A Dynamic Analysis of Social Mobility

A dynamic analysis is distinguished from a static one by the fact that it includes the time factor as an intrinsic element. Until not very long ago, most studies of social mobility were on the static level. This statement may sound strange to those who have in mind the terminology of Auguste Comte. According to him, static sociology is the study of social structure, whereas dynamic sociology is the investigation of social development or evolution. In this sense, any analysis of social mobility would be dynamic by virtue of its subject matter. Social mobility would seem to be the dynamic aspect of social stratification. I hope to convince you that this is not the case. This will be my first task. The next will be to outline the requirements of a dynamic analysis of social mobility. Finally, I shall briefly describe to you how my collaborators and I tried to perform such a dynamic analysis. I may as well confess right at the start that the result has not been entirely satisfactory, owing mainly to certain technical deficiencies of the available data with which we had to put up. The methodological approach, however, seems to be sound, though it might be improved. It appears that the Italian sociologist Livio Livi has been wrestling with the same methodological problem as we; however, he solved it in a different manner. His article "Sur la mesure de la mobilité sociale" was published in the French journal "Population" at the time when we had just finished the analysis of our material.

I

Social mobility is a process but, as I stated just before, it is mostly analysed in terms of statics. This is in part due to the fact that few studies have concerned themselves with over-all mobility between all strata of society. The interest of most sociologists has been concentrated on, and confined to, one single stratum or another, especially the comparatively small functional elites: the intellectuals, the professions, bureaucracy, big business, etc. In these cases, the main questions invariably are: (1) How is the stratum recruited? (2) To what degree are the old

members of the stratum replaced by youth which are born within the stratum? (3) From what other strata do the movers-in originate?

This limitation of the problem has been due mainly to the democratic and liberalistic perspective on social mobility. Through the 19th century, the abolishment of social and political privileges was still a major issue. Social strata were conceived of more in terms of rank than of kind and scientific, as well as public attention, was focused on the opportunities of lower and middle class offspring to rise above their parental status.

As long as social mobility is analysed only with respect to certain singled-out strata and, as far as even within these limits, only the *recruitment* of these strata is investigated, the subjectmatter is, strictly speaking, not the *process* of social mobility at all, but the *result* of certain movements which have taken place. It is, in other words, a static analysis.

Such studies certainly are in themselves useful in many ways. But they do not answer the problems involved in social mobility. To a certain degree, the results may be misleading, even within their special, narrowly defined fields. In substantiating these critical statements, I am going to confine myself to *occupational* stratification, which is only one dimension of the entire stratified structure of society. Furthermore, I am going to refer only to those movements which occur in the *succession of generations,* leaving out those which happen during the life career of one individual. Including these other aspects would make the whole pattern somewhat more intricate, but it would hardly change the essentials of the problem.

There are three reasons why a static analysis of social mobility is insufficient.

(1) A static or cross-sectional analysis of the recruitment of existing social strata would be unsatisfactory, even if social mobility merely consisted in movements of individuals or families from one stratum to another within a society of *stationary* structure. Even in this entirely fictitious case, a static analysis would be adequate only if the transition from one generation to the next occurred within certain time intervals and, in each instance, simultaneously throughout the entire society, i. e., if after 30 or 35 years, a younger generation moved in in force to take the place of the until then active old generation. Practically speaking replacement is not a periodically recurring event, but a continuous process. It does not take place in batches, but by drops. One vacancy has to be filled at a time and the aspirants to openings present themselves one at a time. Therefore, the re-recruitment of any stratum, and of stratified society as a whole, has to be investigated as the continuously flowing process which it really is and this means in terms of dynamics, including the time factor.

(2) In most cases, social mobility is conceived of as individuals' movements between given strata which are supposed to remain essentially unchanged while

the movements are going on. This is a mere fiction. While individuals move between strata, the strata themselves change — in size, in character, and mostly in both. The balance among them is altered. Sometimes, peoples' moving from their parental stratum to another one is necessitated by a change in the public demand for the specific functions of occupational strata. Industrialization meant that a surplus of rural youth *had* to join the labour army. Later, technical rationalization of industry reduced, comparatively, the demand for wage-workers, but increased the demand for white collarists. In other cases, an increasing invasion from certain strata seems to be the immediate cause of a change in the invaded stratum. The European intellectuals, for instance, have experienced not only an increase in number but also a fundamental change of collective mentality and attitude since, towards 1900, they began to absorb more middle-class offspring. In this context, however, it is of minor importance whether social mobility in special directions is the result of structural changes or changes in the stratificational structure and balance are the results of mobility-tendencies. The main point here is *that,* in both cases, social mobility does not take place between essentially unaltered strata, but the affected strata themselves change while individuals are moving in and out. By describing social mobility as a movement of individuals from one given stratum to another, one would adulterate the real character of the process in question.

(3) So far, we have taken into account dislocation of volume and weight going on between the strata of a society which is structured in a certain manner. It has been preliminarily supposed that the social structure itself remains unchanged and only the balance between the strata is gliding. This, too, is a fictitious assumption. In social history, we find such statements as this: "The medieval social order was replaced by modern class society". Nobody is assuming that such structural revolutions happen over night. They always start as disturbances of the balance between existing strata. It is, in any actual case, hardly possible to decide at what point such an internal change led to a fundamental disintegration of the stratified structure itself and the re-arrangement of society as a whole. The contemporary observer may not be aware of more than an increasing mobility between existing strata. Enea Silvio Piccolomini, afterwards to be Pope Pius II, writes in his "Memoirs" that in his time, "many were those adventurers who went to sleep one night, being captains of a lansquenets' squadron, and awakened the next morning, wearing a duke's crown". He saw around him a lively social mobility. In historical retrospect, posterity recognizes it as one symptom of a social revolution. But, strictly speaking, society is always in revolution. As long as social changes are comparatively slowmoving, there seem to be periods of stability interrupted by shorter spells of transition. To-day, waves of social change follow one another, the last swell of a previous one being superseded by the first rise of

the next. Being unsettled seems to be a permanent characteristic of modern society.

While individuals move from stratum to another, the strata themselves are changing in volume and character and, while the balance between strata is gliding, the fundamental stratificational structure itself is upset. Everything is in continous flow. There is no fixed point of reference. In such circumstances, a dynamic analysis becomes imperative.

II

And what are the requirements of such a dynamic analysis?

(1) It has to be based on *over-all* mobility. This is important in order to gain a *general* picture, instead of confining the analysis to one single stratum. By broadening the field of observation, we get access to the double aspect of any individual movement. In a study of, for instance, the recruitment of the bureaucracy, we only become aware of those movements which are an *influx* from different quarters into the bureaucratic stratum and we only see these movements in proportion to the goal-stratum. The same movements would also have to be looked at as *deflux* from the various parental strata and in proportion to *their* volume. Three percent farmers' or six percent wage-workers' children among the higher bureaucracy have quite different significance when we know that the farmers constitute 25 % and the wage-workers 30 % of the population. And what became of the brothers and sisters of those who joined the bureaucratic hierarchy? This double aspect, influx and deflux, is automatically revealed in an overall study of social mobility. Besides, changes between smal ownership and clerical work, or peasantry and labour, are certainly no less important than movements from any of these strata towards the so-called functional elites.

(2) It would be insufficient to investigate, for instance in the manner of a cross-section, from what kinds of families did all those originate who, *at a given time,* are found in the various strata of a society and what became of their siblings. What is needed is at least a time series of cross-sections which would give us a possibility to establish a trend in the change of mobility-frequencies between the various strata, in relation to simultaneous changes in the volumes of these strata.

(3) Any such analysis would naturally have to be based on a previously decided stratificational pattern or model, dividing society into a certain number of strata. Now, any such pattern or model, even the most judiciously chosen one, must be arbitrary to a certain degree. *Within* any of the assumed strata important movements may go on, but they are obliterated in the once accepted stratificational pattern. An increasing or decreasing frequency of such invisible movements might

just be symptomatic of a fundamental change in the stratificational structure itself. Therefore, a study of overall mobility in order to be really dynamic, and that means to include a potential change of the stratified structure itself, ought to be based on a rather *detailed* stratificational pattern showing as many movements as possible. In the final analysis and interpretation, one may then combine several small units into larger strata. These main strata would then be determined and delineated empirically and not by an a priori assumption that this or that social differentiation is structurally important. It would even be possible, over a longer period, to change the combinations of smaller units, if and when a structural change occurs.

(4) On the strength of everyday observation, we must expect that social mobility from certain strata to certain *distant* strata occurs more by steps than by leaps. The distance may be one of rank and kind. Let us say that the son of a small holder becomes a village innkeeper before his grandson becomes the owner of a large brewery in a near-by town. From such considerations, we have to conclude that a dynamic analysis of social mobility should not confine itself to changes which take place from one generation to the next, but it should cover three or even more links in succession. Statistical mass-analyses of this kind may be difficult to carry out, but case studies in family history would probably be a valuable supplement.

(5) Finally, I may just mention a series of other points which demand consideration.

(a) Men and self-supporting women move from their parental stratum to another one mostly by their choice of an occupation. Housewives change by their choice of a husband. Besides, marriage may also influence the status of the groom. Therefore, comparisons are necessary between the status of the groom and his father-in-law, between the status of the groom's and the bride's fathers, and possibly a comparison of both with the pre-marital occupational status of the bride as a transitory step.

(b) As pointed out, influxes have to be co-related with the volumes of the parental strata and defluxes with the volumes of the goal-strata. But here, several complicating factors have to be taken into account. One of them is the differential fertility of the parental strata. Another one is the differential rhythm of re-recruitment in the various goal-strata, as caused by short or long training, by early or late retiring age, by differential mortality. What we know about these things is, as yet, astonishingly little.

(c) In connection with the just mentioned factors there are certain occupational strata which are distinctly juvenile, for instance the lower grade employees; others with a comparatively high average age, for instance both the urban and rural proprietors. On the basis of the Danish census, one of my collaborators worked

out the average age levels of more than 200 occupational groups. What we need, however, are exact data on the typical careers and career-chances both within certain occupational strata and leading from one stratum to another; for instance, from wage-work to small ownership or from the white-collar to the executive group.

These, however, are just some of the major points and far from exhaustive.

III

You will find that our attempt at an approximation of a dynamic analysis falls short even of these basic requirements. To our excuse, I can only say that we could not make silk purses out of sows' ears. We had to accept the material of a municipal census, with all the disadvantages of its classification, and we had 1,500 Rockefeller Dollars to spend on the analysis.

Our material was the 1948 census on the second largest Danish city, which has a population of 106,000 people. Among these, the 40,000 males over 15 years were questioned about the occupational status of their fathers and, as far as they were married, their fathers-in-law. The census itself gives us the questionnees own occupation, age, and marital status. In this way, we were able to compare the occupational status of the questionnee with that of his father, with that of his father-in-law, and the occupation of his father with that of his father-in-law.

Now, these 40,000 men were not analysed as one mass, but subdivided into 8 age-cohorts. The occupational status and parental origin of each age-cohort was tabulated separately.

Within each age-cohort, we distinguished between 18 occupational strata. (1) Agricultural, not subdivided, because in an urban population these are not more than 1 % altogether. (2) Big business-owners and directors. (3) Minor owners in industry, crafts and commerce. (4) The free professions — doctors, lawyers, architects, etc. (5) Clergy and teachers. (6) Higher public officials. (7) Business executives and other higher employees. (8) Lower grades of public officials. (9) White-collar and retail sales-personnel. (10) Railway and other transportation personnel. (11) Mechanics and foremen. (12) Other salaried personnel. (13) Skilled workers. (14) Unskilled workers. (15) Other occupations — a very small, non-specified residual group. (16) Students and other persons in training. (17) Retired and old age pensioners. (18) Occupation unknown.

This classification is dictated by the one used in the municipal census. We were not happy about it, but in our detailed analyses we did what could be done to improve it by subdivision and re-arrangement of certain categories.

Each single age-cohort was then tabulated in a special manner, as exemplified

in table I. The table shows only 3 categories instead of the 18 we worked with, but I only intend to explain the principle here.

Table I

Sons occupation	Parents occupation			
	A	B	C	Total
A	40 600 60	40 600 15	20 300 6	100 1500 15
B	6 200 20	57 2000 50	37 1300 26	100 3500 35
C	4 200 20	28 1400 35	68 3400 68	100 5000 50
Total	10 1000 100	40 4000 100	50 5000 100	100 10000 100

The following description starts with the small-print figures in the middle of each box. A, B, C on the left and the totals on the right of each line give us the occupational distribution of the questionnees themselves. A, B, C along the top line, and the totals below refer to the status of the questionnees' parents. In both cases, the same classification is applied. The right-hand column, therefore, gives us the occupational stratification, while the line below gives us the status of origin of the age-cohort in question.

In the boxes where one occupational status and the identical parental status meet, we have the figures for occupational succession and endogenous recruitment, what Livio Livi calls the *homo-socialis*.

We proceed now to the figures in the corners of each box. These are percentages. The absolute figure in the middle of each box is expressed as a percentage of two quantities. Right-hand above, it says how many percent of the *line*-total. For example, 600 A-individuals, whose fathers were B, are 48 % of the 1500 A-individuals. Forty percent, therefore, is the *influx*-quota from B to A. The percentages right-hand above, along the bottom below, tell us how the now living male population is distributed with respect to their social origin.

The percentages left-hand below are the *deflux*-quotas. The total of column A

indicates that there are 1000 sons of A-individuals. Of these, 200 are found on line B. These 20 % are A-children, whose occupational status is B.

In this way, the tables give synoptically the d*ouble aspect* of which I spoke before. Each single mass of equal occupation and equal origin is quantitatively compared with both the occupational stratum and the stratum of origin.

On this point, we have been at a disadvantage which gave us a lot of extra trouble in the analysis. Our material is *not* an overall, but an *urban* material. This means that the rural-agricultural population is only represented by deflux, but not by influx. Only 1 % of our total mass are themselves agrarians, but owing to rural-urban migration, 12 % are of agrarian *origin.* Therefore, our material tells us nothing about the mobility within the rural population and among its strata. This handicap even affects the analysis of *intra-urban* mobility, because the percentage of rural descendants is very different in the various age-cohorts of the urban population — 22 % among the oldest, but only 3 % among the youngest. This is due to the fact that during the second half of the 19th century, the Danish cities grew mostly by migration from the country-side. Nowadays, the urban population itself is large enough to make its own offspring the main source of reproduction, even if the migration from the country were the same as before. But the rural-urban migration has decreased, even in absolute quantity.

I had to draw your attention to this very annoying gap in our investigation. It is a serious flaw in the material as it was made accessible to us, but it does not affect the method itself and the desirability of applying the method to a really complete population.

In the analysis of our material, we tried, by statistical manipulation, to eliminate the distortion caused by the above mentioned deficiency. Time, however, does not permit a description of this process.

We now proceed to consider another feature of the tabular presentation as shown in table I. The percentages left-hand below through the right-hand total column represent the relative volumes of the occupational strata to-day. The upper-right percentages along the lower line give us the relative volumes of the offspring of the parental strata among the present population. We now shall compare the corresponding volume-quotas, the lower-lefts along each line and the upper-rights through each column. Let us start with the assumption that all young people are statistically proportional. This would mean that all young people, regardless of their origin, had an equal chance to arrive anywhere on the occupational scale. In this case, all deflux-quotas, lower-left in the same line, would be equal with one another and with the corresponding volume-quotas in the right column. Likewise all influx-quotas, upper-right down each column, would be identical between them and with the corresponding upper-right volume quotas on the lower line. This fictitious case is illustrated in table II.

Table II

Sons occupation	Parents occupation			
	A	B	C	Total
A	10 150 15	40 600 15	50 750 15	100 1500 15
B	10 350 35	40 1400 35	50 1750 35	100 3500 35
C	10 500 50	40 2000 50	50 2500 50	100 5000 50
Total	10 1000 100	40 4000 100	50 5000 100	100 10.000 100

Whenever the actually found quota deviates from the model, as it is shown in table II, the social fluctuation is not statistically perfect. This by no means implies a sociological evaluation. Nobody says that mobility *ought* to be numerically equal.

Normally, occupational succession, the deflux-quota in the homo-social box, and endogenous recruitment, the influx-quota in the homo-social box, will be preponderant. One has, in other words, to expect a congestion of masses along the diagonal running from upper left towards lower right. The degree of this congestion signifies the *rigidity* of occupational stratification. The rigidity can be expressed in indexes. The endogenous recruitment quota, upper right in the homo-social box, has to be divided by the volume quota of the stratum of origin, and the succession quota, lower left, has to be divided by the volume quota of the occupational stratum. More than 1.0 indicates comparative rigidity.

The figures in table I are chosen to illustrate three typical cases. Stratum C appears with the same volume in the occupational as well as the parental stratification. Therefore, the succession and endogenous recruitment rates in the homo-social box are identical, 68 %. In stratum A, there are more individuals to-day than there are children of A-parents. Therefore, 60 % A-children are necessary to fill 40 % of the occupational stratum A. The opposite is the case of stratum B.

*) The figures in table II are based on the assumption that the voluminal proportions of the occupational strata are different from those of the strata of origin.

Here, only 50 % of the now living B-children are necessary to occupy 57 % of all B-places in present society.

This leads us to a new analytical consideration. We assume that we deal with 10,000 males over 15 years. In the right-hand column, these 10,000 are classified according to their own occupation. In the lower line, they are classified as to the occupations held by their fathers. Now, if the present A-stratum is more numerous than the A-offspring among the now living, this can mean different things. The occupational stratum A may have grown since the days of our parents. There are, for instance, more salaried employees to-day than 50 years ago. Or vice versa, there are to-day fewer industrial and commercial owners than 50 years ago. Whether or not such an expansion or contraction of the occupational stratum has taken place can be checked up on. We only need to look up the occupational census. But the cause may be another one; namely, a *specific fertility* above or below the average. There may be the same number of small owners to-day as 50 years ago, but there are to-day more small owners' children than there are small owners. In both cases, we have before us either a typical exodus stratum, owing to a shrinking demand for the function of the stratum or to excess fertility, or we have a typical invasion-stratum, owing to increasing demand for the occupational function or to subnormal fertility. It goes without saying that differential fertility can explain minor volume deviations, but never spectacular ones.

There is, however, a third factor, which has already been mentioned: the *differential average ages* of occupational strata. Take lower grade employees, for instance. In this case, the stratum itself has certainly gained volume since the days of our parents, but there is more to it. Among those members of our parental generation, who once were small employees, some have advanced to higher ranks. We catch the parents of our present population at a point in their life career 30 or 35 years more advanced than their offspring are to-day. This same time-lag or career-lag, as we may call it, has also to be taken into account when we compare the occupational structure of the oldest and the youngest age-cohorts among the now active population. This grave disadvantage, however, only exists in a study, based on a census material, collected by filled-out questionaire. In this case, the questions have to be comparatively simple. By personal interview, one can ask about the occupational status of the father both at the time when the questionnee was born and about his present status, or his status at the time of his death. This would also solve the problem of retired persons and old-age pensioners, a deplorably dubious category in my material.

And now, one final feature of the method tentatively applied by us. A dynamic analysis would have to elucidate changing tendencies in occupational succession and re-recruitment in the deflux and influx between strata, as compared with changes in the proportional volumes of the strata themselves. This is, to a certain

Tab. III *Standort- und Herkunftschichten.*

Standort \ Herkunft		Landwirtschaft	Unternehmer	Gewerbetreibende	Freie Berufe	Gehaltempfänger: Höhere öffentl. Beamte	Gehaltempfänger: Geistliche u. Lehrer	Gehaltempfänger: Höhere Privatangestellte	Gehaltempfänger: öffentl. Verkehrspersonal
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Landwirtschaft	1	138 / 33 / 3	1 / - / -	36 / 9 / 1	3 / 1 / 1	2 / - / 1	7 / 2 / 1	4 / 1 / 1	13 / 3 / 1
Unternehmer	2	102 / 14 / 2	112 / 15 / 16	160 / 22 / 2	14 / 2 / 3	4 / - / 1	12 / 2 / 2	10 / 1 / 3	32 / 4 / 2
Gewerbetreibende	3	849 / 18 / 19	61 / 1 / 8	1430 / 30 / 22	36 / 1 / 7	18 / - / 6	53 / 1 / 9	24 / 1 / 6	192 / 4 / 9
Freie Berufe	4	151 / 13 / 3	51 / 4 / 7	216 / 19 / 3	100 / 9 / 18	45 / 4 / 15	77 / 7 / 13	37 / 3 / 9	52 / 4 / 3
Gehaltempfänger: Höhere öffentl. Beamte	5	39 / 11 / 1	15 / 4 / 2	67 / 19 / 1	13 / 4 / 2	22 / 6 / 7	30 / 8 / 5	10 / 3 / 3	36 / 10 / 2
Gehaltempfänger: Geistliche u. Lehrer	6	39 / 21 / 2	13 / 3 / 2	70 / 17 / 1	12 / 3 / 2	5 / 1 / 2	78 / 18 / 13	7 / 2 / 2	26 / 5 / 1
Gehaltempfänger: Höhere Privatangestellte	7	88 / 10 / 2	46 / 5 / 7	222 / 26 / 3	13 / 2 / 2	20 / 2 / 7	20 / 2 / 3	21 / 2 / 5	55 / 6 / 3
Gehaltempfänger: öffentl. Verkehrspersonal	8	305 / 15 / 7	19 / 1 / 3	272 / 14 / 4	13 / 1 / 2	13 / 1 / 4	19 / 1 / 3	15 / 1 / 4	271 / 14 / 13
Gehaltempfänger: Technische angestellte	9	101 / 10 / 2	29 / 3 / 4	201 / 19 / 3	21 / 2 / 4	13 / 1 / 4	21 / 2 / 4	15 / 1 / 4	74 / 7 / 4
Gehaltempfänger: Verkaufsangestellte	10	236 / 9 / 5	96 / 4 / 13	616 / 24 / 9	41 / 2 / 8	13 / 1 / 4	39 / 2 / 7	33 / 1 / 8	139 / 6 / 7
Gehaltempfänger: öffentl. u. priv. Büro-Angest.	11	93 / 7 / 2	39 / 3 / 6	261 / 19 / 4	34 / 2 / 6	26 / 2 / 8	35 / 3 / 6	62 / 5 / 15	130 / 10 / 6
Gehaltempfänger: Sonstige Gehaltempf.	12	48 / 18 / 1	7 / 3 / 1	50 / 19 / 1	5 / 2 / 1	5 / 2 / 2	5 / 2 / 1	2 / 1 / 1	16 / 6 / 1
Arbeiter: gelernte	13	669 / 8 / 15	61 / 1 / 8	1510 / 18 / 22	39 / - / 7	26 / - / 9	27 / - / 5	41 / 1 / 10	459 / 5 / 23
Arbeiter: ungelernte	14	1014 / 12 / 22	33 / - / 4	797 / 10 / 12	21 / - / 4	12 / - / 4	17 / - / 4	14 / - / 3	257 / 3 / 13
Lehrlinge	15	65 / 4 / 1	41 / 2 / 6	282 / 15 / 4	27 / 1 / 5	8 / 1 / 3	13 / 1 / 3	35 / 2 / 9	91 / 5 / 4
Studierende	16	122 / 9 / 3	61 / 5 / 8	235 / 18 / 3	121 / 9 / 22	42 / 3 / 14	95 / 7 / 16	54 / 4 / 14	67 / 5 / 3
Personen im Ruhestand	17	428 / 18 / 9	11 / - / 1	216 / 9 / 3	14 / - / 3	8 / - / 2	17 / 1 / 3	2 / - / -	64 / 3 / 3
Unidentifizierte	18	34 / 3 / 1	28 / 3 / 4	119 / 12 / 2	17 / 2 / 3	21 / 2 / 7	10 / 1 / 2	17 / 2 / 4	35 / 3 / 2
Summe	19	4562 / 12 / 100	724 / 2 / 100	6760 / 17 / 100	544 / 1 / 100	303 / 1 / 100	575 / 1 / 100	403 / 1 / 100	2009 / 5 / 100

Männliche Gesamtbevölkerung über 15 Jahre.

Empfänger				Arbeiter		Lehrlinge	Studierende	Personen im Ruhestand	Unidentifizierte	Summe
Technische angestellte	Verkaufsangestellte	öff. u. priv. Büroangestellte	Sonstige Gehaltempfänger	gelernte	ungelernte					
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	4 1		1 ·	26 6	63 15			5 1	115 28	418 100
14 2	17 2	3 ·	9 1	36 5	37 5			20 3	159 22	741 100
56 1	65 1	17 ·	30 1	428 9	427 9			95 2	1018 21	4790 100
35 3	34 3	13 1	22 2	75 8	61 5			9 1	185 16	1163 100
13 4	9 2	3 1	8 2	31 8	22 6			7 2	35 10	360 100
10 2	14 3	2 ·	9 2	24 6	21 5			4 1	44 10	428 100
25 3	32 4	7 1	15 2	106 12	49 6			15 2	129 15	863 100
53 3	36 2	9 ·	23 1	227 11	321 16			41 2	340 17	1977 100
55 5	17 2	3 ·	10 1	139 13	124 12			18 2	206 20	1047 100
61 2	156 6	28 1	29 1	265 10	260 10			47 2	483 19	2543 100
38 3	76 6	30 2	18 1	160 12	143 10			34 2	177 13	1356 100
7 3	5 2	1 ·	28 11	19 7	25 9			5 2	33 13	263 100
159 2	142 2	30 ·	60 1	1843 21	1412 16			181 2	1951 23	8610 100
108 1	90 1	20 ·	38 1	1033 12	2354 28			265 3	2449 29	8522 100
55 3	101 5	26 1	11 1	455 24	460 24			25 1	189 10	1885 100
46 4	58 4	29 2	25 2	124 9	92 7			24 2	129 10	1324 100
16 1	15 ·	3 ·	15 1	212 9	329 14			51 2	1016 42	2416 100
16 2	24 2	15 22	7 1	105 10	165 16			30 3	363 36	1006 100
767 2	895 2	239 1	358 1	5308 13	6365 16			877 2	9023 23	39.712 100

degree, achieved by separating the various age-cohorts. With necessary reservations, one may say that the occupational distribution of each age-cohort reflects the functional structure of the society at the time when this age-cohort entered gainful employment. When, for instance, we find that among those born 1889—98 the influx to the wage-working stratum and the deflux from small proprietors were especially high, then this corresponds with the fact that at that time the social demand for these functions developed in opposite directions. From other statistical sources, we know that towards 1900 Denmark underwent a wave of rather hectic industrialisation. Or we find that the deflux from various strata towards public and business employees has been increasing through the last 5 age-cohorts. This corresponds with the progressive bureaucratisation of our society. Etc.

To conclude, I am acutely aware of the shortcomings of the analytical method, as described, and even more of the handicaps against which we had to fight in our material. In spite of all this, however, I feel justified in saying that we have come one step nearer a dynamic analysis of social mobility. In support of this claim, three points may be re-emphasized.

(1) The substratum of the analysis is not one special group, but a *total population,* if only an urban one.

(2) We have not confined ourselves to investigate the *recruitment* of strata, as they *are* to-day, but followed synoptically the *defluctive and influctive movements* between all strata.

(3) These processes were not studied with regard to a present population as an undifferentiated whole, but separately for the various age-cohorts within this population. This means that social mobility is investigated as *movements of individuals between changing strata in a society of changing structure.* Social mobilty of individuals is referred to social configurations which are themselves mobile.