generation. This paper has illustrated just such patterns of occupational mobility and has shown that there are distinctive patterns of class mobility and class retention that differ between minority groups as well as between minority groups and the white majority. Ethnic minorities start from a very different distribution of class origins and their subsequent destinations combine the impacts of these class origins, overall changing class distributions and particular within-group patterns of mobility. These

[17] Note that this finding is strengthened in the version of the model where unemployment is not included as a destination, where the OD, EO model can be less confidently rejected (p=0.09). The reason for the better fit of this simpler model in the version where unemployment is not included as a destination can be accounted for by the fact that unemployment also includes looking after home and family and there are far more Indian and to a lesser extent Caribbean women in this position than white non-migrant women, as Table 12 showed.

tend to suggest that the post-migration class of migrants reflects aspects of the migrant's background and experience that may impact on the future of their children: those who suffer downward mobility on migration, may see the next generation regaining the original class, though the process will also be mediated by the degree of fluidity within the society as a whole. Some of those few who obtained higher class positions in the first generation appear to retain this in the next generation (Indians), while Caribbeans were not able to maintain advantages associated with more privileged origins. This could be explained by the loss of the positive selection effects that create migrants in the first place and, possibly, by the onward or return migration of the most successful. We note, again, the particularly high rates of exit of those with parents from the West Indies. However, such interpretations remain somewhat speculative and invite further exploration.

Despite these distinct differences in origins and outcomes according to ethnic group, there are some commonalities. For women, outcomes were more dependent upon their class origins. For men, ethnicity constrains destinations as well as origins, but the evidence would indicate that the association between ethnicity and destinations remains constant across classes of origin, suggesting a set of common processes. Similarly, the relationship between origins and destinations remains comparable within ethnic groups, suggesting that class operates in different but nevertheless predictable ways across and within ethnicities.

The predictability of these processes will involve the mediating impacts of culture, expectations and particular forms of family background and context as well as the distinction between achieved and underlying class, that this paper has drawn attention to. Traditional studies of class (im)mobility tend to give the impression of processes working beyond the control or intervention of individuals. While such a perspective is one way of illustrating the continuing association between parent's and child's class, the findings here, particularly the differential impact of ethnicity for men and women, demand a recognition of agency – of aspirations of those who migrate for their children and how or whether those aspirations are fulfilled in the context in which they find themselves.

Appendix: Results of loglinear models for version of class destinations which attributes class over current unemployment.

Comparison of Log-Linear models fitting different marginals: last class overrides current unemployment in destinations.

	Men				Women			
Marginals constrained	G2	df	p	R2 analog	G2	df	p	R2 analog
E, O, D	1960.3	20	0.000	--	1592.2	20	0.000	--
E, OD	207.7	16	0.000	89%	173.1	16	0.000	89%
OD, EO	49.8	12	0.000	97%	21.7	12	0.041	99%
OD, EO, ED	16.7	8	0.034	99%	6.2	8	0.625	99.6%

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study, author's analysis

Note: O=Origin class; D=Destination class; E=Ethnic group and the combinations refer to those associations for which the marginals are fixed. Commas separate effects where no association is assumed.

References

Aldridge, S. 2001. *Social Mobility: A Discussion Paper*. London: Cabinet Office, Performance and Innovation Unit, April 2001.

Blair, T. 2001. 'Speech on the Government's Agenda for the Future', 8 February 2001. http://www.pm.gov.uk/output/Page1579.asp

Brown, C. 1984. *Black and White Britain: The Third PSI Survey*. London: Heinemann.

Daniel, W.W. 1968. *Racial Discrimination in England*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Erikson, R and Goldthorpe, J.H. 1993. *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Goldthorpe, J.H. with Llewellyn, C. and Payne, C. 1987. *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain.* Second Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Goldthorpe, J. 1997. 'Problems of Meritocracy' in A.H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown and A. Stuart Wells (eds.) *Education: Culture, Economy, Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.663-682.

Halsey, A.H. 2000. 'Further and Higher Education' in A.H. Halsey with J. Webb (eds.) *Twentieth Century British Social Trends*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, pp.221-253.

Heath, A. and McMahon, D. 1997. 'Education and Occupational Attainments: The Impact of Ethnic Origins' in V. Karn (ed.) *Ethnicity in the 1991 Census: Volume Four: Employment, Education and Housing among the Ethnic Minority Populations of Britain*, London: Office for National Statistics.

Heath, A. and McMahon, D. 1999. 'Ethnic Differences in the Labour Market: The Role of Education and Social Class Origins'. University of Oxford: CREST Working Paper Number 69, June 1999.

Heath, A. and Payne, C. 2000. 'Social Mobility' in A.H. Halsey with J. Webb (eds.) *Twentieth Century British Social Trends*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, pp.254-278.

Heath, A. and Ridge, J. 1983. 'Social Mobility of Ethnic Minorities', *Journal of Biosocial Science Supplement*, 8: 169-184.

Hout, M. 1984. 'Occupational Mobility if Black Men: 1962 to 1973'. *American Sociological Review* 49: 308-322.

Knoke, D. and Burke, P.J. 1980. *Log-linear Models*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Modood, T. 1997a. 'Employment' in T. Modood, R. Berthoud and others, pp. 83-149.

Modood, T. 1997b. 'Qualifications and English Language' in T. Modood, R. Berthoud and others, pp.60-82.

Modood, T., Berthoud, R. and others. 1997. *Ethnic Minorities in Britain: Diversity and Disadvantage*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Scott, J. 1996. *Stratification and Power: Structures of Class, Status and Command.* Oxford: Blackwell

Smith, D.J. 1977. *Racial Disadvantage in Britain: The PEP Report*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Robinson, V. 1990. 'Roots to Mobility: The Social Mobility of Britain's Black Population, 1971-87' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 13:2: 274-286.

Yamaguchi, K. 2003. 'Black-White Differences in Social Mobility in the Past 30 Years: A Multinomial Logit Latent-Class Regression Analysis'. Unpublished paper: Universities of Chicago and Utrecht.