

53376

55215

DISTRIBUTED
FREE OF CHARGE

**SEAPRAP RESEARCH
REPORT NO. 64**

SOCIAL MOBILITY AND FERTILITY IN THE PHILIPPINES

ELISEO A DE GUZMAN
Population Institute
University of the Philippines
Manila, Philippines

January 1980

This report is presented as received by IDRC from project recipient(s). It has not been subjected to peer review or other review processes.

This work is used with the permission of Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

© 1980, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

A report of research undertaken with the assistance of an award from the Southeast Asia Population Research Awards Program (SEAPRAP), Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Republic of Singapore

**ARCHIV
53376**

(an edited version)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My greatest thanks go to Dr. Mercedes B. Concepcion, Dean of the Population Institute University of the Philippines, for allowing me to use the 1973 National Demographic Survey data and for providing the necessary guidance up to the time of completion of my research.

Acknowledgements are due Dr. Ledivina Carino, Dr. Alejandro Herrin, and Dr. Gabriel C. Alvarez, of the University of the Philippines; and Dr. Peter C. Smith, Dr. Rodolfo A. Bulatao, and Dr. James A. Palmore, all of the East-West Population Institute, for their helpful suggestions.

I wish to thank Dr. Pedro Flores (former SEAPRAP Program Coordinator) and Dr. Wilfredo F. Arce (SEAPRAP Program Coordinator) for their encouragement and, more importantly, their understanding.

I appreciate the financial assistance provided by SEAPRAP of the International Development Research Centre.

Eliseo A. De Guzman
Philippines
January 1980

ARCHIV
G 8

LCM463

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Significance of the Study	2
Hypotheses	3
CHAPTER II METHODOLOGY	5
Description of the Data	5
Classification and Ranking of Occupations	7
Analytical Procedures	10
Limitations of the Study	16
CHAPTER III SOCIAL MOBILITY IN THE PHILIPPINES	18
National Perspective	18
A. Patterns of intergenerational mobility	18
B. Patterns of intragenerational mobility	34
Urban-Rural Patterns	38
A. Intergenerational mobility	38
B. Intragenerational mobility	45
CHAPTER IV DIFFERENTIAL FERTILITY BY SOCIAL CLASS	53
Social Class and Fertility	55
Intervening Variables	58
Results From Multiple Classification Analysis	70

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER V DIFFERENTIAL FERTILITY AND SOCIAL MOBILITY	77
A Preliminary Look at the Data	78
Results from the Additive Model	82
Results from Another Data Set	85
Fertility Differences by Extent of Mobility	88
CHAPTER VI SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	90
General Summary and Conclusions	90
Implications and Recommendations	92
Recommendations for Further Research	94
REFERENCES	

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

In the process of development traditional modes of designating status, power, and prestige are broken down and new criteria and valuation for the achievement of various positions in the social hierarchy are created (Moore, 1970). The family ceases to be an economic unit and the members of the family leave the household to find employment in the labour market. Increasing individual mobility then becomes one of the universal consequences of economic development (Smelser and Lipset, 1966).

The onset of industrialization brought about increasing social mobility among the economically developed countries as the proportion of the labour force engaged in agricultural occupations dwindled and the flow of manpower from the low-ranking occupations to the intermediate and upper-ranking occupations was facilitated by innovations in technology and work organization, improved education, and rising expectations.

In the face of similar changes gradually taking place in Philippine society, it becomes necessary to take a good look at the amount and degree of social mobility proceeding among the economically active population of the nation. The present research investigates the extent of social mobility, intergenerational and intragenerational, for the nation as a whole and its rural and urban sectors.

The consequences of social mobility for the individual, especially where major shifts are experienced have also been the focus of research (Ellis and Lane, 1967). It has been suggested that mobile persons are subjected to more strain than the non-mobile persons, since the former carry with them the characteristics of their original groups (Lipset and Bendix, 1959).

One of the areas of concern is the influence of social mobility on fertility. Blau and Duncan (1967) suggested that social mobility disrupts social integration such that in order to reintegrate themselves, those parents who experience mobility either have to limit their family size or have more children. Moreover, the disruptive effects of mobility on the individual's behavior are most likely to be found in traditional or modernizing societies where individuals experience low mobility rates (Germani, 1966; Treiman, 1970; Kessin, 1971). Such observations lead us to test the social mobility hypothesis in the Philippine setting.

This study, therefore, has the following purposes: (1) to analyze trends of intergenerational and intragenerational mobility in the Philippines; (2) to compare rural and urban trends in social mobility; (3) to examine the association between social class and reproductive behavior; and (4) to investigate the relationship between social mobility and fertility.

Significance of the Study

Although intergenerational and intragenerational social mobility have long been subjects of research, an increasing interest in mobility trends has been generated by the growing concern for society's ability to reduce inequity among its members and the need to understand the transformations of the labor force under the industrialization process (Pessen, 1974; Lopreato and Hazelrigg, 1972; Hauser and Featherman, 1977).

Unfortunately, most studies in social mobility have utilized data on the more economically developed countries. This type of analysis has been neglected in the less developed parts of the world.

The case of social mobility-fertility studies is more serious. Very few attempts have been made to analyze the relationship in developing countries.

It is hoped that the present investigation will shed more light on the patterns of intergenerational and intragenerational social mobility in the Philippines. The value of the analysis on the association between social mobility and fertility lies in the fact that it is among the first to use data sets from a developing nation while at the same time utilizing a technique which overcomes the shortcomings of previous researches conducted on the same subject.

The social mobility analysis is relevant to the strategy of the Philippine government to increase production by encouraging more labor mobility -- sectorally, occupationally, and geographically. The results may be able to provide some guidelines for determining the nature of specific programs (e.g., upgrading and retraining programs) to be conducted by government and private agencies in order to maximize labor mobility, specifically occupational transfers. Likewise, the investigation of the social class-fertility and social mobility-fertility relationships may provide useful insights for the population program of the government.

Hypotheses

This study aims to test the following hypotheses:

A. Social Mobility

1. A high degree of occupational inheritance characterizes the Philippine occupational structure. Regardless of setting, researches demonstrate a high propensity for sons to occupy their father's stratum (Rogoff, 1950; Glass and Hall, 1953; Mukherjee, 1953; Perrucci, 1961; Beltran, 1962; Lopreato and Hazelrigg, 1972; Chase, 1975; Goyder and Curtis, 1975; Lin and Yaeger, 1975).
2. Upward mobility is more substantial than downward mobility. While some studies reveal the absence of the tendency either for upward or downward mobility among mobile individuals (e.g., Castro, 1976), most tend to show that upward movements predominate over downward movements (see Blau and Duncan, 1967; de Jong, et. al., 1971; Chase, 1975; Lin and Yaeger, 1975).

3. Where mobility occurs, this is predominantly short-distance rather than long-distance. Short-distance movements tended to surpass long-distance movements in studies conducted by Tumin and Feldman (1961), Beltran (1962), Blau and Duncan (1967), Bacol (1971), and de Jong, et. al. (1971).
4. The rural occupational structure is more rigid than its urban counterpart. Analyses revealed a relatively higher degree of mobility among urbanites than among ruralites (e.g., Lipset and Bendix, 1959; Castro, 1976).

B. Fertility

5. Fertility is inversely associated with social class. The negative relationship between fertility and socio-economic status is well-documented. (Freedman, 1961; Concepcion, 1963; Pascual, 1971; Goldscheider, 1971; Belcher and Crader, 1974; Concepcion, et. al., 1975).
6. Mobility has an effect on fertility over and above the additive combination of origin and destination statuses.

While previous research, with very few exceptions, indicates that the additive model is sufficient to account for the differentials in reproductive behavior among mobile couples, this hypothesis on fertility is formulated for various reasons. Firstly, most of the studies conducted so far covered the more developed nations as well as the more urbanized or modernized parts of some developing nations (e.g., Berent, 1952; Duncan, 1966; Westoff, et. al., 1961; Blau and Duncan, 1967; Boyd, 1973).

Secondly, with a few exceptions (e.g., Duncan, 1966; Blau and Duncan, 1967; Boyd, 1973; Deming, 1975), most previous research designs failed to control for the effects of origin and destination classes at the same time. Consequently, the mobility effects, defined as the difference between social status at two points in time, cannot be segregated from the effects of origin and destination statuses.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Description of the Data

Data for this study were taken from the National Demographic Survey (NDS) of May, 1973, conducted jointly by the University of the Philippines Population Institute in collaboration with the Bureau of the Census and Statistics (BCS), now the National Census and Statistics Office (NCSO).

The NDS sample comprised 8,434 households. To obtain estimates for the total population of the Philippines in May 1973, a total of 550 weights were applied, one to each sample enumeration district covered.

Social Mobility Analysis. For the examination of social mobility patterns, the sample was limited to married males aged 25-64 years who reported their occupations in 1965 and 1973, as well as those of their fathers at age 40. It is believed that at these ages men had already completed their formal schooling and were also occupationally stable. Unmarried males were excluded for the simple reason that data needed for the mobility study were not asked of them in the 1973 NDS. The 1973 NDS covered 7,032 currently married males aged 25-64 years which when properly weighted yielded an estimated total of 5,546,772 persons. Those who reported their occupations in 1973 and their fathers' occupation at age 40 formed 71.1 per cent of the weighted sample or 3,945,933. Lack of information on either the son's occupation in 1973 or that of the father at age 40 resulted in a loss of almost 30 per cent of all cases. Since the wife was the primary source of information during the NDS interview, the problem in eliciting the necessary data lay more greatly in the inability of the wife to identify her husband's father's occupation at age 40 than her husband's occupation. The weighted sample for which data on both the 1965 occupation and the 1973 occupation were obtained equalled 88.5 per cent or 4,909,797.

It is apparent from the above that occupation was taken as the indicator of social position. Although occupation is far from perfect as a measure of social status, it probably remains the most important single criterion of status (Glass and Hall, 1954, p. 178; Blau and Duncan, 1967, p. 63; Boyd, 1973, p. 7). Being closely related to economic status, education, and prestige (Rogoff, 1953; Moser and Hall, 1954; Reissman, 1959), occupation continues and will continue to be the chief clue to social status in mobility studies (Pessen, 1974).

In the analysis of intergenerational social mobility, the man's social background, indexed by his father's occupation at age 40, was compared with his current social class, represented by his current occupation, i.e., his occupation in 1973, the time of the survey. In the case of intragenerational social mobility, the son's occupation in 1965 was compared with his occupation in 1973.

Analysis of the Social Class and Social Mobility and Fertility Relationships. The subsample for this second portion of the study consisted of women less than 50 years old, currently married, married only once and with a marital duration of at least 10 years. This selection allowed for a partial control for marital duration in relation to fertility variations and changes in the couple's social status. These women are the spouses of the males involved in the social mobility investigation. The weighted size of the streamlined subsample was 3,010,009, twenty-seven (27) per cent of which was urban based.

In this study fertility is measured in terms of the mean number of children ever born alive. Social origin is indexed by the husband's father's occupation at age 40 and present social class by the husband's occupation in 1973.

An attempt was made to determine the association of fertility with social origin and current social status before finally analyzing the social mobility-fertility hypothesis. The relative strength of social origin and current status in explaining differentials in fertility is evaluated by holding constant background and intervening

variables such as education of the woman, age at first marriage, age of the woman, migrant status, urban-rural residence, work status, and place of birth of the woman. The procedure for doing this is explained in detail in a succeeding section.

While it would be desirable to examine the relation between reproductive behavior and both intergenerational and intragenerational mobility, the very short interval in the intragenerational mobility data makes the analysis for the second type of mobility methodologically inappropriate.

Classification and Ranking of Occupations

To determine whether the occupational movement was upward or downward, it was necessary to rank the occupational groups under which the detailed occupations in the 1973 NDS were classified. In keeping with previous researches on occupational classification or determination of the index of occupational socio-economic status conducted in the Philippines and elsewhere, education and income were used as the criteria. The procedure followed here was basically the same as the method used by Blau and Duncan (1967, p. 26) in their analysis of the American occupational structure.

Since the study includes an analysis of intergenerational and intragenerational mobility, an assumption has to be made as to the stability of the occupational distribution by socio-economic status over the period of time under consideration. This assumption seems reasonable in the light of extensive evidence on the relative stability of occupational prestige and similarity in the ranking of occupations by prestige from country to country, regardless of the level of development, and from subgroup to subgroup within a country (Moser and Hall, 1954; Reiss, Duncan, Hatt and North, 1961; Hodge, Siegel and Rossi, 1964; Tiryakian, 1958; Hodge, Treiman and Rossi, 1966). Data on occupations, years of schooling, and income from another National Demographic Survey also jointly conducted by the University of the Philippines Population Institute and the National Census and Statistics Office (formerly the Bureau of the Census and Statistics) in May 1968, provide the basis for testing such assumption in the Philippines.

A rank order of the eight occupational groups based on mean income and mean number of years of schooling from the 1968 and 1973 National Demographic Surveys is shown in Table 2.1. The percentage increase in education and income is presented as one moves up the ranks. All the percentage differences for mean income from both data sets are in the same direction. For education, two are not in the same direction in the 1973 sample and one for 1968. In these cases, education and income were equally weighted and the larger percentage difference determined the rank of the occupational group. The results show that the ordering of the occupational groups whether based on the 1968 or the 1973 data is consistent, supporting the hypothesis of stability of occupational classification over time.

The classification scheme developed above can now be compared with the results of recent studies on the same topic. In her study of intergenerational mobility, Bacol (1971) employed three approaches in evolving an acceptable occupational classification. At first she grouped and ranked the occupations according to Tiryakian's (1956) classification scheme and to the Australian scheme developed by Broom and Jones (1969). She modified the results using what she called "two objective status indexes -- /the/ education and income" of respondents in each occupation (Bacol, 1971, p. 195). Final changes in the ranking were made on the basis of socio-economic status (SES) scores independently developed by Pullum (1971) resulting in a 14-group classification. When these groups are collapsed according to the present 8-group classification scheme, the ranking of the occupations corresponds to the present ranking. One discrepancy exists though, and that is, Bacol was able to distinguish between upper and lower skilled workers and classified the former group higher than workers in transport and communication occupations. The absolute difference in SES scores between her cut-off occupations in distinguishing these occupational groups, however, was trivial (.092). The same observations apply to the results of Deming's (1975) work with Philippine occupational classification. She ranked the occupations in the 1968 NDS by expressing the median education in each group as a percentage of the median education for the total sample and the median income in each occupational group as a percentage of the

TABLE 2.1. RANKING OF EIGHT OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS FOR MALES 15 AND OVER EMPLOYED IN
1965 & 1973

Occupational Categories	1973 National Demographic Survey				1968 National Demographic Survey				1968 SES Scores ^{b/}
	Years of		Income		Years of		Income		
	Schooling		(in pesos)		Schooling		(in pesos)		
	Percentage		Percentage		Percentage		Percentage		
	Mean	Difference	Mean	Difference	Mean	Difference	Mean	Difference	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1 Professionals, Executives and related workers	14.07		5673.09		14.27		6489.45		2.24
		9.58		48.37		9.95		100.15	
2 Clerical Workers	12.84		3827.72		12.97		3242.24		0.93
		51.06		26.64		6.63		18.09	
3 Sales Workers	8.50		3019.46		7.80		2745.59		0.06
		7.59		17.83		-0.76		22.75	
4 Workers in Trans- port and Com- munication Occupations	7.90		2562.54		7.86		2236.72		-0.22
		2.20		12.28		8.26		4.85	
5 Craftsmen, Production Process Workers	7.73		2282.36		7.26		2133.33		-0.32
		-0.64		14.98		0.14		0.92	
6 Sports and Service Workers, Miners and Quarrymen	7.78		1985.07		7.25		2113.83		-0.34
		83.06		62.91		78.57		97.16	
7 Farmers and Farm Managers	4.25		1218.47		4.06 ^a		1072.12 ^a		-0.90
		-15.00		20.53					
8 Farm workers, Fishermen, Hunters, etc.	5.00		1010.90						-1.12

^{a/} Includes Groups 7 and 8

^{b/} Taken from Table 2.5, Castro (1976), p. 26.

median income for the total sample. The resultant indexes were then averaged to provide an SES score for each occupation group. The only departure of Deming's scheme from the present and Bacol's classification is that the skilled occupations ranked higher than the sales occupation (1.011 and 1.008, respectively) although the difference between the SES scores for these groups was miniscule (0.3 per cent).

Lauby (1975) and Castro (1976) did multiple regressions on the 1973 NDS using prestige score as the dependent variable and the mean income and mean education for each occupation as the independent variables. The prestige scores were adopted from a pilot survey conducted for the Philippine Social Indicators Project (see Ochoa and Eco, 1975). The scores were ratings given by persons of both sexes, aged 15 and over, to 60 occupations according to a five-step prestige ladder. The mean rating of each occupation was calculated, standardized, and finally transformed so that all final values would fit into an arbitrary range of 1 to 100. Lauby utilized the data on all persons employed while Castro used only the data on urban males. The results of both studies confirm the current occupational scheme with only one exception -- service and sports, etc., workers were ranked higher than craftsmen and production process workers (SES scores were 39.36 and 38.92, respectively -- Castro; and 36.08 and 35.53, respectively -- Lauby), but the differences between the scores were minor.

A ranking of the eight occupational groups based on mean income and education of urban males reported in the 1968 NDS matches perfectly the present occupational ranking scheme. The 1968 SES scores are shown in Column 9 of Table 2.1

Analytical Procedures

A. Social Mobility

Two techniques were utilized in the examination of social mobility: descriptive analysis and the use of the model of perfect mobility.

Descriptive Analysis. The mobility experience of an individual may be assessed by analyzing similarities or dissimilarities between social positions at two points of reference such as that of the son and of his father, in intergenerational mobility, or of the son at two age levels or two points in his occupational career, in the case of intragenerational mobility. Figure 1 shows how this is operationalized.

In a cross-classification as above, assuming that the study is an analysis of intergenerational patterns, the row variable would be the father's social class and the column would be son's present social class; then $c_1 \dots c_k$ would represent status hierarchy at the time of the survey, while $b_1 \dots b_k$ would represent the distribution of the son's fathers. The diagonals $a_1 \dots a_k$ would refer to the sons who remained in their parents' social class. The frequencies above the diagonal would refer to those sons who experienced downward mobility while the frequencies below the diagonal would refer to the sons who experienced upward mobility. The ratios $a_1/b_1 \dots a_k/b_k$ (i) would represent the outflow percentages which describe the supply or outmobility pattern of sons from a common social origin to different destination classes. Similarly, the ratios $a_1/c_1 \dots a_k/c_k$ (ii) would represent the inflow percentages which indicate the distribution of the sons occupying a certain social class who came from specific social backgrounds. The outflow matrix (i) shows the extent of social inheritance or the extent to which the sons remain in their parental social class. The inflow matrix (ii), on the other hand, describes the pattern of recruitment into and present compositions of a series of social statuses.

Perfect Mobility Model. The social mobility process can also be examined with the application of the concept of "perfect mobility", defined by statistical independence of social origins and destinations. This means every individual has an equal chance of attaining a given status category regardless of his category of origin or of his social position at any specified point in his status profile (Glass and Hall, 1954; Mukherjee and Hall, 1954; Broom and Jones, 1969). Under this

FIGURE 1

SON'S PRESENT SOCIAL CLASS

Father's Social Class (1)	(2)						Total (3)
	1	2	.	.	.	K	
1	a_1						b_1
2		a_2					b_2
.			.	.			.
.				.	.		.
.					.	.	.
K						a_k	b_k
<hr/>							
Total	c_1	c_2	.	.	.	c_k	d

model, mobility is measured by a mobility ratio which shows the extent to which mobility from one social class to another is greater or less than that expected by "chance"; that is, a mobility ratio of 1.0 indicates that observed mobility is equal to that expected on the assumption of statistical independence. A mobility ratio greater than 1.0 would denote greater than chance frequency, and a ratio less than 1.0 would mean less than chance frequency. The mobility ratio (M.R.) is calculated as follows (Rogoff, 1953):

$$\text{M.R.} = \frac{X_{ij}N}{R_i C_j} = \frac{X_{ij}}{R_i C_j / N} \quad (1)$$

Where

- X_{ij} = the number of individuals moving from one social origin i to class destination j
- R_i = total of social origin i
- C_j = total of social class j
- N = total number of cases.

The columns of a mobility ratio table give the in-mobility values which signify entry into a social stratum relative to expectation. The row entries give the out-mobility values which signify exit from a stratum of origin relative to expectation.

It can be gleaned from Chapter III that these two types of analysis led to some contradictory conclusions. This arises from the fact that each method examines social mobility differently. The descriptive analysis automatically takes into account the relative importance of the k -categories for whichever standard may be used to classify the data, that is b 's or c 's (see Figure 1). The perfect mobility model reduces all the categories to equal importance thus offsetting the weighting produced by the unequal sizes of $b_1 \dots b_k$ or $c_1 \dots c_k$ in the descriptive analysis.

B. Social Class and Fertility

Before finally investigating the social mobility-fertility hypothesis, an examination of the relationship between fertility and social class controlling for some intervening variables is made. In addition to simple cross-tabulations, multiple classification analysis (MCA) -- a form of dummy variable multiple regression -- was used in order to be able to control for the effects of relevant factors.

The following statistics from the MCA output have been utilized in the analysis:

- (1) mean of the dependent variable in each category
- (2) unadjusted deviations from the grand mean for each category
- (3) adjusted deviations from the grand mean for each category
- (4) beta for each independent variable
- (5) adjusted R^2 for all the predictors.

The effect of the independent variables can be measured in terms of the deviations from the grand mean. The unadjusted deviations refer to the gross effect and the adjusted deviations describe the net effect after controlling for the other variables.

The betas are useful in indicating the relative importance of the different independent variables in explaining variations in the criterion variable if all other independents were held constant.

C. Social Mobility and Fertility

In using "social mobility" as an independent variable, one hypothesizes that mobility or stability in social status over a period of time explains differentials in fertility over and above what is accounted for by simply examining the relationship of prior

and current status to the number of live births; that is, there is an interaction effect beyond the simple combined effects of the two statuses. The test for this hypothesis is provided by the MCA, in which the relationship of one status variable with the dependent variable fertility is expressed in terms of the deviations of its category means from the grand mean on the dependent variable. When the other explanatory variable, say current status, is introduced in the analysis, the deviations are then adjusted to remove the effects of any association between the two independent variables, former social class and present social class. The statistical model on which this technique is based is additive, thus allowing for the calculation of expected cell means based on the independent additive effects of origin and present status. The actual mean number of children ever born is then compared with the expected mean to determine the effects of mobility, independent of past and current social status.

The additive multiple classification model is represented by the equation (see Duncan, 1966; Andrews, *et. al.*, 1973):

$$\bar{Y}_{ij} = \bar{Y} + a_i + b_j + e_{ij} \quad (2)$$

Where

\bar{Y}_{ij} = the observed mean fertility in the combination of former class i and present class j

\bar{Y} = the grand mean for the total sample

a_i = the effect on the wife's fertility due to the husband's membership in the ith origin class

b_j = the effect on the wife's fertility due to her husband's membership in the jth destination class

e_{ij} = the deviation of the observed from the expected average number of children ever born on the basis of the additive effects of row and column categories.

The net effects of the two bases for cross-classification, class origin and present class, are estimated by a_i and b_j , respectively. The expected or predicted mean fertility (EMF) for each combination of former class and present class can be derived according to the following formula:

$$(EMF)_{ij} = \bar{Y} + a_i + b_j$$

Where \bar{Y} , a_i , and b_j are as defined above.

Limitations of the Study

Due to data constraints, the analysis of social mobility was limited to the currently married male population 25-64 years old. Questions on labor mobility in the 1973 NDS were not asked of never married persons, even if they were employed at the time of the interview. Consequently, there was a loss of 12 per cent in the sample size and a more complete picture of the mobility of the economically active population could not be portrayed.

A specific problem related to the examination of intragenerational mobility was the absence of better data set. Inasmuch as the 1965 and 1973 occupations represented the longest interval between any two occupations of the individual in his lifetime, these were taken as the variables for the analysis of intragenerational mobility. Evidently this procedure has influenced the amount of mobility that has taken place in the population. However, the study has the advantage of being used in assessing short-term shifts within the occupational structure under the force of recent or current government policies on manpower.

The use of present social class indexed by the husband's occupation in 1973 as an explanatory variable for fertility is limited by the fact that its effects may be more on current fertility than on children ever born, which is cumulative fertility. This is particularly true if the present social class has just been

achieved or the couple has completed their family size long before assuming their new status. The assumption in this study is that attaining a particular status is a dynamic process which, in the case of the couples in the study, continued to affect them up to the time the women were interviewed.

Another limitation of the study arises from the use of the MCA in the analysis of the relationship between social class and fertility controlling for other explanatory variables. This is the problem of interaction among the predictors. The MCA actually makes the assumption "that the average score (on the dependent variable) for a set of individuals is predictable by adding together the 'effects' of several predictors. An important implication of this is that the results can be distorted by interaction." (Andrews, et. al., 1973, p. 18).

An analysis of variance was conducted on the ten predictors to ascertain if significant interaction exists for any two predictors. The results show that most of the interaction effects were insignificant. Considering the number of the predictors involved in the analysis, it is expected that some interactions would be significant. The results of the MCA analysis must therefore be interpreted in the light of this limitation.

CHAPTER III

SOCIAL MOBILITY IN THE PHILIPPINES

This chapter presents an analysis of the flow of manpower among various occupational groups in the Philippines. It is an effort to demonstrate the extent to which members of society experience an improvement or downgrading of their social standing using the occupational structure as the framework of social mobility. Observed mobility can result from the changes in the demand for different occupational services. The occupations comprising the upper strata may expand accompanied by a shrinkage of the agricultural occupations (see for example, Lopreato and Hazelrigg, 1972). Some of the mobility is a consequence of improved education making it more egalitarian, thus improving the quality of manpower. The demand for more professionals can be met by individuals who have acquired the necessary skills and the prolonged period of training required of such status, irrespective of original status. It is possible that those who have been in favourable social backgrounds at the early stages possess the edge over the others who seek the same high level occupations.

The dynamics of the Philippine occupational structure is analyzed employing two approaches: descriptive analysis and the use of "perfect" mobility model.

National Perspective

A. Patterns of Intergenerational Mobility

Descriptive Analysis. Table 3.1 gives the distribution of married males 25-64 years old by their fathers' occupations at age 40 and their own occupation in 1973. The predominance of agricultural workers in the labor force is obvious. Almost two-thirds of the employed males were sons of farmers and farm managers. Less than

one-eighth originated from the lowest occupational stratum. It can be gleaned that over the generation, all non-farm occupations gained at the expense of the agricultural occupations. The greatest expansion as measured by the percentage point differentials was exhibited by the craftsmen and the least by the clerical workers (cf. Table 3.7). The proportion of farm workers hardly changed over the generation.

The percentages in Table 3.2 demonstrate the outflow of sons from a common occupational origin to various occupational destinations. Except for clerical workers, the percentages are largest in the diagonal, an indication of a tendency toward self-recruitment and occupational inheritance. The "holding power" of farm origins was the greatest, while the holding power of the transportation and service occupations was considerably less. Fewer sons of clerical workers became clerical workers themselves than professionals or service workers. Sons of workers in transportation, service and related occupations had an equal chance of rising to white collar jobs, and a much higher chance than the sons of craftsmen had. The fourth and sixth occupational origins sent more than one-fifth of their sons to the white collar occupations, while the farm occupational origins sent only a little over one-tenth of their sons to occupations above the level of craftsmen.

The array of inflow percentages in Table 3.3 shows what proportion of the sons in each occupation was recruited from the different occupational origins. Although derived from data already reviewed, this table gives a somewhat different perspective on the relative chance of upward mobility among sons coming from low ranking occupations. Each higher occupational group has recruited from 34 to 51 per cent of its members from sons of farmers. This is to be expected because of the predominance of agricultural workers in the labor force. Clerical occupations which had the greatest outflow of sons had also the lowest rate of self-recruitment, recruiting more than 92 per cent of their number from other occupational strata followed by the transport and communication occupations

Table 3.1. FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY
FATHER'S OCCUPATION AT AGE 40 AND OWN OCCUPATION IN 1973

Occupational Category	: Father's Occupation		: Respondent's Occupation	
	: at Age 40		: in 1973	
	: Number	: Per Cent	: Number	: Per Cent
1 Professionals, Executives and Related Workers	148,898	3.8	217,041	5.5
2 Clerical Workers	50,401	1.2	96,083	2.4
3 Sales Workers	172,702	4.4	248,306	6.3
4 Workers in Transport and Communication Occupations	82,900	2.1	217,439	5.5
5 Craftsmen, Production Process Workers	287,103	7.3	483,531	12.3
6 Service and Sports Workers, Miners and Quarrymen	186,725	4.7	284,855	7.2
7 Farmers and Farm Managers	2,552,093	64.7	1,890,877	47.9
8 Farm Workers, Fishermen, Hunters, Loggers and Related Workers	465,111	11.8	507,801	12.9
TOTAL	3,945,933	100.0	3,945,933	100.0

Table 3.2. MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO RESPONDENT'S OCCUPATION IN 1973 FOR MARRIED MALES 25 TO 64
YEARS OLD: OUTFLOW PERCENTAGES

Father's Occupation at Age 40	Respondent's Occupation in 1973								Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1 Professionals, Executives and related Workers	<u>37.7</u>	9.0	13.9	6.8	8.3	10.0	11.2	3.1	100.0
2 Clerical Workers	24.0	<u>14.1</u>	7.3	14.0	12.7	18.8	7.3	1.8	100.0
3 Sales Workers	13.0	2.7	<u>42.5</u>	5.4	14.3	8.4	8.7	5.0	100.0
4 Transportation and Communication Workers	10.1	5.4	10.9	<u>27.7</u>	27.3	9.6	7.1	1.9	100.0
5 Craftsmen	5.5	2.6	6.2	12.2	<u>43.0</u>	7.6	13.9	9.9	100.0
6 Service, etc.	10.0	5.1	10.6	9.4	18.0	<u>23.6</u>	14.3	9.0	100.0
7 Farmers	3.0	1.7	3.4	3.8	8.8	5.7	<u>67.0</u>	6.6	100.0
8 Farm Workers, etc.	1.5	1.4	3.9	3.7	8.6	5.8	15.5	<u>59.6</u>	100.0
Total	5.5	2.4	6.3	5.5	12.3	7.2	47.9	12.9	100.0

Table 3.3. MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO RESPONDENT'S OCCUPATION IN 1973 FOR MARRIED MALES 25 TO 64
YEARS OLD: INFLOW PERCENTAGES

Father's Occupation at Age 40		Respondent's Occupation in 1973								Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1	Professionals, Executives and Related Workers	<u>25.8</u>	14.0	8.3	4.6	2.6	5.2	0.9	0.9	3.8
2	Clerical Workers	5.6	<u>7.4</u>	1.5	3.2	1.2	3.3	0.2	0.2	1.2
3	Sales Workers	10.3	5.1	<u>29.5</u>	4.3	5.1	5.1	0.8	1.7	4.4
4	Transportation and Communication Workers	3.9	2.6	3.6	<u>10.5</u>	4.7	2.8	0.3	0.3	2.1
5	Craftsmen	7.3	7.8	7.2	16.1	<u>24.9</u>	7.7	2.1	5.6	7.3
6	Service, etc.	8.6	9.8	8.0	8.1	7.0	<u>15.5</u>	1.4	3.3	4.7
7	Farmers	35.4	44.5	34.5	45.2	46.2	50.9	<u>90.5</u>	33.4	64.7
8	Farm Workers, etc.	3.1	6.8	7.4	8.0	8.3	9.5	3.8	<u>54.6</u>	11.8
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

with 89 per cent. With a very high level of self-recruitment, farmers recruited only less than 10 per cent of their members from other occupational origins. The three highest occupations tended to recruit much less from workers in transport and communication than from any other occupational origin.

The table below shows the percentage of sons whose category was higher or lower than that of their fathers.

<u>Status Category</u>	<u>Son's Category in Relation to Father's Category</u>	
	<u>Higher</u>	<u>Lower</u>
1. Professionals, etc.	-	-
2. Clerical Workers	27.9	72.1
3. Sales Workers	27.4	62.6
4. Transportation, etc.	36.5	63.5
5. Craftsmen, etc.	45.7	54.3
6. Service, Sports, etc.	69.5	30.5
7. Farmers	79.8	20.2
8. Farm Workers, etc.	-	-

Apparently, the tendency to rise is more marked among sons whose parents were in the lower status occupations (excluding groups 1 and 8 where movement in only one direction is possible). Taking the extreme case, in relative terms three times as many farmers' sons as sales workers' sons experienced an upward movement. In comparison, the propensity to move down the social hierarchy is directly related to occupational level. The lower ranking occupational groups demonstrated the least amount of downward mobility in relative terms. The distance traversed when such changes in social class occurred is not very substantial as shown in Table 3.4. The means in this table were computed assuming an equal distance between occupational groups and an interval of 1. A look at Column 2 reveals that the

Table 3.4. MEAN RANK OF OCCUPATIONAL DESTINATION AND ORIGIN BY
OCCUPATIONAL STRATUM

Occupational Category	: Mean Origin : (1) :	: Mean Destination : (2) :
1. Professionals, etc.	4.44	3.29
2. Clerical Workers	5.26	3.72
3. Sales Workers	4.98	3.90
4. Transportation and Communication	5.75	4.23
5. Craftsmen	5.95	5.11
6. Sports, Service, etc.	6.02	4.93
7. Farmers	6.88	6.25
8. Farm Workers, etc.	7.26	6.94

outflow means for the intermediate occupations (groups 3-5) fell in the diagonals, an indication of social inheritance. The diverse origins of the labor force belonging to the non-manual occupations is evident from Column 1 where sizeable numbers of workers were able to cross the manual-non-manual demarcation. Of the white collar-classes, the clerical occupations appeared to be the most accessible to the manual workers as well as the farmers.

In the following section, the same data will be analyzed utilizing an alternative approach - the use of the perfect mobility model. The advantage of the technique is the ability to control for the changes in the relative sizes of the various occupational categories between the parental and filial generations (Rogoff, 1951; Rogoff, 1953; p. 30-31; Hall and Glass, 1954, p. 303; de Jong, Brawer and Robin, 1971, p. 1035).

Perfect Mobility Model. The relationship between occupational origin and destination also can be viewed by comparing observed mobility with expected mobility. This can be done by computing ratios based on the "perfect" mobility model which assumes statistical independence of origins and destinations. Under the condition of perfect mobility each destination stratum has the same distribution of origins as the total sample and each origin stratum has the same distribution of destinations as the total sample, i.e. all the ratios are equal to 1.0. These mobility ratios serve as the baseline for comparison as departures from perfect mobility are reflected in the mobility ratios.

The mobility ratios calculated under a perfect mobility model are presented in Table 3.5. That occupational inheritance was greater than expected is evident from the high values in the diagonal. Out of 56 cells off the diagonal, 26 cells have ratios greater than one. This is an indication that social mobility has taken place, with upward mobility occurring as often as downward mobility. In absolute terms, there were twice as many upwardly-mobile men as downwardly-mobile men. Under the same assumption of equal distances between occupational strata and a class interval of one, the spread of underlined ratios indicates that occupational movements were predominantly short distance. The presence of a few underlined ratios near the upper right-hand corner and near the lower left-hand corner signifies that some long distance movements have occurred. The ratios tend to show a greater extent of exchanges of flows among the three topmost ranking occupational group, although the amount of flows between clerical and sales workers was minimal (supply of manpower to each other was almost equal to expectation).

Compared with other low-ranking occupational destinations, service and related occupations received a disproportionately large number of downward movers from all higher occupational origins and at the same time sending out a relatively large volume of upward movers. Supply of manpower to the agricultural occupations was very much below expectation, irrespective of origin. Examined horizontally,

Table 3.5. MOBILITY RATIOS INDICATING MOBILITY OF MARRIED MALES 25 TO 64 YEARS OLD FROM FATHER'S
OCCUPATION TO OCCUPATION IN 1973 ON THE ASSUMPTION OF INDEPENDENCE

Father's Occupation at Age 40	Respondent's Occupation in 1973								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
1 Professionals, Executives and Related Workers	<u>6.85</u>	<u>3.70</u>	<u>2.21</u>	<u>1.22</u>	0.68	<u>1.39</u>	<u>0.39</u>	0.24	1.38
2 Clerical	<u>4.36</u>	<u>5.79</u>	<u>1.16</u>	<u>2.53</u>	<u>1.03</u>	<u>2.61</u>	<u>2.61</u>	0.14	1.71
3 Sales Workers	<u>2.36</u>	<u>1.16</u>	<u>6.73</u>	0.98	<u>1.16</u>	<u>1.16</u>	0.13	0.39	1.06
4 Transportation and Communication Workers	<u>1.84</u>	<u>2.22</u>	<u>1.73</u>	<u>5.02</u>	<u>2.23</u>	<u>1.33</u>	0.15	0.15	1.38
5 Craftsmen	1.00	1.07	0.99	<u>2.22</u>	<u>3.42</u>	<u>1.06</u>	0.29	0.77	1.06
6 Service, etc.	<u>1.82</u>	<u>2.08</u>	<u>1.69</u>	<u>1.70</u>	<u>1.47</u>	<u>3.27</u>	0.30	0.70	1.39
7 Farmers	0.55	0.69	0.53	0.70	0.71	0.79	<u>1.40</u>	0.52	0.64
8 Farm Workers, etc.	0.26	0.58	0.62	0.68	0.70	0.81	0.32	<u>4.63</u>	0.57
Total	1.74	1.64	1.28	1.43	1.14	1.31	0.23	0.48	

the mobility ratios indicate that the intermediate or blue-collar occupations serve as a repository of downwardly mobile members of the labor force. The sons of service workers were also more likely to be upwardly mobile than any of those from other occupational groups. While the sons of farmers experienced relatively a high degree of mobility, their penetration into the higher occupational levels is much below what would be expected, indicating that the higher occupational levels, particularly the white-collar ones, were not easily accessible to them. In contrast, the white-collar positions were more readily accessible to sons of relatively proximal beginnings.

A closer look at Table 3.5 reveals some interesting patterns. The inheritance ratios (diagonal values) decrease nearly monotonically as one goes down the occupational hierarchy. Expressive of higher self-recruitment, the ratios in the upper ranks are larger than those in the lower ranks. Manifesting a greater intensity of social inheritance than the other lower ranked workers, the farm workers digressed from this pattern. Self-recruitment was almost seven times greater than expected in the professional and sales ranks and a little over five times greater in the transportation and communication group. While recruitment from other ranks was rather pervasive with the exception of the farm occupations (see column values), the magnitude never exceeded recruitment from within the ranks. Generally, recruits for the upper ranks primarily came from the adjacent occupational groups. For example, in the case of the uppermost group, the number of recruits from the clerical rank was four times greater than expected. The ratios for the farm occupations show that they fell short of their quota of supply to all other occupations except their own. One likely reason for such a disadvantage among the individuals of farm origins may be the lack of training for occupations other than agricultural. The amount of recruitment from the agrarian occupations was inversely related to the occupational rank, the higher the occupation the least likely it drew its members from agricultural origins.

The relative changes in class positions between parents and sons, as measured in Table 3.5, are quite different from those suggested by Table 3.3. In the latter table, upper farm occupations manifested the highest degree of self-recruitment. Apparently, this was largely due to the dominant shares of this occupational class in both generations. In other words, one should necessarily encounter a large proportion of the sons of upper farmers to be themselves in the same occupational class, because in both father and son generations that class contains the largest proportion of all members of the labor force. An application of the perfect mobility model, as mentioned earlier, overcomes this difficulty. Under this situation, independence of origins and destinations was assumed and the only determinants of mobility were the proportion of all sons coming from a certain class and the proportion of all jobs available within the same class. While the descriptive analysis shows that, with reference to the whole occupational structure, farmers had the highest inheritance ratio, the second method brings to light the important fact that, as compared with the other categories, mobility in this category was the highest of all. The mobility ratio (1.4, see diagonal of Table 3.5) shows the smallest excess over the expected, an indication that relative to remaining in one's original status, the upper farm sons demonstrated the highest mobility of all strata. An inspection of the entire profile on the basis of the inheritance ratios reveals that the upper farming occupations formed a trough.

Table 3.6 contains summary indices derived from the mobility ratios in Table 3.5. Overall mobility (both in-mobility and out-mobility) was one and one-fifth times higher than expected. Overall stability was almost five times higher than expectation.

An examination of the average in-mobility ratios (Column 1) discloses a moderately high extent of entry into the professional and clerical jobs. The ratios suggest that the two highest occupational classes were the most open to sons from other origins.

Lower in-mobility values were exhibited by the sales (1.28), transportation and communication (1.43), craftsmen (1.14), and service (1.42) groups. Sons from other origins had the same chance of entering the transportation and communication occupations as the sports, service, and related occupations. Of the intermediate occupations, the skilled occupations appeared the least accessible. Recruiting their members mostly from within, the farm occupations showed very low in-mobility ratios. The difficulty of getting out of the farm occupations is manifested by equally low average out-mobility values. True to what has been noted earlier in the descriptive analysis, the sons of clerical workers were the most mobile, the occupational class registering the highest average out-mobility value (1.71). Relative to ease in moving out of origin, the sons of professionals and managers, transportation and communication workers, and sports and service workers who enjoyed the same opportunities followed the clerical workers' sons.

An attempt is made in Column 3 to indicate the reciprocity of occupations to one another by comparing the movement in one direction relative to that in the other. According to this criterion, three clusters of occupations can be identified. The farm occupations had ratios significantly greater than unity which signifies that sons were more likely to leave these occupations than other sons to enter them. The propensity to move into or out of the second and last occupational strata was almost the same, with outward movement slightly favoured. For the remaining occupations, average in-mobility exceeded the average out-mobility. Although most of the ratios are not significantly lower than unity, there is an indication of a trend towards a relative openness of these strata, particularly the highest ranking category. Note that the ratios for the blue-collar occupations (groups 4-6) tend to support a previous observation that these occupations are recipients of mobile individuals originating from other strata.

Table 3.6. SUMMARY MEASURES DERIVED FROM THE MOBILITY RATIOS (TABLE 8) CLASSIFIED BY OCCUPATION

Occupation	Average In-Mobility	Average Out-Mobility	Out-Mobility + In-Mobility : ((2) ÷ (1))	Stability or Inheritance	Stability + In-Mobility : ((4) ÷ (1))	Stability + Out-Mobility : ((4) ÷ (2))
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1 Professionals	1.74	1.38	0.79	6.85	3.94	4.96
2 Clerical Workers	1.64	1.71	1.04	5.79	3.53	2.95
3 Sales Workers	1.28	1.06	0.83	6.75	5.27	6.37
4 Transportation and Communication Workers	1.43	1.38	0.96	5.02	3.51	3.64
5 Craftsmen	1.14	1.06	0.93	3.42	3.00	3.23
6 Service, etc.	1.42	1.39	0.98	3.27	2.30	2.35
7 Farmers	0.23	0.64	2.78	1.40	6.09	1.87
8 Farm Workers, etc.	0.48	0.57	1.19	4.63	11.02	8.12
Overall	1.16	1.19	1.02	4.64		

In scrutinizing Columns 1-4 of Table 3.6 to avoid confusion, one has to recall what Rogoff (1953) has said about the nature of the mobility ratios:

The statistical properties of ... mobility coefficients are such that the immobility and mobility values do not stand in a fixed relation to one another. It does not follow that an occupational class characterized by a high degree of inheritance (immobility) need be characterized by a low degree of mobility (p.58).

The group composed of service and related workers displayed the least tendency to recruit members from within the rank relative to recruitment from other ranks (see Column 5, Table 3.6). This means that it was easier for sons from other origins to enter these occupations than sons from the same origin. The reverse is true for the farm occupations, which is understandable, as well as the sales occupations. It must be remembered that the sales occupations showed the third highest proportions of sons remaining in their parents' class (Table 3.2) and of self-recruitment (Table 3.3).

The high out-mobility among sons of farmers relative to immobility is very apparent from Column 6. This in direct contrast to the sons from the third and last ranking occupations, whose likelihood of entering their fathers' class was greater than that of entering other social classes. Comparatively moderate inclinations to inherit their fathers' social status relative to leaving it were noted for sons of service and clerical workers. Columns 5 and 6, taken simultaneously, demonstrate that the sales rank as well as the farm labor and others rank was relatively closed while the clerical and service groups were open. The other strata were interspersed between these two extremes.

Table 3.7 shows the percentage distributions of the different status categories by origin and destination for various time references. Column 3 of each panel indicates the magnitude as

Table 3.7. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE MARRIED MALES 25 TO 64 YEARS OLD
BY ORIGIN AND DESTINATION AND INDEXES OF DISSIMILARITY

	: Origin :(Father's Occupation : at Age 40)	: Destination :(Respondent's Occupa- : tion in 1973)	: Percentage : Difference
A. Intergenerational			
1 Professionals	3.8	5.5	1.7
2 Clerical Workers	1.2	2.4	1.1
3 Sales Workers	4.4	6.3	1.9
4 Transportation and Communication Workers	2.1	5.5	3.4
5 Craftsmen	7.3	12.3	5.0
6 Service, etc.	4.7	7.2	2.5
7 Farmers	64.7	47.9	-16.8
8 Farm Workers, etc.	11.8	12.9	1.1
	Index of dissimilarity		<u>16.8</u>
	: Origin :(R's Occupation : in 1965)	: Destination :(R's Occupation : in 1973)	: Percentage : Difference
B. Intragenerational			
1 Professionals	4.8	5.2	0.4
2 Clerical Workers	3.0	2.6	-0.4
3 Sales Workers	5.0	5.8	0.8
4 Transportation and Communication Workers	6.4	6.7	0.3
5 Craftsmen	11.2	12.1	0.9
6 Service, etc.	7.3	7.0	-0.3
7 Farmers	48.8	47.1	-1.7
8 Farm Workers, etc.	13.5	13.6	0.1
	Index of dissimilarity		<u>2.4</u>

well as the direction of shifts or movements which were caused by changes in the occupational structure. One of such changes, a major one, is that which involves farmers (See Panel A). While 64.7 per cent of the fathers were farmers and farm managers, only 47.9 per cent of the sons held these positions, which implies a major structural change in the farm occupations. At the same time, the intermediate occupations (groups 4-6) underwent moderate expansions to the sacrifice of the upper level occupations (groups 1-3). This so-called structural mobility, measured by the index of dissimilarity, amounts to 16.8, a little over two-fifths of total observed mobility (see Table 3.8). If this figure is subtracted from the total observed mobility we obtain an indication of the extent of circulation mobility which measures the share of the observed mobility that was not structurally determined. It can be seen from Table 3.8 that circulation mobility amounted to 24.6 per cent, which, compared with figures pertaining to the sixties, approximates the circulation mobility in the United States (25.7) and betters that of Italy (16.6) (Brown and Jones, 1969, p. 338). This index is of great interest

Table 3.8. GENERAL INDICES OF INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY, PHILIPPINES, MAY 1973

Index	:	Percentage
A. Total observed mobility		41.4
1. Upward mobility		27.8
2. Downward mobility		13.6
B. Structural mobility		16.8
C. Circulation mobility		24.6
D. Expected mobility		65.5
1. Upward mobility		39.3
2. Downward mobility		26.3
E. Deviation of observed from expected		-24.2
1. Upward mobility		-11.5
2. Downward mobility		-12.7

because it suggests how open the occupational system would be in the absence of structural demands for movements. Compared with expected mobility under the perfect mobility model in which sons from all social backgrounds have equal opportunity to enter any occupational class, observed mobility amounts to fully five-eighths of the level expected. Had there been a more rapid transformation of the labor force, the discrepancy between actual and expected overall mobility would have probably been correspondingly reduced. It can also be seen from the figures in A and D, Table 3.8, that the ratio of downward movement to overall movement is less favorable under the full-equality model than actual.

B. Patterns of Intragenerational Flows

During the period 1965-1973, occupational changes involved some 750,000 men, representing 15.2 per cent of the total sample. About nine per cent of the total sample experienced upward mobility, while 6.6 per cent suffered a demotion in occupational rank. Structural changes have been very minimal during the interval (Table 3.7, Panel B), such that circulation mobility amounted to 12.8 per cent.

As shown in Table 3.9 (row percentages), farmers, craftsmen, professionals were more likely to remain in their positions. Clerical workers had the greatest propensity to change their jobs and when they did, the chance of achieving a higher position was the same as getting a lower one. In the case of mobile sales workers, transportation and communication workers, and craftsmen, the likelihood of a downward movement was greater than upward movement. For men who held upper farm jobs as of 1965, the chance of gaining a higher rank was indeed very difficult. On the other hand, the upper farm occupational rank served as the terminal destination of manpower from other occupational groups.

Table 3.10 attests to the very high degree of self-recruitment in the upper farm stratum. Of all men who were in this stratum as

Table 3.9. MOBILITY FROM OCCUPATION IN 1965 TO OCCUPATION IN 1973 FOR MARRIED MALES
25 TO 64 YEARS OLD: OUTFLOW PERCENTAGES

Occupation in 1965	Occupation in 1973								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
1 Professional	<u>83.4</u>	2.2	7.1	1.6	1.3	1.1	3.3	0.0	100.0
2 Clerical Workers	16.2	<u>67.6</u>	2.9	2.2	1.5	2.2	6.8	0.6	100.0
3 Sales Workers	4.0	0.8	<u>79.7</u>	2.3	2.7	2.5	4.4	3.6	100.0
4 Transport and Communication Workers	2.3	0.8	1.4	<u>81.5</u>	4.1	3.8	4.5	1.6	100.0
5 Craftsmen	1.2	0.3	2.0	2.4	<u>85.0</u>	2.5	3.9	2.7	100.0
6 Service Workers, etc.	0.9	1.2	2.0	3.9	7.4	<u>72.0</u>	7.6	5.0	100.0
7 Farmers, etc.	0.2	0.5	1.2	1.0	2.4	1.4	<u>89.8</u>	3.5	100.0
8 Farm Workers, etc.	0.3	0.1	2.1	1.2	3.0	1.9	10.3	<u>81.1</u>	100.0
Total	5.2	2.6	5.8	6.7	12.1	7.0	47.1	13.6	

Table 3.10. MOBILITY FROM OCCUPATION IN 1965 TO OCCUPATION IN 1973 FOR MARRIED MALES
25 TO 64 YEARS OLD: INFLOW PERCENTAGES

Occupation in 1965	Occupation in 1973								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
1 Professional	<u>76.9</u>	4.1	5.9	1.1	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.0	4.8
2 Clerical Workers	9.4	<u>78.3</u>	1.4	1.0	0.4	1.0	0.4	0.1	3.0
3 Sales Workers	3.9	1.7	<u>69.3</u>	1.7	1.1	1.8	0.5	1.3	5.0
4 Transportation and Communication Workers	2.9	1.9	1.6	<u>78.1</u>	2.1	3.5	0.6	0.8	6.4
5 Craftsmen	2.6	1.5	3.9	4.0	<u>78.6</u>	4.1	0.9	2.2	11.2
6 Service Workers, etc.	1.3	3.3	2.6	4.3	4.4	<u>75.5</u>	1.2	2.7	7.3
7 Farmers	2.4	8.8	10.3	7.3	9.6	9.8	<u>93.1</u>	12.5	48.8
8 Farm Workers, etc.	0.6	0.4	5.0	2.5	3.3	3.7	3.0	<u>80.4</u>	13.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

2

of 1973, ninety-three per cent had originally been there. The top-most stratum drew its external recruits mostly from the lower white-collar positions (groups 2 and 3) and from the upper blue-collar positions (groups 4 and 5). The sales group, which had the lowest self-recruitment rate, recruited the least from both of the next higher and next lower strata. Ignoring the first occupational stratum, there is a noticeable absence of concentrated external recruitments from proximal groups. Interestingly, external recruitment involved mobile persons of widely dispersed origins.

The inheritance and out-mobility ratios calculated under the model of perfect mobility are displayed in Table 3.11. The inheritance ratio besides being a measure of stability or immobility as stated earlier, can be used as a measure of association between social origin and present social class (Glass, 1954). The inheritance ratios (Column 1) show that the highest intensity of association between previous status and current status was found among the upper occupational groups. As in intergenerational mobility, the sons of farmers achieved the least inheritance ratio which implies a high level of mobility relative to the other occupational classes. In all the class categories, mobility has been very much less than would be expected under the conditions of perfect mobility as shown by the total out-mobility ratios, although the values varied greatly.

In Columns 3 and 4, the out-mobility ratios, calculated taking into consideration the subject's position in the scale as higher or lower than that of their earlier positions, were observed to form a distinct order in the occupational scale. For the subjects who are classified higher, the indices are in a decreasing order down the scale, those from the service occupations excepted. For those placed lower, the indices generally follow an increasing trend. These trends suggest that those men who occupied higher occupations, if ever they experienced changes in occupation, were more likely to achieve a position higher than the previous one, while those who occupied lower status occupations were more likely to fall further down the scale. It would seem that advancement or retrogression in social position is related to the earlier placement of the individual relative to the status hierarchy.

Table 3.11. INHERITANCE AND OUT-MOBILITY RATIOS FOR STATUS CATEGORIES HELD IN 1965 AND 1973

Status Category	: Inheritance :		Out-Mobility Ratio		
	: Ratio :	: Total :	Higher :	Lower :	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
1 Professionals, etc.	16.078	0.204	-	-	
2 Clerical Workers	25.953	0.332	3.127	0.175	
3 Sales Workers	13.885	0.215	0.631	0.178	
4 Transportation and Communication Workers	12.260	0.198	0.334	0.175	
5 Craftsmen, etc.	7.008	0.171	0.293	0.135	
6 Service, Sports, etc.	10.352	0.301	0.478	0.207	
7 Farmers	1.906	0.193	0.171	0.256	
8 Farm Workers, etc.	5.962	0.128	-	-	

Urban-Rural Patterns

A. Intergenerational Mobility

Of the total sample, 72.6 per cent came from the rural areas, while the remaining 27.4 per cent represented the urban areas. Overall mobility in the rural areas was 30.3 per cent, while the urban labor force experienced over twice as much movement (70.7 per cent).

Table 3.12 presents the outflow percentages which describe the supply patterns of sons from different occupational origins in terms of fathers' occupation at age 40. The greater opportunity for personal advancement among urban sons is very glaring as evidenced by the percentages below the main diagonal. Out of 28 cells, the urban per cents are larger than the rural per cents in 25 cells. It can also be noted that it was much more difficult for the rural

Table 3.12. MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION AT AGE 40 TO OCCUPATION IN 1973 FOR MARRIED MALES 25 TO 64 YEARS OLD, URBAN AND RURAL:
OUTFLOW PERCENTAGES

Father's Occupation at Age 40	Respondent's Occupation in 1973								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
A. Urban									
1 Professionals	37.5	10.9	16.3	6.7	8.5	12.1	7.6	.4	100.0
2 Clerical	28.5	17.5	8.2	15.3	11.5	14.6	2.1	2.3	100.0
3 Sales	16.8	2.8	49.1	7.0	12.3	7.5	4.2	.3	100.0
4 Transport and Communication	13.6	6.4	11.6	20.5	32.1	12.8	3.0	.0	100.0
5 Craftsmen	4.8	4.4	9.2	13.1	49.6	9.5	3.9	5.5	100.0
6 Service	15.7	8.0	15.1	9.8	22.0	21.4	2.3	5.5	100.0
7 Farmers	7.7	6.8	11.5	11.3	26.7	17.2	15.7	3.1	100.0
8 Farm Workers	3.9	5.2	8.7	6.7	18.9	12.5	3.8	40.3	100.0
Total	13.0	6.8	15.9	10.7	25.0	14.2	8.6	5.8	100.0
B. Rural									
1 Professionals	38.0	2.9	6.2	7.1	7.9	3.3	23.0	11.3	100.0
2 Clerical	5.4	0.0	3.6	8.4	17.5	36.2	28.9	0.0	100.0
3 Sales	4.1	2.9	27.0	1.6	18.8	10.5	19.2	15.9	100.0
4 Transport and Communication	4.2	3.6	9.8	40.0	19.1	4.2	13.9	5.4	100.0
5 Craftsmen	6.3	0.5	2.9	11.2	33.4	5.5	25.0	15.0	100.0
6 Service	3.2	1.4	5.1	9.0	13.2	26.2	28.7	13.2	100.0
7 Farmers	2.1	0.6	1.8	2.4	5.3	3.5	77.0	7.3	100.0
8 Farm Workers	.9	.5	2.9	3.1	6.3	4.3	18.1	63.9	100.0
Total	2.7	.6	2.7	3.6	7.4	4.6	62.8	15.5	100.0

Table 3.13. MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION AT AGE 40 TO OCCUPATION IN 1973
FOR MARRIED MALES 25 TO 64 YEARS OLD, URBAN AND RURAL:
INFLOW PERCENTAGES

[illegible]

sons of farm origins to attain white-collar jobs than the urban ones. On the other hand, while the difference is not substantial, the probability of reaching the topmost rank for rural sons of craftsmen is higher than for urban sons of the same origin. The holding power of the origins seems to be concentrated in the lower ranks in the rural sample. In the urban sample, the holding power was more visible in the intermediate and higher levels.

The inflow percentages are contained in Table 3.13. In both urban and rural samples, self-recruitment in the farm occupations was the greatest (see percentages in the diagonal). Nevertheless a marked external recruitment from the upper farm group is evidenced by the large row per cents that correspond to it. Generally, the degree of recruitment of sons of farm origins is inversely related to the level of the destination in the urban sample. In the case of the rural sample, recruitment of sons from the same origin tends to be greatest in the professional and clerical ranks and the least in the sales, transport and communication ranks. The upper occupational levels in the rural sector were least likely to draw their members from the higher strata. In the urban sector, outside recruits appeared to come from more heterogeneous origins.

Upward mobility has been more frequent than downward mobility in both the urban and rural sectors (Table 3.14). A look at the figures for all types of movements, however, show that in the rural sector, social inheritance was the rule rather than the exception, with seven out of ten sons remaining in the stratum of their fathers. In contrast, only less than three out of ten inherited their fathers' social position in the urban areas. In the latter area, the likelihood of rising in rank was almost three times the likelihood of suffering a diminution in rank. Taking specific occupational groups, the most upwardly mobile were the upper farmers followed by the service and sports workers in the non-farm sectors. Among the agrarian workers, the lowest occupations again evinced the highest rates of upward mobility.

Table 3.14. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY OCCUPATIONAL ORIGIN
AND BY DIRECTION OF MOBILITY, URBAN AND RURAL

Occupational Origin	Direction of Movement		
	Upward	Downward	Same
<u>A. Urban</u>			
1 Professionals	-	62.7	37.3
2 Clerical Workers	28.5	54.0	17.5
3 Sales Workers	19.6	31.3	49.1
4 Transport & Communication Workers	31.6	47.9	20.5
5 Craftsmen	31.5	19.0	49.5
6 Service Workers	70.7	7.9	21.4
7 Farmers	81.2	3.1	15.7
8 Farm Workers, etc.	59.7	-	40.3
Total	51.7	19.0	29.3
<u>B. Rural</u>			
1 Professionals	-	61.2	38.8
2 Clerical Workers	6.6	92.4	1.0
3 Sales Workers	6.8	66.4	26.8
4 Transport & Communication Workers	17.7	42.7	39.6
5 Craftsmen	20.9	45.7	33.4
6 Service Workers	31.6	42.1	26.3
7 Farmers	15.7	7.3	77.0
8 Farm Workers, etc.	36.1	-	63.9
Total	18.7	11.6	69.7

Total observed mobility in the urban areas was 81 per cent of expected mobility (Table 3.15). However, substantially due to the much less rapid transformation of the labor force overall actual mobility was only three-fifths of the expected level under the perfect mobility model in the agricultural areas.

Table 3.15. GENERAL MOBILITY INDICES FOR URBAN AND RURAL RESPONDENTS

Index	:	Urban	:	Rural
1. Overall observed mobility	:	70.7	:	30.3
2. Structural mobility	:	31.8	:	11.8
3. Circulation mobility	:	38.9	:	18.5
4. Expected mobility	:	87.5	:	50.5
5. Deviation of observed from expected	:	-16.8	:	-20.2

The mobility ratios in Table 3.16 calculated under the assumption of independence between fathers' and sons' occupational classes tend to be largest along the diagonals, this tendency being more marked in the rural than in the urban areas. Indicative of social inheritance, the ratios demonstrate the fluidity of the intermediate strata (occupational groups 4-6) and the tenacity of the upper (groups 1-3) and lower strata (group 8) in the urban sector. A different picture emerges from the rural sector where a demarcation line clearly distinguishes the occupational categories into two broad groups, the first three strata (excluding clerical class where very few cases were reported) where a high intensity of inheritance was found and, the second group, the last four strata where the inclination to inherit the parents' occupation was much less, hence undergoing a relatively higher degree of mobility. The number of underscored ratios off the diagonal

Table 3.16. MOBILITY RATIOS FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION AT AGE 40 TO OCCUPATION
IN 1973 FOR MARRIED MALES 25 TO 64 YEARS OLD, URBAN AND RURAL
UNDER THE ASSUMPTION OF INDEPENDENCE

Father's Occupation At Age 40	Respondent's Occupation in 1973							
	: 1	: 2	: 3	: 4	: 5	: 6	: 7	: 8
A. Urban								
1 Professionals	<u>2.88</u>	<u>1.60</u>	<u>1.02</u>	0.63	0.34	0.85	0.88	0.10
2 Clerical	<u>2.19</u>	<u>2.57</u>	0.52	<u>1.43</u>	0.46	<u>1.03</u>	0.24	0.40
3 Sales	<u>1.29</u>	0.41	<u>3.09</u>	0.65	0.49	0.53	0.49	0.05
4 Transport and Communication	<u>1.05</u>	0.94	0.73	<u>1.92</u>	<u>1.28</u>	0.90	0.36	-
5 Craftsmen	0.37	0.65	0.58	<u>1.22</u>	<u>1.98</u>	0.67	0.46	0.95
6 Service	<u>1.21</u>	<u>1.18</u>	0.95	0.92	0.88	<u>1.51</u>	0.28	0.95
7 Farmers	0.59	1.00	0.72	<u>1.05</u>	<u>1.07</u>	<u>1.21</u>	<u>1.83</u>	0.53
8 Farm Workers, etc.	0.30	0.76	0.55	0.63	0.75	0.88	0.44	<u>6.95</u>
B. Rural								
1 Professionals	<u>14.18</u>	<u>3.63</u>	<u>2.30</u>	<u>1.97</u>	<u>1.07</u>	0.72	0.37	0.04
2 Clerical	<u>2.00</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.33</u>	<u>2.33</u>	<u>2.36</u>	<u>7.87</u>	0.46	-
3 Sales	<u>1.52</u>	<u>3.62</u>	<u>10.0</u>	0.44	<u>2.54</u>	<u>2.28</u>	0.30	1.02
4 Transport and Communication	<u>1.56</u>	<u>4.50</u>	<u>3.63</u>	<u>11.08</u>	<u>2.58</u>	0.91	0.22	0.35
5 Craftsmen	<u>2.33</u>	0.75	<u>1.07</u>	<u>3.11</u>	<u>4.51</u>	<u>1.20</u>	0.40	0.85
6 Service, etc.	<u>1.18</u>	<u>1.88</u>	<u>1.89</u>	<u>2.50</u>	<u>1.78</u>	<u>5.70</u>	0.46	0.97
7 Farmers	0.78	0.88	0.67	0.67	0.72	0.76	<u>1.23</u>	0.47
8 Farm Workers, etc.	0.33	0.75	1.07	0.86	0.85	0.93	0.29	<u>4.12</u>

(13 for urban and 27 for rural) shows evidence of greater mobility (relative to total mobility) in the rural than in the urban sector when changes in the occupational structure were controlled. At this juncture it must be remembered that while overall observed mobility for the urban area was much higher than overall mobility in the rural area (Table 3.15), the proportion of circulation mobility (independent of structural changes) to overall mobility in the former area was 55 per cent while in the latter sector it was 61 per cent. The underlined ratios appear to concentrate in cells adjacent to the diagonal but there is a sprinkling in areas far off the diagonal, an evidence of some long-distance movements among the upwardly as well as the downwardly mobile.

B. Intragenerational Mobility

In terms of intragenerational movements, the urban sample was more mobile than the rural sample. About 81 per cent of all urban and about 86 per cent of all rural men did not change jobs between 1965 and 1973. Upward movement was almost of the same degree for both the urban (9%) and rural (8%) sectors. Downward mobility was experienced by 10 per cent of the urban sample and by 6 per cent of the rural sample.

Tables 3.17 and 3.18 show the outflow and inflow percentages, respectively. The inheritance ratios computed on the basis of the model of perfect mobility are presented in Table 3.19. The presence of two barriers -- one, a "braking" effect for the downwardly mobile from the upper strata, and two, a "screening" effect for the upwardly mobile from the lower strata -- is depicted in the first two tables. These effects are more conspicuous in the urban sector than in the rural sector. For those who held professional, and clerical jobs, downward moves were concentrated at the lowest white-collar occupations -- sales -- beyond which only limited numbers of moves were recorded. In the case of the other non-farm occupations, the barrier is visible right before the farm occupations. It seems that if an individual fell from the uppermost levels, his

Table 3.17. MOBILITY FROM OCCUPATION IN 1965 TO OCCUPATION IN 1973 FOR MARRIED
MALES 25 TO 64 YEARS OLD, URBAN AND RURAL: OUTFLOW PERCENTAGES

Occupation in 1965	Occupation in 1973								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
A. Urban									
1 Professionals	81.5	3.0	8.1	1.9	1.9	0.9	2.7	0.0	100.0
2 Clerical	18.4	69.5	3.6	0.8	1.9	2.8	2.4	0.6	100.0
3 Sales	5.1	0.9	85.6	1.2	2.7	2.5	2.0	.0	100.0
4 Transport & Communication	2.5	1.1	1.4	85.8	5.3	3.2	0.6	0.1	100.0
5 Craftsmen	1.3	0.3	2.2	1.4	89.5	2.1	0.9	2.3	100.0
6 Service	0.3	0.9	2.5	4.5	8.3	78.3	2.7	2.5	100.0
7 Farmers	.0	.4	7.5	4.6	9.7	5.7	68.1	4.0	100.0
8 Farm Workers, etc.	.9	.0	3.2	1.0	6.9	8.0	3.9	76.1	100.0
Total	13.1	7.0	14.1	13.6	24.5	13.7	8.4	5.6	100.0
B. Rural									
1 Professionals	88.4	.4	4.5	.7	.0	1.4	4.6	6.0	100.0
2 Clerical	7.8	60.4	.0	7.6	.0	.0	24.2	0.0	100.0
3 Sales	1.8	0.7	67.1	4.6	2.5	2.3	9.6	11.4	100.0
4 Transport & Communication	2.1	0.2	1.5	75.7	2.4	4.5	9.9	3.7	100.0
5 Craftsmen	1.1	0.3	1.8	3.6	79.5	3.0	7.6	3.1	100.0
6 Service	1.5	1.4	1.6	3.4	6.4	65.0	12.9	7.8	100.0
7 Farmers	.2	.5	.8	.8	2.0	1.1	91.1	3.5	100.0
8 Farm Workers, etc.	.2	.1	2.0	1.2	2.5	1.1	11.1	81.8	100.0
Total	2.1	1.0	2.7	4.1	7.5	4.5	61.5	16.6	100.0

Table 3.18. MOBILITY FROM OCCUPATION IN 1965 TO OCCUPATION IN 1973 FROM MARRIED MALES 25 TO 64 YEARS OLD, URBAN AND RURAL: INFLOW PERCENTAGES

[illegible]

Table 3.19. INHERITANCE RATIOS FOR THE OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES HELD IN 1965 AND 1973 ACCORDING TO THE RESPONDENT'S RESIDENCE

Occupational Class	Inheritance Ratios	
	Urban	Rural
1 Professional, etc.	6.2	42.1
2 Clerical Workers	9.9	60.4
3 Sales Workers	6.1	24.8
4 Transportation and Communication	6.3	18.5
5 Craftsmen	3.6	10.6
6 Sports, Service, etc.	5.7	14.4
7 Farmers	8.1	1.5
8 Farm Workers	13.6	4.9

previous origins worked a sizeable braking effect on the magnitude of his fall, thereby greatly reducing his chances of sliding down the white-collar occupations. The second barrier operated to make difficult for those occupying lowly origins to penetrate the two topmost occupational classes. For these individuals, the intermediate as well as the lowest white-collar occupations became the focus of upward mobility since they required less education and length of training and provided rewards commensurate to such qualifications (see Columns 1 and 5, Table 2.1).

The highest inheritance ratio, hence, highest association between earlier and present occupations was found in class 8 in the urban and class 2 in the rural (Table 3.19). The least index was observed from classes 5 and 7 in the urban and rural areas, respectively. The farm workers were a disadvantaged group in the urban setting where their out-mobility was much more restricted than persons coming from other occupational strata. On the other hand, they enjoyed relatively greater mobility in the rural

areas. This could have stemmed from differential recruitment requirements of the next ranking occupations in the urban and rural sectors. The remaining classes behave similarly and lie between the two extremes in both sectors. It can be noted that clerical occupations consistently registered high inheritance ratios, an indication of an "exclusivist" tendency. Irrespective of the residence, clerical workers in 1965 tended mostly to remain as such in 1973.

It is possible that the present investigation has yielded results which suffer from some form of bias arising from the broad groupings of the occupations. For one, Duncan (1966, p. 96) noted from his reanalysis of Rogoff's (1952) mobility tables, that "some (underscoring mine) modifications of the mobility pattern ... occurred in consequence of the change in structure represented by alterations of the frequency distributions of origin and destination classes." However, the findings of a more recent study conducted by Hauser, Koffel, Travis, and Dickinson (1975) are reassuring. Using existing data on intergenerational mobility in the United States (1910 to 1970), they tested whether differences in conclusions among mobility trends and patterns are traceable to the differences among data and statistical measures applied. The aforementioned comprehensive study revealed no changes of association between father and son categories in the aggregate of cells involving occupational inheritance or in the aggregate of cells involving occupational mobility regardless of data. The same results held throughout men's work careers and they held whether occupations were classified in as few as three or as many as 12 categories.

The foregoing analyses of the occupational structure employing two approaches, descriptive analysis and the use of model of perfect mobility, provided some insights on the characteristics of the Philippine social stratification system. Distinguished into eight major occupational groups, male labor force has been found to be almost 42 per cent mobile. Albeit a big proportion of this overall mobility was due to structural changes, shifts in occupations were

mainly due to the freer circulation of individuals. The rapid expansion of some occupations and the concomitant shrinkage of the others served to create a highly mobile urban population (71 per cent). Whether the same phenomenon can be evolved in the rural sector to enhance vertical mobility, while simultaneously maintaining the relatively free flow of individuals, remains to be seen in the future.

Judging from the intergenerational flows of manpower, the Philippines can be said to be gradually evolving from a rigid occupational structure. Inheritance rates by specific occupations have been less than the total mobility rates (upward and downward), with the exception of the agricultural occupations in the rural areas where the inheritance rates ranged from 64 to 77 per cent. Regardless of time reference, the propensity to remain in one's former position was directly related to status rank -- the higher the stratum was in the status hierarchy the greater the proclivity to stay and the lower the occupational status the less the tendency to remain. However, this does not mean that the higher ranking strata (professional and clerical occupations) have been closed to external recruits; on the contrary, these two occupational groups have been the most open destination classes for the upwardly mobile sons.

The most mobile individuals were sons whose fathers were farmers or who previously held farm occupations, in the case of intragenerational movement. These individuals experienced much difficulty in getting out of their status origins, but once out demonstrated an astounding capability to penetrate various upper occupational strata. Relatively fewer numbers, however, reached the topmost occupations as their origin worked against them in the acquisition of the necessary training and skills required by these occupations. As vividly shown in the case of intragenerational mobility, a barrier tended to prevent them from entering the top ranking positions, though this effect was not limited to them since those from the other low statuses suffered the same fate.

Among the mobile persons, those who held higher statuses in 1965 exhibited greater likelihood of gaining a still higher status in 1973; and those who held lower statuses showed greater proclivity to assume lower ones in 1973.

Overall upward mobility as shown by the descriptive analysis exceeded downward mobility with the probability of upward movement increasing monotonically with a reduction in rank. This is confirmed by the perfect mobility model. Sons of manual backgrounds demonstrated the most success in crossing the manual-non-manual boundary, particularly the sons of sports and service workers. Mobility of these sons exceeded theoretical expectations with the reverse applying to the lower occupations.

Regarding downward mobility, the data on intragenerational flows showed the presence of a braking effect that tended to cushion the fall of those in the upper strata, with the result that the probability of remaining in the white-collar statuses was heightened.

Irrespective of the direction of movement, a prominent pattern is the tendency for change to occur between adjacent or closely related occupational strata. This phenomenon is revealed by both methods of analysis. High proportions, under the descriptive analysis, and mobility ratios above unity, under the perfect mobility model, tend to cluster around the occupational origin. Although movement has been mainly short-distance, the data point to long distances negotiated by some of the mobile individuals. For example, the supply of sons from the intermediate levels to the white-collar occupations exceeded expectation; similarly, actual recruitment from the white-collar occupations into the middle occupations surpassed what was expected though to a relatively lesser degree. It appears that clerical jobs exerted superior appeal to the upwardly mobile individuals than did the other white-collar strata. The reasons for this could be the greater rewards in terms of income and prestige of the clerical jobs than the sales jobs and the difficulty of meeting the qualifications required by the professional, technical, and managerial jobs.

As expected, the urban sector emerged having the less rigid occupational structure. Rural mobility was only 43 per cent /gross of the urban total mobility. Circulation mobility, a measure of the openness of the occupational structure, in the rural areas amounted to less than one-half of the circulation mobility in the urban areas, although relative to gross mobility, the former appeared to be more egalitarian.

In spite of the restrictions manifest, the intergenerational and intragenerational flows of manpower in the Philippines suggest favorable trends in relation to the permeability of the occupational structure and the provision of a more equitable opportunity for members of the labor force, particularly those from the low levels, to attain higher or more rewarding positions in the occupational ladder: (1) the increased relative "openness" of the top ranking occupations; (2) the greater mobility among the intermediate status individuals, (3) the very diverse origins of upward movers, and (4) the increased percentage of members from low ranking occupational origins supplied to the high ranking occupations.

CHAPTER IV

DIFFERENTIAL FERTILITY BY SOCIAL CLASS

Differential fertility has always been a field of special interest to researchers who delve into questions relating to the reproductive behavior of various groups of human populations. Studies on differential fertility seek enlightenment on the underlying factors which help explain fertility levels and trends. Indeed, differential fertility research provides baseline information for assessing prospects of fertility change, a characteristic which makes it much akin to the study of population change.

Additionally, the analysis of fertility differences by associated factors has become increasingly important in the Philippine context in view of efforts to bring down the high rate of population growth in the country. The Philippine intercensal growth rate was found to be 3.01 per cent during the sixties and 2.78 per cent during the period 1970-1975. Part of this decline has been attributed to the family planning program of the government. The identification of variations in the reproductive behavior among subgroups of the population serves to pinpoint target populations and establish a system of priorities for the current family planning program to make it more effective.

In this chapter, the relationship between social status, past and present, and the reproductive behavior of women less than 50 years old, married only once, living with their husband, and married for ten years or more at the time of the 1973 National Demographic Survey, is examined while controlling for various background and intervening variables. This subsample actually is composed of the wives of the males whose occupational data have been analyzed in the preceding chapter. Fertility is measured in terms of cumulative fertility or the mean children ever born (CEB) per woman at the time of the interview. Present social class is

determined by the husband's occupation in 1973 and social origin by the husband's father's occupation at age 40. In order to obtain usable cross-tabulations and meaningful results, the eight occupational groups used in Chapter III were lumped into four social categories. The broad groups were combined as follows:

Professionals, Administrators, Executives, Managers	--	High White-Collar
Clerical and Sales Workers	--	Low White-Collar
Transport and Communication Workers, Craftsmen and Production Process Workers, Service Workers	--	Blue-Collar
Farmers, Farm Workers, Fishermen, Hunters, Loggers	--	Farm

In the following tables, the number of cases refers to the inflated population, that is the weighted sample.

The phenomenon of fertility differences by occupational class is widely known. Relatively high fertility has been associated with farming and low-ranking occupations while lower rates of fertility have been associated with the high-ranking occupational positions. Studies demonstrate that the influence of social class on fertility extends over two generations (Blau and Duncan, 1967; Boyd, 1973; Berent, 1952). Analogous differences in fertility behavior are revealed after classification by either husband's father's or wife's father's occupation. Classification by husband's first job, occupation at marriage or current job provides parallel results. Generally, the higher the couple's social origin or present social status, the smaller is the number of their children on the average.

Social Class and Fertility. Table 4.1 shows an inverse relationship between social class and fertility, as measured by the average number of children ever born (CEB) per woman. The average number of children ever born per couple increases monotonically as one moves from the high white-collar stratum to the farm stratum. The same observation applied regardless of the basis of classification, whether it be by class origin or by present social class. In general, interclass differences are greater when mean children ever born is classified by present social class than when classified by class origin.

When residence is controlled (Table 4.2), the expected inverse relationship between social class and mean CEB by social origin is greatly attenuated. In both rural and urban areas, the high white-collar group, however, still manifested the smallest number of children. Looking at the urban sample alone reveals that the inverse relationship between social class and fertility still persists but it is no longer linear as the blue-collar and farm women reported the same average number of children. In the case of the rural sample, the relationship has become ambiguous, having assumed an inverted V configuration. The t test of significance shows that such a pattern has not been due to sampling fluctuations. A plausible explanation for such phenomenon could be that in view of the dominance of endogamy (Castro, 1976), in the rural areas the low white-collar women came from families which enjoyed comparatively better income than the blue-collar and farm strata, such that these women were not only healthier but also more fecund than their counterparts in the lower strata. It is possible that they also came from bigger families of orientation and continued this family building behavior. Moreover, they comprised only a small minority of the rural population (1.9 per cent).

The monotonic inverse relationship becomes limited only to the classification by present social class. By and large, interclass differentials (see column 3) are larger among the urbanites

Table 4.1. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN (CEB) PER CURRENTLY MARRIED
WOMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS, ORIGIN AND PRESENT

Status Categories	: CEB ^a	: Number of Cases
<u>Social Origin</u>		
High white-collar	5.48	76,309
Low white-collar	5.82	115,872
Blue-collar	6.10	314,114
Farm	6.31	1,789,853
<u>Present Class</u>		
High white-collar	5.27	123,919
Low white-collar	5.57	252,228
Blue-collar	6.10	718,914
Farm	6.40	1,798,949

^a

Differences between means by status categories significant
at $P \leq .05$.

Table 4.2. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN (CEB) PER CURRENTLY MARRIED
WOMEN BY RESIDENCE AND SOCIAL CLASS, ORIGIN AND PRESENT

Residence and Status Categories	Social Origin		Present Social Class	
	CEB	N of Cases	CEB	N of Cases
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<u>Urban</u>				
High white-collar	5.31	57,505	5.19*	92,120
Low white-collar	5.36	84,086	5.49*	166,973
Blue-collar	5.83	167,262	5.91*	389,277
Farm	5.83	285,744	6.07*	104,159
<u>Rural</u>				
High white-collar	5.98*	18,804	5.49	31,799
Low white-collar	7.04*	31,786	5.73	85,255
Blue-collar	6.40*	146,852	6.34	329,637
Farm	6.41	1,504,109	6.42	1,694,790

*

Differences between means by status categories significant
at $P \leq .01$.

than the ruralites. This seems to be inconsistent with what has been observed among more economically developed countries where education, socio-economic status or occupation, and income differentials have narrowed under the force of urbanization. A comparison of the urban mean children ever born per currently married woman by social class with the corresponding rural counterpart reveals that, without exception, the urban women had less number of children. It must be noted, however, that the t test shows that differences between the means of the last two classes are not statistically significant, irrespective of residence.

Intervening Variables. In this section, fertility differentials by social class are examined controlling for the woman's age, education, work status, age at marriage, and number of years worked as well as migrant status. It has been shown above, that for all currently married women there is a clear-cut inverse relationship between fertility and social class, but when urban-rural residence is held constant, this relationship is greatly weakened. This demonstrates the fact that certain variables impinge on the existing relationship between reproductive behavior and social class.

A. Age. A glance at Table 4.3 reveals that among the younger women (25-29 years old), no association exists between social class and mean number of children ever born, by class origin or by present social class. The data show that women who currently occupy the highest ranking social stratum have the least number of children, but there is no evidence to prove that this is not due to sampling fluctuations. The lack of association may be due to the fact that these women are in the peak of their childbearing and have not yet realized their desired family size; it may be that the effect of social class would emerge only after this desire is reached. The data for the older women lend support to this statement as the negative relationship is clearly portrayed, especially so when the classification is done by present social class. Among women who

Table 4.3. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN BY AGE AND SOCIAL CLASS, ORIGIN AND PRESENT

Age and Status Categories	Social Origin		Present Social Class	
	CEB	N of Cases	CEB	N of Cases
	(1)		(3)	(4)
<u>25-29^a</u>				
High white-collar	4.67	7,552	4.54	3,348
Low white-collar	4.46	6,567	4.60	16,705
Blue-collar	5.05	21,866	4.86	46,215
Farm	4.72	134,111	4.67	161,782
<u>30-34^b</u>				
High white-collar	3.78	13,186	4.56+	13,306
Low white-collar	5.20	18,945	4.84+	47,563
Blue-collar	5.46+	64,808	5.26	151,884
Farm	5.62+	403,731	5.69	400,542
<u>35-39^b</u>				
High white-collar	4.75+	20,834	4.97	39,268
Low white-collar	5.13+	34,373	5.50	64,196
Blue-collar	6.02	90,379	5.93	234,556
Farm	6.42	462,263	6.53	436,666
<u>40-44^b</u>				
High white-collar	6.25	21,102	5.89+	39,693
Low white-collar	6.25+	27,373	6.00+	67,819
Blue-collar	6.60+	79,637	6.85	158,411
Farm	7.22	349,595	7.35	399,512

a

Differences between means by status categories not significant.

b

Differences between means by status categories significant at $P \leq .05$.

+

Differences between means by status categories not significant.

have almost completed their childbearing, a rise in social class from the farm stratum to the high white-collar stratum meant a 20 per cent reduction in fertility or 1.5 children. Women who belong to the two white-collar strata reported almost the same average number of children.

B. Education. The inverse relationship between the number of years the woman spent in school and her fertility is a universal finding although as mentioned earlier a convergence is somewhat revealed by data from the more developed countries. Education is one of the most important variables in the investigation of fertility differences. Once this is obtained, formal education does not change readily over time. It is a reflection of the social status of the woman's family of orientation. Education serves to broaden interests and facilitate interaction beyond the inner family circle breaking down traditional familistic values. The more educated the woman is, the more capable she is in pursuing activities which promote values incompatible with high fertility.

The data for total women in Table 4.4 (column 5) support the negative relationship between fertility and education. The pattern of differences is one of decreasing fertility with increasing education. To illustrate, women who reported as having received some college education had 1.3 children less than women who never attended school. A notable finding is the generally higher fertility among women with a modicum of elementary schooling than women who had no schooling at all. Several explanations are advanced to clarify the lower fertility among women in the "no schooling" category. According to Smith (1975) who found the same phenomenon in his data, a later age at marriage provides a partial explanation. He discovered that for the nation as a whole, relatively small proportions of women in the "no schooling" category married under 18 years. Pascual (1971) added that the "unfavorable health and environmental conditions still found in many rural areas have led to relatively many miscarriages among the women and depressed overall fertility."

Table 4.4. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMAN BY
EDUCATION AND PRESENT SOCIAL STATUS

Education of Woman	Present Social Status					Total ^{c/}
	High-	Low-	Blue-			
	white	white	collar	Farm		
	collar	collar				
No Schooling ^{a/}	4.22 (2807)	5.95 (17654)	5.63 (26748)	6.38 (276174)		6.28 (323383)
Primary ^{a/}	5.11 (10683)	6.66 (37829)	6.84 (158333)	6.55 (739663)		6.59 (946508)
Intermediate ^{a/}	6.65 (16956)	5.33 (54916)	6.19 (294268)	6.32 (632200)		6.24 (998340)
High School ^{b/}	5.53 (24989)	5.63 (90754)	5.69 (189339)	5.86 (130856)		5.72 (435938)
College ^{a/}	4.89 (68484)	4.85 (49094)	5.08 (48827)	6.17 (13882)		5.03 (180287)

^{a/}

Differences between means by status categories significant at
 $P \leq .05$.

^{b/}

Differences between means by status categories not significant.

^{c/}

Differences between means by education significant at $p \leq .005$.

Regarding the data at hand, it can be seen that the "no schooling" category comprises a small minority in the various social strata, except farm. Also it is suspected that a great percentage of the women in this category are inclined to be physically handicapped or in poor health making them less fertile.

A different picture emerges when the other columns are scrutinized. Regardless of social status, the pattern of differentials forms an inverted U-shaped curve. The same observation applies to the data in Table 4.5.

By and large, the row means in Tables 4.4 and 4.5 do not show any definite pattern of relationship between fertility and social status controlling for educational levels. Only one group of women, those who had some secondary education (Table 4.4), demonstrated the expected pattern of decreasing mean fertility with a rise in the social hierarchy. However, caution should be exercised in interpreting the data for this group of women as the differences between means by social class did not attain statistical significance even at $p = .05$. These women exhibited a homogeneous pattern of fertility by social class, the average number of children ranging from 5-6 children. If the population is grouped by education completed, occupying a higher status does not necessarily mean lower fertility or vice-versa.

C. Work Status. In her analysis of the relationship between labor force participation and fertility, Villa (1979) observed that currently working women had the lowest fertility, followed by those who never worked. Those who stopped working manifested the highest fertility. Nevertheless, the MCA analysis showed that labor force status explained very little of the differences in fertility. Its predictive value rose slightly when age and duration of marriage were held constant. Some studies conducted elsewhere tend to show that for certain groups of women, those who participated in the labor force had more children than those who did not

Table 4.5. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN BY
EDUCATION AND SOCIAL ORIGIN

Education	High-White	Low-White	Blue-Collar	Farm	Total
No Schooling	7.23* (2923)	4.71* (8139)	6.58* (11600)	6.43 (249841)	6.39 (272503)
Primary	8.02* (7523)	6.73* (15450)	6.27* (74189)	6.60* (671051)	6.59 (768213)
Intermediate	5.76 (13477)	6.01 (32541)	6.49 (106969)	6.29 (609123)	6.29 (762110)
High School	5.32 (23574)	5.86 (34702)	5.81 (88193)	5.60 (196342)	5.66 (342811)
College	4.63* (28812)	5.33* (25040)	5.06 (33163)	5.06 (57345)	5.02 (144360)

*

Differences between means by status categories significant at
 $P \leq .05$.

participate at all. Indeed, the woman had to work to augment the family's income to be able to support the big family. Data from a limited exploratory sample of 146 women in Misamis Oriental show that the working women had a higher mean CEB, 4.24 children, than the non-working wives, 3.87 (Herrin, 1978). This finding seems to gain support from the present data which show a negligible difference in children ever born between working and nonworking wives when the data are classified by present class (6.14 vs. 6.10, respectively) and by class origin (6.05 vs. 6.08, respectively).

When work status of woman is controlled, only the data classified by present social class depict the negative relationship between social class and fertility (Table 4.6). Except for women belonging to the farm stratum, a comparison by social class categories shows that the mean children ever born to working mothers is less than the mean children ever born to nonworking mothers. This applies whether the data are classified by social origin or present social class. Agricultural work is mainly done in the rural areas where employment has little impact on fertility, partly because the value of large numbers of children often remains strong, and in part because the mother performs the activity in or near her home and keeps her young children with her while she works or leaves them with other family members.

D. Work Experience. Work experience is defined by the number of years the woman has worked as of the interview date. This is cumulative work experience and it is possible that the woman was not actually working at the time of the survey. The sample has been categorized into two, namely: those who have worked for less than 10 years and those who have worked for 10 years or more. When work experience is held constant, various interesting features appear. The linear inverse relationship between fertility and social status does not gain any support from the data displayed in Table 4.7. Fertility becomes inversely related to social class only when an extreme stratum, i.e., high white-collar or farm, is taken as

Table 4.6. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN BY WORK STATUS AND SOCIAL CLASS, ORIGIN AND PRESENT

Work Status & Class Categories	Social Origin		Present Social Class	
	CEBa/	N of Cases	CEBa/	N of Cases
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<u>Working</u>				
High white-collar	4.67	32,059	4.61	52,766
Low white-collar	6.06	43,252	5.51+	111,836
Blue-collar	5.46	84,388	5.66+	179,343
Farm	6.36	485,286	6.49	469,480
<u>Not Working</u>				
High white-collar	6.83	77,934	5.53+	12,469
Low white-collar	5.38+	19,353	5.61+	26,139
Blue-collar	5.64+	38,037	5.80	90,802
Farm	6.22	202,319	6.31	185,804

a/

Differences between means by status categories significant
at $p \leq .05$.

+

Differences between means by status categories not significant.

a reference point, meaning the other means are compared with the mean of the highest or lowest social class. A rise-fall pattern in mean fertility is observed as one moves from the highest social class down to the farm class. Table 4.7 demonstrates higher mean children ever born for the low white-collar women than the blue-collar women, with one exception where both classes reported almost similar number of cumulative fertility. One is tempted to advance the explanation that the inclusion of owners of sari-sari stores which have proliferated in the rural areas has only resulted in increasing the mean children ever born to the low white-collar class. Classification by work experience has so glaringly brought this feature out, while controlling for the other variables failed to capture this distinctive interclass variation.

The crossclassification also shows that in one half of the cases, the mean children ever born for the women who have worked longer exceeded the mean CEB of those who worked less and in some instances even the mean fertility of the nonworking mothers (see Table 4.6). These differentials may well have arisen from the fact that those women who have worked for more than 10 years were relatively older and married for a longer period.

E. Age at Marriage. The length of exposure to the risk of pregnancy within marriage is dependent on the age at marriage -- it is prolonged where marriage takes place at an early age and it is shortened where marriage occurs at a later age. In certain instances, however, it is not exactly the age at marriage which determines the length of the woman's exposure to the risk of childbearing. Marriage may follow sometime after the couple has started living together. Unless the woman's age at first union coincides with her age at first marriage, the former becomes the critical factor, not the latter. Increased age at marriage operates to reduce fertility through lessened exposure to intercourse. The effect of age at marriage is greatest in high fertility populations where the practice of family planning is largely unknown and family size is closely related to the number of years married spent within the reproductive span.

Table 4.7. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN BY NUMBER OF YEARS WORKED AND SOCIAL CLASS, ORIGIN AND PRESENT

Years Worked and Status Categories	Social Origin		Present Social Class	
	CEBa/	N of Cases	CEBa/	N of Cases
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<u>Less than 10 years</u>				
High white-collar	4.47	14,724	4.23	15,421
Low white-collar	6.37	24,848	5.75+	50,253
Blue-collar	5.63	47,702	5.78+	119,801
Farm	6.14	210,173	6.22	168,635
<u>10 Years and over</u>				
High white-collar	4.70	15,097	4.49	28,150
Low white-collar	5.54+	16,946	5.50+	49,026
Blue collar	5.26+	30,403	5.21+	43,281
Farm	6.60	233,551	6.68	265,620

a/
Difference between means by status categories significant at
 $P \leq .05$.

+

Differences between means by status categories not significant.

In general, fertility is negatively related with social status even holding age at marriage constant as portrayed in Table 4.8. This is not without exception, although in cases where the expected linear inverse relationship is not shown, the situation is far from the muddled one in Table 4.4. In all social classes, whether classified by origin or present class, women who married later bore less children on the average than women who married before reaching their twentieth birthday. Controlling for age at marriage tends to minimize interclass differentials, regardless of classification, such that the largest difference in mean children ever born between the highest and lowest stratum is 0.87 children. Although slight differences by social class are in evidence, it must be remembered that the differences are all statistically significant except for the means referring to women who married in their teens classified by class origin.

F. Migrant Type. Migratory behavior has both direct and indirect effects on fertility. Migrants are known to be predominantly young adults (Kim, 1972; Perez, 1976) and as such are more fertile than the non-migrants. It is expected therefore that they exhibit higher than average fertility. The nuptiality patterns adopted by migrants may also be diverging. Geographical movement entails the breaking of family ties and requires the establishment of new social connections in the place of destination. Both can have disparate effects on fertility. Migrants either marry later and have fewer children or marry earlier and have more children as a means of social integration (Bogue, 1970). The migration status of either the wife or the husband shortens the amount of exposure of the woman to the risk of childbearing. Where both the husband and the wife are migrants, it is possible to assume that the woman's length of exposure to the risk of pregnancy is the same as where both are non-migrants.

Invariant cumulative fertility by migration status from the 1973 NDS tabulations does not sustain the hypothesized lower fertility among migrants as against the migrants, at least when

Table 4.8. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN BY AGE AT MARRIAGE AND SOCIAL CLASS, ORIGIN AND PRESENT CLASS

Age at Marriage and Status Categories	Social Origin		Present Social Class	
	CEBa/	N of Cases	CEBa/	N of Cases
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<u>Less than 20 years</u>				
High white-collar	5.99+	35,431	6.03	38,307
Low white-collar	6.28+	50,827	5.91	119,395
Blue-collar	6.75	180,061	6.60	395,706
Farm	6.76	1,061,869	6.76	1,115,023
<u>20 Years and Over</u>				
High white-collar	5.04+	40,878	4.93	85,612
Low white-collar	5.47+	65,045	5.26	132,833
Blue-collar	5.22	134,053	5.49	323,208
Farm	5.66	727,984	5.80	683,926

a/

Differences between means by status categories in the second panel significant at $P \leq .05$.

+

Differences between means by status categories not significant.

classified by social origin or social class at present. When the women are classified by present social class, both migrant types averaged the same number of cumulative fertility (6.2 children) and when classified by class origin, migrants registered a cumulative fertility a bit lower than the non-migrants (6.2 vs. 6.3, respectively) but this difference is statistically nonsignificant. Nevertheless, when the mean children ever born by social class among migrants is compared with the corresponding social class among non-migrants, the expected configuration is very much evident (see Table 4.9). Almost without exception, the migrant mothers averaged less children than their non-migrant counterparts, although some of the differences are miniscule.

A consistent linear negative relationship between cumulative fertility and social class is portrayed when migrant type is controlled. Excluding one case where the high white-collar and the low white-collar strata reported almost the same mean children ever born (see underscored figures in table), cumulative fertility increases systematically with decreasing social status.

Results from Multiple Classification Analysis. So far discussion has been limited to crosstabulations to test for the relationship between reproductive behavior and social class controlling for various demographic and non-demographic factors. While these crosstabulations have furnished helpful insights they failed to isolate the effects of other pertinent variables. To determine the real nature of relationships between social class factors and fertility, important background and intervening variables should be held constant. Multiple classification analysis (MCA) provides the means for accomplishing this end.

Only one dependent variable is analyzed, that is mean children ever born, while the list of predictors includes social origin as indexed by husband's father's occupation, present social class

Table 4.9. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN BY MIGRANT TYPE AND SOCIAL CLASS, ORIGIN AND PRESENT CLASS

Migrant Type and Status Categories	Social Origin		Present Social Class	
	CEBa/	N of Cases	CEBa/	N of Cases
	:	(2)	(3)	(4)
:				
<u>Migrant</u>				
High white-collar	5.19	42,703	5.07	79,057
Low white-collar	5.70	53,156	5.56	132,080
Blue-collar	6.17+	158,267	6.10	369,994
Farm	6.30+	659,882	6.59	575,796
<u>Non-Migrant</u>				
High white-collar	5.83	33,606	<u>5.61+</u>	44,862
Low white-collar	5.95	62,241	<u>5.57+</u>	117,624
Blue-collar	6.02+	155,490	6.11	346,262
Farm	6.34+	1,121,907	6.32	1,219,196

a/
Differences between means by status categories significant at
P \leq .05.

+

Differences between means by status categories not significant.

indexed by the husband's present occupation, woman's age, her education, age at first marriage, work experience, residence, place of birth, knowledge and use of contraception, and migrant type.

A suggestion is made in the previous sections that a clearer relationship between social status and mean children ever born emerges when the data are classified by present social class rather than by social origin. Table 4.10 provides a test for this suggestion. What was done was to make various MCA runs to determine the effect of the inclusion of a predictor or predictors on the dependent variable. The beta coefficients show that present social class (husband's present occupation) has a stronger relationship to mean children ever born than social origin (husband's father's occupation). This situation does not change even when the effects of other predictors are held constant. The demographic variables of age of the woman, age at marriage, and use of contraception seemed to be relatively the most important explanatory variables of fertility. An examination of the adjusted R^2 s shows that age of woman and use of contraception taken together with some other predictors (Run 4) yielded an adjusted R^2 of .11. When age at marriage is introduced as a predictor (Run 3) the R^2 jumped to .22. Addition of other variables (Runs 1 and 2) did not produce any appreciable change in the percentage of the total variance explained by the predictors. On the basis of this evidence, there is little doubt that age at marriage strongly determines the number of children ever born per woman.

Age at marriage was found to have a monotonic negative relationship with children ever born (Table 4.11). Women who married before their fifteenth birthday had 7.1 children on the average. Those who married when they were 20-24 years of age had 5.9 children on the average, and those who tied the marital knot upon reaching at least 25 years of age averaged 4.4 children. This is to be expected since the effect of later age at marriage is to shorten the duration of risk of exposure to pregnancy. Adjusting

Table 4.10. BETA COEFFICIENTS AND ADJUSTED R^2 s FOR CHILDREN EVER BORN BY
SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Variables	Beta Coefficients Derived from MCA Runs					
	: Run 1	: Run 2	: Run 3	: Run 4	: Run 5	: Run 6
Social Origin	.02	.02	.02	.03	.03	.03
Present Social Class	.04	.05	.05	.06	.14	.11
Age of Woman	.43	.43	.43	.31	.31	*
Use of Contraceptive	.10	.10	.10	.10	.08	*
Woman's Education	.08	.08	.08	.14	*	*
Residence	.07	.07	.07	.07	*	*
Age at First Marriage	.35	.35	.35	*	*	*
Work Experience	.04	.04	*	*	*	*
Migrant Type	.03	.03	*	*	*	*
Place of Birth	.03	*	*	*	*	*
Adjusted R^2	0.222	0.221	0.220	0.113	0.095	0.013

*

Not included in this run

Table 4.11. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED PREDICTORS AND CHILDREN EVER BORN FOR CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN, PHILIPPINES, 1973

MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN: 6.22				
Independent Variables	: Group Mean	: Deviation from the Grand Mean:		Beta Coefficient
		: Unadjusted	: Adjusted	
<u>Social Origin</u>				0.02
High white-collar	5.56	-0.67	+0.11	
Low white-collar	5.84	-0.39	+0.07	
Blue-collar	6.13	-0.09	+0.03	
Farm	6.34	+0.12	+0.02	
<u>Present Social Class</u>				0.04
High white-collar	5.32	-0.91	-0.32	
Low white-collar	5.58	-0.64	-0.24	
Blue-collar	6.14	-0.09	+0.02	
Farm	6.42	+0.20	+0.06	
<u>Age of Woman</u>				0.43
15 - 29	4.70	-1.52	-2.45	
30 - 34	5.46	-0.76	-1.16	
35 - 39	6.24	+0.01	-0.04	
40 - 44	7.01	+0.78	+0.98	
45 - 49	6.76	+0.53	+1.16	
<u>Use of Contraception</u>				0.10
Has not used	6.27	+0.05	-0.13	
Has used	6.05	-0.17	+0.46	
<u>Education</u>				0.08
No Schooling	6.35	+0.12	-0.05	
Primary	6.62	+0.39	+0.23	
Intermediate	6.25	+0.02	+0.03	
High School	5.71	-0.51	-0.33	
College	5.01	-1.22	-0.45	
<u>Residence</u>				0.07
Urban	5.74	-0.48	-0.31	
Rural	6.40	+0.18	+0.11	
<u>Age at Marriage</u>				0.35
Less than 15 years	7.06	+0.83	+1.38	
15 - 19	6.59	+0.36	+0.52	
20 - 24	5.93	-0.30	-0.49	
25 years and over	4.40	-1.83	-2.51	
<u>Work Experience</u>				0.04
Has Worked	6.06	-0.16	-0.10	
Never Worked	6.33	+0.11	+0.07	
<u>Place of Birth</u>				0.03
Agricultural	6.31	+0.09	+0.04	
Non-Agricultural	5.83	-0.39	-0.17	
<u>Migrant Type</u>				0.03
Migrant	6.22	0.00	+0.09	
Non-Migrant	6.23	+0.01	-0.05	

for other predictors resulted in substantial upward changes in the unadjusted coefficients, affirming the strong independent effects of age at marriage on fertility.

The younger the mother, the fewer the children, and the older the woman the more children she has, all things being equal. The raw data show that women who were aged 45-49 years reported mean children ever born less than women aged 40-44. It is surmised that this has arisen from the inability of the oldest women to provide an accurate account of their birth histories. When the other predictors are held constant, the expected monotonic negative relationship emerged.

The raw data show that women who have not used any method had the biggest family size. When the effects of the other predictors were controlled, the ever users emerged as having the greatest number of children. Such a result confirms previous findings which state that the married women who had relatively larger families were more likely to accept family planning. While this reflects the independent effects of contraceptive usage, the influence of the other predictors served to mask the direct relationship thus resulting in the expected pattern of relationship as shown by the unadjusted deviations from the grand mean.

The relationship between present social class, residence, and woman's education and fertility was discovered to be monotonic and moderately strong. With the exclusion of the women who never attended school, mean children ever born decreases with increasing education. Although the residence differential was reduced from .34 children to a mere .20 children when adjustment for the effects of other independent variables was made, the smaller family size among urbanites persisted. The same observation applies to present social class. While the relationship is inverse and systematic, interclass differentials were substantially reduced in the adjusted data.

One of the outstanding features of Table 4.11 concerns the relationship between fertility and social origin. The unadjusted figures show a consistently declining mean children ever born per woman as one shifts from the lowest stratum to the highest stratum, the differential between the lowest and the highest being almost a child. However, when control is made of the other predictors, the relationship became positive and there was virtually no variation in fertility by social category. This implies that social origin has almost no independent effect on fertility and that relationship between social origin and mean children ever born was the consequence of the association between social origin and the other variables.

Women who were born in agricultural areas or who never worked were found to have higher mean children ever born, whether or not adjustment was made for the other predictors. Notwithstanding, adjustment led to the narrowing of the observed differentials. For migrant types, the unadjusted figures exhibit virtually no difference at all; the adjusted ones manifest a widening of the gap with the migrants averaging 6.31 and the non-migrants averaging 6.17 children. Overall, in spite of the apparent relationship between these predictors and fertility, the unadjusted and adjusted deviations were small and the relationship was relatively weak.

In this chapter, the relationship between fertility and social class and other background and intervening variables was analyzed using crosstabulations and multiple classification analysis (MCA). It was found that social class is inversely related to mean children ever born and the relationship is stronger when social class is indexed by present social class rather than social origin. In fact, the observed inverse relationship between social origin and fertility is mainly due to the relationship of social origin with other predictors, not due to its own independent effects. Present social class, education, and residence were important sociological determinants of fertility. Migrant type, place of birth, and work experience were relatively less important predictors of fertility.

CHAPTER V

DIFFERENTIAL FERTILITY AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

The preceding chapter has demonstrated the existence of an inverse relationship between social class and fertility among currently married women who have been married for ten years or more. Knowing that these women had started their lives in varying socio-economic statuses, one queries whether the process of achieving a certain class has an influence on family building patterns. Other than the influence of the woman's social origin and present social class combined, does social mobility have a unique effect¹ on family size? The present chapter addresses itself to this type of question.

Past investigations of the possible effects of mobility on social behavior and fertility have failed to strongly support the presence of independent effects of social mobility. Variations in the dependent variables among mobile individuals were found to better fit the additive assumption, meaning differences were mainly due to the combined effects of former and present statuses, although Blau and Duncan (1967) have reservations about the adequacy of the additive model to account for the variations in fertility which they observed in their U.S. data. Such studies have lent support to the acculturation hypothesis which states that the position of the mobile person will lie between that of the two non-mobile groups at origin and at destination. This situation may have arisen from the fact that such studies have utilized data from the more developed countries.

The main data utilized in this chapter covered women who were under 50 years of age at the time of the National Demographic Survey (NDS) in 1973, currently married, and married only once

¹Effect throughout this chapter connotes the relationship between relevant variables rather than causality.

with a marriage duration of 10 years or more. Such women were also the subject of investigation in Chapter IV. The delimitation of the sample for the analysis is in keeping with earlier social mobility-fertility studies and allows for a partial control for duration of marriage with respect to difference in family size and shifts in social status.

As in the previous chapter, fertility is measured by the number of children ever born per woman and social origin is indexed by the husband's father's occupation at age 40 and present social class by the husband's occupation in 1973.

A Preliminary Look at the Data

Table 5.1 gives the crosstabulation of currently married couples by social origin of the husband and present social class. Nonmobile couples constituted 71 per cent of all the sample cases. The rest were the couples whose social origins differed from that of their present social class, the upwardly mobile (below the diagonal) outnumbering the downwardly mobile (22 per cent vs. 7 per cent) as evident from gains via mobility registered by the white-collar and blue-collar groups and from the concomitant losses among the farming group.

The mean children ever born per woman by social origin of the husband and present social class is displayed in Table 5.2. A look at the marginal means shows the monotonic relationship between social class and fertility. The same observation is made when the means on the diagonal are examined. Without exception, cumulative fertility decreases with rising status. When the other cells are scrutinized, one discovered differences in mean children ever born from cell to cell. Apparently, not all of the observed variations are due to sampling fluctuations. The data then suggest some kind of relationship between mobility and fertility. Some summaries are attempted below before making any conclusions.

Table 5.1. NUMBER OF CURRENTLY MARRIED COUPLES CLASSIFIED BY
SOCIAL ORIGIN AND PRESENT SOCIAL CLASS, 1973

Social Origin (Husband's)	Present Social Class					Total
	High	Low	Blue	Farm		
	White-collar: (1)	White-collar: (2)	Collar : (3)			
High white-collar	26,562	15,858	19,822	7,533	69,775	
Low white-collar	12,686	52,331	31,716	13,479	110,212	
Blue-collar	22,598	32,112	167,302	70,964	292,976	
Farm	30,130	85,633	294,165	1,338,016	1,747,944	
Total	91,976	185,934	513,005	1,429,992	2,220,907	

Table 5.2. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMAN BY
SOCIAL ORIGIN AND PRESENT SOCIAL CLASS

Social Origin (Husband's)	Present Social Class				
	High	Low	Blue	Farm	Total
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
High white-collar	4.99	5.79	5.62	6.02	5.46
Low white-collar	4.95	5.80	5.66	7.86	5.91
Blue-collar	5.29	5.70	5.96	6.89	6.11
Farm	5.10	5.66	6.10	6.41	6.31
Total	5.10	5.73	6.01	6.45	6.23

Table 5.3. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMAN BY
TYPE OF MOBILITY AND CLASS ORIGIN

Social Origin (Husband's)	Type of Mobility		
	Upward	Non-mobile	Downward
High white-collar	*	4.99	5.75
Low white-collar	4.95	5.80	6.31
Blue-collar	5.53	5.96	6.41
Farm	5.93	6.41	*

* Movement not possible.

Controlling for social origin enables one to cope with the varying chances of the various social groups for mobility -- the higher the social class the less likelihood for upward mobility and the lower the social class the less probability of downward mobility. Table 5.3 shows that within each class, the downwardly mobile had the largest family size. Within each type of mobility, the uppermost occupational displayed the smallest number of children. Under these circumstances, one is tempted to make the observation that the data in Table 5.3 support the acculturation hypothesis. This is entirely out of the question, however, as the specific destinations of both the upwardly mobile and the downwardly mobile are not revealed by the data. Analysis of the hypothesis would require the comparison of the mean fertility of the mobile couples with that of the non-mobile couples in both statuses, origin and destination. The application of the acculturation hypothesis will be discussed later in this chapter.

The apparent effects of social class can be deduced by looking at the means among non-mobile couples by social class (diagonal of Table 5.2) which evince a monotonic relationship. Differences in fertility are also noted when wives are classified by either social origin or by destination. On the basis of the data, we can also assume that mobility, per se, does not have any effect on fertility, and that variations in fertility among mobile couples are brought about by the simultaneous effects of the social origin and the present status. In other words, it is assumed that family size for any combination of past and present occupational class is a weighted average of the additive effects of the two statuses (see Boyd, 1973 and Blau and Duncan, 1967). This serves as the bench-mark for the present analysis. The additive multiple classification analysis (MCA) was employed to test for the effects of mobility on children ever born.

Results from the Additive Model

The solutions to the additive multiple classification analysis are shown below. The net effects of social origin are shown in Column 1 and the net effects of the present social class are shown in Column 2.

Social Class	Net Effects	
	Social Origin	Present Social Class
	(1)	(2)
High white-collar	-0.18	-1.11
Low white-collar	0.11	-0.54
Blue-collar	0.10	-0.25
Farm	-0.02	0.25

Using Formula 3 described in Chapter II, together with the grand mean of 6.23 children (see Table 5.2) these coefficients give the expected children ever born per woman by social origin and present social class. For example, for an upwardly mobile couple originating from a blue-collar status and presently occupying a high white-collar position, the expected mean children ever born is calculated thus, $6.23 + (0.10) + (-1.11) = 5.22$ children. The results are found in Table 5.4, first panel. The deviations in the second panel of the table were derived by subtracting the expected means from the actual means in Table 5.2. These deviations (both magnitude and direction) form the bases for determining the fit of the data to the additive model. If the deviations are zero, it would signify that the additive model is adequate in explaining fertility variations by type of mobility. This would mean that mobility does not have any effect and that the manifest fertility differentials would be due to combined effects of social origin and destination. The signs are positive where the actual means exceed the expected ones, and the signs are negative where the actual means fall below the expected means.

Table 5.4. EXPECTED MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMAN BY SOCIAL ORIGIN AND PRESENT SOCIAL CLASS CALCULATED FROM THE ADDITIVE MODEL, AND DEVIATIONS OF ACTUAL FROM EXPECTED CEB

	Present Social Class			
	High	Low	Blue	
	White-Collar	White-Collar	Collar	Farm
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<u>Social Origin (Husband's)</u>				
High white-collar	4.94	5.51	5.80	6.28
Low white-collar	5.23	5.80	6.09	6.57
Blue-collar	5.22	5.79	6.08	6.56
Farm	5.10	5.67	5.96	6.44
<u>Actual Means Minus</u> <u>Expected Means</u> ^{a/}				
High white-collar	0.05	0.28	-0.18	-0.26
Low white-collar	-0.28		-0.43	1.29
Blue-collar	0.07	0.09	-0.12	0.33
Farm		-0.01	0.14	-0.03

^{a/}

Calculated from Table 5.2 and first panel of this table.

The data does not seem to fit the additive model as the deviations are non-zeros (except in two cells where the actual means equalled the expected means) and sometimes, substantial. The deviations for the upwardly mobile and the downwardly mobile do not present any evidence to the effect that the additive model generally overestimates or underestimates the mean fertility in both mobile groups. At least on this basis alone, the deviations are fairly consistent. There is some danger in examining these deviations further as some of them are based on relatively limited cases (9 to 20 unweighted cases), particularly 3 of the biggest deviations (see underscored values). The overall picture in Table 5.4 is summarized below by reclassifying the women according to type of mobility. Column 2 produces the reduced form of 5.4, derived by multiplying the means by the corresponding number of cases in Table 5.1 by type of mobility, summing them up, and then dividing the sum by the total number of cases in the group.

Type of Mobility	: Actual : Mean (1)	: Expected : Mean (2)	: Difference
Upward	5.86	5.79	0.07**
Non-mobile	6.32	6.36	-0.05**
Downward	6.42	6.26	0.16**

** Differences between actual and expected means all significant at $p < .005$.

The above weighted means allow for testing the degree of difference between the actual and expected means, and, following Trieman (1966) t tests were employed. All the deviations between the means by type of mobility have been found to be statistically significant. Additionally, a two-analysis of variance was calculated for children ever born, as the criterion variable, with

social origin and present social class as the predictors. The F test indicated statistically significant interaction between the two predictors, $p = .038$. In the light of these evidences, we can reject the additive assumption and accept the social mobility-fertility hypothesis as having been supported.

Now some word on the applicability of the acculturation hypothesis to the data at hand. According to this hypothesis, the fertility of the mobile individuals is expected to be intermediate between that of the two non-mobile groups (origin and destination). The means in Table 5.2 will be looked at again in order to compare the fertility of mobile individuals with that of the non-mobile at class origin and destination, respectively. For example, we find the downwardly mobile from a high white-collar position to a blue-collar position to have a mean fertility of 5.62. This is higher than the mean children ever born among non-mobile mothers at origin (high white-collar) and lower than the average family size among non-mobile wives at destination (blue-collar). Similar triangular comparisons can be made for the upwardly mobile and downwardly mobile. The pattern illustrated above, which conforms with the acculturation hypothesis, does not seem to be the predominant one. Out of the possible 12 comparisons, 6 cells have means which are either lower or bigger than the means at both non-mobile statuses, and in one case the mean is the same as the mean at destination. The same comparisons can be made for the data in Table 5.5. Seven cells out of 12 depart from the pattern suggested by the acculturation hypothesis. The pattern observed from the data then cannot provide sufficient grounds for accepting the acculturation hypothesis. This lends support to the hypothesis that social mobility has a unique effect on reproductive behavior.

Result from Another Data Set

Further test of the fertility-social mobility hypothesis is done using the same sample of women, but this time social origin is

indexed by the woman's father's occupation. The analysis of variance disclosed a very significant interaction between woman's father's occupation and husband's occupation in 1973 ($p < .001$).

Table 5.5 (first panel) presents the observed mean children ever born per woman classified by the woman's father's occupation and the husband's occupation in 1973. The deviations of the actual means from the expected means calculated from the additive multiple classification model are displayed in the second panel. One can see that the direction of the deviations for both upwardly and downwardly mobile couples is generally consistent. In fact, the deviations are more systematic than the ones presented in the first data set. Among the upwardly mobile, 4 out of 6 deviations were positive and among the downwardly mobile 5 out of 6 deviations were positive. The deviations are fairly large and more importantly, exhibit a clear pattern.

As before, the women were reclassified by type of mobility to summarize the pattern shown in Table 5.5. The results are shown below and are consistent with the patterns shown on page 84, with

Type of Mobility	: Actual Mean : (1)	: Expected Mean : (2)	: Difference : (3)
Upward	5.96	5.91	0.05**
Non-Mobile	6.34	6.36	-0.02**
Downward	5.91	5.85	0.06*

** Differences between actual and expected means significant at $p < .005$.

* Difference between actual and expected means significant at $p = .05$.

Table 5.5. MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN PER CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMAN BY WOMAN'S FATHER'S OCCUPATION AND HUSBAND'S PRESENT OCCUPATION

	: Husband's Present Occupation (Present Social Class)				
	: High	: Low	: Blue	:	:
	: White-collar	: White-collar	: Collar	: Farm	: Total
	: (1)	: (2)	: (3)	: (4)	: (5)
<hr/>					
<u>Woman's Father's</u>					
<u>Occupation</u>					
<u>(Social Origin)</u>					
High white-collar	4.79	3.87	4.70	7.22	5.05
Low white-collar	5.22	4.51	5.61	6.04	5.26
Blue-collar	4.70	5.98	6.28	6.59	6.18
Farm	5.58	5.82	6.15	6.42	6.31
Total	5.22	5.45	6.09	6.42	6.21
<u>Actual Means Minus</u>					
<u>the Expected Means</u>					
High white-collar	0.24	-0.88	-0.57	1.66	
Low white-collar	0.46	-0.45	0.13	0.27	
Blue-collar	-0.83	0.25	0.03	0.05	
Farm	0.16	0.20	0.01	-0.01	

one exception, social mobility in the present case depresses the fertility of both the upwardly mobile and downwardly mobile couples as shown in Columns 1 and 2.

Fertility Differences by Extent of Mobility

The summary tables above do not allow for the analysis of the potential effects of the extent of social mobility on reproductive behavior. Table 5.6 has been constructed to examine the probable effects of the degree of mobility. Here the upwardly and downwardly mobile individuals were classified into those who had shifted two or more statuses from their social origins and those who had shifted but one level.

Most notable of the results in the table pertains to the pattern of the means among the very downwardly mobile couples. In all cases, the actual means in this group were consistently and significantly greater than the expected means. Likewise, the actual means were generally and significantly higher than the expected means among the moderately upwardly mobile and the very upwardly mobile. In sum, the additive model failed to account for the variations observed in the mean children ever born among mobile couples by extent or distance of movement.

Table 5.6. ACTUAL AND EXPECTED MEAN CHILDREN EVER BORN BY DIFFERENT GROUPS OF WOMEN, TYPE OF MOBILITY AND DEGREE OF MOBILITY

	: Actual	: Expected	: Number of	: A - E
	: Mean CEB	: Mean CEB	: Cases	
Women with marital duration of 10 years and over				
Husband's Father's Occupation to Husband's Occupation in 1973				
Very upwardly mobile	5.48	5.47	138,361	0.01
Moderately upwardly mobile	6.02	5.92	338,964	0.10**
Moderately downwardly mobile	6.41	6.29	118,538	0.12**
Very downwardly mobile	6.43	6.14	40,834	0.29**
Woman's Father's Occupation to Husband's Occupation in 1973				
Very upwardly mobile	5.60	5.55	160,562	0.05**
Moderately upwardly mobile	6.00	6.06	400,810	-0.06**
Moderately downwardly mobile	5.97	6.02	109,420	-0.05
Very downwardly mobile	5.78	5.52	55,899	0.26**

** Differences between actual and expected means significant at $p \leq .005$.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONSGeneral Summary and Conclusions

The occupational structure is characterized by high inheritance rates, both intergenerationally and intragenerationally (Chapter III). The probability for Filipinos to remain in their fathers' occupational class and their likelihood to remain in their jobs are quite pronounced. Social inheritance was found to be relatively higher in the rural areas than in the urban areas. The degree of social inheritance is directly related to the placement of the occupational group in the hierarchy -- the higher the level, the greater likelihood for social inheritance, and the lower the stratum, the less proclivity for social inheritance. Thus for the Philippines as a whole, the tendency for professionals to inherit their fathers' occupation was seven times the expected, while among the farmers it was less than twice. Nevertheless, the degree of penetration of the other occupational strata by sons of various origins was quite pervasive.

Overall, the white-collar positions proved to be the most open to sons of diverse origins. The data on intragenerational movements showed, however, that the probability of mobility into other occupational levels is greatly influenced by the individual's original position -- the higher his former occupation, the greater the probability of achieving a higher position. On the other hand, those who occupied lower ranking occupations were more likely to fall further down the social hierarchy. The upward or downward shift in level is directly related to the individual's placement at the earlier period.

Upward mobility exceeded downward mobility for all levels of aggregation -- national, urban or rural. As exemplified by the data on intragenerational mobility two barriers acted to influence the extent of exchanges among the various occupational strata. One barrier (a braking effect) served to prevent the further lowering of the social ranks of those coming from the high-ranking occupations with the consequence that limited numbers from the two topmost levels went beyond the sales position. The second barrier (a screening effect) prevented the easy penetration of persons of lowly origins into the top ranking occupations. For this group of individuals, the intermediate positions became the most likely destinations. This contributed to the observed predominance of short-distance movements over long-distance movements. It is not surprising, therefore, that shifts in occupational status usually occurred between proximal or closely related occupations.

While the identified brakes were more apparent among the urban population than among the rural population, the modernized section of the country, nevertheless, emerged as having experienced relatively more mobility than the less modernized sector, both in term of circulation mobility and structural mobility. Urban overall mobility was almost two-and-a-half times rural mobility.

Consistent with studies conducted here and elsewhere, social status was found to be negatively related to fertility (Chapter IV). Couples occupying higher positions had fewer children on the average than those in the lower positions. Multiple classification analysis (MCA) demonstrated that present social class is an important factor influencing fertility. However, social origin was discovered to exert no independent effects on fertility. The analysis revealed that among various factors considered, age at marriage was the strongest predictor of mean children ever born. The relationship is monotonic before and after controlling for the effects of the other predictors. Keeping other factors constant served only to

heighten the inverse relationship. In addition to present social class, education and residence were other important sociological determinants of fertility.

Data from the 1973 National Demographic Survey were used to test the effects of social mobility on fertility (Chapter V). It was hypothesized that in the Philippines, social mobility has a unique effect on reproductive behavior over and above the combined effects of social origin and destination. The additive multiple classification analysis yielded results which were consistent and the differences between actual means and the expected means were statistically significant. Social mobility had the effect of depressing fertility in both directions of movement, both the upwardly and the downwardly mobile couples exhibiting less fertility than the non-mobile ones.

Implications and Recommendations

There is no society which approaches absolute equality (Davis and Moore, 1945; Davis, 1949). The demands of the individuals are so varied and satisfaction of wants is derived through multifarious means. Individuals, too, are inherently different and the varying satisfactions sought by society require individuals to possess distinct basic skills and specializations. But a dominant feature of the individual is dynamism. His desire for change or improvement in status regardless of his present status, however, is subject to the sanctions prescribed by society, explicitly or implicitly. While status differences by occupation are themselves acceptable for the order of society, the opportunity to gain a better station in life should be made more equitable. This problem has two inter-related dimensions. One relates to the members of the economically active population who are presently working. What are their chances of getting a better occupation than they now have? Will they remain forever in their present jobs in spite of their aspiration for better income and security? The other dimension

is connected with the greater numbers of the future members of the labor force. What are their chances of gaining an occupation which is better, if not much better, than the occupation of their parents? The problem boils down to effecting more social mobility, both intragenerational and intergeneration, to better conditions in life and to hasten economic development.

In order to enhance social mobility in the Philippines, it is recommended that more employment opportunities be provided and that individual chances of acquiring education in any level be equalized. These two recommendations, it can be noted, are mutually reinforcing. The following strategies may be adopted to achieve these ends:

1. development of small-scale or home-based industries to expand self-employment opportunities;
2. organization of more industry-oriented cooperatives to boost local development and self-sufficiency;
3. development of industries related to local production or economic activities (e.g., fruit or vegetable processing in places where these are produced in large quantities);
4. institution of grants-in-aid programs in all public and private colleges and universities;
5. provision of vocational short-term courses in the provinces for the out-of-school population and of special programs for skills development among farm workers.

In the meantime, it is recommended that the family planning program cater to the needs of special target populations which are notable for high fertility and low contraceptive practice. Along this

line, the following strategies are proposed:

1. developing information, education and communication (IEC) programs suitable for specific target groups, viz. farm couples, males, marginal workers and landless labor;
2. identifying new and effective IEC channels and delivery systems like indigenous social groups and community organizations;
3. tapping locally-based private and public agencies for delivery of IEC messages and conduct of IEC campaigns.

Since exposure to pregnancy is a function of age at marriage which has been found to be the most important demographic determinant of fertility, incentives for late marriage should be provided, such as accident insurance for the couple or financial assistance in building a home.

Recommendations for Further Research

A worthwhile social mobility research would be to investigate the effects of background, intervening and some contingency variables on the status achievements of the individual. Applying the analytical techniques of Hauser and Featherman (1977) on Philippine data, even on a limited scale would be of great value to people interested in the transformation of the labor force in the face of modernization. Temporal changes in actual occupational statuses may be studied in relation to changes in the individual's characteristics and behavior. Such investigation should include an analysis of the relationship between geographical mobility and social mobility.

Studies on intergenerational mobility, like the present one, have looked at mobility between and among major occupational groups. It is possible that a lot of exchanges of manpower occur among specific occupations within a major occupational group. Measuring the extent of vertical mobility among related or proximal occupations can be another area of future research.

Since changes in social status occur at different times during the reproductive lifetime of a woman, it would be most useful to relate the timing of births or the length of birth intervals with such status changes. A future investigation would then focus on causality. Shifts in occupational classes can be analyzed if they related with changes in the woman's reproductive behavior.

The present study points out significant effects of social mobility on fertility. Research may be conducted on the various mechanisms through which social mobility operates to influence fertility.

REFERENCES

Books

- Andrews, Frank, et. al.
1973
Multiple Classification Analysis.
Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan.
- Balan, Jorge, et. al.
1973
Men in a Developing Society.
Geographic and Social Mobility in
Monterrey, Mexico.
Latin American Monograph, No. 30.
Institute of Latin American Studies.
Austin, The University of Texas Press.
- Bennet, Alfred B., Jr.
1971
Managers and Entrepreneurs: A
Comparison of Social Backgrounds in
Philippine Manufacturing. In
Industrialization: Its Impact on the
Philippines. IPC Papers No. 10.
Frank Lynch and Alfonso de Guzman II,
eds. Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila
University Press.
- Blau, Peter M. and
Otis Dudley Duncan
1967
The American Occupational Structure.
New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Bogue, Donald J.
1970
Migration and Differential Fertility.
In Differential Current Fertility in
the United States. Lee-Jay Cho,
Wilson H. Grabill, and Donald J.
Bogue, eds. Chapter 5. Community
and Family Study Center, University
of Chicago.
- Carroll, John J.
1965
Changing Patterns of Social Structure
in the Philippines, 1896-1963.
Manila, Ateneo de Manila University
Press.

- Cho, Lee-Jay, Wilson H.
Grabill, and Donald J. Bogue
1970
Differential Current Fertility in the United States. Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago.
- Davis, Kingsley
1949
Human Society. New York, The MacMillan Company.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley
1966
Methodological Issues in the Analysis of Social Mobility. In Social Structure and Social Mobility in Economic Development. N.J. Smelser and S.M. Lipset, eds. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company.
- Germani G.
1966
Social and Political Consequences of Mobility. In Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development. N.J. Smelser and S.M. Lipset, eds. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company.
- Glass, David V.
1954
Social Mobility in Britain. London, Routledge and Paul.
- Glass, David V. and J.R. Hall
1954
Social Mobility in Britain: A Study of Intergeneration Changes in Status. In Social Mobility in Britain. David V. Glass, ed. London, Routledge and Paul.
- Goldscheider, Calvin
1971
Population, Modernization, and Social Structure. Boston, Little Brown.
- Hauser Robert M. and
David Featherman
1977
The Process of Stratification: Trends and Analysis. New York, Academic Press.
- Hodge, Robert, Donald Treiman,
and Peter Rossi
1966
A Comparative Study of Occupational Prestige. In Class, Status and Power. S.M. Lipset and R. Bendix, eds. New York, Free Press.

- Imoagene, Oshomha
1976
Social Mobility in Emergent Society. Changing African Family Project Series, Monograph 2. Canberra, The Australian National University.
- Kim, Yun
1972
Net Internal Migration in the Philippines. Technical Paper No. 2. Bureau of the Census and Statistics. Manila.
- Lipset, Seymour M. and
Reinhard Bendix
1959
Social Mobility in Industrial Society. University of California, University of California Press.
- Lopreato, Joseph and
Lawrence E. Hazelrigg
1972
Class, Conflict, and Mobility. Theories and Studies of Class Structure. San Francisco, Chandler Publishing Company.
- Moore, Wilbert E.
1970
Industrialization and Social Change. In Industrialization and Society. Bert F. Joselitz and Wilbert Moore, eds. UNESCO.
- Moser, C.A. and J.R. Hall
1954
The Social Grading of Occupations. In Social Mobility in Britain. David V. Glass, ed. London, Routledge and Paul, Ltd.
- Murkerjee, Ramkrishna
1954
A Further Note on the Analysis of Data on Social Mobility. In Social Mobility in Britain. David V. Glass, ed. London, Routledge and Paul, Ltd.
- Pessen, Edward (ed.)
1974
Three Centuries of Social Mobility in America. Lexington, D.C. Heath and Co.
- Reisman, Leonard
1959
Class in American Society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

- Reiss, Albert J., Jr., et.al.
1961 Occupations and Social Status. New York, Free Press of Glencoe.
- Rogoff, Natalie
1951 Recent Trends in Urban Occupational Mobility. In Reader in Urban Sociology. P.K. Hatt and A.J. Reiss, Jr., eds. Glencoe, The Free Press.
- Rogoff, Natalie
1953 Recent Trends in Occupational Mobility. Glencoe, The Free Press.
- Smelser, Neil J. and Seymour M. Lipset
1966 Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company.
- Stycos, J. Mayone
1968 Human Fertility in Latin America. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Svalastoga, Kaare
1964 Social Differentiation. In Handbook of Modern Sociology. Richard E.L. Faris, ed. Chicago, Rand McNally and Company.
- Tien, H.Y.
1965 Social Mobility and Controlled Fertility. New Haven, College and University Press.
- Treiman, Donald J.
1970 Industrialization and Social Stratification. In Social Stratification: Research and Theory for the 1970's. Edward O. Laumann, ed. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, Co.
- Tumin, Melvin
1967 Social Stratification: The Forms and Functions of Inequality. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
- Tumin, Melvin and Arnold Feldman
1961 Social Class and Social Change in Puerto Rico. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Westoff, Charles F.
1956

The Changing Focus of Differential Fertility Research: The Social Mobility Hypothesis. In Population Theory and Policy. J.J. Spengler and O.D. Duncan, eds. Glencoe, The Free Press.

Westoff, Charles, F., Robert G. Potter, Jr.,
and Philip C. Sagi
1963

The Third Child: A Study in the Prediction of Fertility. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Westoff, Charles F., Robert G. Potter, Jr.,
Philip C. Sagi, and Elliot G. Mishler
1961

Family Growth in Metropolitan America. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Journal Articles

Aiken, Michael and David Goldberg
1969

Social Mobility and Kinship: A Re-examination of the Hypothesis. American Anthropologist 71:261-270.

Axelrod, Morris
1956

Urban Structures and Social Participation. American Sociological Review 21:13-18.

Bacol, Melinda M.
1971

Intergenerational Occupational Mobility in the Philippines. Philippine Sociological Review 19(3-4):193-208.

Baltzell, E. Digby
1953

Social Mobility and Fertility Within an Elite Group. Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 31:411-420.

Belcher, John C., and Kelly W. Crader
1974

Social Class, Style of Life and Fertility in Puerto Rico. Social Forces 52 (June, 1974).

Bell, Wendell and Marion D. Boat
1957

Urban Neighbourhoods and Informal Social Relations. American Journal of Sociology 62:391-398.

- Berent, Jerzy
1952 Fertility and Social Mobility.
Population Studies 5:244-260.
- Blau, Peter M.
1956 Social Mobility and Interpersonal
Relations. American Sociological
Review 21:290-295.
- Boggs, Stephen T.
1957 Family Size and Social Mobility in a
California Suburb. Eugenics Quarterly
4:208-213.
- Boyd, Monica
1973 Occupational Mobility and Fertility
in Metropolitan Latin America.
Demography 10:1-18.
- Broom, L. and F.L. Jones
1969 Father-to-Son Mobility: Australia in
Comparative Perspective. American
Journal of Sociology 74:333-342.
- Chase, Ivan D.
1975 A Comparison of Men's and Women's
Intergenerational Mobility in the
United States. American Sociological
Review 40:483-505.
- Davis, Kingsley and Judith Blake
1956 Social Structure and Fertility: An
Analytical Framework. Economic
Development and Cultural Change 4:211-235.
- De Jong, Peter Y., Milton J. Brawer,
and Stanley S. Robin
1971 Patterns of Female Intergenerational
Occupational Mobility: A Comparison
with Patterns of Male Intergenerational
Occupational Mobility. American
Sociological Review 36:1033-1042.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley and Robert W. Hodge
1963 Education and Occupation Mobility: A
Regression Analysis. American Journal
of Sociology 68:629-644.
- Ellis, R.A. and W.C. Lane
1967 Social Mobility and Social Isolation:
A Test of Sorokin's Dissociative
Hypothesis. American Sociological
Review 32:237-253.

- Fox, Thomas, and S.M. Miller
1966 Economic, Political and Social Determinants of Mobility: An International Cross-Sectional Analysis. *Acta Sociologica* 9:76-93. As cited in N.J. Smelser and S.M. Lipset's *Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development*, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company.
- Freedman, Ronald
1961 The Sociology of Human Fertility: A Trend Report and Bibliography. *Current Sociology* 10-11:35-121.
- Garnier, Maurice and Lawrence E. Hazelrigg
1974 Father-to-Son Occupational Mobility in France. *American Journal of Sociology* 80:478-502.
- Goldberg, David
1959 The Fertility of Two-Generation Urbanites. *Population Studies* 12:214-222.
- Goyder, John C. and James E. Curtis
1975 A Three-Generational Approach to Trends in Occupational Mobility. *American Journal of Sociology* 81:129-138.
- Greer, Scott
1956 Urbanism Reconsidered: A Comparative Study of Local Areas in a Metropolis. *American Sociological Review* 21:19-25.
- Haller, Archibald, Donald Holsinger and Helcio Saravia
1972 Variations in Occupational Prestige Hierarchies: Brazilian Data. *American Journal of Sociology* 7:941-956.
- Haller, Archibald and David Lewis
1966 The Hypothesis of Intersocietal Similarity in Occupational Hierarchies. *American Journal of Sociology* 72:210-216.
- Hauser, Robert M., et.al.
1975 Structural Changes in Occupational Mobility Among Men in the U.S. *American Sociological Review* 40:585-598.

- Hodge, Robert W., Paul M. Siegel,
and Peter H. Rossi
1964 Occupational Prestige in the United
States, 1925-63. American Journal of
Sociology 70:281-302.
- Hutchinson, Bertram
1957 The Social Grading of Occupations in
Brazil. British Journal of Sociology
8:176-189.
- Hutchinson, Bertram
1957 Fertility, Social Mobility and Urban
Migration in Brazil. Population
Studies 14:182-189.
- Kantner, John F., and Clyde W. Kiser
1954 The Interrelation of Fertility, Fertility
Planning, and Intergenerational Social
Mobility. Milbank Memorial Fund
Quarterly 32:69-103.
- Kessin, Kenneth
1971 Social and Psychological Consequences
of Intergenerational Occupational
Mobility. American Journal of Sociology
77:1-18.
- Lin, Nam and Daniel Yaeger
1975 The Process of Occupational Status
Achievement: A Preliminary Cross-
National Comparison. American Journal
of Sociology 81:543-562.
- Litwak, Eugene
1960 Occupational Mobility and Extended
Family Cohesion. American Sociological
Review 25:9-21.
- Lopreato, Joseph
1965 Social Mobility in Italy. American
Journal of Sociology 71:311-314.
- Lynch, Frank
1965 Trends Report on Studies in Social
Stratification and Social Mobility
in the Philippines. East Asia
Cultural Studies 4:165-191.

- Pascual, Elvira M.
1971
Differential Fertility in the Philippines. Philippine Sociological Review 19(3-4):209-230.
- Perrucci, Carolyn Cummings
1967
Social Origins, Mobility Patterns and Fertility. American Sociological Review 32:615-625.
- Reimer, Ruth and Clyde Kiser
1954
Economic Tension and Social Mobility in Relation to Fertility Planning and Size of Planned Family. The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 32:167-231.
- Scott, Wolf
1958
Fertility and Social Mobility Among Teachers. Population Studies 11:251-261.
- Stuckert, Robert P.
1963
Occupational Mobility and Family Relationships. Social Forces 41:301-307.
- Tiryakian, Edward
1958
The Prestige Evaluation of Occupations in an Underdeveloped Country: The Philippines, American Journal of Sociology 63:390-399.
- Treiman, Donald
1966
Status Discrepancy and Prejudice. American Journal of Sociology 61:651-664.
- Treiman, Donald J. and Kermit Terrell
1975
The Process of Status Attainment in the United States and Great Britain. American Journal of Sociology 81:563-583.

Unpublished Materials

- Bacol, Melinda M.
1971
A Study of Inter-Generational Occupational Mobility in the Philippines. Unpublished master's thesis. Population Institute, University of the Philippines.

- Beltran, Anita Kho Go
1962
Occupational Origin and Variation in Patterns of Occupation Succession: The Case of Filipino University Students. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Chicago.
- Concepcion, Mercedes B.
1963
Fertility Differences Among Married Women in the Philippines. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Sociology, University of Chicago.
- de Guzman, Eliseo A.
1975
Differential Fertility in the Philippines. Research Note No. 81. Population Institute, University of the Philippines.
- Deming, Mary Beard
1975
The Influence of Marriage and Child-bearing on Occupational Mobility in the Philippines. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Sociology, University of Chicago.
- Guillergan, Perla J.
1969
Patterns of Female Participation in the Labor Force in Mandaluyong and Quiapo-San Miguel. Unpublished master's thesis. University of the Philippines.
- Herrin, Alejandro N.
1978
Female Work Participation and Fertility in the Philippines: A Preliminary Report on a Methodological Sub-Phase of an Exploratory Study. Research Institute for Mindanao Culture, Xavier University.
- Lauby, Jennifer
1975
Indicators of Social Mobility. In Measuring Philippine Development. Chapter 9. Development Academy of the Philippines.
- Ochoa, Georgina and Cecille Carreon-Eco
1975
A Pilot Survey in Social Indicators. In Measuring Philippine Development. Chapter 10. Development Academy of the Philippines.

Perez, Aurora E.
1977

Internal Migration in the Year 2000.
Paper presented at the PREPF Workshop
on "Determinants of Population Growth
in the Year 2000" held at the Population
Center Foundation Bldg., Makati.
21 April 1977.

Pullum, Thomas W.
1971

The Development of an Ordinal Ranking
of Occupations. Technical Note NDS-4.
Population Institute, University of
the Philippines.

Smith, Peter C.
1975

Educational Differentials in Overall
and Marital Fertility, 1968-1972.
PREPF Research Note No. 10.
Population Institute, University of
the Philippines.

Villa, Ruby R.
1979

Female Labor Force Participation and
Fertility in the Philippines.
Unpublished master's thesis. Population
Institute, University of the Philippines.

SEAPRAP

THE SOUTHEAST ASIA POPULATION RESEARCH AWARDS PROGRAM

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

- * To strengthen the research capabilities of young Southeast Asian social scientists, and to provide them with technical support and guidance if required.
- * To increase the quantity and quality of social science research on population problems in Southeast Asia.
- * To facilitate the flow of information about population research developed in the program as well as its implications for policy and planning among researchers in the region, and between researchers, government planners and policy makers.

ILLUSTRATIVE RESEARCH AREAS

The range of the research areas include a wide variety of research problems relating to population, but excludes reproductive biology. The following are some examples of research areas that could fall within the general focus of the Program:

- * Factors contributing to or related to fertility regulation and family planning programs; familial, psychological, social, political and economic effects of family planning and contraception.
- * Antecedents, processes, and consequences (demographic, cultural, social, psychological, political, economic) of population structure, distribution, growth and change.
- * Family structure, sexual behaviour and the relationship between child-bearing patterns and child development.
- * Inter-relations between population variables and the process of social and economic development (housing, education, health, quality of the environment, etc).
- * Population policy, including the interaction of population variables and economic policies, policy implications of population distribution and movement with reference to both urban and rural settings, and the interaction of population variables and law.
- * Evaluation of on-going population education programs and/or development of knowledge-based population education program.

- * Incentive schemes — infrastructures, opportunities; overall economic and social development programs

SELECTION CRITERIA

Selection will be made by a Program Committee of distinguished Southeast Asian scholars in the social sciences and population. The following factors will be considered in evaluating research proposals:

1. relevance of the proposed research to current issues of population in the particular countries of Southeast Asia;
2. its potential contribution to policy formation, program implementation, and problem solving;
3. adequacy of research design, including problem definition, method of procedure, proposed mode of analysis, and knowledge of literature;
4. feasibility of the project, including time requirement; budget; and availability, accessibility, and reliability of data;
5. Applicant's potential for further development.

DURATION AND AMOUNT OF AWARDS

Research awards will be made for a period of up to one year. In exceptional cases, requests for limited extension may be considered. The amount of an award will depend on location, type and size of the project, but the maximum should not exceed US\$7,500.

QUALIFICATIONS OF APPLICANTS

The Program is open to nationals of the following countries: Burma, Indonesia, Kampuchea, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. Particular emphasis will be placed on attracting young social scientists in provincial areas.

Applications are invited from the following:

- * Graduate students in thesis programs
- * Faculty members
- * Staff members in appropriate governmental and other organizations.

Full-time commitment is preferable but applicant must at least be able to devote a substantial part of their time to the research project. Advisers may be provided, depending on the needs of applicants.