November 1992 Occasional Paper No. 17

The Class Structure in Hong Kong

香港亞太研究所

Tsang Wing Kwong

Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Shatin, New Territories
Hong Kong

HK$20.00
ISBN 962-441-017-8

The Class Structure in Hong Kong

Tsang Wing Kwong

Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Shatin, New Territories
Hong Kong

About the author

Tsang Wing Kwong is a Lecturer in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Acknowledgements

This essay is an extract of my Ph.D. dissertation. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my gratitude to my supervisor Professor Rance P. L. Lee for his continuous encouragement throughout my study and insightful advice on the writing of the dissertation.

ISBN 962-441-017-8

The Class Structure in Hong Kong

Abstract

It has been substantiated by a stream of studies in the last two decades that Hong Kong residents hold a strong conviction that the colony is a land of abundant opportunities and these opportunities are allocated in accordance with individual achievement rather than social ascription. This study aims to investigate whether this subjective perception is an objective reality within the social structure of Hong Kong. In this study economic-class situations of all occupational titles found in the 1981 census are first measured by making use of the method of socio-economic index construction. Based on the socio-economic index constructed, social-class situations existing in the social structure of Hong Kong are identified by using the method of mobility-table analysis. As a result, the process of class structuration underlying the class structure of Hong Kong is revealed. It proves that class-situation inheritance is a prominent phenomenon in the social structure of Hong Kong and that Hong Kong society is not as open as its residents perceive it to be.

"The expectation of equality of opportunities and the perception of Hong Kong as a land of abundant opportunities seem to have been vindicated in the mind of the Hong Kong Chinese." (Lau and Kuan, 1988:66)

The above citation aptly summarizes a consensual conclusion from a stream of studies conducted in Hong Kong over the last two decades. In the early 1970s, Chaney and Podmore found in their survey of young adults that 62.7 percent of respondents agreed with the statement that "Hong Kong is truly a land of opportunity and people get pretty much of what they deserve here" (1973:60). In 1969, Johnson conducted a survey of the community leaders in Tsuen Wan and found that over half of the respondents identified achievement rather than ascription as the primary determinant of individual success in Hong Kong (Johnson, 1971:252). In 1978, Lau and Ho revealed in their survey of young workers that 60 percent of respondents believed that "Hong Kong offered opportunities for upward mobile common

people" (Lau and Ho, 1982). In a survey conducted in Kwun Tong in 1985, Lau and Kuan found that "an overwhelming 87.6 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Hong Kong was a place full of developmental opportunities. Hence, it is individual efforts that count in one's success or failure" (Lau and Kuan, 1988:63-64). Again in a similar survey done in 1986, Lau and Kuan found that "84.2 percent of respondents... agreed that in Hong Kong, provided a person had the ability and worked hard, he should have the opportunity to improve his social and economic status" (1988:64). In the same study, more than half of the respondents reported having inter-generational upward mobility (Lau and Kuan, 1988:66).

Although these research findings have strongly confirmed that the conviction about Hong Kong being an open society has been deeply implanted in the consciousness of the Hong Kong Chinese, all these findings are based on social-psychological data and have not been verified by objective data. For instance, Lau and Kuan report that in their 1986 survey "a subjective sense of upward mobility appears" (1988:66). However this reported upward mobility has not been contrasted with inter-generational data on socio-economic status. Furthermore, the subjective attribution of personal success to achievement has again not been juxtaposed to objective status attainment data.

It is the purpose of this essay to use objective data to verify whether Hong Kong is a place of abundant opportunities, and whether upward mobility is as easy as it seems. In other words, this study aims to investigate whether Hong Kong is really an open society as its residents perceive it to be.

The objective data used in this study is the Hong Kong 1981 census data. The conceptual framework guiding the study is Weber's concepts of economic and social classes. We will, first of all, measure the economic-class situation, that is market situation, of each occupational title found in the 1981 census data. We then will investigate how these economic-class situations are distributed across generations. In other words, we will analyze how the opportunities for inter-generational mobility are constituted

into closures of life chances, that is, according to Weber's definition, social classes. Taken together, this study is set out to investigate the process of class structuration in Hong Kong. Giddens[1] defines class structuration as "the process whereby economic classes become social classes" (1981:105), in other words, the process through which "indefinite multiplicity of cross-cutting interests created by differentiated market capacities" (1981:105-106) is grouped into "a number of (social) classes manageable for explication of the major components of social structure and the process of social change" (1981:101).

Accordingly, the pages that follow will be organized into five sections. In Section One, the major theories and researches relating to the study will be outlined. Based on the theories and researches, the conceptual framework guiding the present study will be constructed. Then the data sets used in the analysis will be depicted and their external validity will be validated and discussed in Section Two. In Section Three, economic-class situations of all occupational titles found in the 1981 census data will be measured by making use of methodology derived by Duncan (1961) and Nam and Powers (1983) in their socio-economic index construction. In Section Four, based upon the socio-economic index constructed in Section Three, we will try to identify social-class situations, that is closures of inter-generational mobility chances, prevailing in the social structure of Hong Kong. This is accomplished by using the mobility-table analysis method developed mainly by Goodman (1965, 1969a, and 1969b). Subsequently, it is hoped that the process of class structuration and the class structure in Hong Kong can be revealed. Finally, in the concluding section, the major findings of this study will be recapitulated. Based on the findings, we will try to see whether Hong Kong society is really as open as its residents perceive it to be.

1. The Conceptual Framework: A Weberian Approach to Class Structure Analysis

There is a consensus among sociologists that two lines of theoretical thinking have dominated the study of class structure and mobility. They are, of course, the Marxist and the Weberian perspectives (cf. Burris, 1987; Giddens, 1981; Goldthorpe, 1987; Marshall *et al.*, 1988; Murphy, 1985; Parkin, 1979). The present study is based mainly on the Weberian perspective. Such a choice of theoretical perspective, though partly due to personal discretion, is mainly based on the fact that the Weberian perspective is much better researched and developed than the Marxist one in the area of social mobility.

The underdevelopment of the social mobility study within the Marxist tradition, as aptly documented by Goldthorpe (1987:1-36), is due to the fact that the social mobility thesis is in fundamental contradiction to the overall theory of social class and the theory of social change within Marxism. For classical Marxism, Goldthorpe points out that:

> Marxism attached little importance to social mobility.... Mobility is given a prominent part in the analysis of capitalism only as an aspect of the *Verelendungstheorie*, in which it is envisaged that with the growth of the capitalist economy, peasants, small entrepreneurs, artisans, and the like will be increasingly forced downwards into the rank of the proletariat. As a form of socialist doctrine, Marxism dismissed the possibility of upward movement from the working class as merely a liberal myth: in fact, the chances of such ascent were negligible and irrelevant – the only form of advancement to which members of the working class could realistically aspire was that of collective advancement to be gained through the labour movement, class struggle and, ultimately, revolution. (1987:4)

As for the Neo-Marxists, their responses to mobility study do not differ much from their ancestor. Again, Goldthorpe points out that:

> The Marxist response to the growing volume of mobility research over recent decades has not in fact gone further than the charge of ideological bias: that is to say, there has been a refusal to respond intellectually to this research other than by trying to explain or situate it as an activity reflecting the class attachments of those engaged in it.... Two further essentially defensive and unfruitful reactions are also to be noted. First, it has been argued that the Marxist concern is with class structure in the sense of a structure of positions constituted by the prevailing relations of production, and that from this standpoint the question of distribution of individuals among these positions is of quite minor significance.... Secondly, it has been contended that, whatever status may be given to mobility theoretically, it can be of little actual consequence for class relations and the class struggle: this is because mobility across the fundamental line of class division within capitalist society – that between the major owners of the means of production and the mass of employees – is held down, by the very nature of the transmission of capital, to so low a level as to be quite negligible in its effects. (1987:24)

Contrary to the Marxists' negative attitude towards mobility study, the Weberian contributions to mobility study is substantial and sustained. I will argue in the remaining pages of this section that the Weberian conceptions of class and class structuration can provide a framework to integrate two of the research traditions in class structure and mobility study, namely socio-economic index and mobility-table analysis into a coherent theoretical framework.

1.1 Locating the Theoretical Footing of the Study within Weber's Theory of Stratification and Domination

To start with, it is helpful to highlight how the Weberians relate the theory of class to the general theory of stratification and domination. This will not only help us locate the theoretical footing of the present study, but will also provide us with a more

complete picture of the Weberian theory of class.

Classes, status groups, and parties have commonly been regarded as the three basic constituent parts of the Weberian theory of stratification and domination. Weber contends that "classes, status groups, and parties are phenomena of the distribution of power within a community" (Weber, 1969:181). According to Weber, the ways in which power is distributed within a community constitute three fundamental orders in a community (Weber, 1969:180-181). They are the economic, social, and political orders. Social order refers to "the way in which social honor is distributed in a community between typical groups participating in this distribution," while "economic order is... the way in which economic goods and services are distributed and used" (Weber, 1969:181). By the same token, political order is the way in which social power is distributed (Weber, 1969:194). Within each of these orders or spheres of distribution, different "typical groupings" are formed. Within the economic order or the markets of economic goods and services, classes are formed; within the social order, status groups or circles of "specific style of life" are constituted (Weber, 1969:187); and within the political order, parties are organized and contest with each other mainly within the "state" (Weber, 1969:194). Furthermore, according to the results of the distribution in each sphere, the typical groupings of each order are stratified into the dominants and subordinates or the positively and negatively privileged (Weber, 1969:187-188 and 1978:303-305).

Weber further points out that though classes, status groups, and parties are analytically distinct, in reality they are, in most cases, inter-related. For example:

> [C]lass distinctions are linked in most varied ways with status distinctions. Property as such is not always recognized as a status qualification, but in the long run it is, and with extraordinary regularity. (1969:187)

Weber also points out that:

> [P]arties may represent interests determined through *class situation* or *status situation*, and they may recruit their following respectively from one or the other. But they need be neither purely class nor purely status parties. In most cases they are partly class parties and partly status parties. (1969:194)

Thus, we can see that Weber's theory of class constitutes only part of his theory of stratification and domination. Classes are only one type of human grouping, which are typically formed and operate within the economic order and the sphere of distribution of economic goods and services, i.e. the market. Accordingly, the present study will confine the analysis only to the typical groupings, i.e. classes, found in the economic order of Hong Kong.

Even within Weber's theory of class, a number of scholars have underlined a distinction between the concept of *class situation* and *class action* that is of vital importance in understanding the theory (Cox, 1950; Jones, 1975; Weber, 1969:181-186; Wenger, 1987).[2] Class situation refers to the objective situation a class occupies within a given economic order, while class action refers to the "communal action" taken by members of a class who are motivated by the subjective class interest derived from a particular class situation (Weber, 1969:184). By communal action, Weber means "action which is oriented to the feeling of the actors that they belong together" (1969:183). However, Weber points out that "the rise of... communal action from a common class situation is by no means a universal phenomenon" (1969:183). In order for class action to emerge out of a given class situation:

> [T]he fact of being conditioned and the result of the class situation must be distinctly recognizable. For only then the contrast of life chances can be felt not as an absolutely given fact to be accepted, but as a resultant from either (1) the given distribution of property, or (2) the structure of the concrete economic order. It is only then that people may react against the class structure not only through acts of an intermittent and irrational protest, but in the form of rational association. (Weber, 1969:184)

In other words, common class situations are by no means a neces-

sary and sufficient condition for the formation of class action, they "merely represent possible, and frequent, base for communal action" (Weber, 1969:181). In light of such a conceptual distinction, it must be pointed out that the present study will only focus on analyzing the objective class situations prevailing in Hong Kong society and will not explore any of the subjective class interests and/or class actions that may have derived from these class situations.

Having identified the theoretical footing of the present study, we can now go on explaining in greater detail the Weberian conception of class situation. It has been pointed out by a number of Weberians that a distinction between the concepts of economic class[3] and social class is of vital importance in understanding Weber's conception of class and class situation (Collins, 1986: 132-138; Giddens, 1981:41-52). Thus, in the discussion that follows, we will first explicate the conception of economic-class situation and how the concept can be operationalized by means of measures of socio-economic status of occupations. Then, we will examine the conception of social-class situation and how it can be operationalized by applying the modelling techniques in mobility-table analysis. Finally, we will outline how these two conceptions of class situations can be integrated into a conceptual framework guiding the study of the class structure in Hong Kong.

1.2 Economic Class and the Measures of Socio-economic Status

1.2.1 The Concept of Economic Class

According to the Weberian conceptualization (Weber, 1978:302-307, 926-940; Giddens, 1981:41-52; Collins, 1986:132-138), economic class is defined as a group of individuals sharing common life chances in labour and commodity markets, in other words, sharing a common market situation. The differentiation or even stratification of market situations depends mainly on the

market capacities that each economic class can bring to the bargaining encounter in labour or commodity markets. In Weber's own words:

> We speak of a *class* when (1) a number of people have in common a specific causal component of their life chances, insofar as (2) this component is represented exclusively by economic interests in the possession of goods and opportunities for income, and (3) is represented under the conditions of the commodity or labor markets. This is *class situation*.... Class situation is, in this sense, ultimately market situation. (1978:927-928)

We can see that economic class is a group of individuals sharing a common market situation or a group of individuals possessing the same amount of market capacity in labour or commodity markets. Weber further contends that the primary differentiating factor of market situation in a capitalistic economic order is the possession of property. Hence, he divided economic class broadly into two categories: the propertied and the propertyless. The propertied is a group of individuals able to constitute "a monopoly on the possibility of transferring property from the sphere of use as *wealth* to the sphere of *capital*, that is, it gives them the entrepreneurial function and all chances to share directly or indirectly in returns on capital" (Weber, 1978:927). While the propertyless are those who "have nothing to offer but their labor or the resulting products, and... are compelled to get rid of these products in order to subsist at all" (Weber, 1978:927).

Later in his career, Weber elaborated on his conception of economic class by dividing it into two sub-classes, namely property class and commercial class. The former "is primarily determined by the property differences" and the latter "by the marketability of goods and services" (Weber, 1978:302). Based upon these two dimensions, Weber further refined his schema by introducing another dimension into his classification. That is, each economic class can be subdivided into three layers: the positively privileged, the middle class, and the negatively privileged. Thus, Weber's conception of economic class can be summarized as in

Table 1.

Table 1 Weber's Conception of Economic Class

	Property Class	Commercial Class
Positively privileged	Rentiers, receiving income from:	Entrepreneurs:
	1. men (the case of slave-owners)	1. merchants
	2. land	2. shipowners
	3. mines	3. industrial entrepreneurs
	4. installations (factories and equipments)	4. agricultural entrepreneurs
	5. ships	5. bankers and financiers
	6. creditors (of livestocks, gain or money)	6. professionals with sought-after expertise or privileged education (e.g. lawyers, physicians, artists)
	7. securities	7. workers with monopolistic qualifications and skills
Middle class	Those who make a living from their property or their acquired skills (e.g. some of the commercial classes)	1. self-employed farmers and craftsmen 2. public and private officials
Negatively privileged	1. the unfree	Labourers with varying qualifications:
	2. the declassed (the proletarii of Antiquity)	1. skilled
	3. debtors	2. semi-skilled
	4. the "Paupers"	3. unskilled

Source: Weber, 1978:303-305.

In reviewing Weber's classificatory schema of economic class, Giddens underlines that a "diversity of cross-cutting class relationships... may stem from Weber's identification of 'class

situation' with 'market position'. If the later is applied strictly, it is possible to distinguish an almost endless multiplicity of class situations" (1981:48). One way to scale down this endless multiplicity of economic-class situations, as suggested by some Weberians, is to identify a social category that can most likely reflect the market situations of its incumbents and use it as the unit of analysis of economic class. In fact, quite a number of scholars have pointed to "occupational position" as such a social category and use it as the unit of analysis in their study. For example, Blau and Duncan contend:

> Occupational position is not identical either with *economic class* or with prestige status, but it is closely connected with both, particularly with the former. Class may be defined in terms of economic resources and interests, and the primary determinant of these for the large majority of men is their occupational position.... If class refers to the role persons occupy in the economy and their managerial influence on economic concerns, it is more accurately reflected in a man's specific occupation than his employment status in contemporary society, where the economy is dominated by corporations rather than individual proprietors. Occupational position does not encompass all aspects of the concept of class, but it is probably the best single indicator of it. (1967:6-7)

In Britain, Goldthorpe also takes occupational categories as the primary indicator of Weber's concept of economic class. He contends that the occupational grading scale, which he and his colleagues have constructed in the Oxford Social Mobility Study is able:

> [T]o bring together... occupations whose incumbents will typically share in broadly similar *market and work situations*... (and) combine occupational categories whose members would appear... to be typically comparable, on one hand, in terms of their sources and levels of income and other conditions of employment, in their degree of economic security and in their chances for economic advancement; and on the other hand, in their location within

> the systems of authority and control governing the processes of production in which they are engaged. (Goldthorpe, 1987:40; see also Marshall *et al.*, 1988:21-23)

Finally, Collins, a well known Weberian, also considers occupations as the primary factor in class formation. He suggests:

> Occupations are the way people keep themselves alive. This is the reason for their fundamental importance. Occupations shape the differences among people, however, not merely by the fact that work is essential for survival, but because people relate to each other in different ways in this inescapable area of their lives. Occupations are the major basis of class cultures; these cultures, in turn, along with material resources for inter-communication, are the mechanisms that organize classes as communities. (1975:61-62)

Having identified occupational positions as the primary indicator of the Weberian concept of economic class, we can further the operationalization of the concept by making use of the research efforts on the measures of socio-economic status of occupations.

1.2.2 The Measures of Socio-economic Status

In the field of measures of socio-economic status of occupation, we can at least identify three approaches (Haug, 1977; Nam and Powers, 1983:1-20; Powers, 1982). They are the *occupational prestige approach*, the *Duncan's socio-economic index*, and the *Nam-Powers occupational status scores*.

The *occupational prestige approach*, sometimes called the *popular evaluation approach*, is simply a survey of people's perceptions of the relative prestige of a list of occupational titles (Goldthorpe and Hope, 1974; National Opinion Research Center, 1947; Treiman, 1977). This approach is built upon a number of presuppositions. The first concerns the definition of the concept of prestige. In this approach, prestige is defined as "deference-entitlement." When a person (or a group of persons) is said to possess prestige it means that others are willing to acknowledge and defer to his superiority

(Shils, 1968:106-108; Goldthorpe and Hope, 1972:23-24; Treiman, 1977:20). The second presupposition is that occupational roles are assumed to be the most significant entitlement to deference. It is argued that occupational role is chosen to be the main indicator because it is highly correlated with other deference-entitling properties, such as authority delegated to different occupations, income rewarded according to occupational performance, educational qualifications required, etc. (Shils, 1968:107-108; see also Duncan, 1961; Nam and Powers, 1983; Goldthorpe and Hope, 1972). Finally, it is assumed that the general public is rating occupational titles in terms of their prestige (Treiman, 1977:26-29). Based upon these presuppositions, the procedure of constructing an occupational prestige index is in fact quite simple: to work out a representative list of occupational titles, to survey a representative sample on their judgment of the relative prestige of the occupations included on the list, and to calculate prestige scores for each occupation according to the rating found in the survey. The perspectives have initiated large numbers of studies around the world. Treiman has reviewed and compared 85 occupational prestige studies from 60 countries and has concluded:

> Occupational prestige hierarchies are substantially similar throughout the world. In all societies, ranging from highly industrialized nations like the United States to peasant villages in up-country Thailand, the basic pattern of occupational evaluations is the same – professional and higher managerial positions are most highly regarded, lower white-collar and skilled blue-collar jobs fall in the middle of the hierarchy, and service and laboring jobs are the least respected. (1977:103)

The *Duncan's Socio-economic Index*, named after its inventor Otis Dudley Duncan (Duncan, 1961), has been regarded as an improvement of the occupational prestige approach in general and the NORC (National Opinion Research Center) scale in particular. Based upon the 78 occupational prestige scores found in the NORC scale, Duncan chose 45 of those, "whose NORC titles are reasonably equivalent to (1950's) census titles" (Duncan,

1961:124), and used them as the dependent variables in his analysis. On the other hand, Duncan identified educational and income levels as predictors and went to the 1950 census data to find the corresponding values for each of the 45 occupations chosen. Based upon these two sets of values a multiple regression equation was constructed.[4] With this equation, prestige scores for all the other occupational titles listed in the 1950 census were predicted from the corresponding census data. As a result, "a socio-economic index for all occupations" was obtained. This index has been widely used by social scientists and is considered to be an improvement of the *occupational prestige approach* in at least two aspects. Firstly, it is an index which has exhausted all 270 occupational titles found in the US census. Secondly, the index is built upon empirically and theoretically justifiable predictors (Duncan, 1961:115-117) rather than subjective judgment. In fact, selecting educational and income levels as predictors is the basic assumption of this approach. Duncan justified his selection and the assumption as follows:

> A man qualifies himself for occupational life by obtaining an education; as a consequence of pursuing his occupation, he obtains income. Occupation, therefore, is the intervening activity linking income to education. If we characterize an occupation according to the prevailing levels of education and income of its incumbents, we are not only estimating its 'social status' and its 'economic status'. We are also describing one of the major 'causes' and one of its major 'effects'. It would not be surprising if an occupation's 'prestige' turned out to be closely related to one or both of these factors. (1961:116-117)

The index has been updated and revised by other scholars (Featherman and Stevens, 1982; Siegel, 1971). According to a recent review, Duncan's approach is still recommended as a preferable approach to prestige index (Featherman and Stevens, 1982:108).

The *Nam-Powers occupational status scores*, or sometimes called the *objective indicators approach*, is derived directly from the census

data of the United States (Nam and Powers, 1983). Following the theoretical logic of the *Duncan's socio-economic index*, Nam and Powers, and their colleagues in the US Census Bureau, use educational and income levels as the sole predictors and calculate the socio-economic scores for all occupational titles directly from census data. Thus, the only difference between the Duncan's index and the Nam-Powers scores is that the latter does not refer to any occupational prestige scores and simply averages the value of the two predictors to obtain the scores. The actual calculating procedure can be summarized as follows:

a. Arraying detailed occupations according to the median educational level of the incumbents;
b. Arraying the same occupations separately according to the median income levels of the incumbents;
c. By using the number of persons engaged in each occupation, determining the cumulative interval of persons in each occupation for each of the two arrays, beginning with the lowest-ranked occupation; and
d. Averaging the midpoints of the two cumulative intervals of occupants and dividing by the total... to get a status score for the occupation. (Nam and Powers, 1983:50)

A similar approach has been applied by Blishen and Carroll to the Canadian census data (Blishen and Carroll, 1982), and the Nam-Powers scores have been used by social scientists in a number of studies (Nam and Powers, 1983:54-55).

From the above review, we can synthesize all three approaches and use occupational titles as the sole indicator for socio-economic status.[5] Furthermore, all of them accept that income and educational levels are highly correlated with occupational status. They either assume that occupational prestige scores can reflect the deference-entitlement properties commanded by income and educational qualifications; or take income and educational levels directly as predictors of occupational status scores. The only difference among them is in how these three variables are used in their grading operations. The occupational prestige approach uses

subjective judgment on relative occupational prestige as the sole criterion for grading. The Nam-Powers approach uses objective value of educational and income levels as the predictors, while the Duncan's socio-economic index employed both the subjective prestige scale and the objective value of educational and income levels in its construction.

Taken together, we can see that the Weberian conception of economic class can be and, in fact, has been taken as the theoretical foundation for constructions of the occupational status indices. Conversely, occupational status indices, especially Duncan and Nam-Powers indices, can be viewed as the measures of the Weberian concept of market situation of economic class. In fact, this conceptual stance is what this study is going to adopt in the conceptualization of the economic-class situation in Hong Kong.

1.3 Social Class and the Study of Social Mobility

1.3.1 The Concept of Social Class

Apart from the concept of economic class, Weber introduces another concept into his theory of class, that is "social class." Social class is defined by Weberians as a cluster of economic classes which takes the form of a social closure, within which the opportunities for both inter- and intra-generational mobility are easy and typical. In Weber's own words, "a 'social class' makes up the totality of those class situations within which individual and generational mobility is easy and typical" (Weber, 1978:302).

A number of Weberian theorists have pointed out that the concept of social class is of vital importance in understanding Weber's theory of class. For example, Giddens stresses that "a 'social class' exists only when these class situations cluster together in such a way as to create a common nexus of social interchange between individuals" (1981:49). In other words, Giddens suggests that social class can be understood as a cluster of economic classes which shares similar chances for social mobility

both within and across generations.

Another prominent Weberian theorist, Frank Parkin highlights Weber's concept of closure and suggests that it is the core of Weber's theory of class. According to Weber, "closure... is an ever-recurring process... toward the monopolization of specific, usually economic, opportunities.... This monopolization is directed against competitors who share some positive or negative characteristics; its purpose is always the closure of social and economic opportunities to outsiders" (1978:342). By applying Weber's concept of closure to the analysis of class structure, Parkin suggests that the bourgeoisie constructs and maintains itself as the dominant class in modern capitalist societies by monopolizing the opportunities for acquisition of both productive and cultural capitals and excluding the proletariat and their descendants from encroaching into these social closures (Parkin, 1979:47-60). Parkin further suggests that, in reaction to the exclusionary closure of the dominant class, the dominated class would also organize itself into closure in a form of usurpation. By usurpation, Parkin refers to the "collective attempts by the excluded to win a greater share of resources" and to bite into the privileges that the dominant classes have monopolized (1979:44, 75-88). Thus, we can see that, in Parkin's conception, social closure is understood as a two-way process which consists of, on the one hand, the exclusionary closure constructed and maintained by the dominant class and, on the other hand, the usurpationary closure organized by the subordinate class. As Parkin himself concludes, "exclusion and usurpation may... be regarded as the two main generic types of social closure, the latter always being a consequence of, and collective response to the former" (1979:45).

Taken together, Weber and his followers define social class as a cluster of economic classes which constitutes a social closure. Within this social closure the opportunities for both individual and generational mobility are monopolized in a way that inter-closure mobility is difficult and rare while intra-closure mobility is typical and easy. Accordingly, Weber inducts the division of social class into four categories:

a. The working class as a whole – the more so, the more automated the working process becomes;
b. The petty bourgeoisie;
c. The propertyless intelligentsia and specialists (technicians, various kinds of white-collar employees, civil servants – possibly with considerable social differences depending on the cost of their training); and
d. The class privileged through property and education.

Based upon Weber's distinction between economic and social class, Giddens works out his theory of class structuration. Class structuration refers to "the process whereby *economic classes* become *social classes*" (1981:105). In other words, it is a process through which "indefinite multiplicity of cross-cutting interests created by differentiated market capacities" is grouped into a limited number of clusters in a structured form (Giddens, 1981:105-106).

One of the primary factors[6] affecting the process of class structuration, Giddens suggests, is "the distribution of mobility chances which pertain within a given society" (1981:107). The nature of the process, Giddens explicates, is that:

> In general, the greater the degree of 'closure' of mobility chances – both intergenerationally and within the career of the individual – the more this facilitates the formation of identifiable classes. For the effect of closure in terms of intergenerational movement is to provide for the reproduction of common life experience over the generations; and this homogenization of experience is reinforced to the degree to which the individual's movement within the labor market is confined to occupations which generate a similar range of material outcomes. In general we may state that the structuration of classes is facilitated to the degree to which mobility closure exists in relation to any specified form of market capacity. (1981:107)

In light of the conceptualization of social class and class structuration reviewed above, we can see that the foundation of a social

class structure and the process of class structuration is the distribution of opportunities for social mobility. Thus, a number of Weberians have suggested that social mobility analysis and more specifically the modelling techniques derived from mobility-table analysis can be taken as operational measures of the concept of social class and class structuration (Goldthorpe, 1987:39-68; Breiger, 1981). For example, Goldthorpe suggests that social mobility analyses can be related to the Weberian concept of social closure and class structuration in the following ways:

> First, mobility has been seen, to take over Giddens's terminology, as a basic source of class "structuration": it is the rate and pattern of mobility that will determine the extent to which classes may be recognized as collectivities of individuals or families occupying similar locations within the social division of labour over time. Secondly, it has been suggested that the extent of mobility evident within a society may be taken as a significant indicator of the prevailing balance of advantage and power in class relations and, further, of characteristic modes of class action. Parkin, for example, has argued that class conflict is to an important degree expressed in the form of strategies of exclusion, chiefly adopted by more advantaged groupings; and counter-strategies of solidarism, which are typically the resort of those in less advantaged situations. Mobility rates and patterns can thus serve to reveal, on one hand, the effectiveness of the former; and, on the other hand, at least the potential for success of the latter. (1987:39)

Another example of the Weberians' effort to operationalize the concept of social class with techniques generated from mobility-table analysis is Breiger's assertion. Breiger explicitly relate Goodman's general log-linear modelling method in mobility-table analysis with the Weberian concept of social class. He asserts that Goodman's mobility-table modelling technique can help "to develop an operational conceptualization of social class structure" (1981:579).

In order to understand how exactly mobility-table analysis contribute to the operationalization of the Weberian concept of

social class, we have to explicate in greater details the logic and procedures of mobility-table analysis.

1.3.2 Analysis of Social Mobility

It has commonly been recognized that within the area of social mobility study, there are two distinct methodological traditions. One is the contingency-table tradition, while the other is the regression tradition (Duncan, 1979:793; Hauser *et al.*, 1975b:586, 1978:920-921; Pullum, 1975:2). Each of them addresses different problem areas in mobility study. The contingency-table tradition, more commonly known as mobility-table analysis, concentrates mainly on the analysis of the pattern and extent of social mobility in different societies at different phases of development. The regression tradition, also known as status-attainment path study, is primarily concerned with exploring the factors contributing to individuals' opportunities for social mobility and status attainment.

In view of the nature of this study, our main concern is the extent and pattern of social mobility in Hong Kong. Therefore, we will not dwell any further onto the status attainment tradition,[7] and will concentrate our exposition on the contingency-table analysis. Furthermore, even within the contingency-table tradition we can still identify different research propositions,[8] however the one that really concerns us here is "the proposition of perfect mobility," as it is commonly called.

The theoretical origin of "the propositions of perfect mobility" can be traced back to nineteenth-century liberalism when it was believed that "ample opportunity existed under liberal democracy for every individual to occupy a place in society suited to his capacity" (Goldthorpe, 1987:3). Such equalitarian or meritocratic assertion can also be found in the expositions of some contemporary sociologists; for instance, Parsons' famous dichotomy of ascription-achievement orientation in social selection (Parsons *et al.*, 1951; see also Crowder, 1974) or Bell's thesis on meritocracy in post-industrial society (Bell, 1973:408-455).

These theses of equalitarian-meritocraticism are exactly what the study on perfect mobility in an open society sets out to verify. According to these theses, it is assumed that in an open society individuals should be perfectly mobile among various occupational or class categories. In other words, there should be no occupational or class inheritance in such a society (Pullman, 1975; Bowles and Nelson, 1974). One way to verify the thesis of perfect mobility is to test whether there is interaction between the rows (which conventionally indicate the occupational or class categories of fathers) and columns (which represent those of the sons) in a mobility table. Conventionally, log-linear modelling techniques have been employed to do the testing. The basic logic is to compare the estimated frequency counts with the observed counts and to see whether the Likelihood Ratio Chi-square supports the Perfect Mobility Model (i.e. non-interaction model) (Goodman, 1965, 1969a, 1969b; Hauser *et al.*, 1975a; Hout, 1983).

However, there is a substantial consensus among research findings that the Perfect Mobility Model in no way fits with empirical data. Hence, Perfect Mobility Model is often taken by researchers as the ideal type or point of departure for constructing mobility models which fit the empirical data. Among these research efforts on "model-hunt," one of the most prominent and widely cited models is Goodman's Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model (Goodman, 1965). In the model, the diagonal cells of the mobility table, which are assumed to indicate the occupational or class inheritance, are blocked out in the log-linear analysis so as to test the effect of the diagonals on the model. Based on the logic of Goodman's model, a number of models have been developed to test the various effects on mobility. For example, Hauser's model which deals with structural mobility (Hauser *et al.*, 1975a, 1975b), the corners model which highlights the barriers to mobility at the top and bottom of the social hierarchy (Goodman, 1965), the Buffer-Zone Model and Closure Model proposed by Goldthorpe which also deal with barriers to mobility (Goldthorpe, 1987:39-68), and the symmetrical model which copes with the upward and downward directions of mobility (Goodman, 1972).

The works on mobility-table modelling have grown into a substantial branch of mobility study (cf. Boudon,1973; Hout,1983; Pullman, 1975). Theoretically, mobility-table modelling has falsified the thesis of perfect mobility and proven the existence of occupational or class inheritance. Methodologically, it has set a successful example of applying sophisticated statistical models, such as the log-linear model, to sociological inquiry.

However, it has also been pointed out by some critics that the mobility-table approach as a whole suffers from a number of theoretical and methodological flaws. Thus, it is worthwhile to explain some of them so as to guard against them when applying this approach to the present study.

Duncan (1966:54-63) points out that the approach is methodologically at fault by assuming that a mobility table actually reveals information of occupational structures and social mobility between two generations. First of all, Duncan underlines that most of the mobility tables are based on data of the concurrent occupational status of both fathers and sons. Thus, it is by no means reflecting occupational structures of two different generations. Furthermore, even if the table contains the occupational status of fathers at a prior point in time, for instance, a conventional practice is to ask the respondents to recall their fathers' occupational status when they were at school or at the age of sixteen; the effort will still be upset by the following facts. First, the difference in fertility age will upset the assumption that the fathers in the mobility table are of the same generation. Second, according to this practice males in the "father generation" who have no sons will totally be excluded from the table, while those with high fertility may be overly represented. Taken together, Duncan concludes that:

> If the sons in the mobility table are, in fact, representative of the occupational structure at some recent point in time, then the distribution of sons by their fathers' occupations *cannot* represent the occupational structure at some definite prior moment in time. This has nothing to do with the fallibility of retrospective reports on father's occupation. Nor can the problem be avoided by asking for a time-specific or age-specific report on father's occupation. (1966:62)

Duncan's challenge has shed considerable doubt on the conventional interpretations in mobility-table analysis. He, therefore, proposes that the mobility table should be reinterpreted:

> Instead of thinking of the classification of father's occupation as conveying information about a 'generation' of 'fathers', think of it as describing the origin statuses of the sons. Particularly if the data on father's occupation apply to a time point proximate to the opening of the son's career, this origin status provides a natural base line against which one can measure the son's subsequent occupational achievement. The father-son mobility table, then, becomes a table showing a cross-classification of origin by destination statuses of the cohorts included in the study. (1966:62-63)

Secondly, Breiger (1981) launches another critique at the mobility-table analysis. He points out that "there does not exist a model of the mobility table that takes the proper number and composition of occupational categories as an explicit theoretical decision" (1981:580). It is quite apparent that Breiger's accusation is well-grounded, because in most of the mobility-table analyses, scholars tend to take the classification and composition of occupational or class categories as given and seldom bother to give them any theoretical justification. Furthermore, in the process of analysis, these categories are often arbitrarily collapsed into aggregates to suit whatever analytical purpose (see for example Goodman, 1965; Hauser *et al.*, 1975a, 1975b). In other words, "social mobility analysts do not take social class seriously" (Breiger, 1981:579). Taking this neglect of social class as a point of departure, Breiger uses his project to bring social class back into the centre of social mobility analysis. First, he refers to Weber's concept of "social class" and Giddens' theory of class structuration as theoretical bases. According to the two theorists, the basic criteria for the demarcation of "social classes" are the differentials in

mobility chances, that is, the formation of a social class is manifested in the form of a "closure" within which the opportunities for both inter- and intra-generational mobility have been monopolized. Thus, it can be hypothesized that within a social class "mobility is easy and typical" (Weber, 1978:302) while mobility across social classes is difficult and rare. Based upon this theoretical proposition, Breiger postulates "a dual structure for occupational mobility table":

> What is sought is a single partition of occupational categories, applied simultaneously to the rows and columns of a mobility table. Internally, the rows and columns of each subtable resulting from this partition are unordered, with no dependence of destination on origin. Externally, the classes are ordered with respect to typical mobility chances, class of destination depending differentially on class of origin. (1981:586)

Taken together, Breiger has suggested that we should redefine the objective of mobility-table analysis. According to him, the objective should not be to look for mobility patterns which fit a set of presumably fixed class categories, but to search for models of closures of mobility opportunities so as to determine the classification and composition of class categories. Breiger's critique has not only redefined the objective of mobility-table analysis, but has also relocated the analysis back into the mainstream theory of social class, namely, back into the Weberian tradition. Thus, Breiger's elaboration of the mobility-table analysis can be taken as a significant indicator of the Weberian concepts of social class, social closure and class structuration, which have been highlighted in the previous section.

The critiques of Duncan and Breiger have injected valuable insights into the mobility-table analysis. On the one hand, Duncan's critique has clarified the meanings implied in a mobility table. It has rescued the analysis from the inter-generational interpretation, which Duncan asserts to be methodologically at fault, and redirected the interpretation to the origin-destination thesis. On the other hand, Breiger's critique has redefined the objective of

the analysis in a way of making it theoretically much better grounded. Moreover, Breiger's analysis has also offered an operational conceptualization to the Weberian concept of social class. And it is Breiger's operationalization that is to be used in my following analysis of the social class structure and the process of class structuration in Hong Kong.

To recapitulate, the theoretical framework upon which the present study is based is the Weberian theory of stratification in general and conception of class situation in particular. Within the conceptual framework of class situation, we have formulated two theoretical postulates upon which the analyses of this study will be based:

1. Measures of socio-economic status using occupational titles as indicators, and corresponding educational and income levels as predictors, can be taken as the operationalized measures of the Weberian conception of economic-class situation.
2. The modelling techniques in mobility-table analysis can be used as operationalized measures of the Weberian conception of social class and class structuration.

2. The Data Sets

The data sets that the present study will analyze are selected from the 1981 census data, which were collected and prepared by the Census and Statistics Department of the Hong Kong government.

I think it is necessary to explain the reasons for choosing census data and, specifically, the 1981 data as the data set for the present study. First of all, in view of the nature of the present study, a considerably large and territory-wide data set is required. Census data is one available option that fits the requirements. If resource constraint is also taken into consideration, the census data is one of the best options available. Secondly, the 1981 census is chosen instead of other census data available for computer analysis, which are the 1976 and 1986 census data; the 1981 census is the only full census which contains the most comprehensive

information necessary for the present study. Thirdly, 1981 can be viewed as a watershed of the economic development of Hong Kong. On the one hand, 1981 was the time when the Hong Kong economy reached its maturity. With the influx of immigrants from China in the 1950s and the rapid economic growth in the 1960s and 1970s, Hong Kong witnessed the consolidation and stabilization of her social and economic structures in the 1980s. On the other hand, the impact of 1997 and the entailed problem of the "brain drain," which probably has affected the social structure of Hong Kong, had not yet surfaced in 1981. Taken together, I think 1981 is the appropriate time to study the occupational and class structure which grew out of the economic development that Hong Kong has witnessed since the war.

The present study will analyze two sets of data chosen from the 1981 census. One is a random sample of 20% of the Hong Kong population made available by the Census and Statistics Department. The other is a 5% random sample from the same source. The two sets of data will be tailored in different ways in order to fit different analytical purposes.

(a) The Individual Data Set: From the 20% sample, all individuals who are aged fifteen or above and economically active[9] are selected. Thus the sample contains 466,057 cases among which 298,888 are males and 167,169 are females. This data set is arrayed by individual, that is, each case contains only personal information of an individual. It is tailored in such a way that it can be used for the construction of a socio-economic index for all occupational titles listed in the census data, in other words, the data set will be used in the construction of the socio-economic status index and economic-class situations in Hong Kong.

(b) The Family Data Set: The 5% sample is arrayed by family. In each case, the information on the son/daughter, father and mother are included. This data set is tailored for the purpose of inter-generational mobility analysis, in other words, for the construction of the social class structure and process of class structuration in Hong Kong. However, it must be emphasized that the census data is a household data rather than a family data, that is,

it only contains family members who live together within a household. Hence, it is not possible to track down, from the data, those sons and daughters who are of age and have moved away from the household. In order to avoid serious bias caused by any possible characteristics demonstrated by those sons and daughters who still lived with their parents after coming of age, the data set will only include those sons and daughters aged fifteen to twenty-seven, a considerably large proportion of whom still live with their parents. Furthermore, since the data set is catered for occupational mobility analysis, only those cases in which both sons/daughters and fathers are economically active will be included. Taken together, the data set for mobility analysis contains 19,375 cases, among which 10,440 are males and 8,935 are females.

To justify that the sons and daughters in the family data set are not different from the same age-cohort in the population, a comparison is made between the sons and daughters in the family data set with the same age-cohort found in the 20% individual data set. The comparison is made under the assumption that the age-cohort selected from the 20% individual data set is a representative sample of the same age-cohort found in the population. If we accept such an assumption, then the result of the comparison can verify whether the family data set is a representative sample.

First of all, we can compare the sex and age distributions of the two cohorts. From Table 2, we can notice, first of all, that the sex distributions of the two cohorts are quite similar. There is only a 2.5% difference in the sex ratio between the two cohorts, in other words, in the family data set, females are 2.5% over-represented. As for the age distribution, we can detect some discrepancies between the two cohorts, which are distributed in a regular pattern. In the family data set, young men and women aged twenty-one or below are over-represented, while those aged twenty-three or above are under-represented. These discrepancies are by no means surprising because offspring who are of age are expected to have moved away from their parents' households. However, in view of the objective of the present study, what is at issue is not

whether there are discrepancies in age distribution between the cohorts, but whether these discrepancies have biased the subjects' market and class situations, which are the primary unit of analysis of the study.

Table 2 Comparison of the Sex and Age Distributions between the Age Cohorts (15-27) from the Individual and Family Data Sets (%)

		Cohort from the Family Data Set	Cohort from the Individual Data Set	Differences
Sex				
	Male	53.9	56.4	-2.5
	Female	46.1	43.6	2.5
	Total	100.0	100.0	
Age				
	15	2.5	1.5	1.0
	16	4.5	3.0	1.5
	17	7.0	4.7	2.3
	18	9.3	6.9	2.4
	19	10.8	8.4	2.4
	20	12.7	10.1	2.6
	21	11.1	10.1	1.0
	22	10.7	10.7	0.0
	23	9.5	10.1	-0.6
	24	7.7	9.6	-1.9
	25	5.9	9.0	-3.1
	26	4.6	8.2	-3.6
	27	3.7	7.6	-3.9
	Total	100.0	100.0	

In order to verify whether there are discrepancies in market situations between the two cohorts, three indicators of market

situations are chosen for comparison. They are years of education, monthly income from main employment, and socio-economic status scores.[10] In Table 3, we make a comparison of the means of the three indicators between the two cohorts. We can see that the difference in years of education is only 0.3. In other words, the young men and women in the family data set stay at school 3.6 months longer than their counterparts. With reference to the educational structure of Hong Kong, such a duration hardly constitutes any significant differences in educational levels. Secondly, the difference in the means of incomes between the cohorts is -132.5, which is slightly less than 10% of the two means. Finally, the difference in the means of the socio-economic status scores reads 1.2. In light of the range of the scores, which by definition is 100 (cf. Section 3), the difference can be considered quite small. Taken together, we may say that the differences in the means of the three indicators are quite small. Furthermore, the differences are not of the same direction, that is, the subjects in family data receive more education and have higher socio-economic scores, yet they earn less. Therefore, we would suggest that the cohort from the family data sets indicates no apparent bias in market and class situations.

Table 3 Comparison of Means of Years of Education, Monthly Income, and Socio-economic Status Scores between the Age Cohort (15-27) from the Family and Individual Data Sets

	Cohort from the Family Data Set	Cohort from the Individual Data Set	Differences
Years of education	11.1	10.8	0.3
Monthly income from main employment	1,329.9	1,462.4	-132.5
Socio-economic status scores	52.9	51.7	1.2

Furthermore, we can break down the comparison into different gender or age groups (cf. Table 4). By breaking down the comparisons into male and female groups, we can see that the differences in the means of the three indicators do not deviate much from the overall means differences, shown in Table 3. Both the men and women from the family data set stay slightly longer at schools and attain slightly higher socio-economic statuses, while they earn around 10% less than their counterparts.

As for the comparison between different age groups, we can notice that across all age groups, subjects from the family data set stay longer at school. The largest difference appears in the age group of twenty-five and it reads -0.7. Such a duration, as pointed out above, still constitutes no significant difference in educational levels. As for the income differences, subjects from the family data set in most of the age groups, except one, earn less than their counterparts. The largest difference is about 5% of the two means and it appears in the age group of fifteen. The only age group that has an income difference in converse direction is the group of twenty-four and the difference is only HK$14.7. Finally, in most of the age groups, subjects from the family data set attain higher socio-economic status scores. The largest difference is -4.0, which can be considered, quite small for scores with a range of 100. Taken together, after breaking down the comparison into age groups, we cannot locate any particular age group in which the differences of the means in the three indicators are irregularly large. Furthermore, for the age groups of twenty-three or above, which have been under-represented in the family data set, we also cannot find any irregularity in the differences of their means. Therefore, we may suggest that though young men and women aged twenty-three or above are slightly under-represented in the family data set, it has not caused any substantial bias in the market and class situations.

To summarize, in the previous comparisons, we have tried to establish the external validity of the family data set. We suggest that, with regard to the market and class situations, which are the primary concern of the study, the sons and daughters in the fami-

Table 4 Comparison of Means of Years of Education, Monthly Income, and Socio-economic Status Scores between the Age Cohort (15-27) from the Family and Individual Data Sets by Sex and Age

	Years of Education			Monthly Income from Main Employment			Socio-economic Status Scores		
	A	B	D	A	B	D	A	B	D
Sex									
Male	11.1	10.7	0.4	1,421.8	1,590.7	-168.9	53.9	52.7	1.2
Female	11.0	10.8	0.2	1,223.1	1,296.9	-73.8	51.7	50.3	1.4
Age									
15	9.2	9.1	0.1	770.0	813.3	-43.3	33.6	34.1	-0.5
16	9.4	9.4	0.0	843.6	868.4	-24.8	35.9	36.7	-0.8
17	10.0	9.8	0.2	924.0	960.9	-36.9	40.9	40.2	0.7
18	10.7	10.4	0.3	1,032.4	1,069.1	-36.7	46.6	45.1	1.5
19	11.1	10.8	0.3	1,117.4	1,149.5	-32.1	51.2	49.2	2.6
20	11.4	11.0	0.4	1,210.0	1,251.3	-41.3	54.7	52.1	2.6
21	11.4	11.0	0.4	1,334.9	1,347.8	-12.9	56.6	53.3	3.3
22	11.4	10.9	0.5	1,411.5	1,445.9	-34.4	56.8	53.3	3.5
23	11.4	10.9	0.5	1,512.4	1,548.1	-35.7	57.7	53.9	3.8
24	11.6	11.0	0.6	1,682.5	1,667.8	14.7	58.5	54.5	4.0
25	11.7	11.0	0.7	1,767.9	1,786.8	-18.9	58.9	55.3	3.6
26	11.5	11.0	0.5	1,891.0	1,907.9	-15.9	58.9	55.7	3.2
27	11.4	11.0	0.4	1,952.5	2,029.5	-77.0	60.2	56.4	3.8

Note: A = Cohort from the Family Data Set.
B = Cohort from the Individual Data Set.
D = Differences.

ly data set do not deviate much from the same age cohort in the population.

However, we must admit that we cannot tell whether the fathers in the family data set are a representative fraction of their generation. Hence, I would reiterate Duncan's criticism and interpretation of data sets for inter-generation mobility study (Duncan, 1966:54-63), which has been reviewed in detail in Section One. Duncan states that in any inter-generational data set for mobility study, males in the "father generation" who have no offspring are totally excluded, while fathers of high fertility are over-represented. Therefore, he suggests that the interpretation that we can draw from such a data set is an origin-destination interpretation rather than an inter-generational explication. According to the origin-destination interpretation, we take the father's socio-economic status in an inter-generational data set as the "origin status" of the son/daughter in his/her attainment process and the son/daughter's present status as the current destination of his/her attainment path. With such an origin-destination interpretation in mind, the family data set of the present study can then be construed as an array of origins and destinations of a group of young men and women who were aged fifteen to twenty-seven and lived in Hong Kong in 1981.

3. Socio-economic Index and Economic Class Structure in Hong Kong

It has been suggested in the previous section that the market situations of economic classes can be operationalized by the measures of socio-economic status of occupations, such as those indices postulated by Duncan or Nam and Powers. Therefore, we can construct the economic class structure in Hong Kong by calculating a socio-economic index for "all" the occupations found in Hong Kong.

However, before we can set out to construct such a socio-economic index, we must first resolve at least two essential

problems. Firstly, we must identify the occupational groupings to be used as indicators. Secondly, we must select the criteria for rating these occupations. Thus, this section will be divided into four parts: (1) the occupational groupings, (2) the criteria for rating, (3) the socio-economic index of Hong Kong, and (4) discussion.

3.1 The Occupational Groupings

In the Hong Kong 1981 census data, occupations are classified into 147 subgroups with three-digit codes (Census and Statistics Department, 1981b). The classification employed in the census data is based mainly on division of labour and industry. In respect to division of labour, we can find classifications such as managers and administrators, clerical workers, supervisors and foremen, and labourers. On the other hand, in respect to division of industry, there are classifications such as agricultural workers and fishermen, manufacturing workers, and sales and service workers. However, such a classification neglects one of the essential dimensions of socio-economic status, namely ownership of property. In order to include the dimension of ownership of property, especially capital, into the index, the variable "Activity Status" in the census data is used. In the census data, the variable is coded into twenty-seven categories, among which are "Employee (Government Sector)," "Employee (Private Sector)," "Self-employed (Except Hawking)," "Employer," etc. (Census and Statistics Department, 1981b:17). A tabulation of "Activity Status" by "Occupation" is computed so as to identify those occupations which consist of a considerable number of employers. The first ten occupational groupings, which have the highest percentage of employers within the occupation, are listed in Table 5. If any occupational grouping consists of 20% or more of "employing incumbents," the occupation will then be broken down into two separate titles, and separate socio-economic scores will be calculated. Accordingly, the first six occupational groupings in

Table 5 The First Ten Occupational Groupings Consisting of Most Employing Incumbents (%)

Code	Title	Employing Incumbents within the Occupational Grouping	Employing Incumbents of the Occupational Grouping within "Employing Class"
401	Managers and Working Proprietors of Wholesale and Retail Trade (except Import and Export)	56.28	23.48
402	Managers and Working Proprietors of Import and Export	54.93	6.93
211	General Managers, Production Managers (except Farm), Sales Managers (except Wholesale and Retail Trade), Administrative Managers, Personnel Managers, Transport Operations Managers, and Other Managerial Workers	36.63	27.06
171	Lawyers, Judges, Jurists and Notaries	30.17	0.44
103	Medical Doctors (excluding Herbalists), Dentists and Veterinarians	29.70	1.36
501	Managers and Working Proprietors of Hotels, Restaurants, Guest Houses, Cafeterias, Bars, Cafés, Discotheques and Dance Halls and Wardens of Hostels	20.03	2.58
611	Master Fishermen, including Masters and Shippers of Fishing Craft	13.86	0.14
106	Dispensing Opticians, Pharmaceutical Assistants, Dental Surgery Assistants, Herbalists (Chinese Medicine Practitioners), Acupuncturists, and Other Assistants and Nursing Personnel not elsewhere classified	7.58	0.54
101	Physical and Life Scientists	6.41	0.03
531	Barbers, Hairdressers, Make-up-men (Stage and Studio), Bath Attendants, Manicurists, and Beauticians	6.22	1.33

Source: Computed from a 20% sample of 1981 Hong Kong census data.

Table 5 meet with the criterion. As a result, the occupational groupings to be used in the construction of socio-economic index grow from 147 to 153. Hence, the socio-economic index to be constructed will be based on this extended list of occupational groupings. It is believed that this extended list, to a certain extent, has been able to take into account the dimension of ownership of capital, because the "Employers" in these six occupational titles have already made up 61.03% of the total "Employing Class" of the sample.

Having identified the occupational groupings to be used as indicators, we must decide who are to be accepted as the incumbents of these occupational groupings? An old argument within the gradational perspective is whether females should be included as incumbents, and if they should, then whether separate indices should be constructed for males and females, or whether it is desirable to construct a common index for the whole labour force.

Both Duncan's index and an early version of Nam-Powers index (with the 1950 census data) are only based on data for male in the civilian labour force. The rationale behind such a sex-biased choice are:

> The social status of a family is more likely to reflect the occupation of the husband than that of the wife, if both are employed.... Males out-numbered females in the 1950 labor force by better than two and a half to one, and male preponderance characterized the great majority of individual occupations.... We note that better than one out of ten census occupational titles are explicitly masculine in gender.... If terminology is any indication, people still think of gainful workers as men, for the most part. (Duncan, 1961:118)

Apart from these arguments of male dominance in occupational life, Featherman and Stevens recently put forth a more sophisticated argument supporting Duncan's choice. Featherman and Stevens constructed an index corresponding to Duncan's but with both males and females in the labour force and then applied both indices to a study of occupational mobility and attainment. They

recommended "the Duncan socio-economic index... among the socio-economic indexes as the best scale of occupational status.... In light of the comparative performance of the scale in analyzing men's and women's occupational attainments... we are more skeptical about the practical utility of TSEI2 (i.e. the socio-economic index including both males and females in the labor force)" (Featherman and Stevens, 1982:109).

On the other hand, proponents for a common index for both sexes would point to the fact that, with rising female labour force participation rate and improving social standing for women in recent decades, Duncan's argument is apparently outdated. Furthermore, the argument put forth by Featherman and Stevens is based mainly on technical ground, and it is by no means theoretically defensible. Nam and Powers argue for the common index by pointing to the fact that the differences between the index based on men and that based on both sexes may in fact reveal some latent features in the occupational hierarchy, such as occupational segregation by sex and income discrepancy against women. Nam and Powers then support their case by constructing two socio-economic indices using the 1970 US census data. One is based on male incumbents while the other is based on both males and females. The Pearson correlation between these two indices are as high as +.98 (Nam and Powers, 1983:83). However, there are significant deviations in several specific occupations. In 26 out of 30 occupations "the scores based on all incumbents were lower than scores based on male incumbents." Nam and Powers explain that this is due to the fact that "most of them were traditional female occupations, employing high proportions of women. Because women are generally paid less than men employed in the same occupation, it is not surprising that the median income level of all 26 occupations dropped substantially when women were included in the base population.... As a result... they receive a significantly lower ranking in the occupational hierarchy" (1983:84-86). Thus, they conclude:

> A comparison of occupational status scores based on data for men with scores based on data for the total experienced civilian labor force indicated important difference among specific detailed occupations as well as at the level of the major occupational groups. The scores derived from the data for all incumbents reflect occupational segregation by sex (gender) as well as the different income and educational levels of men and women in the experienced civilian labor force. They are, therefore, more valid contemporary measures of the status of occupations than scores based solely on the characteristics of men in the labor force.... The social structure in which earlier measures of occupational status were developed has change, and important theoretical and methodological issues in social stratification research require that these changes be taken into account in constructing measures of occupational status. (1983:88-89)

For the present study, we will construct the index based on data for both men and women in the labour force. Apart from the arguments cited above, the decision is also based empirically on the labour characteristics revealed from the census data. Female working population in Hong Kong has increased substantially in absolute number for the last three decades. Furthermore, the proportion of female participants in the economically active population has grown from 28% to 35% for the same period. Finally, the female labour force participation rate rose from 36.8% in 1961 to 49.5% in 1981. Thus, we contend that a socio-economic index based on data for both male and female incumbents is, theoretically and empirically, a more appropriate measure of market situations of occupations in Hong Kong.

3.2 *Criteria for Rating*

Having identified the occupational groupings to be used as indicators, we must decide on the criteria to be used for rating them. In this decision, we are confronted with at least three questions. First, what are the predictors to be employed in the rating? Second, what are the relative weights of these predictors? Third,

what parameters of the predictors are to be used in the calculation of socio-economic status scores?

First, we have to decide on the predictors. As explicated in Section One, it has been a conventional practice when measuring socio-economic status to take income and educational levels as predictors for occupational status. It has also been illustrated that such a choice is well-grounded within the Weberian theory of class in general and their conception of economic class in particular. Accordingly, in the present study, we will employ income and educational levels as predictors in constructing the socio-economic index of Hong Kong.

In the 1981 census data, education level is recorded in the variable "Educational Attainment" (Census and Statistics Department, 1981b:14). It is an ordinal scale. Thus, it has to be recoded into an interval scale.[11] As for the income level, there are altogether three variables in the census data recording the income of an individual. They are "Earnings from Main Employment," "Earnings from Secondary Employment," and "Other Cash Income" (Census and Statistics Department, 1981b:18). In the present study only "Earnings form Main Occupation" will be used in measuring the income level of the respective occupations. The reason for such a choice is obvious as the other two income variables do not directly reflect the earning ability of the occupation in question.

Secondly, as far as the relative weights of the predictors are concerned, there seems to be no consensus among the practitioners in the field. First of all, in Duncan's regression equation for occupational prestige, which is based on the 1950 US census data, both income and educational levels carry nearly equal weight, that is, the regression coefficients are 0.59 and 0.55 respectively (Duncan, 1961:124-125). Nam and Powers adopted the same method by simply averaging the scores of the two predictors (Nam and Powers, 1983:50). However, in an updated version of Duncan's index, Siegel works with the 1960 US census data and comes up with a new set of regression coefficients for income and educational levels. They are 0.313 and 0.602 respectively (Siegel,

1971; quoted in Featherman and Stevens, 1982:88, 91). More recently, Featherman and Stevens, using the 1970 census data, worked out another revised socio-economic index. They came up with relative weights similar to those of Siegel's. Therefore, they concluded:

> It appears that whereas education and income previously (1950) were about equally important dimensions underlying occupational prestige, the relative emphasis has shifted in the last two decades towards education. No matter which combination of education and income measures are used, income has a smaller effect on the prestige of occupations. (1982:89)

Featherman and Stevens contend that one of the factors contributing to the changes in the relative effects of the two predictors is "the educational upgrading of the US labor force between 1950 and 1970" (1982:89). In fact, such an interpretation corresponds neatly with a stream of theories concerning education, development and social selection, such as the Human Capital theory, the Post-industrial Society thesis, or the theory of Credential Society. These theories, though from different points of view, argue that the more developed a society, especially its educational system, the more weight will be assigned to educational qualifications in social selection and stratification.[12] These theories seem to suggest that the overall educational level of the labour force could be one possible reference to guide our decision on the relative weights of the predictors.

As for the case of Hong Kong, since we are unable to locate any relevant empirical data for occupational prestige to work with,[13] it seems that we have to base our decision on the aforementioned reference, that is the overall educational level of the labour force. In light of the educational and economic development in Hong Kong, I would suggest that Hong Kong was about to enter into a credential society in the early 1980s. This can be evidenced by looking at the changes in educational levels of the working population in Hong Kong. As indicated in census data (cf. Tsang, 1990, Table 2.2.5), the educational attainment of the Hong Kong

labour force improved substantially from the 1960s to the 1980s. The improvement is indicated by the decrease in the proportion of workers having only primary education or below, which dropped from 23.1% in 1961 to 10.84% in 1981. The improvement can also be indicated by the increase in the proportion of workers who had attained secondary education or above, which rose from 28.93% in 1961 to 62.13% in 1981. However, if we cross-tabulate the educational levels with the occupational categories, we can see that the improvement on education is by no means general across all occupations. For example, the data of the 1981 census reveal that there were apparent differentials in educational levels among occupational categories (Tsang, 1990, Table 2.2.6). More than one-fourth of the professionals and managerial workers held university degrees and more than half of them had received some form of post-secondary education. At the other extreme, the majority of the manual labourers had not attained education beyond primary level. Between the two extremes lay the clerical and sales workers. Most of the clerical workers, i.e. 72.9%, were upper-secondary school graduates, while half the sales workers had attained secondary education or above. In terms of educational credentials, we can postulate that there were clear differentials in market situations among occupations in Hong Kong. Therefore, we can conclude that Hong Kong society has not yet entered the developmental stage in which there is an overall upgrading of educational levels of its working population. Hence we suggest that equal weight for income and educational levels is an appropriate measure for a socio-economic index of Hong Kong in 1981.

Thirdly, we come to the question of what parameters are to be used in measuring the two predictors. In each occupational grouping Duncan uses the percentage of incumbents who had four years of high school education in 1950 as a measure of educational level, and the percentage of incumbents whose annual income was US$3,500 or more in 1949 to measure income level. Furthermore, Duncan suggests that the two parameters should be adjusted by age because age is apparently an essential factor ac-

counting for the income as well as educational variations among individuals (Duncan, 1961:120-121). Featherman and Stevens tried out a number of alternative measures similar to those of Duncan's and conclude that Duncan's suggested parameters are the best (Featherman and Stevens, 1982:109). However, Nam and Powers point out that Duncan's measures are time-prone, that is "with the passage of time, these two indicators will move further away from the statistical average.... (Thus), new indicators need to be developed and standardization over time may thereby be compromised" (Nam and Powers, 1983:49). Therefore, Nam and Powers contend that "our decision was to select the median level of years of school completed and the median level of total income for the aggregate of persons in each detailed occupation" (1983:48). Nam and Powers defend their decision by stating:

> The calculation of a median measure for each variable instead of an arithmetic mean or other average tendency was based on the distributions of the variables, particularly income, which are skewed. As a consequence of the distributional property, the mean would portray an average which was unrealistically high. The median, on the other hand, would divide the occupational aggregate in half. (1983:48-49)

Paradoxically, using medians as parameters in measuring income and educational levels in socio-economic index construction has been criticized by Duncan as early as 1961. He pointed out:

> Census data on education and income ordinarily are summarized by medians. The median has desirable properties as measure of central tendency and offers convenience of computation.... However, it is not clear that any measure of central tendency is the most appropriate summary of the education and income distributions for the problem at hand. The median, in particular, is somewhat insensitive to differences between distributions in the proportion of cases lying toward the extremes of the range.... It seemed appropriate to indicate the educational and income levels of each occupation by the proportion of its incumbents falling toward the upper ends of the respective distributions.

(1961:120)

What we have here is a split decision. On the one hand, Duncan queries the appropriateness of using central tendency statistics in measuring the properties of the two predictors. Specifically, he criticizes the insensitivity of the median towards the cases lying at the extremes. On the other hand, Duncan's suggested parameters are also criticized by Nam and Powers of being time-prone, that is, the parameters would have to be revised with passage of time. Furthermore, as we try to apply Duncan's parameters to the context of Hong Kong, we encounter another problem with the parameters, that is we have to decide the appropriate income and educational levels for Hong Kong on which the computation of the parameters are to be based. In other words, Duncan's parameters are not only time-specific but also society-specific. Thus, it may be difficult to make inter-society comparison with them. Thirdly, Duncan's preference for utilizing the "upper ends of the respective distributions" in the measures is also questionable. We may ask why the upper proportion of the respective distributions is used to summarize the properties of the predictors. Though they may work well with distributions which are skewed towards the upper ends, such as the income distributions of most of the occupations in the present study (cf. Tsang, 1990, Table 3.3.2), in cases where the distributions are skewed towards the lower ends, as in the case of the distributions of educational levels of most of the occupations in Hong Kong (cf. Tsang, 1990, Table 3.3.1), Duncan's parameters will inevitably leave out the majority of the incumbents of these occupations and be unable to capture the overall properties of the predictors.

Confronted with such inclusive and entangled arguments, we must clarify a fundamental question, that is: what are the functions of these parameters in the construction of a socio-economic index? Apparently, the parameters in questions are expected to be able to summarize the overall properties of income and educational levels of each occupation, based on which inter-occupational comparisons can then be made and relative status scores be

computed. If we accept such a job-description for the parameters, central tendency statistics will seem to be the appropriate measures. However, Duncan and Nam and Powers have emphasized that different central tendency statistics are affected by different aspects of the distribution of the variables. So the question is: are the intra-occupational distributions of income and educational levels really that essential to the problem at hand? The answer is that they are not, because what is at stake here is the inter-occupational comparison. What we need are parameters that can summarize, on one hand, the aggregate returns an occupation as a whole is able to generate and, on the other, the knowledge, skills, or whatever relevant educational outcome the incumbents of an occupation can bring onto the job. If we accept these general requirements for the parameters in question, it seems apparent that the arithmetic means of income and educational levels of each occupation are the most suitable measures. On one hand, they are able to summarize adequately the overall properties of the predictors, because they are able to take into account distributions skewed towards either end. On the other, they are common statistics that would facilitate comparison among socio-economic indices from different societies or from different points in time. Therefore, the present study will use the means of income and educational levels of each occupation in the computation of a socio-economic score. However, we will also calculate the scores which are based on the medians of the educational and income levels for the sake of comparison (cf. Table 6).

Another reason for choosing the means rather than the medians in measuring the central tendency of income and educational levels of occupations in Hong Kong is that the means can provide stronger discriminating power in ranking the occupations. As we look at the distributions of income and educational levels of occupations in Hong Kong, we see that a large number of occupations have equal medians so it is impossible to rank these occupations by medians. On the other hand, we can notice that none of the means of income and educational levels of all the occupations are equal, thus it will serve well as a basis for ranking

these occupations (cf. Tsang, 1990, Tables 3.3.1 and 3.3.2).

One final consideration in the selection of parameters is whether we should standardize the income and educational levels with the age composition of each occupation. Again, we are confronted with a split decision on this topic. Duncan has used age-standardized income and educational levels in constructing the index, and he justifies his decision by stressing the well-known fact that income and educational levels vary with age-compositions of occupations (Duncan, 1961:120-121). Although Nam and Powers accept the effect of age-compositions on income and educational levels, they contend that variations on age-composition or any other subcategories, such as race or sex, should not be controlled but on the contrary must be reflected in the index. That is because these variations are essential constituents of the occupational hierarchy that the index intends to measure (1983:49). Nam and Powers further their contention by underlining that "it would always be possible for analysts who wished to do so to control these correlates statistically in the process of performing their analyses" (1983:50). Therefore, as a nationwide standard of occupational status, the Nam-Powers index does not incorporate the effects of these subcategories into their index. In the present study, as we intend to construct an overall status index for all the occupations in Hong Kong, we will, therefore, adopt Nam and Powers' decision and use parameters which are not standardized by age-composition.

In summary, the criteria to be used in this study for rating occupational status are the means of income and educational levels of each occupation and each of the means will carry equal weight in the measure.

3.3 The Socio-economic Index

Having decided on the occupational groupings to be used as indicators, the predictors for ranking these occupations, and the parameters used to measure these predictors, we can now proceed

with the task of constructing the socio-economic index. The procedures for computing the status scores for each occupation is similar to that of Nam and Powers (Nam and Powers, 1983:50-51). The only difference is that I will use means rather than medians in the calculation. The procedure can be summarized as follows:

a. The 153 occupational groupings are ranked in ascending order according to the means of the educational levels of the incumbents.

b. The occupational groupings are ranked the same way according to the means of the incumbents' income levels.

c. By using the number of incumbents in each occupational grouping, we compute the cumulative intervals of the incumbents in each occupational grouping for each of the two rankings.

d. The midpoints of the cumulative intervals of each occupational groupings in each of two rankings are divided by the total number of incumbents in all occupational groupings. The resulting values, which range from 0 to 100, can be taken as the scores for income and educational levels of each grouping (cf. Table 6, columns 3 and 5).

e. By averaging the two scores of each occupational grouping, we then obtain the socio-economic status score for each occupational grouping (cf. Table 6).

Following these procedures, the socio-economic index is then constructed with the *individual data set* which is a 20% sample from the 1981 Hong Kong census data and consists of all the individuals, both males and females, who were aged 15 or above in 1981 and were members of the civilian labour force.[14] The result of the construction is shown in Table 6.

Table 6 Distribution of Socio-economic Status Score of Occupational Groupings in Hong Kong, 1981

CODE	OCCUPATIONAL TITLES[a]	(1) STATUS SCORE	(2) INCOME MEAN	(3) INCOME SCORE	(4) EDUCATION MEAN	(5) EDUCATION SCORE	(6) STATUS[c] SCORE BY MEDIAN
103	MEDICAL DOCTORS, DENTISTS, ETC	99.8890	30749.9	99.8341	18.3953	99.9440	99.7562
109	MEDICAL DOCTORS, DENTISTS, ETC--EMPLOYERS	99.8519	18350.1	99.9612	18.3824	99.7427	99.8537
179	LAWYERS, JUDGES, ETC--EMPLOYERS	99.8343	12904.0	99.9925	18.3211	99.6761	99.9633
171	LAWYERS, JUDGES, JURISTS & NOTARIES	99.8046	11770.2	99.9078	18.3086	99.7013	99.9144
121	TEACHERS IN POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTES	99.7204	10160.0	99.6136	18.2571	99.8271	99.7507
201	GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATORS, ETC	99.6916	9810.6	99.7548	17.9872	99.6283	99.8658
202	FOREIGN DIPLOMATS, CONSULS, ETC	98.8064	8128.7	99.9315	17.6445	97.6812	99.8658
101	PHYSICAL & LIFE SCIENTISTS	97.8723	7883.9	96.0846	17.1197	99.6600	98.2694
113	AIRCRAFT & SHIP OFFICERS	97.4137	7517.3	99.7030	17.0559	95.1244	96.6033
111	ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, SURVEYORS, ETC	97.3275	6818.7	96.4172	16.5892	98.2379	97.9753
124	TEACHERS N.E.C.[b]	96.6177	6739.2	95.4350	16.4577	97.8005	96.9821
301	GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE OFFICIALS, ETC	96.3845	6567.3	95.9111	16.3455	96.8578	97.8331
122	TEACHERS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS	96.2499	6356.8	93.2740	16.0061	99.2258	96.5610
211	GENERAL MANAGERS, ETC	95.9186	5680.2	97.5558	15.9568	94.2813	96.5295
151	AUTHORS, JOURNALISTS, & RELATED WORKERS	95.7662	4830.6	93.9281	15.8298	97.6044	94.2243
131	ECONOMISTS, STATISTICIANS, ETC	95.5255	4806.3	93.7553	15.6391	97.2957	93.1095
174	SOCIAL WORKERS & LABOUR OFFICERS	95.0254	4716.6	92.5853	15.4709	97.4656	96.6879
105	PHYSIOTHERAPISTS, PHARMACISTS, ETC	94.9587	4627.0	92.8588	15.3435	97.0587	93.3570
132	ACCOUNTANTS & AUDITORS	94.7839	4367.0	94.2068	15.2870	95.3610	92.6516
219	GENERAL MANAGERS, ETC--EMPLOYERS	94.3416	4269.3	99.0822	15.2618	89.6011	87.1470
173	LIBRARIANS, ARCHIVISTS, & CURATORS	94.2235	4076.9	91.3318	15.1462	97.1152	87.1560
175	PROFESSIONAL N.E.C.	94.1959	3857.0	92.7381	14.9807	95.6537	93.2113
102	PHYSICAL & LIFE SCIENCES TECHNICIANS	93.5889	3798.8	90.0131	14.9321	97.1648	92.6175
104	QUALIFIED NURSES, MIDWIVES, ETC	92.8651	3702.9	87.0260	14.7328	98.7042	92.9305
123	TEACHERS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS, ETC	92.4079	3643.8	88.5441	14.7007	96.2717	96.4478
334	AIR TRANSPORT REGULATORY STAFF, ETC	92.2678	3632.2	91.8738	14.5528	92.6617	87.2564
112	ENGINEERING TECHNICIANS, ETC	92.0923	3471.5	91.0144	13.6928	93.1702	92.0164

Table 6 Distribution of Socio-economic Status Score of Occupational Groupings in Hong Kong, 1981 (continued)

409	MANAGERS OF IMPORT & EXPORT--EMPLOYERS	91.5040	3366.3	98.4908	13.5851	84.5172	94.1964
335	POSTMASTERS, ETC	91.3868	3330.7	90.0625	13.4248	92.7111	89.0928
106	MEDICAL ASSISTANTS, HERBALISTS, ETC	88.0569	3307.7	85.9185	13.3857	90.1952	76.9209
402	MANAGERS OF IMPORT & EXPORT	87.8747	3184.4	95.6471	13.2857	80.1024	91.5701
312	ELECTRONIC COMPUTER OPERATORS, ETC	86.3333	3183.7	79.8640	13.1858	92.8025	79.3377
162	COMPOSERS, MUSICIANS, SINGERS, ETC	85.7088	3100.3	92.4194	13.0811	78.9983	84.8434
411	INSURANCE, REAL ESTATE SALESMEN	85.4153	3023.0	92.1259	13.0551	78.7047	86.5327
542	FIRE FIGHTERS, PRISON GUARDS, ETC	84.8310	3013.0	91.5986	13.0075	78.0634	92.0174
311	STENOGRAPHIC SECRETARIES, TYPIST, ETC	84.4686	2951.2	77.4616	12.9221	91.4757	74.2431
172	PROFESSIONAL SPORTSMEN, JOCKEYS, ETC	83.7484	2951.2	91.9165	12.8614	75.5803	78.7882
332	RAIL TRANSPORT REGULATORY STAFF, ETC	83.6095	2925.5	88.1106	12.7448	79.1085	87.2151
161	SCULPTORS, PAINTERS, DESIGNERS, ETC	83.0414	2781.2	86.6422	12.7165	79.4405	77.2858
541	POLICEMEN,SECURITY GUARDS, ETC	82.7891	2701.2	89.4746	12.6407	76.1035	82.8511
403	SALES SUPERVISORS, ETC	82.3556	2530.3	87.6332	12.5175	77.0780	85.7514
408	MANAGERS OF WHOLESALE & RETAIL--EMPLOYERS	81.8325	2496.7	94.8233	12.5172	68.8417	78.9020
963	RAIL TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT OPERATORS	80.8536	2294.3	84.1303	12.5025	77.5770	82.7472
321	BOOKKEEPERS, BANK TELLERS, ETC	79.8334	2267.6	72.7828	12.2216	86.8840	65.6620
851	BROADCASTING STATION OPERATORS, ETC	79.5670	2245.4	79.9740	12.0208	79.1599	85.5757
141	RELIGIOUS WORKERS	79.0797	2179.7	62.3648	11.6962	95.7946	72.5155
701	PRODUCTION SUPERVISORS & FOREMEN	79.0401	2075.4	84.9797	11.6154	73.1006	77.6144
551	TOURIST GUIDES, AIR HOSTESSES, ETC	78.3932	2068.0	79.0723	11.6040	77.7141	75.8567
337	TELEPHONE SWITCHBOARD OPERATORS, ETC	77.6599	2066.1	75.4770	11.5669	79.8428	68.1308
331	SEA TRANSPORT REGULATORY STAFF, ETC	76.8546	2020.82	79.7665	11.3968	73.9426	76.0749
502	HOUSEKEEPERS IN HOTELS & INSTITUTIONS	76.6197	2012.40	78.7939	11.3407	74.4454	74.9031
401	MANAGERS OF WHOLESALE & RETAIL	76.0789	2003.50	90.4003	11.2208	61.7575	73.2800
333	ROAD TRANSPORT REGULATORY STAFF, ETC	73.8875	2000.69	75.7143	11.1755	72.0606	74.6890
342	STOCK CLERKS, PERSONNEL CLERKS, ETC	73.5603	1979.25	64.7867	11.0348	82.3339	70.4241
509	MANAGERS OF HOTELS OR REST.--EMPLOYERS	73.0873	1953.14	95.2768	11.0347	50.8979	52.8504
501	MANAGERS OF HOTELS OR RESTAURANTS	71.8805	1888.80	86.2213	10.9057	57.5398	46.6750
845	TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH INSTALLERS, ETC	71.6237	1882.80	69.1277	10.7811	74.1196	75.1341
341	OFFICE MACHINE OPERATORS, ETC	71.3460	1858.50	62.4558	10.7173	80.2362	68.3265
964	ROAD TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT OPERATORS	68.4249	1852.42	82.0366	10.6220	54.8132	69.3523
424	SALES WORKERS N.E.C.	68.2611	1832.40	61.5895	10.5786	74.9326	72.6020
941	STATIONARY ENGINE OPERATORS	67.4530	1829.40	62.6724	10.2151	72.2336	72.5151

Table 6 Distribution of Socio-economic Status Score of Occupational Groupings in Hong Kong, 1981 (continued)

343	HOTEL, OFFICE, CLINIC RECEPTIONISTS	66.8751	1827.33	55.3408	10.0243	78.4093	72.5865
832	MECHANICAL MACHINE FITTERS & ASSEMBLERS	65.8206	1825.40	68.3359	9.9376	63.3052	67.8337
934	INSULATORS, GLAZIERS, & PAPERHANGERS	63.6191	1804.26	75.2768	9.8708	51.9613	62.1378
841	ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES MECHANICS	63.2041	1804.00	56.6072	9.8511	69.8010	66.3843
711	MINERS & RELATED WORKERS	62.8416	1794.94	75.6608	9.7344	50.0224	50.5478
842	ELECTRICAL WIREMEN & REPAIRMEN	62.2520	1794.64	59.4212	9.7006	65.0828	70.9451
823	PLUMBERS & PIPE FITTERS	61.0644	1768.58	70.3533	9.6779	51.7754	55.8250
903	PHOTOGRAPHIC PRINTERS, ETC	61.0346	1767.93	49.9328	9.6073	72.1365	69.0222
901	COMPOSITORS, TYPESETTERS, ETC	60.8564	1762.66	57.6644	9.5427	64.0484	65.4931
905	PRINTING PRESSMEN (LETTER-PRESS)	59.9110	1752.67	57.2796	9.5125	62.5423	65.5383
843	ELECTRICAL FITTERS & ASSEMBLERS	57.7763	1743.15	44.7029	9.4965	70.8496	55.7982
422	FASHION MODELS AND DEMONSTRATORS	56.6182	1730.28	37.9835	9.4643	75.2529	44.9244
846	MOTOR-VEHICLE ELECTRICIANS	56.5610	1726.63	48.9554	9.4097	64.1666	63.6249
861	JEWELERS, GOLDSMITHS, ETC	56.4466	1726.39	55.7947	9.3534	57.0986	51.1013
741	CHEMICAL PROCESSORS & RELATED WORKERS	56.4341	1716.23	50.4789	9.3424	62.3893	59.0237
834	SEWING MACHINE MECHANICS, ETC	55.8185	1715.75	50.3675	9.2741	61.2695	61.8011
904	PRINTING PRESSMEN (LITHO OFFSET)	55.6185	1708.31	49.8420	9.2355	61.3949	64.0955
831	MOTOR-VEHICLES MECHANICS & REPAIRERS	55.2725	1699.15	46.0045	9.2175	64.5404	65.3958
336	POSTMEN, MESSENGERS, ETC	54.7022	1696.12	33.9906	9.1807	75.4139	53.7632
961	FOREIGN-GOING SHIP EQUIPMENT OPERATORS	54.2414	1689.54	79.5593	9.0943	28.9234	65.0536
553	OTHER SERVICE WORKERS N.E.C.	54.0033	1688.29	50.1328	9.0314	57.8738	50.1738
953	RIGGERS, CRANE OPERATORS, ETC	53.7205	1672.13	79.2771	8.8990	28.1640	67.0465
913	SIGN WRITERS & OTHER PAINTERS	52.1783	1669.99	62.1051	8.7355	42.2515	58.2445
933	CONSTRUCTION CARPENTERS, JOINERS, ETC	51.7563	1661.24	76.0246	8.7340	27.4879	64.1540
421	WHOLESALE & RETAIL TRADE SALESMEN, ETC	51.2882	1659.76	35.7260	8.7263	66.8504	52.2646
822	SHEET-METAL WORKERS, COPPERSMITHS, ETC	50.7023	1654.55	50.9623	8.7194	50.4423	49.1991
754	BLEACHERS, DYERS, ETC	50.3003	1648.16	49.2126	8.6754	51.3880	40.1326
906	PRINTERS N.E.C.	50.1750	1635.86	38.1335	8.6659	62.2164	52.7920
921	QUALITY INSPECTORS & TESTERS	49.6828	1627.95	27.6769	8.6250	71.6888	51.7239
796	BREMERS, & WINE & BEVERAGE MAKERS	48.2430	1621.28	45.6399	8.5572	50.8460	38.1883
761	TANNERS, FELLMONGERS & PELT DRESSERS	48.2155	1618.49	45.3444	8.5377	51.0865	31.8705
912	AUTOMOBILE PAINTERS	48.1134	1603.23	45.2424	8.4714	50.9844	43.7132
931	BRICKLAYERS, PLASTERERS, ETC	46.8590	1598.37	67.2721	8.4678	26.4460	59.0536
801	CABINET-MAKERS & RELATED WOOD WORKERS	45.7041	1594.73	58.8527	8.4621	32.5556	52.5763

Table 6 Distribution of Socio-economic Status Score of Occupational Groupings in Hong Kong, 1981 (continued)

772	GARMENT PATTERN MAKERS, MARKERS, ETC	45.5323	1582.46	38.6694	8.4414	52.3952	33.1953
771	TAILORS,FUR TAILORS, & DRESSMAKERS	45.0312	1582.04	48.6026	8.3875	41.4598	40.7707
932	REINFORCED CONCRETERS, ETC	44.8595	1571.06	69.7425	8.3445	19.9765	61.3541
511	COOKS, HOTEL MAIDS, WAITERS, ETC	44.4593	1562.84	53.3001	8.31650	35.6185	35.4989
937	STONEMASONS	44.2995	1549.30	70.5181	8.31228	18.0809	62.3498
824	STRUCTURAL METAL PREPARERS & ERECTORS	44.2425	1542.27	55.4867	8.31107	32.9983	49.7886
833	WATCH & CLOCK MAKERS & REPAIRERS	43.8028	1538.54	29.1734	8.30225	58.4323	44.5070
911	CONSTRUCTION PAINTERS, ETC	43.3588	1538.19	58.2135	8.28109	28.5042	53.1736
962	LOCAL FERRY EQUIPMENT OPERATORS	43.3300	1535.12	75.1332	8.24170	11.5268	45.5157
935	WELL DIGGERS, UNDERWATER WORKERS,ETC	43.3264	1532.88	59.6951	8.20007	26.9577	58.5384
731	WOOD PREPARATION WORKERS, SAWYERS, ETC	42.3047	1523.88	57.4819	8.18588	27.1274	42.9877
611	MASTER FISHERMEN, ETC	42.1571	1517.86	84.0783	8.12069	0.2360	35.2368
795	BAKERS, PASTRYCOOKS, ETC	42.1044	1517.84	45.5189	8.11876	38.6898	47.1220
612	TOPICAL FISH & GOLD FISH HATCHERS	41.1912	1508.24	58.4604	8.11247	23.9220	38.5022
936	SCAFFOLDERS	41.0014	1507.81	62.5558	8.08034	19.4471	60.4141
531	BARBERS, HAIRDRESSERS, ETC	40.8823	1505.48	43.8323	8.06274	37.9323	29.7750
938	CONSTRUCTION WORKERS N.E.C.	40.8592	1499.03	60.5309	8.03922	21.1876	59.4577
871	OPTICAL LENS MAKERS, ETC	40.5085	1490.00	39.1422	8.00110	41.8748	39.8418
792	BUTCHERS, FISH BUTCHERS, ETC	40.1801	1484.25	57.8706	7.98560	22.4896	51.8174
965	LIGHTHOUSE OPERATORS, ETC	39.4415	1480.26	49.7109	7.93860	29.1720	60.7807
811	STONE CUTTERS & CARVERS	39.1666	1451.76	50.5379	7.93390	27.7954	47.7033
794	DAIRY PRODUCT PROCESSORS, ETC	38.1995	1449.24	43.4533	7.92610	32.9457	47.0017
872	POTTERS, POTTERY MAKERS, ETC	37.7531	1437.15	33.0190	7.91090	42.4872	33.7545
721	METAL PROCESSORS	37.2830	1418.51	42.9206	7.88976	31.6454	30.8362
752	WEAVING- & KNITTING-MACHINE SETTERS, ETC	36.8470	1416.98	32.6592	7.88530	41.0348	22.1493
793	FOOD PRESERVERS & CANNERS, ETC	36.7866	1416.61	49.5483	7.78947	24.0250	46.9007
844	ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT ASSEMBLERS	36.4192	1402.51	12.8256	7.75310	60.0128	37.8338
952	RAILWAY & ROAD VEHICLE LOADERS, ETC	36.2560	1395.00	47.3773	7.69210	25.1347	57.5182
821	TOOL & DIE MAKERS, ETC	35.6873	1390.00	31.4995	7.63430	39.8751	31.3176
603	FORESTERS, GARDENER & RELATED WORKERS	35.3041	1371.53	46.4254	7.58348	24.1829	38.4125
902	BOOKBINDERS	34.6443	1371.48	27.2882	7.58046	42.0004	35.1573
881	PLASTIC MOULDING-MACHINE OPERATORS	34.2139	1351.78	37.6420	7.50649	30.7858	41.9426
521	LAUNDERS, DRY-CLEANERS & PRESSERS	31.7363	1340.20	30.1116	7.49890	33.3610	28.1701
798	TOBACCO PREPARERS, ETC	31.6386	1340.16	33.8324	7.47147	29.4449	39.6593

Table 6 Distribution of Socio-economic Status Score of Occupational Groupings in Hong Kong, 1981 (continued)

552	EMBALMERS AND UNDERTAKERS	30.6008	1313.73	49.7878	7.35699	11.4137	34.6614
891	PAPER & PAPERBOARD PRODUCT MAKERS	30.4049	1305.56	32.8672	7.34105	27.9427	43.2660
782	LEATHER GOODS MAKERS	27.5875	1297.35	16.7347	7.33080	38.4404	25.0770
774	SEWERS, SEWING-MACHINE OPERATORS, ETC	27.0841	1294.00	7.9089	7.32590	46.2593	17.3166
797	FOOD PROCESSORS N.E.C.	25.9630	1276.90	33.7835	7.31100	18.1426	36.8827
753	WEAVERS & RELATED WORKERS	25.6817	1260.63	28.3939	7.26957	22.9695	22.6133
773	KNITTERS & KNITTING-MACHINE OPERATORS	22.9127	1243.42	15.8739	7.25399	29.9516	19.8894
923	MUSICAL INSTRUMENT MAKERS, ETC	22.9072	1226.31	16.4747	7.07789	29.3397	29.2369
423	STREET HAWKERS, PEDDLERS & NEWSVENDORS	22.4113	1216.83	40.8073	7.07690	4.0152	18.1819
781	SHOEMAKERS, SHOE REPAIRERS, ETC	21.6862	1194.54	21.2126	7.05900	22.1598	29.0738
883	TIRE MAKERS, RUBBER FOOTWEAR MAKERS, ETC	20.6474	1192.71	17.6654	7.01110	23.6294	29.2482
971	LABOURERS N.E.C.	18.0060	1192.43	19.4683	6.79523	16.5438	43.7831
791	GRAIN MILLERS, ETC	17.9782	1169.30	16.5868	6.76080	19.3695	29.4472
601	MASTER FARMERS, ETC	16.9971	1161.67	33.3956	6.59380	0.5986	6.8021
512	CHARWORKERS, CLEANERS, WATCHMEN, ETC	16.4215	1127.50	24.3395	6.53119	8.5034	13.6568
751	FIBRE PREPARERS	15.2838	1096.50	17.1256	6.46290	13.4421	21.8053
613	FISHERMEN, & RELATED WORKERS	14.8976	1095.21	29.6862	6.24390	0.1090	13.7587
922	RATTAN FURNITURE & BRUSH MAKERS, ETC	14.1964	1088.23	15.2895	6.20393	13.1033	30.2664
775	FURNITURE UPHOLSTERERS, ETC	11.1774	1008.80	3.5833	6.14277	18.7714	21.6421
951	HAND PACKERS, MACHINE PACKERS, ETC	8.3477	985.49	2.3341	5.78019	14.3613	24.7730
513	DOMESTIC AMAHS	8.0747	925.64	14.6043	5.71155	1.5452	12.4360
882	PLASTIC PRODUCT ASSEMBLERS	6.5101	923.75	0.5865	5.36344	12.4336	20.2794
514	BABY-SITTERS	6.5101	921.55	1.2811	5.02410	11.7390	8.0890
602	FARM HANDS, POULTRY HATCHERY, ETC	1.9088	834.69	1.5298	4.53247	2.2877	7.2872

Note : [a] The occupational titles listed are abbreviations. A detailed title list can be found in Census & Statistics Dept., 1981b.

[b] N.E.C. : Not Elsewhere Classified.

[c] The computation of the scores is based on the medians of educational and income levels of each occupational grouping, further explanation can be found in the text.

3.4 Discussion

Based on the socio-economic status scores of the 153 occupational groupings in Hong Kong constructed in this section, we can see that there are great variations in market capacities among economic classes in Hong Kong. This can be indicated by the differentials in the means of income and educational levels of the 153 occupational groupings listed in Table 6.

For differentials in educational levels, the most learned occupational grouping is the "medical doctors, dentists and veterinarians" whose average years of schooling is 18.3953, while the least educated grouping is the "fishermen, fish hatchers, fish farmers, oyster culturists and related workers" who receive an average years of schooling of 4.5325. Hence the range of educational levels among the 153 occupational grouping is 13.8628 years.

As for the variations in income levels, the lowest income group, which is "the plastic product assemblers," earns on average only 834.69 dollars per month; while the highest income grouping, which consists of "lawyers, judges, jurists and notaries who are employers," earns 30,749.9 dollars per month on average. In other words, the lawyers and their fellow incumbents earn on average 29,915.21 dollars more than the plastic product assemblers monthly.

In conclusion, the socio-economic index for the 153 occupational groupings in Hong Kong has suggested that there are wide variations in the educational qualifications which incumbents of various occupations have brought with them to the balancing encounter in the labour market. On the other hand, the returns they earn from performing the respective occupational roles and subsequently their purchasing power in the commodity market also differ greatly. Thus, they confirm that there are apparent differentials in the market capacities among economic classes in Hong Kong.

4. The Social Class Structure in Hong Kong

In Section Three we have revealed how the socio-economic status scores of occupational groupings in Hong Kong vary. These statistics show how the economic classes differ in their market capacities in both the labour and commodity markets. In this section we will investigate whether these variations in market situations will constitute social closures among which mobility opportunities are conditioned, and whether the economic classes will "structurate" into social classes.

According to the theoretical exposition presented in Section One, we have learnt that we can measure the relative mobility chances among classes by means of mobility-table analysis and, in particular, the log-linear modelling method. However, if we are to make use of that method, we must first construct a mobility table. More specifically, we must identify the class categories, which constitute the rows and columns of a mobility table. According to Giddens' assertion, these categories should be of limited numbers "manageable for explication of the major components of social structure and the process of social change" (1981:101). Hence in this section we will begin with identifying the class categories which will constitute the mobility table to be analyzed. Then, a variety of mobility models will be tested in order to substantiate the model which fit the data of Hong Kong. Subsequently, it is hoped that the social class structure of Hong Kong will emerge.

4.1 Identifying the Class Categories

To begin with, let us look at two widely accepted schemata of such class categories in the US and UK. In the United States, Duncan developed a 17-category schema based on the occupational categories prepared by the US Bureau of the Census (Blau and Duncan, 1967:23-27). This schema has become the basis of mobility-table analysis in the US.[15] In the United Kingdom, the Oxford Social Mobility Group derived a 7-category schema based on the *Classification of Occupations 1970* released by the Office of Population Census and Survey (Hope, 1972; Goldthorpe, 1987:40-43; Halsey *et al.*, 1980:17-19). We have juxtaposed the two schemata in Table 7.

Table 7 Comparison between Duncan's 17-category Class Schema and the 7-category Class Schema of the Oxford Social Mobility Group

Duncan's 17-category Class Schema	The 7-category Class Schema of the Oxford Social Mobility Group
1. Professionals, self-employed.	1. Higher-grade professionals, administrators, managers, and proprietors.
2. Professionals, salaried.	
3. Managers.	2. Lower-grade professionals, administrators, and managers. Supervisors, and higher-grade technicians.
4. Salesmen, other.	
5. Proprietors.	
6. Clerks.	3. Clerical, sales and rank-and-file service workers.
7. Salesmen, retail.	
8. Craftsmen, manufacturing.	4. Small proprietors and self-employed artisans. The petty-bourgeoisie.
9. Craftsmen, other.	
10. Craftsmen, construction.	5. Lower-grade technicians and foremen. The 'aristocracy of labour.'
11. Services.	
12. Operatives, other.	6. Skilled manual workers in industry.
13. Operatives, manufacturing.	7. Semi-skilled manual workers in industry, and agricultural workers.
14. Labourers, manufacturing.	
15. Labourers, other.	
16. Farmers.	
17. Farm labourers.	

Sources: Blau and Duncan, 1967:27; and Goldthorpe, 1987:40-45.

We can see that a number of perspectives are running through these schemata. First, we can find a classification by ownership of property or capital, such as the property and the propertyless, in

Weberian terminology, or the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, according to Marxist conceptions. Secondly, we can reveal a classification based on marketable knowledge and skills, for instance, the professionals, the technocrats, and clerical workers. Thirdly, a demarcation based on the hierarchy of authority in the workplace can also be detected, for example, managers and administrators, supervisors and foremen, and labourers. Fourthly, a classification by industries is also used in the schemata, such as manufacturing and construction workers, service and sales workers, and agricultural workers. Taken together, these criteria of classification present a comprehensive schema of class demarcation which takes into account both the Weberian and Marxist perspectives.

With reference to these schemata and their underlying theoretical perspectives and the occupational classification formulated by the Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department in the 1981 census, we can now construct the class schema to be used in the mobility-table analysis in this study. The Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department has grouped occupations into eight major groups in the 1981 census, as presented in Table 8. As pointed out before, the occupational classification designed by the Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department has neglected some essential criteria in class demarcation, such as ownership of capital or hierarchy of authority in workplace. Therefore, in order to incorporate these criteria into the analysis, we have extended the occupational classification into a 14-category schema, as presented in Table 8. The rationale behind the reconstruction is as follows:

1. In order to incorporate the "employing class" or the bourgeoisie into the schema, we break down both Group 1 and 2 in the classification of the Census and Statistics Department into the employing and the employed classes respectively, as we have done in the previous section.

2. We also build into the schema an "intermediate class" in the hierarchy of authority in the workplace, which has been indicated by both Duncan and the Oxford Social Mobility Group in

Table 8 Comparison of Major Occupational Groupings Classified in the 1981 Census and in this Study

Code	Major Occupational Groupings Classified by Census and Statistics Department[a]	Class Category	Major Occupational Groupings used in this Study[b]
1	Professional, technical and related workers	1	Professional, technical and related workers—employers
		2	Professional, technical and related workers—except employers
2	Administrative and managerial workers	3	Administrative and managerial workers—employers
		4	Administrative and managerial workers—except employers
		5	Supervisors and foremen
3	Clerical and related workers	6	Clerical and related workers
4	Sales workers	7	Sales workers—except hawkers
		12	Sales workers—hawkers
5	Service workers	10	Service workers—except domestic helpers
		14	Service workers—domestic helpers
6	Agricultural workers and fisherfolks	13	Agricultural workers and fisherfolks
7/8/9	Production and related workers, transport equipment operators and labourers	9	Technicians and craftsmen
		8	Operative workers
		11	Manufacturing labourers
0	Arm forces and unclassifiable		

[a] Source: Census and Statistics Department, Hong Kong, 1981b:34.
[b] Explanation can be found in the text.

their schemata. This intermediate class is represented by the category of Supervisors and Foremen, which consists mainly of supervisory workers in the sales, service, and manufacturing sectors. More specifically, it is made up of three occupational groups in the census classification, that is, the 3-digit coded sub-groups 403, 502, and 701 in the 1981 census coding manual (Census and Statistics Department, 1981b).

3. We also refine Groups 4 and 5 in the census classification by singling out the Hawkers (code 423) and the Domestic Helpers (codes 513 and 514) from the Sales Workers and the Service Workers respectively.
4. The Census and Statistics Department includes more than half of the 3-digit coded occupational groupings together under a single title "Production and related workers, Transport Equipment Operators and Labourers," that is Group 7/8/9 in the coding manual. With reference to occupational classifications of the US Bureau of the Census and that of Duncan's, we break Group 7/8/9 into three Classes. They are (i) the category of *Technicians and Craftsmen*, which consists of occupational groupings 801 to 938 except 851, 881, 882, and 883 in the coding manual; (ii) the category of *Operative Workers*, which is made up of occupational groupings 941 to 965 and 851 and 881; and (iii) the category of *Manufacturing Labourers* includes all the remaining occupational groupings in Group 7/8/9, which are mainly manual labourers in the manufacturing sector.
5. Finally, we exclude Group 0, which consists mainly of the armed forces and economically inactive persons, because this study is confined to the civilian labour force as are most of the mobility studies.

Apart from identifying the class categories which constitute the rows and columns of the mobility table, we also have to rank the respective categories in descending order so as to be able to analyze the upward or downward direction of the mobility. One of the ways to rank these categories is to array them by their income and educational levels (Blau and Duncan, 1967:27; Featherman and Hauser, 1978:25-37). As the socio-economic index constructed in the previous section is based on the means of income and educational levels of each occupational group, therefore, in the present study, we can rank the 14-class categories by their average socio-economic status scores. The result of the ranking is presented in Table 9.

The ranking of the 14-class categories basically follows the magnitude of their average status scores. However there is one exception, that is the relative rankings of Class 3 and Class 4. We rank the Administrative and Managerial Workers who are employers (i.e. Class 3) higher than their fellow incumbents of the same occupation but who are not employers (i.e. Class 4) disregarding the fact that the average status score of the latter is higher than that of the former. We think that our maneuver is theoretically and empirically well-grounded. First, the difference between the two scores is only 0.71. Furthermore, when we look at the average educational levels, we can see that the difference in score is mainly due to the fact that the employed managers are more educated than their employing counterparts. Thirdly, in terms of income level, the employing managers are in fact better off than their learned fellow incumbents. Lastly, both the Weberian and Marxist perspectives contend that, theoretically, the property class or the bourgeoisie would occupy a higher position than the managers and administrators who have to sell their labour in the market. Thus, the following mobility analysis will begin with a mobility table made up of 14 categories which will be ranked in accordance with the order shown in Table 9.

Table 9 Ranking of 14-Class Categories by Socio-economic Status Scores, for Hong Kong Labour Force in 1981

Class	SESCORX2		MAINEARN		EDUYEARS	
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
1 Professional, technical and related workers—employers	94.10	6.30	13727.22	17394.81	16.43	2.96
2 Professional, technical and related workers—except employers	93.08	4.64	3938.09	4035.25	15.48	2.73
3 Administrative and managerial workers—employers	88.21	6.63	6186.05	10330.07	11.68	4.26
4 Administrative and managerial workers—except employers	88.92	9.89	5411.63	6752.36	13.03	4.28
5 Supervisors and foremen	79.81	1.90	2398.24	2105.38	11.07	3.55
6 Clerical and related workers	77.78	5.84	1835.14	940.64	13.03	2.11
7 Sales workers—except hawkers	57.01	10.90	1656.98	1869.45	10.30	3.63
8 Operative workers	48.89	22.05	1730.71	803.39	8.31	3.71
9 Technicians and craftsmen	47.85	10.96	1536.21	799.75	8.79	3.56
10 Service workers—except domestic helpers	36.47	22.11	1610.74	1126.38	7.81	4.26
11 Manufacturing labourers	26.09	10.62	1165.73	635.89	7.91	3.64
12 Sales workers—hawkers	22.41	0.00	1480.26	1635.07	6.14	4.25
13 Agricultural workers and fisherfolks	16.21	10.09	1307.34	1404.40	5.54	4.57
14 Service workers—domestic helpers	7.84	0.56	1068.65	416.19	5.84	5.59

Source: Computed from a 20% sample of 1981 Hong Kong census data.

Table 10 Observed Frequencies of Father's Class Position by Son's or Daughter's Early Class Position in Hong Kong, 1981

Father's Occupation	Son's or Daughter's Occupation													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
1	0	9	0	0	1	6	1	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	26
2	0	51	1	11	6	96	19	8	52	24	39	1	0	0	308
3	2	65	10	26	49	204	74	16	81	52	107	9	2	0	697
4	4	67	2	25	25	213	49	19	83	50	59	6	0	0	602
5	0	52	2	9	45	233	33	26	123	65	94	1	2	0	685
6	0	100	2	23	33	438	47	30	135	64	114	2	2	0	990
7	0	48	1	6	16	231	88	26	174	60	153	3	2	0	808
8	0	118	3	23	48	578	129	215	677	197	598	20	2	3	2611
9	0	142	2	21	65	644	105	141	1211	280	855	13	6	3	3488
10	0	197	4	27	72	739	177	200	989	532	892	9	9	5	3852
11	2	133	1	12	65	585	103	155	693	216	954	11	2	2	2934
12	0	70	5	14	34	260	104	114	359	137	358	125	8	1	1589
13	0	17	0	4	4	62	16	49	210	65	198	4	81	2	712
14	0	9	1	4	2	18	3	4	3	2	8	1	0	0	55
Total	8	1078	34	205	465	4307	948	1003	4792	1747	4433	205	116	16	19357

Source: Computed from a 5% sample of 1981 Hong Kong census data.

4.2 *14 x 14 Mobility-Table Analysis*

With the 14-category class schema, we can now construct a 14 x 14 mobility table. As pointed out in Section Two, the mobility table is constructed with the *family data set* which is a 5% sample from the 1981 Hong Kong census data and consists of sons and daughters who were 15 to 27 in 1981. Thus the table that is to be constructed reflects only the early career of the sons and daughters, or in Duncan's words, it is "a table showing a cross-classification of origin by destination status of the cohorts included in the study" (Duncan, 1966:62-63). Table 10 presents the observed frequencies of this table of origin by destination.

Based on the mobility table, we can now set out to verify whether the mobility chances are conditioned in such a way that intra-category mobility is easy and typical while inter-category mobility is difficult and rare; in other words, whether social closure and social class exist in Hong Kong society.

4.2.1 The Perfect Mobility Model

One of the conventional ways to start is with the Perfect Mobility Model (Goodman, 1965, 1969a, 1969b; Hauser *et al.*, 1975a; Hout, 1983). It is basically a null hypothesis of the social closure thesis, which assumes that there is no social closure or no interaction between origin and destination, that is fathers' and sons' class categories are statistically independent of each other. We test this hypothesis by means of the log-linear modelling technique. By contrasting these expected frequencies (cf. Tsang, 1990, Table 4.2.2) with the observed frequencies, we can decide whether the independent model fits the data. According to the goodness-of-fit statistics shown at the bottom of Table 11, the likelihood ratio Chi-square is 2790.97795, with 169 degrees of freedom. According to the Chi-square distribution, the null hypothesis of perfect mobility is rejected by a huge margin. On the other hand, the index of dissimilarity[16] of the model is 0.120, meaning the Perfect Mobility Model misplaced 12% of the cases in the table.

However, though the overall model is rejected, we can still continue our investigation into the phenomenon of immobility or class inheritance by looking into the residuals of the model.[17] By residual, I mean the difference between the observed and expected frequencies of each respective cell in the mobility table. For purpose of comparison, standardized residuals can be "obtained by dividing each residual by the square root of the expected count" (Norusis, 1985:330). Furthermore, adjusted residuals can also be "calculated by dividing each standardized residual by an estimate of its standard error" (Norusis, 1985:330). The rule of thumb for the residual evaluation is that, if an adjusted residual is larger than 2 in absolute value, the residual will basically be accepted as statistically significant at 0.05 level (Norusis, 1985:330). The adjusted residuals of the Perfect Mobility Model, presented in Table 11, yield strong evidence to support our suspicion that there is immobility or class inheritance prevailing in the social structure of Hong Kong:

1. Most of the adjusted residuals in the diagonals (12 out of 14, except $Cell_{1\ 1}$ and $Cell_{14\ 14}$), which conventionally signify the immobility or inheritance of class positions between fathers and their children, are significantly large and positive in value. This indicates that sons and daughters have much higher chances to inherit their fathers' class positions than they would have had in a perfectly mobile class structure.

2. The thesis of immobility can further be supported by the fact that 10 of these diagonal residuals are of the highest positive values across both the rows and columns in which they are. In fact, it is a common understanding in mobility-table analysis that the rows of a mobility table represent the "outflow" frequencies of particular origins, while the columns of the table represent the "inflow" counts of particular destinations (Hout, 1983:11-12). This means that, on the one hand, young men and women from these 10 origins "enjoy" the highest probability to follow their fathers' class positions than to "outflow" into the other 13 destinations. On the other hand, it also indicates that

Table 11 Adjusted Residuals under Perfect Mobility Model from Father's Class Position to Son's or Daughter's Early Class Position in Hong Kong, 1981

Father's Occupation	Son's or Daughter's Occupation													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	-.1038	6.4628	-.2140	-.5279	.4812	.1014	-.2486	-1.1928	-2.0173	.4475	-.9127	-.5279	-.3962	-.1460
2	-.3597	8.4778	.6296	4.3421	-.5248	3.7934	1.0422	-2.0625	-3.2271	-.7612	-4.3108	-1.2692	-1.3736	-.5088
3	3.2494	4.4049	8.0852	7.0169	8.1271	4.5370	7.1261	-3.5011	-8.1832	-1.4682	-4.8313	.6100	-1.0881	-.7734
4	7.6418	6.0440	.9321	7.5336	2.8498	7.8698	3.7446	-2.2777	-6.3348	-.6259	-7.7714	-.1519	-1.9354	-.7169
5	-.5419	2.3499	.7403	.6634	7.2523	7.5373	-.0987	-1.6663	-4.1984	.4314	-5.8210	-2.3770	-1.0610	-.7665
6	-.6568	6.3835	.2034	3.9892	1.9642	17.0791	-.2245	-3.1350	-8.3220	-2.8864	-8.7527	-2.7044	-1.6625	-.9290
7	-.5904	.4705	-.3598	-.8978	-.8004	4.4254	8.0644	-2.5726	-2.1673	-1.6208	-2.7405	-1.9510	-1.3234	-.8352
8	-1.1171	-2.5147	-.7970	-.9562	-2.0231	-.1496	.1099	7.5664	1.4929	-2.8378	.0024	-1.5728	-3.7204	.6163
9	-1.3263	-4.2607	-1.8429	-2.9120	-2.2948	-5.9390	-5.7037	-3.3523	15.0575	-2.2710	2.5013	-4.3735	-3.6108	.0761
10	-1.4101	-1.3754	-1.1892	-2.4261	-2.4143	-5.1111	-.9718	.0329	1.4767	11.5824	.4217	-5.5917	-3.2851	1.1376
11	.7765	-2.6566	-1.9881	-3.7344	-.7175	-3.2684	-3.7791	.2688	-1.5482	-3.4133	13.4548	-3.9302	-4.0466	-.2965
12	-.8460	-2.1114	1.3813	-.7235	-.7133	-5.8898	3.1763	3.7405	-2.0852	-.5857	-.3677	27.6698	-.5165	-.2856
13	-.5528	-3.7718	-1.1405	-1.3207	-3.2679	-8.8523	-3.3388	2.0857	2.9850	.0987	3.1754	-1.3207	37.9644	1.8755
14	-.1510	3.4959	2.9132	4.5082	.5986	1.8707	.1917	.7007	-3.3213	-1.3967	-1.4768	.5508	-.5767	-.2136

= The highest positive value across both the respective row and column.

= The highest positive value across either the respective row or column.

Goodness-of-fit test statistics

Likelihood Ratio Chi-square = 2790.97795, df = 169, p = 4E-32

Pearson Chi-square = 4466.24705, df = 169, p = 4E-32

Index of dissimilarity = 0.120.

youths who "inflow" into each of these 10 destinations are most likely to be from the same class origins.

3. The data also reveal that the phenomenon of immobility is more likely to happen to the lower classes. The two highest positive residuals across the entire table are those of $Cell_{12\ 12}$ and $Cell_{13\ 13}$. Furthermore, the residuals of the diagonals from Classes 8 to 13 are all positive in value and larger than 10, which are larger than most (except $Cell_{6\ 6}$) of the residuals across the entire table.

4. In addition to the relative mobility opportunities among different class categories, the distribution of the adjusted residuals also provides essential information on the direction of social mobility. A conventional interpretation in mobility-table analysis is to take the upper right off-diagonal cells as downward mobility, and the lower left of the off-diagonal cells as upward mobility. We can notice from Table 11 that young men and women from the origin of professional and managerial classes, that is Classes 1 to 4, are less likely to move downward into the manual working classes, that is Class 8 or below. This is because most of the respective residuals (i.e. the sub-table of rows 1-4 by columns 8-14) are negative in value and the only two positive values are negligible. On the other hand, youths from working class origin (i.e. Classes 8 to 13) have less opportunities to move upward to become white collar workers (i.e. Classes 1 to 6). The data show that of the 24 residuals (i.e. the sub-table of rows 10-13 by columns 1-6), 20 of them are negative in value, while the two positive residuals are insignificant. Therefore, the data suggest that there are constraints which prevent the upper classes from long distant downward mobility and restrict the lower classes from far-ranging upward mobility.

5. Finally, the data suggest that Classes 1 and 14 seem to be inappropriate categories in the present study, because nearly half of the cells relating to these two categories (25 out of 52) are empty. Thus, the estimates relating to these categories and

cells are a bit unreliable for any induction or inference. However, in my opinion, the inappropriateness of these two categories is only idiosyncratic to the present study. It is mainly due to the nature of the data used in constructing the mobility table under study. Since the data include only sons and daughters who were aged 15 to 27 in 1981, that is in their early career, it is natural that not many employing professionals (i.e. Row 1) appear in the table. If we look at the career patterns of most of the professionals, we can see that it is not easy to become an employing professional in one's mid-twenties considering the years of education required and the capital needed to start one's own business. On the other hand, the inappropriateness of Class 14 (i.e. domestic service workers) is mainly due to the fact that not many local youths would prefer a career as domestic helpers and the vacancies have been filled by imported labourers, mainly from the Philippines. Besides, domestic service workers are mainly female, thus it seems natural that we cannot find many fathers who are incumbents of the occupation. Thus, in the following analyses, we will merge these two class categories with other categories.

In conclusion, the analysis postulates that the ideal model of perfect mobility does not fit the objective reality of the social structure. Furthermore, there is considerable evidence suggesting that immobility or class inheritance seems to prevail in quite a number of class categories. Taken together, the results suggest that we can pursue our investigation in two directions. One is to go on exploring the phenomenon of class inheritance with the 14 x 14 table. The other is to collapse some of the class categories in the 14 x 14 table so as to search for the appropriate clusters of categories which fit the structure of Hong Kong society. We will begin with the former exploration first.

4.2.2 The Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model

The Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model is the most commonly used model in detecting immobility or class inheritance in mobility analysis (Goodman, 1965; Hout, 1983:18-23; Pullum, 1975:70-93;

and Hauser *et al.*, 1975a, 1975b). The model assumes the existence of immobility and postulates that it is the cause of most of the residuals in the log-linear model. It also assumes that perfect mobility may prevail in the off-diagonal cells. The method to verify these assumptions is to "block out" the diagonals (i.e. assign a zero count to the diagonals) in the log-linear model and to test the model of perfect mobility against the off-diagonal cells.

Accordingly, the Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model was run. The likelihood ratio Chi-square of this model equals 1164.3686 with 157 degrees of freedom (Tsang,1990, Table 4.2.4), hence the Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model does not fit the data. However, in comparison with the Perfect Mobility Model, the Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model is definitely an improvement. First of all, the index of dissimilarity of the Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model is 0.072, that is it misplaced only 7.2% of the cases in the table, while the Perfect Mobility Model misplaced 12%. Furthermore, the likelihood ratio Chi-square of the Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model is also much smaller than that of the Perfect Mobility Model. In fact, it has been suggested by Goodman (1970) and Hauser and his colleagues (Hauser *et al.*, 1975a) that we can take the Perfect Mobility Model as the baseline model and the value of its likelihood ratio Chi-square (=2790.97795) as the total variation in the data that we wish to explain (=100%) by the subsequent models. We can then compare the two models by saying that the Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model accounts for only 41.72% (1164.37/2790.98) of the variation in the baseline model. Therefore, the "goodness-of-fit" of the analysis has improved substantially.

In conclusion, the 14 x 14 mobility-table analysis verifies that the ideal model of perfect mobility is far from the reality prevailing in the social structure of Hong Kong. Furthermore, by looking into the distribution of the residuals of the model, we notice that, on one hand, immobility or class inheritance is a prominent phenomenon in Hong Kong society and, on the other, most of the offspring of upper classes are well protected from falling too far down along the social hierarchy, while most young men and

women from lower classes are constrained from far-ranging upward mobility. Thirdly, in order to verify the class inheritance thesis, the Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model is tested against the data. Though the overall model does not fit the data in terms of the likelihood ratio Chi-square, the Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model fits the data much better than the Perfect Mobility Model.

4.3 10 x 10 Mobility-Table Analysis

According to the Weberian conception of social class, in a social class structure, a limited number of social closures are constituted to guarantee similar mobility chances for members of each social class. In the 14 x 14 mobility-table analysis in the previous section, we were unable to find an overall structure of such social closure. However, we did reveal some discrepancy on mobility opportunities among the 14-class categories. Therefore, we can further our search for social closures by grouping together the 14-class categories which share similar mobility opportunities to reduce the number of categories in the table and the residuals of the model. Subsequently, we hope to attain a model that fits the data.

In this section, we will construct and analyze a 10 x 10 mobility table. In comparison with the conventional practice in the mobility-table analysis, which usually collapses the categories into five or less, (Blau and Duncan, 1967:58; Hauser *et al.*, 1975a, 1975b; Pullman, 1975:104-115; Featherman and Hauser, 1978:28; Hope, 1972:179; Goldthorpe, 1987:69-93) the 10-category table would seem to be a middle range model (Pullman, 1975:90). One of the reasons for not directly analyzing a mobility table with more restricted number of categories, say five or less, is that in the 14 x 14 table, we have revealed that both Class 1 and Class 14 are inappropriate categories for the data under study. We then suggest the two categories should collapse with other related classes for further analysis. Furthermore, it is one of the objectives of the present study to contrast the analysis results of mobility tables which consist of both sons and daughters and that of sons only (cf.

Section 4.4). However, we are unable to run the log-linear model with data consisting only of fathers and sons because there are too many empty cells in the 14 x 14 table. Therefore, an intermediate analysis with the 10 x 10 table is necessary.

The 10-category class schema to be used to construct the table is presented in Table 15. In contrast with the 14-category schema, the new schema has only made some adjustments at the two extremes of the hierarchy. At one extreme, the two employing classes are combined with their fellow incumbents of the same trades, while at the other extreme, the three lowest categories are collapsed into a category which more or less contains the unskilled manual labourers. The reason for such combinations is that they are congruent not only with the general structure of division of labour but also the overall ranking of the categories in Table 12.

The observed frequencies of the 10 x 10 mobility table are presented in Table 13. The data are then tested against the Perfect Mobility Model. The results of the log-linear analysis are shown in Table 14. As expected, the overall "goodness-of-fit" of the model is far from acceptable. The main reason for running the Perfect Mobility Model is to look into the distribution of the residuals of the model and to detect the phenomenon of immobility or class inheritance. In comparison with the distribution of adjusted residuals of the 14-category schema, the residuals of the 10-category schema demonstrate a much clearer and more homogeneous picture of class inheritance:

1. All ten adjusted residuals in the diagonals are positive in value and well exceed the value of two, which is the significant value for the 0.05 level (Norusis, 1985:330). They range from 7.2523 to 30.4193. Thus, the results confirm that there is immobility or class inheritance among these ten class categories.

2. Nine out of ten of these diagonal residuals are of the highest positive value across both the rows and columns in which they are located. As indicated in the previous section, this means that young men and women from each of these nine class categories have the highest probability to "inflow" into their

Table 12 Ranking 10-Class Categories by Socio-economic Status Scores, for Hong Hong Labour Force, 1981

Class	SESCORX2		MAINEARN		EDUYEARS	
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
1	93.11	4.70	4224.24	5230.73	15.50	2.74
2	88.64	8.76	5720.98	8375.45	12.50	4.32
3	79.81	1.90	2398.24	2105.38	11.07	3.55
4	77.78	5.84	1835.14	940.64	13.03	2.11
5	57.01	10.90	1656.98	1869.45	10.30	3.63
6	48.89	22.05	1730.71	803.39	8.31	3.71
7	47.85	10.96	1536.21	799.75	8.79	3.56
8	36.47	22.11	1610.74	1126.38	7.81	4.26
9	26.09	10.62	1165.73	635.89	7.91	3.64
10	17.52	7.67	1342.29	1393.98	5.93	4.68

Source: Computed from a 20% sample of 1981 Hong Kong census data.

Table 13 Observed Frequencies of Father's Class Position by Son's or Daughter's Class Position (10-Category) in Hong Kong, 1981

Father's Class Position	Son's or Daughter's Class Position										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	60	12	7	102	20	8	54	27	43	1	334
2	138	63	74	417	123	35	164	102	166	17	1299
3	52	11	45	233	33	26	123	65	94	3	685
4	100	25	33	438	47	30	135	64	114	4	990
5	48	7	16	231	88	26	174	60	153	5	808
6	118	26	48	578	129	215	677	197	598	25	2611
7	142	23	65	644	105	141	1211	280	855	22	3488
8	197	31	72	739	177	200	989	532	892	23	3852
9	135	13	65	585	103	155	693	216	954	15	2934
10	96	28	40	340	123	167	572	204	564	222	2356
Total	1086	239	465	4307	948	1003	4792	1747	4433	337	19357

Table 14 Adjusted Residuals under Perfect Mobility Model from Father's Class Position to Son's or Daughter's Class Position (10-Category) in Hong Kong, 1981

Father's Class Position	Son's or Daughter's Class Position									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	9.8967	3.9367	-.3689	3.6738	.9316	-2.3175	-3.6684	-.6056	-4.3992	-2.0319
2	8.1291	12.2162	8.0287	8.8382	7.9041	-4.1872	-10.4882	-1.5275	-8.9890	-1.2333
3	2.2939	.8956	7.2523	7.5373	-.0987	-1.6663	-4.1984	.4314	-5.8210	-2.6548
4	6.3033	3.7750	1.9642	17.0791	-.2245	-3.1350	-8.3220	-2.8864	-8.7527	-3.3018
5	.4167	-.9686	-.8004	4.4254	8.0644	-2.5726	-2.1673	-1.6208	-2.7405	-2.4914
6	-2.6046	-1.1885	-2.0231	-.1496	.1099	7.5664	1.4929	-2.8378	.0024	-3.2909
7	-4.3630	-3.3981	-2.2948	-5.9390	-5.7037	-3.3523	15.0575	-2.2710	2.5013	-5.5369
8	-1.4951	-2.6998	-2.4143	-5.1111	-.9718	.0329	1.4767	11.5824	.4217	-6.0649
9	-2.5788	-4.2156	-.7175	-3.2684	-3.7791	.2688	-1.5482	-3.4133	13.4548	-5.5290
10	-3.4563	-.2169	-2.3828	-9.7366	.7758	4.4553	-.5730	-.6623	1.2789	30.4193

= The highest positive value across both the respective row and column.

= The highest positive value across either the respective row or column.

Goodness-of-fit test statistics

Likelihood Ratio Chi-square = 2328.68158, df = 81, p = 4E-32

Pearson Chi-square = 2893.91700, df = 81, p = 4E-32

Index of dissimilarity = 0.115.

fathers' class positions and the least chance to "outflow" into other destinations. In short, they indicate a definite immobility and class inheritance in these nine class categories.

3. The distribution of the residuals also indicates that the phenomenon of class inheritance is much more likely to happen at the two extremes of the social hierarchy. At the lower extreme, the residuals of Classes 7 through 10 are all positive in value and larger than 10. At the top of the hierarchy, the residuals of Classes 1 and 2 are equal to 9.896 and 12.2162 respectively. Hence, these six residuals are among the seven highest values across the entire table.

4. A clear line of social cleavage between manual and non-manual labourers also begins to emerge from the data. If we take Classes 1 though 5 as non-manual labourers and Classes 6 through 10 as manual labourers, we can then divide Table 14 into four subtables. Two prominent features emerge. First, in the upper right table, all the residuals except one are negative in value. Of these 24 values, 19 of them are greater than 2, while the only positive value in this sub-table is as small as 0.4314. In other words, youths of non-manual labour origins are less likely to "outflow" into manual destinations. Second, in the lower left table, 23 out of 25 of the residuals are negative in value. 17 out of these 23 values are greater than 2, while the two positive values are also insignificant, which means that youths of manual labour origins have fewer chances to "outflow" into non-manual labour destinations. In conclusion, there prevail two definite social closures between which mobility is rare and difficult.

5. So far, we have revealed only that inter-class mobility between manual and non-manual occupations is atypical. Yet we have not been able to verify the other side of the story, namely that intra-class "mobility is easy and typical" (Weber, 1978:302). In the upper left sub-table of Table 14, only one-fifth of the residuals are negative in value and all of them are less than one. These data suggest that intra-class mobility within the

non-manual labour division is easy and typical. However, within the manual labour division, the situation is less conclusive. In the lower right sub-table, we can still find one-third (8 out of 25) of the residuals that have significantly large negative values.

The phenomenon of class inheritance which emerges from the distribution of the adjusted residuals can further be verified using the Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model. The likelihood ratio Chi-square of the model equals 890.52016 with 71 degrees of freedom (cf. Tsang, 1990, Table 4.3.7), so it suggest that the model still does not fit the data well. However, we can see that by "blocking out" the diagonals of the 10 x 10 mobility table the likelihood ratio Chi-square has dropped substantially in comparison to the Perfect Mobility Model results of both the 14 x 14 and 10 x 10 mobility table. Furthermore the index of dissimilarity of the model is 0.067, that is, it misplaces only 6.7% of the cases, while the baseline model misplaces 12%.

In conclusion, the 10 x 10 mobility table provides us with clearer and more definite evidence supporting the proposition that class inheritance does exist in the social structure of Hong Kong. However, it still cannot provide us with a model which, on the whole, fits the data. Therefore, we have to continue our search for a model which is congruent with the reality of Hong Kong society.

4.4 *5 x 5 Mobility-Table Analysis*

The analyses in the previous section have revealed that a definite line of social cleavage between manual and non-manual labourers is running through the social structure of Hong Kong. Therefore, in this section, we are going to further our analysis by grouping the class categories according to manual and non-manual labour division (cf. Goldthorpe, 1987:40-43; Halsey *et al.*, 1980:17-19; Hope, 1972). We will collapse the 10-category class schema into 5 categories. The 5-category class schema is presented in Table 15.

Table 15 Comparison among the 14-Category, 10-Category, and 5-Category Class Schemata

14-Category Class Schema		10-Category Class Schema		5-Category Class Schema	
1	Professional, technical and related workers—employers	1	Professional, technical and related workers	1	Professionals, administrators, and managers
2	Professional, technical and related workers—except employers				
3	Administrative and managerial workers—employers	2	Administrative and managerial workers		
4	Administrative and managerial workers—except employers				
5	Supervisors and foremen	3	Supervisors and foremen	2	Routine non-manual labourers
6	Clerical and related workers	4	Clerical and related workers		
7	Sales workers—except hawkers	5	Sales workers—except hawkers		
8	Operative workers	6	Operative workers	3	Skilled manual labourers
9	Technicians and craftsmen	7	Technicians and craftsmen		
10	Service workers—except domestic helpers	8	Service workers—except domestic helpers	4	Semi-skilled manual labourers
11	Manufacturing labourers	9	Manufacturing labourers		
12	Sales workers—hawkers	10	Unskilled manual labourers	5	Unskilled manual labourers
13	Agricultural workers and fisherfolks				
14	Service workers—domestic helpers				

Based on this 5-category class schema, a 5 x 5 mobility table is constructed. The observed frequencies of the table are presented in Table 16. The data are then tested against the Perfect Mobility Model. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 17. As pointed out before, the overall "goodness-of-fit" statistics are not the point of interest in running the Perfect Mobility Model because it has been verified in the previous sections that the ideal model of perfect mobility does not correspond with the reality of Hong Kong society. Therefore, our primary interest is to look into the distributions of the adjusted residuals of the model and to verify the phenomenon of class inheritance.

Table 16 Observed Frequencies of Father's Class Position by Son's or Daughter's Early Class Position (5-Category) in Hong Kong, 1981

Father's	Son's or Daughter's Early Class Position					
Class Position	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	273	743	261	338	18	1633
2	243	1164	514	550	12	2483
3	309	1569	2244	1930	47	6099
4	376	1741	2037	2594	38	6786
5	124	503	739	768	222	2356
Total	1325	5720	5795	6180	337	19357

In Table 17, we can see that the residuals of the diagonals are all positive and significantly large values. In fact, these five values take up 81% of the positive value in the entire table. It suggests that class inheritance prevails among these five class categories. Moreover, we can also detect two other significantly large and positive values, which lie in $Cell_{1\,2}$ and $Cell_{2\,1}$ in Table 17. These values indicate that there are relatively greater opportunities for inter-class mobility between professional and managerial classes

and routine non-manual workers, that is, Categories 1 and 2. Therefore, if we collapse Categories 1 and 2 together, we will then have four diagonals which take up 98% of the positive values in the entire table. On the other hand, among the off-diagonal residuals, most of them (16 out of 19) are significantly large negative values, while the remaining three positive values are insignificant. What we have is a particular pattern of distributions of residuals with most of the positive values clustering along the diagonals, with the off-diagonal cells being occupied by negative residuals. This indicates that within the four clusters in the diagonals, class inheritance is typical and intra-cluster mobility is easy, while the chances to "outflow" from or "inflow" into these clusters are most unlikely. In other words, inter-cluster mobility is rare and difficult.

Table 17 Adjusted Residuals under Perfect Mobility Model from Father's Class Position to Son's or Daughter's Early Class Position (5-Category) in Hong Kong, 1981

Father's	Son's or Daughter's Early Class Position				
Class Position	1	2	3	4	5
1	16.5110	14.7620	-12.8677	-10.1714	-2.0623
2	6.2169	20.2696	-10.7638	-11.1915	-5.1320
3	-6.6468	-7.9098	14.1252	-.5706	-7.0010
4	-5.2797	-8.7246	.1790	13.8124	-9.2301
5	-3.2446	-9.3085	1.6163	.7457	30.4193

☐ = The highest positive value across both the respective row and column.

Goodness-of-fit test statistics:

Likelihood Ratio Chi-square = 1787.84081, df = 16, p = 0.000

Pearson Chi-square = 2239.38185, df = 16, p = 0.000

Index of dissimilarity = 0.104.

In light of the Weberian conception of social class, which defined social class as closure within which social mobility is easy and typical, we have come to the point of being able to decide how many social classes there are in the social structure of Hong Kong, either four or five. In my opinion, there are five. The reason behind my choice is that if we look more closely into the adjusted residuals in $Cell_{1\,2}$ and $Cell_{2\,1}$ in Table 17, we can see that the magnitude of the adjusted residuals in $Cell_{1\,2}$ (14.7620) is relatively much greater than that in $Cell_{2\,1}$ (6.2169). This indicates that it is relatively easier to have mobility from Category 1 to Category 2 than vice versa. It implies that upward mobility from the origins of "routine non-manual labourers" to the destinations of "professionals, administrators and managers" is relatively more difficult than downward mobility, the opposite direction. Furthermore, 5-category structure of social class seems to be in congruence with Weber's conception of social class as well as results of mobility-table analyses in the US and UK. Thus, we can conclude that these data suggest that there prevail five definite social classes in the social structure of Hong Kong.

We can further our validation of the thesis of social classes in Hong Kong by testing the data against a *Revised Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model*. That is, in the model we are not only "blocking out" the diagonals but also $Cell_{1\,2}$ and $Cell_{2\,1}$ in the 5 x 5 table. The likelihood ratio Chi-square of the model is 37.5061 with 9 degrees of freedom, while the 95% percentile of the Chi-square distribution with 9 degrees of freedom is 16.9190 (Tsang, 1990, Table 4.4.5). Thus the 5 x 5 Revised Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model still does not match with the data. However, in comparison with the baseline model (i.e. the 14-category Perfect Mobility Model), the present model is by all means a substantial improvement. For example, it accounts for only 1.34% of the variance and only misplaces 1% of the cases.

What confront us are two sets of analysis results. On one hand, the "goodness-of-fit" statistics suggest that we are not able to substantiate the Revised Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model. On the other hand, the distribution of the adjusted residuals of the Perfect

Mobility Model confirms that four social closures of mobility opportunities exist in Hong Kong society. In my opinion, what is at issue here is a difference between two orientations in mobility study. For instance, a study may set out to find the general pattern of social mobility prevailing in a society. If that is the case, the objective of the study will then be to look for a model which can account for most of the movement in a mobility table and remove most of the residuals (both positive and negative values). The "goodness-of-fit" statistics in the log-linear model are specifically designed for this objective. However, if a study intends to reveal the phenomenon of immobility or class inheritance implanted in a social structure, its main concern will then be the patterns of distributions between the positive and negative residuals in the log-linear model. In other words, the objective of the study will be to find out the relative chances of mobility within and across the cells or clusters in a mobility table. For this objective, the overall "goodness-of-fit" of the model is not its primary concern, because a model may have a significantly large Chi-square (i.e. a significantly large amount of value of its residuals remain unaccounted for) but at the same time be able to present a clear and theoretically meaningful pattern of distributions between the positive and negative residuals. In other words, most of the residuals, which remain unaccounted for by the model, are negative in value and lie in the off-diagonal cells, just as in the present study. In fact, the present study undoubtedly belongs to the second objective, because we are in search of social classes and closures of mobility opportunities that prevail in the social structure of Hong Kong. Therefore, with reference to the distributions of the adjusted residuals in the Perfect Mobility Model, we accept the proposition that there are four to five social closures which exist in the social structure of Hong Kong though the overall "goodness-of-fit" statistics fail to lend their definite support.

4.5 *Analysis of Mobility Table of Father and Son*

It is a common practice in mobility-table analysis to construct and analyze tables containing only data of fathers' and sons' class positions and exclude daughters' data from the analysis (Duncan, 1961; Featherman and Hauser, 1978; Hope, 1972; Goldthorpe, 1987). However, in the previous analysis, we have incorporated both sons' and daughters' data into the destination dimension of the mobility table. The reasons for incorporating daughters' data into the study are quite obvious. The primary reason is that it is a prominent characteristic in the labour market of Hong Kong that female participants have constituted a significant share of the labour force. This phenomenon is especially true among young women. For example, in 1981 the female labour force participation rates for the age cohort 15-19, 20-24 and 25-34 were 42.6%, 79.7% and 56.8% respectively (Census and Statistics Department, 1981:31). Therefore, in our mobility table which contains offspring aged 15 to 27, one cannot argue for the exclusion of daughters from the analysis. Furthermore, it is a well-recorded fact in mobility analysis that there is class inheritance between fathers and sons. If we are able to prove the existence of class inheritance with data containing both sons and daughters, as the present study has done, we will have much greater confidence in asserting the proposition that immobility or class inheritance prevails in Hong Kong society.

However, for the sake of comparing studies in other societies as well as results of the previous analyses, we will construct and analyze mobility tables which contain data of fathers and sons in this section. We begin with the 10 x 10 table and then proceed to the 5 x 5 table. For each table, both Perfect Mobility and Quasi-Perfect Mobility Models are tested. The results of the Perfect Mobility Models are presented in Tables 18 and 19. As for the Quasi-Perfect Mobility Models, the likelihood ratio Chi-squares of the 10 x 10 and 5 X 5 tables are presented in Table 20 Models 8 and 10 (cf. Tsang, 1990, Tables 4.5.1 to 4.5.8).

Table 18 Adjusted Residuals under Perfect Mobility Model from Father's Class Position to Son's Early Class Position (10-Category) in Hong Kong, 1981

Father's Class Position	Son's Early Class Position									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	7.4198	2.2840	.5065	1.2734	.8265	-1.6378	-2.6934	.0335	-2.1855	-1.8832
2	5.5010	10.5925	8.1185	2.8225	6.7901	-3.4282	-9.4353	-1.0177	-2.0374	-.2352
3	2.8235	.7463	6.1701	4.1306	.8267	-1.8344	-4.5475	.9796	-2.4566	-2.0332
4	5.7448	2.0858	2.4926	14.1289	-.5966	-2.6011	-6.6385	-2.8372	-4.9970	-2.5787
5	-.7772	-1.5187	-.4609	2.6126	7.7510	-1.7722	-.7353	-1.2967	-1.7686	-1.8448
6	-1.3171	-.6479	-1.3793	.6267	-1.4135	7.1821	.5953	-2.1416	-1.0766	-2.8063
7	-2.7995	-2.0599	-2.5963	-5.5673	-5.5954	-3.6969	15.8176	-2.0299	-1.5095	-4.9548
8	-1.4762	-2.5404	-2.2911	-3.0854	-.6747	.1856	.0445	11.0232	-2.1805	-5.0950
9	-2.2893	-3.0202	-1.5916	.3957	-1.9958	-.3404	-2.0608	-4.0198	13.0558	-4.5487
10	-2.8903	-.2918	-2.0877	-6.7234	.7329	4.0035	-1.3488	-1.3953	-.6554	24.5128

= The highest positive value across both the respective row and column.

= The highest positive value across either the respective row or column.

Goodness-of-fit test statistics

Likelihood Ratio Chi-square = 1547.29878, df = 81, p = 4E-32

Pearson Chi-square = 1970.20290, df = 81, p = 4E-32

Index of dissimilarity = 0.129.

Table 19 Adjusted Residuals under Perfect Mobility Model from Father's Class Position to Son's Early Class Position (5-Category) in Hong Kong, 1981

Father's Class Position	Son's Class Position				
	1	2	3	4	5
1	12.4951	9.1581	-11.4664	-2.9047	-1.0571
2	4.7481	15.5001	-9.0352	-6.0799	-3.9190
3	-3.9732	-7.7211	14.1518	-4.0618	-6.1624
4	-4.7322	-4.2712	-1.5102	10.9547	-7.6835
5	-2.7275	-6.1675	.8964	-1.5696	24.5128

☐ = The highest positive value across both the respective row and column.
Goodness-of-fit test statistics
Likelihood Ratio Chi-square = 1058.11300, df = 16, p =0.000
Pearson Chi-square = 1352.30890, df = 16, p =0.000
Index of dissimilarity = 0.1114.

In summary, a comparison of the "goodness-of-fit" statistics of the various models are presented in Table 20. First of all, the likelihood ratio Chi-squares of models 7 and 9 (i.e. the Perfect Mobility Models of 10 x 10 and 5 x 5 tables containing sons only) indicate that the two respective models of perfect mobility do not fit the data. Furthermore, though models 8 and 10 show substantial improvements in the "goodness-of-fit" when compared with models 7 and 9, they are still far from significant. Thus, both sets of models I and II suggest a similar conclusion, that is, the ideal model of perfect mobility does not exist in both sets of data. However, the Revised Quasi-Perfect Mobility Models (i.e. models 6 and 10) seem by far the most satisfactory.

As explicated before, the performance of models 6 and 10 can and should be evaluated in light of the distribution of the adjusted residuals of the two models. By comparing Table 20 with 19, we

notice that the patterns of distributions of residuals are almost identical. That is, the four diagonals have taken up almost all the positive values in the table, while the off-diagonal cells are crowded with residuals of negative value. The two models indicate that four definite closures of mobility opportunities prevail, showing that four social classes exist in the social structure of Hong Kong.

Finally, we may want to know whether immobility or class inheritance is more likely to happen between father and son than between father and both son and daughter. The index of dissimilarity of the various models, shown in Table 20, may provide the answer. By comparing the index of models 3 and 7, we can see that model 7 has 1.4% more misplaced cases than model 3, which shows that the mobility table containing only data of father and son deviates farther from the ideal model of perfect mobility. Furthermore, by comparing the indices of models 4 and 8, we can see that the index of model 8 is slightly smaller than that of model 4. This means that by "blocking out" the diagonals, where immobility lies, model 8 has misplaced less cases (0.3%) than model 4. Hence, immobility is more likely to happen between father and son. However, it must be underlined that the difference between the two sets of models, I and II, is quite small.

In conclusion, from the analyses of the various mobility tables, two prominent features emerge. First, social mobility is by no means perfect in the social structure of Hong Kong. In other words, one's initial destination, that is one's early class position, is not independent of his origin. Secondly, mobility opportunities in Hong Kong society are differentiated in a way that they constitute five social closures within which mobility is typical and easy and across which mobility is rare and difficult. In light of Weber's definition of social class, we may conclude that the class structure of Hong Kong is broadly structured into five social classes, namely professionals, administrators and managers; routine non-manual labourers; skilled manual labourers; semi-skilled manual labourers; and unskilled manual labourers (cf. Table 15 for detailed classifications).

Table 20 Comparison of Goodness-of-fit Statistics among the Various Mobility Models

Models	No. of Cases	Likelihood Ratio χ^2	Degrees of Freedom	χ^2_R/χ^2_1	χ^2_R/χ^2_7	Index of Dissimilarity
I. Mobility table containing both sons and daughters						
A. 14 x 14 Table						
1. Perfect Mobility Model	19357	2790.97795	169	100.00%		0.120
2. Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model	19357	1164.36860	157	41.72%		0.072
B. 10 x 10 Table						
3. Perfect Mobility Model	19357	2328.68158	81	83.44%		0.115
4. Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model	19357	890.52016	71	31.91%		0.067
C. 5 x 5 Table						
5. Perfect Mobility Model	19357	1787.84081	16	64.06%		0.104
6. Revised Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model	19357	37.50761	9	1.34%		0.010
II. Mobility table containing sons only						
A. 10 x 10 Table						
7. Perfect Mobility Model	10440	1547.29878	81		100.00%	0.129
8. Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model	10440	457.58759	71		29.57%	0.064
B. 5 x 5 Table						
9. Perfect Mobility Model	10440	1058.11300	16		68.39%	0.111
10. Revised Quasi-Perfect Mobility Model	10440	41.38510	9		2.68%	0.014

χ^2_R = The Likelihood Ratio Chi-square of the respective model.
χ^2_1 = The Likelihood Ratio Chi-square of model 1.
χ^2_7 = The Likelihood Ratio Chi-square of model 7.

Conclusion: Emergence of a Class Structure

"One of the objects of class theory has been to identify the principal line of social cleavage within a given system -- the structural 'fault' running through society to which the most serious disturbances on the political landscape are thought to be ultimately traceable" (Parkin, 1979:3).

This is exactly what this essay set out to explore, that is, to trace these "lines of social cleavage" running through the social structure of Hong Kong. We began our excursion, first, with the 153 occupational groupings generated by the occupational classification found in the 1981 Hong Kong census data. Using the means of income and educational levels of each occupational grouping, we constructed a socio-economic status index for all these occupations, which ranges, by definition, from 0 to 100. Arraying these 153 occupational groupings by their socio-economic status scores, we obtained an occupational hierarchy of Hong Kong society. In light of the Weberian conception of economic class, we suggested that the index reflects the market situations of economic classes in Hong Kong. Based on these findings, we asserted that there are great differentials in market capacities in both labour and commodity markets among economic classes in Hong Kong. Secondly, with reference to Weberian as well as Marxist class definition, we grouped the 153 occupational groupings into 14-class categories with which a 14 x 14 mobility table was constructed. Based upon the table, new mobility tables were generated and various mobility models were tested. Subsequently, we came up with a 5-category class schema with which five closures of mobility opportunities were identified. According to Weber's definition of social class, we suggested that the class structure of Hong Kong is structured into five social classes, namely professionals, administrators, and managers; routine non-manual labourers; skilled manual labourers; semi-skilled manual labourers; and unskilled manual labourers. Taken together, we revealed a process of class struc-

turation operating in Hong Kong society, that is "the process whereby economic classes become social classes" (Giddens, 1981:105). In other words, we traced the way through which the variations in market situations constituted closures of mobility opportunities within the social structure of Hong Kong.

In light of all these findings, we are ready to answer the question that we have posed at the beginning of this essay, that is, "Is Hong Kong society as open as her residents perceive?" Our answer is: Hong Kong, in an absolute sense, is not an open society. That is because within her social structure, there prevails a number of "lines of social cleavage" along which class inheritance and monopolization of social mobility opportunities are constituted and maintained.

It must be emphasized that the openness of a society can be assessed from two difference standpoints, namely absolute and relative openness.[18] In light of such a distinction, we can see that, in the previous paragraphs, the openness of Hong Kong society was assessed from the absolute standpoint and our rejection of Hong Kong as an open society is based on a yardstick assuming a social structure of perfect mobility.

As for the assessment of the relative openness of a society, it can be accomplished in two different ways. One is the intra-society comparison, that is to compare mobility data collected from the same society but at different points in time, so as to see whether the society has become more open over time (Goldthorpe, 1987; Halsey, 1977; Hauser and Featherman, 1973; Hauser *et al.*, 1975a, 1975b; Hope, 1980). The other approach is the inter-society comparison, that is to compare mobility data from different societies which are similar in structure. The objective of this kind of comparison is to find out which society is relatively more open (Erikson, 1983; Kerckhoff, 1974; Kerckhoff *et al.*, 1985; Treiman and Terrel, 1975).

Accordingly, the relative openness of Hong Kong society can be assessed in these two ways. However, we cannot locate any research findings in Hong Kong which are of similar nature and in comparable format to the present study,[19] thus it seems that we

cannot make any intra-society comparison for the time being.

As for inter-society comparisons, we can certainly find a huge corpus of studies on class inheritance and social mobility in other societies to compare with, yet we must be careful about the problem of comparability, that is whether these data are comparable to those of the present study. In fact, Burawoy (1977) points out that comparisons of social mobility studies among societies are not merely comparisons between mobility data but comparisons between the social structures within which this mobility takes place. Burawoy stresses that educational and occupational structures in each society are culturally and historically specific, thus he queries the reliability and validity of this kind of comparative studies on social mobility among societies. Burawoy uses the comparative study between the United States and Great Britain done by Treiman and Terrel (1975) as an example to illustrate that in these comparative studies, the heterogeneity of the social structures are either completely over-sighted or they are homogenized by various statistical techniques of standardization. Hence, Burawoy criticizes such studies which "sacrifice understanding on the altar of technique... (and) impose homogeneity upon heterogeneous social structures" (1977:1031). Therefore, he contends that "the interpretation of status attainment can be undertaken only with reference to the historically specific social structure in which it occurs – in particular the patterns of empty places which define the educational and occupational structures" (1977:1035).

On the other hand, Treiman rebuts Burawoy's criticism by explicating in details that their comparison is theoretically and methodologically sound (1977:1043-1053). Apart from his rebuttal, Treiman also draws our attention to a more fundamental issue involved in the debate, that is "whether a quantitative comparative sociology is a sensible endeavor" (1977:1053). Treiman certainly thinks that it is and I tend to agree with him. However, we cannot simply beg the question of comparability or Burawoy's criticism. Therefore, in comparing attainment processes among societies, we must first of all ask whether the social structures of these societies are comparable.

With Burawoy's criticism and the problem of comparability in mind, we find that most of the mobility studies in Western societies are neither culturally nor historically comparable to this study, which is based on the social structure of an oriental city still under British colonial rule in the early 1980s. As for our neighbouring countries, such as the three other Newly Industrialized Economies in East Asia, namely Singapore, Taiwan and South Korea (Deyo, 1987), we still find that their social structures are not comparable to the uniqueness of that of Hong Kong. On the one hand, the occupational structures of both Taiwan and South Korea in which a large portion of their incumbents engages in agricultural production (Barrett and Chin, 1987:27, Table 2) are apparently not comparable to that of Hong Kong whose incumbents are mainly employed in manufacturing and servicing industries. On the other hand, the major difference between the social structures of Hong Kong and Singapore is their ethnic compositions. Singapore is a multi-racial and multi-cultural society (Chiew, 1985:49, Table 3.1), while Hong Kong is inhabited by a population of which the majority is Chinese. Taken together, if we are to make any comparison of the social mobility processes among these societies, we must deal with the aforementioned structural differences between these societies sensibly and not to homogenize their heterogeneity. Obviously, such a job is beyond the scope of the present study. Hence, for the time being the question whether Hong Kong society is relatively more open than other societies will remain unanswered.

Before we accept the findings of this study that, in an absolute sense, Hong Kong is not an open society as her inhabitants perceive, we are obliged to underline some of the limitations of the present study.

Methodologically, the present study apparently faces a number of limitations. First, the data sets under analysis are cross-sectional data which only characterize individuals who resided in Hong Kong in March 1981. Furthermore, the data set used in mobility-table analysis contains only sons and daughters who were aged fifteen to twenty-seven in 1981, that is in their early

careers. As a result, the analysis only characterizes one phase of the subjects' career, thus it can neither reveal any information on their intra-generational mobility nor provide any information on the temporal change in the class structure of Hong Kong. In other words, the study cannot tell whether Hong Kong has become more open over time. Finally, since the data contain only the concurrent occupational statuses of both fathers and sons, they do not reflect the occupational statuses of two generations.

In view of the nature of the data sets analyzed in this study and the methodological limitations derive from it, one may query the validity of the findings of this study. However, I would contend that, though this study has envisaged some limitations as most other social researches do, the findings and conclusion of this study are still basically valid and sound.

First of all, let us examine the findings and conclusion related to the analysis of economic-class situations, that is, socio-economic status of occupational groupings in Hong Kong. It must be underlined that the data set used in this analysis is the 20% sample from 1981 Hong Kong census data which are arrayed by individuals, while most of the aforementioned limitations are derived from the 5% sample which are arrayed by households. Thus, most of the queries and concerns discussed above in fact do not concern the findings and conclusion of the analysis presented in Section Three.

Secondly, as for the findings and conclusion related to the mobility-table analysis presented in Section Four, we have to admit that the father's and son's or daughter's class categories in the mobility tables represent only their concurrent class positions in 1981 and do not indicate the class positions of two generations. However, we want to reiterate once again Duncan's criticism of mobility-table analysis that it is a built-in limitation in all mobility tables based on cross-sectional data that they are in no way able to represent class categories of two generations (Duncan, 1966: 54-63; see also discussion in Section One). Therefore, in our interpretation of the findings of mobility-tables analyses we have followed closely Duncan's recommendation that father's class position in

mobility tables can only be viewed as son's or daughter's class origin rather than the class or occupational structure of the father's generation (Duncan, 1966:63). In fact, the mobility-table analysis conducted in Section Four has been confined to measuring the interactions between class origins and destinations and to detecting the existence of closure of mobility opportunities. Therefore, we contend that our interpretations of the findings related to social mobility have never gone beyond the limitations that the data allow.

Thirdly, in light of the structure of the data, one may suspect that the class inheritance or effects of origins on destinations revealed in our analysis is but a tautology of the attributes already contained in the data. That is because the data contain only sons' and daughters' early careers, in other words, they have just climbed the first rung of their mobility ladders. Therefore, their abilities and efforts, i.e. achievement, could not have exerted much impact on their occupational statuses yet. Thus, the effects of origins on destinations may have disappeared in later phases of their careers.

I must admit that the charge can be answered by conducting a longitudinal study on social mobility in Hong Kong, which is beyond the scope of this study. However, for the time being, I think we may answer the charge by looking into findings of longitudinal studies in other societies. In the corpus of mobility studies, it is not difficult to find studies which confine themselves to early occupational attainment, for example, the famous Wisconsin Study Group has published numerous books and articles on their analyses of the early occupational-status attainment of the Wisconsin sample (Sewell and Hauser, 1975; Sewell, Hauser and Featherman, 1976; Sewell *et al.*, 1969, 1970; Sewell and Orenstein, 1965; Hauser, 1969; Haller and Sewell, 1967; Haller and Portes, 1973). Hence, our analysis on early-career mobility is by no means foreign to the mobility study tradition. Furthermore, it is shown in some studies that the effect of family background on occupational-status attainment does not decrease as an individual ascends the career ladder. For example, Sewell, Hauser and Wolf found

that the effect of father's occupational status on son's early occupational status did not differ much from that on son's occupational status at his mid-thirties. The respective path coefficients of the two effects are .059 and .055 (Sewell, Hauser and Wolf, 1980:556). Halsey's finding in a study on a sample of males who lived in Britain in 1972 even suggested that the effect of father's occupational status on son's first occupational status was less than that on son's occupational status in 1972. The respective path coefficients are .110 and .175 (Halsey, 1977:180). In light of all these studies and findings, we will suggest that, though this study has been limited by its data to the analysis of early status attainment, its findings and conclusion of the effects of origins on destinations are by no means spurious.

As for the theoretical limitations of this study, it has been underlined more than once in this essay that, within the Weberian perspective, a saturated theory of social stratification should consist of three aspects, namely the economic aspect of classes, the cultural and communal aspect of status groups, and the political aspect of parties. In the present study, only the market situation of economic and social classes have been explored. Furthermore, even within the study of class, this study has only investigated the objective aspect of class situations while the subjective aspects of class interests and class actions are beyond the scope of this study.

To recapitulate, in this study, I have tried to summarize a family of concepts used by different Weberians and integrate them into a coherent conceptual framework. These concepts include economic and social classes, occupational status and prestige, differentials in educational and income levels, socio-economic status, mobility opportunity, social closure, and class structuration. Furthermore, I have operationalized this conceptual framework by making use of the measures of socio-economic status developed by Duncan and Nam and Powers, and the mobility-table analysis worked out by Goodman and others. Based upon this conceptual framework, I have then addressed the issue of openness of society. I have substantiated the argument that Hong Kong is not an open society in absolute sense, yet I

cannot verify whether she is relatively more open than before or her neighbours. However, I think the issue of the relative openness of Hong Kong society is a research problem worth further exploration. Thirdly, this study has also addressed a theoretical issue which is more of local concern. As explicated at the beginning of the essay, a number of empirical studies have demonstrated that Hong Kong Chinese strongly believe that Hong Kong is an open society. However, the findings of the present study suggest otherwise. Therefore, the issue is why there is such a discrepancy between the subjective perception of the residents and the objective reality of the social structure. I have to admit that, though the present study has revealed this discrepancy, it is beyond the scope of this study to provide answers to the issue. However, I would underline that this issue is again worth further investigation. Finally, the findings of this study have also laid the groundwork for further investigations on various aspects of the class formation and social stratification in Hong Kong society. First, by adopting the analytical framework worked out in this study, similar analyses can be carried out with the 1976 and 1986 census data. Subsequently, we may have a clear picture of the temporal changes in the class structure and attainment path existing in Hong Kong society. In other words, we will be able to give an assessment of the relative openness of Hong Kong society over time. Secondly, in light of the findings of this study on the objective aspect of class situations, we can extend this class study into the subjective aspect of class interests and actions in Hong Kong. For example, one can study how social closures, both as exclusion and usurpation, are perceived, constructed and maintained through class actions waged by different social classes in Hong Kong. Thirdly, based upon the findings of this study on economic and social classes, investigations can be conducted to see how status groups and political amalgamations are organized among social classes so as to have a more comprehensive understanding of the pattern of social stratification and the nature of domination in Hong Kong society.

Notes

1. There have been some controversies over whether Giddens should be viewed as a Weberian. Though Giddens himself declines to be labelled as such (Giddens, 1981:297), yet quite a number of reviewers think otherwise. They include Barbalet (1982:484 and note 2), Binns (1977:47-54), Crompton and Gubbay (1977:29-40), and Sarre (1989:93). In view of the evidence presented by both sides, I tend to agree to the fact that Giddens is in essence a Weberian. Thus, he will be classified as such in this study.
2. Weber's distinction between class situation and class action is to a certain extent congruent with Marxist distinction between class in itself and class for itself, or in particular Poulantzas' distinction between class place and class position. In fact, both perspectives have taken the transformation from objective class situation or class place to subjective class action or class position as a central thesis of their class analysis. It has been asserted by a number of scholars that the analysis of such a transformation process can be analytically divided into three areas, namely class structuration, class formation and class struggle (Wright, 1989; Giddens, 1981; Poulantzas, 1973, 1978; Przeworski, 1985). In this study, only the process of class structuration will be analyzed.
3. Economic class, in fact, is not a term coined by Weber himself. It is used by some Weberians, such as Giddens (1981:41-52) and Collins (1986:132-138), to connote a family of concept used by Weber in different phases of his career, they include the early conception of class (Weber, 1978:926-940) and the latter conception of property class and commercial class (Weber, 1978:302-307).
4. The regression equation that Duncan has come up with is:

   $$X = 0.59Y + 0.55Z - 0.6$$

   where X is the percentage of "excellent" or "good' rating received by an occupation in the NORC prestige survey;
   Y is the proportion of men in the occupation with income of $3,500 or more in the 1950 census; and
   Z is the proportion of men in the occupation with four years of high school or higher education attainment in the 1950 census (Duncan, 1961:124-125).
5. Apart from this uni-indicator approach which uses occupation as the sole indicator, there is another approach using multi-indicator

approach, for instance, Sewell *et al.*, 1969; and cf. Nam and Powers, 1983:58-76.

6. According to Giddens' thesis, there are basically three factors affecting the process of class structuration. They are (1) the overall organization of the productive enterprise and the distributive groupings (Giddens, 1981:108-109), (2) the form of class consciousness (112-117), and (3) the form of power and the form of state (118-127). These three factors in fact correspond quite neatly to Weber's classification of class, status group, and political party. They also appear to be congruent with some Neo-Marxist classification of economic, ideological, and political forces in class formation (Poulantzas, 1978:17-24). Taken together, both Weberians and Marxists seem to agree to that the formation of social classes depends on the economic and market formation, the cultural and communal formation, and the power and political formation.
7. For status attainment tradition see, for examples, Blau and Duncan, 1967; Halsey, 1977; Halsey *et al.*, 1980; Sewell and Hauser, 1975; Sewell, Hauser and Featherman, 1976; and Sewell, Hauser and Wolf, 1980.
8. Within the contingency-table tradition, there are basically two divisions. One is the "proposition of perfect mobility" which will be explicated in this essay. The other can be called the "proposition of mobility in industrialized society," which tries to explicate the relationship between industrialization and social mobility. There is voluminous work on this division, for examples, Lipset and Bendix, 1967; Archer and Giner, 1971; Boudon, 1973; Erikson *et al.*, 1979; Featherman and Hauser, 1978; Goldthorpe, 1987; Hope, 1980; McClendon, 1977; and Treiman, 1970.
9. In the data prepared by the Census and Statistics Department, economically active refers to those respondents whose "Activities Status" code is greater than 30 (Census and Statistics Department, 1981b:17-18).
10. The computation of the socio-economic status scores for occupational titles in Hong Kong will be explained in greater detail in Section Three of this essay.
11. The variable "Educational Attainment" is recoded into "Years of Education," a variable in interval scale, in the following ways:

	Educational Level	Years of Education
00	No Schooling	0
01	Kindergarten	2
11	Lower Primary (P1 to P4)	6
12	Upper Primary (P5 to P6)	8
21	Form 1/Middle 1	9
22	Form 2/Middle 2	10
23	Form 3/Middle 3	11
24	Form 4/Middle 4	12
25	Form 5/Middle 5	13
41	Craft (including Apprenticeship) Courses	13
31	Form 6/7/Middle 6	15
42	Diploma/Certificate Courses (Technician Level)	15
43	Endorsement Certificate Courses	15
51	Diploma/Certificate Courses in Colleges of Education or Technical Teachers' College	17
52	Nurse Training Courses	17
62	Higher Diploma	17
71	Non-Degree (Diploma/Certificate) Courses	17
81	Degree Courses	18
82	Post-graduate Courses (including Post-graduate Degree and Diploma/Certificate Courses)	20

12. For the Human Capital theory or more general Technical Functionalism, see Clark (1962) and Schultz (1961); as for the Post-industrial Society thesis, refer to Bell (1973); and for theory of the Credential Society, see Collins (1979).
13. I can only locate one survey on occupational prestige of Hong Kong, which was conducted by F.C. Chung in 1977 (Chung, 1977). However, the sample of the survey is far from representative, because the respondents were confined to the "working parents and siblings of 546 students from the Department of Sociology and Social Work, and of Business Management (of Hong Kong Baptist College)" (Chung, 1977:7). Furthermore, the result of the survey contains some findings which are not congruent with the general result of most of the similar surveys conducted in other countries (Treiman, 1977). For example, the occupational prestige score of "policeman" is the second lowest among the 113 occupa-

tions under study, that is, it is ranked after occupations such as street sweeper, janitor, hawker, and domestic servant. The only explanation for this "peculiar" finding that the author could provide is, "The ranking of the policeman after the street sweeper may be variously interpreted. Like all the others, this finding is peculiar to Hong Kong" (Chung, 1977:15). In light of all this, I am not going to take into account the result of Chung's survey in the present study.

14. To be in line with most of the related studies, such as Duncan's (1961), Nam and Powers' (1983), Siegel's (1971), and Goldthorpe and Hope's (1974), the present study will only concentrate on the civilian labour force. Therefore, those occupational subgroups whose three-digit codes are 001 to 011 in the census data will be excluded. They include armed forces, not applicable, and workers not classifiable by occupation (Census and Statistics Department, 1981:31).

15. The mobility-table analyses which are based on or start with Blau and Duncan's 17-category schema are Vanneman (1977), Pullum (1975), Featherman and Hauser (1978), Hauser *et al.* (1975a, 1975b), Breiger (1981), and Hout (1983).

16. The index of dissimilarity is the proportion of cases which must be shifted in either the array of the observed frequencies or that of the expected frequencies in order to equalize the two arrays. Thus it can be interpreted as cases which are "misplaced" or "unexplained" by a particular log-linear model. (cf. Pullum, 1975:60-61; Hout, 1983:15; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965:235-236) The calculation of the index (D) can be expressed as follows:

$$D = 1/2 \text{ (sum of absolute value of } F_{ob} - F_{ex})/N$$

where F_{ob} = observed frequencies,
F_{ex} = expected frequencies,
N = total number of cases.

17. Blau and Duncan work out a mobility ratio, which is a ratio of the observed frequencies to expected frequencies, to detect the occupational inheritance in a mobility table (1967:30-38). By the same token, the present study will make use of another device, which is also based upon the difference between the observed and expected frequencies in a Perfect Mobility Model, to analyze the phenomenon of class inheritance, that is the adjusted residuals found in the SPSSX output (Norusis, 1985:330). The significance of the parameter can be found in the text that follows.

18. The analytical distinction between absolute and relative openness is borrowed from the discussions on equality presented by Rae *et al.* (1980) and Coleman (1973). Similar analysis can also be found in Goldthorpe discussion of the openness of the British society (1987:27-29).

19. Stephen Tang (1981) made use of a 1% random sample from the 1976 Hong Kong census data to explore the effects of familial structures and backgrounds on the differentials in educational attainment. However, the main objective of Tang's study is to account for educational attainment rather than status attainment. Furthermore, some of the key variables in Tang's study, such as class position, are operationalized in such a different way that it has made the present study not comparable to Tang's.

References

Archer, M. and S. Giner (1971), "Social Stratification in Europe." Pp.1-59 in M. Archer and S. Giner (eds.) *Contemporary Europe: Class, Status and Power*. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson.

Barbalet, J.M. (1982), "Social Closure in Class Analysis: A Critique of Parkin." *Sociology* 16:484-497.

Barrett, R.E. and S. Chin (1987), "Export-oriented Industrializing States in the Capitalist World System: Similarities and Differences." Pp.23-43 in F.C. Deyo (ed.) *The Political Economy of the New Asian Industrialism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bell, D. (1973), *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*. New York: Basic Books.

Bibb, R. and W.H. Form (1977), "The Effects of Industrial, Occupational, and Sex Stratification on Wages in Blue-collar Markets." *Social Force* 55:974-996.

Binns, D. (1977), *Beyond the Sociology of Conflict*. London: Macmillan.

Blau, P. and O.D. Duncan (1967), *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Wiley.

Blishen, B.R. and W.K. Carroll (1983), "Socioeconomic Measures from Canadian Census Data." Pp.43-54 in M.G. Powers (ed.) *Measures of Socioeconomic Status: Current Issues*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Boudon, R. (1973), *Mathematical Structures of Social Mobility*. Amsterdam: Elservier Scientific.

Bowles, S. and V.I. Nelson (1974), "The 'Inheritance of IQ' and the Intergenerational Reproduction of Economic Inequality." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* LVI:39-51.

Breiger, R.L. (1981), "The Social Class Structure of Occupational Mobility." *American Journal of Sociology* 87:578-611.

Burawoy, M. (1977) "Social Structure, Homogenization, and the Process of Status Attainment in the United States and Great Britain." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:1031-1042.

Burris, V. (1987), "The Neo-Marxist Synthesis of Marx and Weber on Class." Pp.67-90 in N. Wiley (ed.) *The Marx-Weber Debate*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Calvert, P. (1982), *The Concept of Class: An Historical Introduction*. London: Hutchinson.

Census and Statistics Department, Hong Kong government (1961), *Hong Kong Report on the 1961 Census, vol. III*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

——(1971), *Hong Kong Population and Housing Census 1971, Main Report*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

——(1976), *Hong Kong By-Census 1976, Main Report, vol.1: Analysis*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

——(1981), *Hong Kong 1981 Census, Main Report, vol.1: Analysis*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

——(1981a), *Hong Kong 1981 Census, Main Report, vol.2: Tables*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

——(1981b), *Hong Kong 1981 Land Census: Coding Manual (Long Form)*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

——(1986), *Hong Kong 1986 By-Census, Main Report, vol.2: Tables*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Chaney, D.C. and D. Podmore (1973), *Young Adults in Hong Kong: Attitudes in a Modernizing Society*. Hong Kong: Centre of Asian Studies, University of Hong Kong.

Chiew, Seen-Kong (1985), "The Socio-cultural Framework of Politics." Pp.45-67 in J.S.T. Quah, C.H. Chee and S.C. Meow (eds.) *Government and Politics of Singapore*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Chung, F.C. (1977), "Ranking Occupational Prestige in Hong Kong: A Popular Evaluation." Occasional Paper of Social Research Centre, Hong Kong Baptist College.

Clark, B.R. (1962), *Educating the Expert Society*. San Francisco: Chandler.

Coleman, J.S. (1973), "Inequality, Sociology and Moral Philosophy." *American Journal of Sociology* 80:739-764.

Collins, R. (1975), *Conflict Sociology: Toward an Explanatory Science*. New York: Academic Press.

——(1979), *The Credential Society*. New York: Academic Press.

——(1986), *Max Weber: A Skeleton Key*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Cox, O.C. (1950), "Max Weber on Social Stratification: A Critique." *American Sociological Review* 15:223-227.

Crompton, R. and J. Gubbay (1977), *Economy and Class Structure*. London: Macmillan.

Crowder, N.D. (1974), "A Critique of Duncan's Stratification Research." *Sociology* 8:19-45.

Deyo, F.C. (ed.) (1987), *The Political Economy of the New Asian Industrialism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Duncan, O.D. (1961), "A Socioeconomic Index for All Occupations." Pp. 109-138 in A.G. Reiss, Jr., (ed.) *Occupations and Social Status*. New York: Free Press.

——(1966), "Methodological Issues in the Analysis of Social Mobility." Pp.51-97 in N.J. Smelser and S.M. Lipset (eds.) *Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

——(1979), "How Destination Depends on Origin in the Occupational Mobility Table." *American Journal of Sociology* 84:793-803.

Erikson, R. (1983), "Changes in Social Mobility in Industrial Nations: A Case of Sweden." Pp.165-195 in D.J. Treiman and R.V. Robinson (eds.) *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Erikson, R. *et al.* (1979), "Intergenerational Class Mobility in Three Western European Societies." *British Journal of Sociology* 30:415-441.

Featherman, D.L. and R.M. Hauser (1978), *Opportunity and Change*. New York: Academic Press.

Featherman, D.L. and G. Stevens (1982), "Revised Socioeconomic Index of Occupational Status: Application in Analysis of Sex Difference in Attainment." Pp.83-127 in M.G. Powers (ed.) *Measures of Socioeconomic Status*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Giddens, A. (1981), *The Class Structure of the Advanced Society*, 2nd ed. London: Hutchinson.

Goodman, L.A. (1965), "On the Statistical Analysis of Mobility Tables." *American Journal of Sociology* 70:564-585.

——(1969a), "How to Ransack Social Mobility Tables and Other Kinds of Cross-Classification Tables." *American Journal of Sociology* 75:1-39.

——(1969b), "On the Measurement of Social Mobility: An Index of Status Persistence." *American Sociological Review* 34:831-850.

——(1970), "The Multivariate Analysis of Qualitative Data: Interactions among Multiple Classifications." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 65:226-256.

——(1972), "A General Model for the Analysis of Surveys." *American Journal of Sociology* 77:1035-1086.

Goldthorpe, J.H. (1987), *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Goldthorpe, J.H. and K. Hope (1972), "Occupational Grading and Occupational Prestige." Pp.19-79 in K. Hope (ed.) *The Analysis of Social Mobility: Methods and Approaches*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

——(1974), *The Social Grading of Occupations: A New Approach and Scale*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Haller, A.O. and A. Portes (1973), "Status Attainment Processes." *Sociology of Education* 46:51-91.

Haller, A.O. and W.H. Sewell (1967), "Occupational Choices of Wisconsin Farm Boys." *Rural Sociology* 32:37-55.

Halsey, A.H. (1977), "Towards Meritocracy? The Case of Britain." Pp.173-186 in J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey (eds.) *Power and Ideology in Education*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Halsey, A.H. *et al.* (1980), *Origins and Destinations: Family, Class, and Education in Modern Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Haug, M.E. (1977), "Measurement in Social Stratification." Pp.51-79 in *Annual Review of Sociology*. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews Inc.

Hauser, R.M. (1969), "School and the Stratification Process." *American Journal of Sociology* 74:587-600.

——(1978), "A Structural Model of the Mobility Table." *Social Forces* 56:919- 953.

Hauser, R.M. and D.L. Featherman (1973), "Trends in the Occupational Mobility of U.S. Men, 1962-1970." *American Sociological Review* 38:302-310.

Hauser, R.M. *et al.* (1975a), "Temporal Change in Occupational Mobility: Evidence for Men in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 40:279-297.

——(1975b), "Structural Change in Occupational Mobility among Men in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 40:585-598.

Hope, K. (1972), "Quantifying Constraints on Social Mobility: The Latent Hierarchies of a Contingency Table." Pp.121-190 in K. Hope (ed.) *The Analysis of Social Mobility*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

——(1980), "Trends in the Openness of British Society in the Present Century." Pp.127-170 in D.J. Treiman and R.V. Robinson (eds.) *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*. Greenwich: JAI Press.

Hout, M. (1983), *Mobility Tables*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Johnson, G.E. (1971), "Migrants and Voluntary Associations in a Colonial Chinese Setting." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University.

Jones, B. (1975), "Max Weber and the Concept of Social Class." *Sociological Review* 23:729-757.

Kerckhoff, A.C. (1974), "Stratification Processes and Outcomes in England and the U.S." *American Sociological Review* 39:789-801.

Kerckhoff, A.C. (ed.) (1980), *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization: Longitudinal Perspectives on Educational Attainment*. Greenwich: JAI Press.

Kerckhoff, A.C. *et al.* (1985), "Social Mobility in Great Britain and the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 91:281-308.

Lau, S.K. and K.F. Ho (1982), "Social Accommodation of Politics: The Case of the Young Hong Kong Workers." *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 20:172-188.

Lau, S.K. and H.C. Kuan (1988), *The Ethos of the Hong Kong Chinese*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

Lipset, S.M. and R. Bendix (1967), *Social Mobility in Industrial Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Marshall, G. *et al.* (1988), *Social Class in Modern Britain*. London: Unwin.

McClendon, M.J. (1977), "Structural and Exchange Components of Vertical Mobility." *American Sociological Review* 42:56-74.

Murphy, R. (1985), "Exploitation or Exclusion." *Sociology* 19:225-243.

Nam, C.B. and M.G. Powers (1983), *The Socioeconomic Approach to Status Measurement*. Houston: Cap and Gown Press.

National Opinion Research Center (1947), "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation." *Opinion News* IX:3-13.

Norusis, M.J. (1985), *SPSSX Advanced Statistics Guide*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Parkin, F. (1979), *Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique*. London: Tavistock.

Parsons, T. (1940), "An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification." *American Journal of Sociology* XLV:841-862.

Parsons, T. *et al.* (1951), *Towards a General Theory of Action.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Poulantzas, N. (1973), *Political Power and Social Classes.* London: New Left Books.

——(1978), *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism.* London: Verso.

Powers, M.G. (1982), "Measures of Socioeconomic Status: An Introduction." Pp.1-28 in M.G. Powers (ed.) *Measures of Socioeconomic Status: Current Issues.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Przeworski, A. (1985), *Capitalism and Social Democracy.* Cambridge University Press.

Pullum, T.W. (1975), *Measuring Occupational Inheritance.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Rae, D. *et al.* (1980), *Equality.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Sarre, P. (1989), "Recomposition of the Class Structure." Pp.78-123 in C. Hamnett, L. McDowell and P. Sarre (eds.) *The Changing Social Structure.* London: Sage.

Schultz, T.W. (1961), "Investment in Human Capital." *American Economic Review* 51:1-17.

Sewell, W.H. and R.M. Hauser (1975), *Occupation and Earning: Achievement in the Early Career.* New York: Academic Press.

Sewell, W.H., R.M. Hauser and D.L. Featherman (1976), *Schooling and Achievement in American Society.* New York: Academic Press.

Sewell, W.H., R.M. Hauser and W.C. Wolf (1980), "Sex, Schooling, and Occupational Status." *American Journal of Sociology* 86:551-583.

Sewell, W.H. and A.M. Orenstein (1965), "Community of Residence and Occupational Choice." *American Journal of Sociology* 70:551-563.

Sewell, W.H. *et al.* (1969), "The Educational and Early Occupational Attainment Process." *American Sociological Review* 34:82-92.

——(1970), "The Educational and Early Occupational Status Attainment Process: Replication and Revision." *American Sociological Review* 35:1014-1027.

Shils, E. (1968), "Deference." Pp.104-132 in J.A. Jackson (ed.) *Social Stratification.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siegel, P.M. (1971), "Prestige in the American Occupational Structure." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago.

Taeuber, K.E. and A.F. Taeuber (1965), *Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change.* Chicago: Aldine.

Tang, S.L.W. (1981), "The Differential Educational Attainment of Children: An Empirical Study of Hong Kong." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago.

Treiman, D.J. (1970), "Industrialization and Social Stratification." Pp.207-234 in E.O. Laumann (ed.) *Social Stratification: Research and Theory for the 1970s.* Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

——(1977), *Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective.* New York: Academic Press.

Treiman, D.J. and K. Terrel (1975), "The Process of Status Attainment in the United States and Great Britain." *American Journal of Sociology* 81:563-583.

Tsang, W.K. (1990), "Class Structure and Social Mobility in Hong Kong: An Analysis of 1981 Census Data." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Vanneman, R. (1977), "The Occupational Composition of American Classes: Result from Cluster Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:783-807.

Weber, M. (1969), *From Max Weber.* Translated and edited by H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills. New York: The Free Press.

——(1978), *Economy and Society.* Edited by G. Roth and C. Wittch. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wenger, M.G. (1987), "Class Closure and the Historical/Structural Limits of the Marx-Weber Convergence." Pp.43-64 in N. Wiley (ed.) *The Marx-Weber Debate.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Wright, E.O. (1978a), *Class, Crisis and the State.* London: Verso.

——(1978b), "Race, Class, and Income Inequality." *American Journal of Sociology* 83:1368-1397.

——(1979), *Class Structure and Income Determination.* New York: Academic Press.

——(1989), "A General Framework for the Analysis of Class Structure." Pp. 3-43 in E.O. Wright *et al. The Debate on Class.* London: Verso.

Wright, E.O. and L. Perrone (1977), "Marxist Class Categories and Income Inequality." *American Sociological Review* 42:32-55.

Young, M.F.D. (1958), *The Rise of Meritocracy.* Harmondworth: Penguin.

香港的階級結構

曾榮光著

（中文摘要）

在過往二十年，一系列有關香港的研究均證實，香港居民抱有一種強烈的信念，認為香港是一個充滿機會的地方，而且這些機會是依個人的成就來分配，而非取決於社會世襲。本研究旨在探討這種主觀的觀感是否一存在於香港社會結構內的客觀現實。本研究首先應用「社會地位指數」的計算方法，以量度在一九八一年人口統計中的全部職業稱號的「經濟階級位置」。建基在這個社經地位指數，本研究又應用「社會流動圖表」分析方法，以認定存在於香港社會結構的「社會階級位置」。結果，本研究展示了存在於香港社會結構背後的「階級結構化」的過程；同時證實階級位置繼承是香港社會結構中一個顯著的現象，而香港社會亦並不如其居民所感覺那般開放。